

# In Critical Solidarity

The Newsletter of the Labor and Labor Movements Section (in formation) of the ASA

Vol. 1, No. 1, Summer 2001

Section Web Page: [www.bgsu.edu/dept/soc/prof/mason/ASA](http://www.bgsu.edu/dept/soc/prof/mason/ASA)

## Officers and Council

Chair: Judy Stepan-Norris,  
University of California,  
Irvine ([jstepann@uci.edu](mailto:jstepann@uci.edu)).

Secretary-Treasurer: Dan  
Clawson, University of  
Massachusetts, Amherst  
([clawson@sadri.umass.edu](mailto:clawson@sadri.umass.edu)).

Council Member: Edna  
Bonacich, University of  
California, Riverside  
([ebonacic@wizard.ucr.edu](mailto:ebonacic@wizard.ucr.edu)).

Council Member: Fernando  
Gapasin, University of  
California, Los Angeles  
([fgapasin@ucla.edu](mailto:fgapasin@ucla.edu)).

Council Member: Howard  
Kimeldorf, University of  
Michigan  
([hkimel@umich.edu](mailto:hkimel@umich.edu)).

Council Member: Jeffrey C.  
Leiter, North Carolina State  
University  
([jeff@server.sasw.ncsu.edu](mailto:jeff@server.sasw.ncsu.edu)).

Council Member: Robert  
A. Penney, University of  
Michigan  
([rpenney@umich.edu](mailto:rpenney@umich.edu)).

Newsletter Editor:  
Kim Scipes, University of  
Illinois at Chicago  
([sscipel@icarus.cc.uic.edu](mailto:sscipel@icarus.cc.uic.edu)).

Website Manager:  
George P. Mason, Bowling  
Green State University  
([gmason@bgsu.edu](mailto:gmason@bgsu.edu)).

## Message from Section Chairperson—Judy Stepan-Norris

We have made great progress with the Section-in-formation over the past year and a half! In 1999 we put together a formal proposal for session status, gathered signatures from over 100 ASA members who said they would join the section, and were officially designated as a Section-in-formation. We met at the 2000 ASA convention to elect acting officers, and to decide on several issues concerning our future direction. The general sentiment supported a section with a meaningful connection to the labor movement, and that fostered sociological scholarship on labor and labor movements. We set our sights on enrolling 300 members by December 31, so that we would earn official section status, and be able to sponsor a couple of sessions at the upcoming 2001 ASA meetings.

Although we didn't meet our goal by December 31, we are now very close to the 300-member requirement and could reach it by the August meeting. As of mid-July, we are only 10 short of the mark! Meanwhile, we managed to obtain the sessions we hoped for (as "Regional Spotlight Sessions"), co-sponsor a session with PEWS, sponsor a one-hour Roundtable Session, and co-sponsor an ASA tour on L.A. Sweatshops. Please find the information on these activities below, and plan to attend as many as possible. Also plan to attend the business meeting, where we will be making important decisions, including electing new acting officers, discussing names for the awards we will give out in the future, and deciding on topics and organizers for next year's sessions. This year we will set the course for the future of the Section, so please plan to be there to have your say!

---

From the E	
Section Highlights, ASA Annual Meeting, Anaheim.....	3
Why Renewed Interest in the Labor Movement?--	- 6
<u>Responses:</u>	
• Edna Bonacich.....	6
• Ian Robinson.....	7
• Gay Seidman .....	7-9
UCLA's Milkman to Head UC's Institute of Labor & Employment! ...	9
Anaheim: Section Roundtables.....	10-11
Anaheim: Regional Spotlight Sessions .....	12
Scholarly Work: Publications, Grants, Awards, 2000-2002.....	13-14
Resources.....	15

## From the Editor

Welcome to the first issue of "In Critical Solidarity," the newsletter of the Labor and Labor Movements Section of the ASA. Although we are still "in formation," we hope that as a result of this year's efforts, that we can soon drop that qualifier.

Due to the hard work of a number of people, we have put together a program for Anaheim that we think will offer considerable intellectual stimulation. Because we are still short of 300 members, we did not get any panels on the program. However, Harland Preschel did an excellent job of organizing a series of roundtable presentations that we think will demonstrate the vitality of our section, and present some of the exciting research taking place in the US and around the world on the issue of labor and labor movements. Please attend the presentations, interact with the presenters and each other, and let's build this section. Details on pages 10-11.

Additionally, there are three labor-related Regional Spotlight Sessions that were added by the Program Committee to which we want to draw your attention: one on "The New Labor Movement in Los Angeles," one on "Workers Across Borders," and there is a tour of LA sweatshops. There is also a joint session developed with PEWS (Section on Political Economy of the World System) on "Globalization and Labor." Details are on page 12.

I would like to suggest a couple of "traditions" that our Section might develop as we go forth.

First, I would like to see at least one substantive article and responses in each issue. To that end, Howard Kimeldorf solicited for this issue a provocative article from Peter Evans, and responses from Edna Bonacich, Ian Robinson and Gay Seidman. Peter offers some compelling arguments and fresh ideas for labor's renewal as part of a larger dialogue with our commentators. I would like to thank Howard for soliciting the

article and arranging respondents, and I thank Peter, Edna, Ian and Gay for their contributions to this stimulating exchange.

The second "tradition" I would like to develop is sharing of resources. This has several parts. It includes listing of articles on labor/labor movements published over the past two years (2000, 2001) or accepted for publication in the future. Priority, of course, will go to listing section members' scholarly work, but hopefully we will have room to include a wide range of relevant material. We can also list other organizations, special publications, films, records, etc., that relate to our subject matter.

Along with this, we should actively promote graduate students' work. If this Section is as successful as I think it will be, we will be drawing more graduate students into our ranks. It is important that we seek grad students to join us, and encourage them to produce the best work each of them is capable of doing. Ideally, we can even begin a "mentoring" program for students in programs that are not strong in labor researchers, so that we can help develop talent whenever and wherever we find it.

As students of labor certainly know, the strength of any organization depends on the active involvement of its members. Our Section is no exception. Our immediate need is to get 300 ASA members into our Section, and although we are close, we must ensure that we cross that threshold: something everyone could do is solicit, friends, colleagues, advisees and other interested parties to join: it costs only \$5.00 a year in addition to ASA membership dues. (A great idea is for advisors to purchase initial memberships for their graduate students!)

But we need involvement over the longer term as well. Please get involved, take responsibility, and help wherever you think you can. I am sure Judy Stepan-Norris, Dan Clawson and the rest of the Council can suggest ways to move forward.

In critical solidarity,  
Kim Scipes, editor

## Section Highlights, ASA Annual Meeting, Anaheim: August 18-20, 2001

Below are events specifically organized, in whole or in part, by the Labor and Labor Movements Section-in-Formation. All sessions are listed on the ASA web site [www.asanet.org](http://www.asanet.org), under preliminary program. Locations provided were taken from this site—information was current as of July 1, 2001. Additional details are provided further in this Newsletter: Roundtables are detailed on pages 10-11, and Labor-related Regional Spotlight Sessions, Tour and the Joint Session with the Section on the Political Economy of the World System (PEWS) are listed on page 12.

- Saturday, August 18, 8:30 am: Session co-sponsored with PEWS, organized by Richard Appelbaum and Leslie Gates: **Globalization and Labor**. Event #26, to be located in Hilton Anaheim.
- Sunday, August 19, 10:30-11:30 am: **Labor and Labor Movements Roundtables**, organized by Harland Prechel. Event #204, to be located in Hilton Anaheim.
- Sunday, August 19, 11:30 am-12:30 pm: **Labor and Labor Movements Business Meeting**. Following the Roundtables in the same location.
- Sunday, August 19, 2:30 pm: Regional Spotlight Session organized by Ruth Milkman: **The New Labor Movement in Los Angeles: Achievements and Prospects**. Event #257, to be located in the Anaheim Convention Center.
- Monday, August 20, 10:00 am- 4:00 pm: **Sweat Shop Tour** organized by Ku-Sup Chin and Robert Ross.
- Monday, August 20, 2:30 pm: Regional Spotlight Session organized by Fernando Gapasin: **Workers Across Borders**. Event #374, to be located in the Anaheim Convention Center.

We hope to provide updates on the Section Web Page: [www.bgsu.edu/dept/soc/prof/mason/ASA](http://www.bgsu.edu/dept/soc/prof/mason/ASA), but if not available there, please go to the ASA site [www.asanet.org](http://www.asanet.org).

---

Because there is considerable membership overlap with our Section and the Labor Studies Division of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, and as a sign of solidarity, Labor-related events at the SSSP Conference are listed:

### Labor Studies Division, SSSP-sponsored events:

- Friday, August 17, 9:00 -10:45 am: Theorizing Global Activism. (This is a joint session with the Labor Studies Division and the Social Problems Theory Division.)
- Saturday, August 18, 11:00 am -12:45 pm: Author Meets Critics. Howard Kimeldorf, [Battling for American Labor: Wobblies, Craft Workers and the Making of the Union Movement](#) and Ching Kwan Lee, [The South China Miracle: Two Worlds of Factory Women](#). Organized by Heidi Gottfried.
- Saturday, August 18, 1:00 -2:45 pm: Labor, Immigrant Issues and Globalization, organized by Fernando Gapasin.
- Sunday, August 19, 9:00 -10:45 am: The Future of the American Labor Movement: Strategic Directions organized by Bruce Nissen and Lars Christiansen.

SCHOLARLY EXCHANGE:**Why Renewed Interest in the Labor Movement?**

--Peter Evans

Why should there be a resurgence of interest in the labor movement? Why now? In the United States, the new AFL-CIO leadership has been unable to stem the decline of union membership. In 2000, only 9% of private sector workers were union members, the lowest proportion since 1902. Simply extrapolating current numerical trends makes the union member a more likely candidate for extinction than the California condor, and the labor movement a depressing subject for inquiry. Why then is there a growing interest in the labor movement? The answer lies in the fact that the same trends that beleaguer the labor movement have also transformed it. It has been forced to think of itself again as a social movement rather than a secure mutual benevolent society. Strategies, internal character and, perhaps most important, its position vis a vis other groups have changed in a way that has brought labor once again to the forefront of progressive social action.

The transformation is easiest to see if we compare the U.S. labor movement in the year 2000 with the popular pejorative caricature of what the movement looked like 40 years ago when the unionized proportion of the private labor force was at its peak along with the relative economic situation of union members. In the popular 1960's caricature, the average union member was a white male earning a comfortable income, patriotic and therefore opposed both to his sons' and daughters' opposition to the Vietnam War and to the communists who seemed so prominent in the labor movements of the Third World, comfortable in a patriarchal world and therefore unsympathetic to issues of gender equality or women's rights. The caricature was, of course, unfair. The relative economic security that had been achieved over the course of the prior half century was never secure. Defending it always required rank and file militancy. Equally

important, there were always innovative new ideas percolating in the ranks of labor. For example, the relative comfort of the 1960's also witnessed the organizing breakthroughs of the United Farm Workers. Nonetheless, the labor movement as an institution seemed to have been accepted as part of the status quo.

Today, not even the most jaundiced observer could claim that the labor movement is a comfortable part of the status quo. Jobs in unionized industries shrink, and the bargaining power of workers in these industries is undermined by the increased mobility of capital. Job growth is in industries where unions have a weak foothold. The jobs and living standards of unionized workers no longer seem secure. The changes go beyond wages, working conditions, and new challenges to organizing. The labor movement's constituency is changing. In 2000, a clear majority of union members are women and/or minorities. From 1999 to 2000 while the number of men in unions was shrinking by almost 400,000 the number of women union members grew by 150,000. Immigrant workers (many of them undocumented) are at the forefront of emblematic organizing campaigns like Justice for Janitors.

As constituencies and conditions change, tactics and ideologies change along with them. To ignore "women's issues" like child care is to ignore the issues of a growing share of the membership. When immigrant workers are a central labor constituency, immigrant rights become integral to workers' rights. All of these changes expand the overlap between the labor movement's agenda and the agenda's of other social movements. Organizing campaigns revolve more around a language of justice and dignity. Building relations with communities becomes as important as shutting down production. Social movement unionism begins to replace bread and butter unionism.

The dynamics unleashed by greater vulnerability and changing constituencies expand the common ground that labor shares with other social movements. The potential for new alliances that flows from this common ground is only beginning to be explored, but it is

one of the things that generates new excitement about the labor movement. Once labor is thought of as an ally for a broad array of social movements, the potential magnitude of its contribution to common campaigns is striking. Sixteen million may be an historic low for the labor movement, but in relation to other social movements, it is a huge membership. Relative to NGOs, whose members' involvement sometimes consists primarily writing a small, once-a-year check, the labor movement also stands out. Labor issues are central to members' lives at least eight to ten hours a day, every working day. Membership demands real collective action and shared risks. Only a small minority of militant and dedicated members of other social movements experience the same level of involvement.

"Globalization" adds another dimension to the changing role of the labor movement in struggles over social change. The accelerated movement of production and jobs across national boundaries undoubtedly subjects workers to increased insecurity and erodes labor's bargaining power. Yet, at the same time, the redefinition of political conflict that accompanies globalization reinforces the political centrality of the labor movement's oppositional role.

Globalization is only partly about geography. The underlying thrust of the "globalization" agenda is aggressively subordinating an ever wider range of social relationships to the logic of market transactions and trying to make decision-making power synonymous with market power. New governance mechanisms like NAFTA, the WTO and the FTAA don't just open up borders, they make access to decision-making depend on market assets rather than citizenship rights. To begin with, these organizations and agreements are the sites in which the rules of globalization are written. As sites, they are accessible to a restricted set of officials from member governments and a broad range of legal input from private economic actors. Even the limited democratic input that could be provided by public debate and input from elected representatives is lacking. Once the rules are

written, implementation follows the same pattern. The confidential tribunals which adjudicate compensation to investors under NAFTA's "Chapter 11" are archetypal of the shift. Investors who feel that national laws infringe on their right to make profits can appoint arbiters, who together with others appointed by government officials (without any specific accountability) decide how the rules should be implemented. In the fora of global governance, citizens and societal interests have no standing.

Environmentalists trying to save trees and turtles or Third World women protesting the blind market logic of "structural adjustment" programs are both asserting claims that transcend the logic of market allocation. The aggressive assertion by both corporations and global governance institutions that "investor rights" take precedence over all other claims leaves these social movements confronting essentially the same logic of decision-making that workers negotiating with corporate managements have always confronted. Thus, globalization expands further the common ground that labor shares with other social movements.

Recognizing that globalization is about who has access to decision-making is also important to globalizing the labor movement itself. With 163 million members worldwide, the organized labor movement is one of the largest potential transnational actors. As long as globalization is seen simply in terms of the geographic mobility of jobs, its consequence is to increase the competition among workers in different locations around the world. Once conflicts are defined as being about who gets to participate in making global economic rules, labor movements share a common interest in democratization regardless of their geographic location. Building transnational solidarity around the shared agenda of democratizing control over global rule-making gives the labor movement the possibility of "re-scaling" itself to operate on a global scale comparable to its corporate adversaries.

Like the opportunities for building alliances with other social movements, the labor movement's opportunity to build ties across geographic boundaries stems from the same features of the contemporary political economy that threaten its existence. It is the powerful combination of threat and opportunity that makes today's labor movement exciting to analysts and activists alike. Potentially, labor's response could enable it to transcend old divisions and become the core of a broad transformative movement to reestablish the primacy of social goals and democratic governance. A response less innovative, imaginative and determined will leave labor marginalized as a social force –just as recent statistical trends predict, and leave other social movements without the key ally that they need to challenge the dominance of market logic. No wonder there is renewed interest in the labor movement.

---

### Visions for the Labor Movement

--Edna Bonacich

Peter Evans' description of the changing situation of the labor movement is provocative. He shows how the increased vulnerability of labor, and its changing constituencies, are pushing the movement in a direction that many people have long felt it needed to move: away from the complacency of power, away from support for Cold War politics abroad, and towards becoming a movement once again, especially one that participates in a broad, social justice coalition. In other words, Evans' analysis demonstrates how the changes in the labor movement are embedded in forces that are pressuring the movement both from within and without.

Evans also makes the excellent point that organized labor remains one of the most powerful actors on the side of progressive causes. NGOs and community groups may be more democratic and more sensitive to race and gender issues, but they can hardly mobilize the kind of force represented by 16 million union members in the United States, and 163 million worldwide. No other progressive organization

### Bonacich (con't.)

comes close to this level of membership and potential for coordinated opposition.

In discussing the role that the labor movement can play in globalization, Evans states that the basic conflict is "about who gets to participate in making global economic rules," and that all labor movements have a shared interest in democratization. To what ends is this democratization aimed? What rules does labor want to create? Or rather, as supporters of labor, what rules would we like to see the movement fight for?

It seems to me that we can approach this question from two points of view, following a division that has plagued the labor movement from its birth. One approach is to accept the inevitability of capitalism, and to try to win as much for working people (including women, people of color, and immigrants, and extended to cover the poor and unemployed) as possible. This has been the tradition of the US labor movement establishment and, of course, it has won significant gains. Under globalization, the goal would be to establish a kind of global welfare state, with a minimum (or living) wage, health and safety provisions, environmental safeguards, and the protection of the right to organize and bargain collectively. The concepts embodied in the US Fair Labor Standards Act and the National Labor Relations Act, or some stronger set of similar principles, could be fought for, providing institutional support for achieving real improvements for workers.

The second approach questions whether this approach is fundamentally flawed. The Welfare State in Western societies has been seriously undermined because of a crisis in capitalism that led the giant corporations to reassert their power and demand a higher level of profitability. The class struggle has not been this clear for a number of decades. Capital is determined to crush labor and demolish unions. Is an accommodation possible, given the logic of the system? And if not, then what? Luckily, I have run out of my 500 words. But this is one question that follows from Peter Evans' essay.

## Comment on Evans' "Why Renewed Interest in the Labor Movement?"

--Ian Robinson

I strongly agree with much of what Evans argues. To improve upon the insights he offers, we need to move beyond the aggregate level. It is true, for example, that most U.S. union members are now women and/or minorities. But this has been true of the (public and private) service sector unions for twenty years, while little has changed in most building trades and manufacturing sector unions over the same period. What the aggregate data signify, then, is the rise of the service sector unions. In the 1980s, for the first time, the membership of these unions exceeded that of manufacturing and building trades unions combined. The growing weight of these unions is likely to continue. What does this imply for the evolution of labor movement politics?

Despite their similar membership demographics and their relative insulation from economic globalization, there are major political differences among these unions. The SEIU, AFSCME and the Teamsters were at the core of the New Voice coalition that made John Sweeney the AFL-CIO President in 1995; the UFCW, HERE, and CWA backed the Old Guard candidate. Within four years of that historic showdown, changes in their top leaders reversed the alignment of the Teamsters and HERE in AFL-CIO politics. It has been many years since we have seen such political volatility within unions, and such divergence in union strategies for responding to current challenges.

Political struggles, within major unions and among rival coalitions of affiliates, will determine whether the potential that Evans identifies at the end of his essay will be realized. We need to better understand the factors that shape the outcomes of these conflicts.

---

## Response to Peter Evans' Essay

--Gay W. Seidman

Peter Evans' essay serves as a refreshing reminder of labor's potential contribution as a

## Seidman (con't.)

social actor: in contemporary discussions of globalization, "labor" is more likely to appear as a factor of production than as a reference to workers or their organizations. But historically, labor activism has always been transnational. A discourse of international labor solidarity was already well-established by the end of the nineteenth century, articulating a universalist appeal that was expected to transcend borders and underpin a new social order. And as Peter reminds us, as long as the voices of workers and their communities are ignored or silenced, globalization will continue to marginalize whole segments of the world's population: a transnational workers' movement could serve as the core of a democratic challenge to the current exclusionary pattern.

But perhaps, as sociologists, we should examine labor's promise more cautiously, developing a research agenda that could strengthen a transnational vision without obscuring difficulties. Labor's global history is not unproblematic. While organized labor often speaks the language of international solidarity, labor's actions have often reflected a more narrowly-defined nationalism, as labor federations protect workers' immediate interests rather than longer-term goals. In the last century, European labor unions supported imperialist campaigns and colonial projects; in the United States, unions often led campaigns to restrict immigration or to impose segregation. After World War II, American unions purged themselves of internationalists as part of a cold war re-orientation, allying themselves with American foreign policy and supporting conservative unionists around the world. During the cold war, international labor organizations routinely called on workers of the world to unite, but they frequently helped them to untie.

Today, unions struggle to develop an internationalist vision. Militant unionists in recent struggles from South Korea to Nigeria have explicitly distinguished between workers, representing citizens (especially male ones), while excluding migrants, women, and unskilled workers. Even in South Africa, where

Seidman (con't.)

progressive unionists are acutely aware of the dangers posed by exclusionary unionism, unions officials face xenophobic pressures from members who see immigrants from the rest of Africa as competitors in an already-flooded labor market. Even when workers' interests are redefined to include broad issues like democracy, inclusion, or childcare, nationalism remains an all-too-easy choice.

Organizational dynamics also impede transnationalism. Union leaders are accustomed to working within a single national framework, within national laws and institutions that have few international parallels. Sectoral 'internationals' are rarely capable of mobilizing real support. Ordinary union bureaucrats are generally stretched thin, focused on more immediate problems than those of building long-term links with workers around the globe; even with new technologies like email and faxes, constructing meaningful international links takes time, money, translators, energy—resources that few unionists have to spare, especially in poorer nations. Where international links between unions exist, they usually stem from the work of small groups of committed activists—and even then, one can question how deep these linkages go. Creative attempts to find new bases for transnational union activism, such as organizing workers internationally by sector, by multinational employer, or by links along a commodity chain, have had little impact. How much international contact has to take place before a majority of union members redefine their identities, privileging international worker solidarity?

Perhaps unions are not the best vehicle for expressing an internationalist vision; perhaps when Peter suggests that labor could challenge the terms of globalization, he is really speaking of 'labor' more broadly, with workers acting as citizens rather than as union members. But even so, there may be persistent differences across national lines, stemming as much from differences in structural location as from simple organizational patterns. Aside from workers' perceptions that they are engaged in a global

competition for new investment—since jobs that “move” from Los Angeles to Mexico could be seen as creating new jobs for Mexican workers—how far do the concerns of workers in Central America really coincide with those of workers in Milwaukee? At what point might they diverge, impeding a common project?

Consider a basic aspect of the contemporary global economy: pressures from the WTO and the IMF have forced governments in developing countries to lower protective tariffs and slash subsidies, opening their markets to international competition and privatizing state-run companies. Workers from Brazil to Zambia are experiencing drastic insecurity, as economic restructuring creates new volatility in sectors once relatively privileged by state development strategies—a volatility often worsened by the elimination of hard-won legal protections for workers, in the name of increasing labor-market flexibility to attract investment.

Democratization of international bodies could create welcome possibilities for workers' voices, but we should remember that those voices may not speak in harmony: will unions in industrialized countries be willing to support the restoration of protective barriers in developing countries or to provide subsidies to developing countries' industries, if those tariff barriers restrict potential export markets? Conversely, how will workers in developing countries respond to persistent efforts by workers in industrialized regions to retain skilled, higher-paid jobs—particularly when those efforts are all-too-often phrased in terms which imply that less-educated third world workers are less skilled, less productive or less worthy?

Labor standards and codes of conduct, too, may look very different to workers in China than to those in Detroit. Who sets the standards, and along what lines? Who would monitor the implementation of labor standards and codes, and will those monitors acknowledge all the local, contextual variations involved in defining labor-related concerns? And, if labor standards

Seidman (con't.)

were to be embedded in trade treaties, who would ensure that such standards are not invoked for the wrong reasons, to undermine trading partners' sovereignty rather than to protect workers? How could poorer nations, with insignificant economic clout, enforce labor standards on anyone else—or is this to be a one-way process, where rich countries, whose workers are also global consumers, use their market clout to enforce standards upon the rest of the world? How can the democratic institutions that Peter envisages create standards that would be universally-applicable, but still respect international variation—and simultaneously address and ameliorate existing international inequalities?

I raise these questions not out of cynicism, but because I think that, as sociologists, we might be able to help: as Weber once noted, sociologists who acknowledge and explore 'inconvenient facts' can help political projects, offering alternative interpretations and directions. Perhaps if we analyze carefully examples of transnational activism – both successes and failures – unionists could better build transnational links; perhaps if we could offer alternative understandings of the working of the global economy, workers in different parts of the world would stop interpreting their interests in competitive terms. Before we can really imagine a democratic transnational labor movement, there is much work to be done.

### UCLA's Milkman to Head UC's Institute for Labor & Employment!

Professor Ruth Milkman of UCLA has been chosen to head the University of California's exciting new Institute for Labor and Employment. The Institute for Labor and Employment (ILE) is a new multi-campus research program devoted to studying, and finding solutions for, problems of labor and employment in California and the nation. It expands upon the existing Institutes of Industrial Relations (IIRs) at UC Berkeley and UCLA, which were founded in 1945, and on the two Centers for Labor Research and Education housed in the IIRs on those two campuses. The ILE itself is based at UCLA and UC Berkeley, but draws on and supports faculty, academic staff, and students throughout all the campuses in the UC system, sponsoring a variety of employment-related research and service activities.

The ILE's immediate research agenda focuses on the "new economy," "new labor," and "new workers" in California. It promotes research on economic policy that can help forge a new social contract appropriate to the recent technological and organizational transformations in the state's workplaces; on the revitalization of the organized labor movement that is currently underway and which has been particularly visible in California; and on the role of immigrant workers who are well represented in California's labor force. Initial work includes:

- **An Annual Report on the state of California Labor.** ILE will publish an annual report on the California workforce. These data and other ILE-sponsored research will be the basis for a widely accessible report on the situation of labor in the state.
- **Needs Assessment.** The ILE has commissioned a needs assessment that will review the employment policy concerns of decision-makers and stakeholders throughout the state.
- **Faculty Research.** ILE funds a wide variety of research projects by UC faculty and academic staff on labor and employment trends and problems.
- **California Union Leadership School.** The UCLA and UC Berkeley Labor Centers are establishing a new school for union leaders.

Our congratulations to Ruth for taking on this most timely and important role! Our Section will be eager to help in any way that we can.

**Session Roundtables on Labor, Labor Movements, and Changed Working Conditions**

Organizer: Harland Prechel, Texas A&amp;M University

1. Contingent Labor Markets. Table Presider: *Patricia Adler*, University of Colorado.
  - *Patricia Adler* and *Peter Adler*, University of Colorado, “Seasonality and the Ethnic Stratification of Contingency Labor.”
  - *Leann Tigges* and *Randi Cartmill*, University of Wisconsin, “Employee Benefits and Contingency in Local Labor Markets: Consequences for Contingent and Noncontingent Workers.”
2. Comparative Perspectives: Globalization and Labor. Table Presider: *Litao Zhao*, Stanford University.
  - *Joe Bandy*, Bowdoin College, “Enforcing Liberation: The Repression of Labor Movements in Mexico’s Export- Processing Zones.”
  - *Sook-hyun Yoon*, Fukui Prefectural University, “Comparative Study of Underlying Principles of Management in Japan and Korea.”
  - *Litao Zhao*, Stanford University, “Human Capital, Political Capital and Family Business: The Market Transition Debate Revisited.”
3. Comparative and Historical Analyses of Labor. Table Presider: *Christopher Rhomberg*, Yale University.
  - *Christopher Rhomberg*, Yale University, “Hegemony by Exclusion: Keeping Working Class Insurgency Under Wraps in Oakland in the 1930s.”
  - *Guillermo Grenier* and *Bruce Nissen*, Florida International University, “Comparative Union Response to Mass Immigration: The Case of Miami.”
4. Historical Analyses of Unions and Strategies to Control Labor. Table Presider: *Jane Poulsen*, University of Connecticut.
  - *Kim Scipes*, University of Illinois at Chicago, “Theorizing Ideological forms of Economic Trade Unionism in North America: A Comparative Empirical Test –Unions in Chicago’s Steel and Meatpacking Industries and Their Approach to Race Relations, 1936-1954.”
  - *Adriana Leela Bohm*, “Do Jointness Programs Ameliorate Racial Tensions? The UAW and Race, 1936-2000.
  - *Jane Poulsen*, University of Connecticut, “An Uneasy Stability: Reinterpreting the Postwar Accord in the U.S. Coal Mining and Tire Manufacturing Industries, 1950-1970.”
5. Families and the New Labor Market: Problems and Solutions. Table Presider: *April Brayfield*, Tulane University.
  - *Sue Mennino*, *Beth Rubin*, and *April Brayfield*, Tulane University, “What Makes a Company Family Friendly: The Impact of Workplace Culture, Family Benefits, and Flextime on Home-to-Job and Job-to-Home Spillover.”
  - *Dan Clawson*, University of Massachusetts, “To Win Childcare, We Need Unions.”
6. The Contemporary Labor Movement: Strategies for Organizing. Table Presider: *Roland Zullo*, University of Michigan.
  - *Roland Zullo*, University of Michigan, “Testing the Impact of Union Political Activism.”
  - *Christopher Langford*, Texas A&M University, “Labor Organizing Hispanic Workers in the Meatpacking Industry in Omaha.”
  - *Leslie Bunnage* and *Judy Stepan-Norris*, University of California Irvine, “Union Summer Campaigns: Determinants of Success and Failure.”

7. Theoretical Considerations: Process and Structure in the Workplace. Table President: *Jonathan Isler*, University of California Davis.
  - *Jonathan Isler*, University of California Davis, “Constructing Solidarity: A Dialectical.”
  - *Silvia Dorado*, University of Massachusetts, “The Entrepreneurial Process: Lifting ‘theoretical’ blinders.”
  - *Ruth Rubinson*, Fashion Institute of Technology, “Parallel Structure of Authority.”
8. Organizational Flexibility versus Workers’ Flexibility. Table President: *Nancy Plankey Videla*, University of Wisconsin Madison.
  - *Cynthia Cranford*, University of Southern California. “Contesting Gendered and Racialized Flexibility in the City: Organizing Justice for Janitors in Los Angeles.”
  - *Rob Mackin* and *Nancy Plankey Videla*, University of Wisconsin Madison, “Flexible for Whom? Turnover and Industrial Upgrading.”
  - *George Gonos*, SUNY Potsdam, “Private Staffing Agencies as Company-Dominated Unions.”
9. Risk and Changing Conditions of Professional Labor. Table President: *Jennifer Von Steele*, Stanford University.
  - *Jonathan Gabe*, *David Denney*, *Raymond Lee*, *Mary Ann Elston*, and *Maria O’Beirne*, University of London, “Risk, Fear and Work Related Violence.”
  - *Jennifer Von Steele*, Stanford University, “A Case Study of Pro Bono Legal Services: Policies, Attitudes, and Work in a New Jersey Law Firm.”
  - *Jason Owen-Smith*, Stanford University, “Accumulative Advantage Across Public and Private Science: Explaining Trends in University Patent.”
10. Organizational Change and the Transformation of Work. Table President: *Mary Ingram*, University of California Santa Barbara.
  - *Marek Korczynski*, Loughborough University, “Service Work Organization: The Customer-Oriented Bureaucracy.”
  - *Mary Ingram*, University of California Santa Barbara, “The Paradox of Consulting: Agents of Change and Conformity.”
  - *Emily Barman*, University of Chicago, “Temporality in the Sociological Study of Organizations.”
  - *Wubiao Zhou*, Cornell University, “Types and Dynamics of Organizational Change.”
11. Restructuring Incentive Systems: Workplace Change and Compensation. Table President: *Doug Krause*, Rutgers University.
  - *Yang Yang*, Duke University, “Sectors and Occupations: An Analysis of Wage and Growth in Returns from Employer Changes.”
  - *Joseph Blasi* and *Doug Krause*, Rutgers University, “The Implications of Pay Patterns and High Performance Work Systems for Unions and Collective Bargaining.”
  - *Karen McCue*, University of New Mexico, “Economic Democracy? Worker Capitalism? Are ESOPs a New Organizational Form?”
12. Black Employment Opportunities and Constraints in the New Economy. Table President: *Natasha S. Varn-Davis*, University of California Irvine.
  - *Natasha S. Varn-Davis*, University of California Irvine, “Marital Status Differences in Black Women’s Employment.”
  - *Susan Turner Meiklejohn*, Hunter College, “It is Happening Here: Suburban Harassment of Black Residents of Detroit.”

## **REGIONAL SPOTLIGHT SESSIONS**

### **Session #257: The New Labor Movement in Los Angeles: Achievements and Prospects**

Sunday, August 19<sup>th</sup>, 10:30 AM, Anaheim Convention Center

Organizer and Presider: Ruth Milkman, University of California at Los Angeles and UC Institute for Labor and Employment.

- “The Justice for Janitors Campaign in Los Angeles.” Stephanie Arellano, Organizer, Service Employees International Union, Local 1877.
- “The Power of Community in Labor Organizing.” Peter Olney, Director of Organizing, International Longshore and Warehouse Union.
- “Labor and Politics in Los Angeles.” Harold Meyerson, Executive Editor, *LA Weekly*.
- Discussant: Marshall Ganz, Harvard University.

### **Session #374: Workers Across Borders**

Monday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 10:30 AM, Anaheim Convention Center

Organizer and Presider: Fernando E. Gapasin, University of California at Los Angeles

- To be announced. Ralph Armbruster-Sandoval, University of California at Santa Barbara.
- “Monitoring the Consumer-Producer Divide: Solidarity Efforts in the Anti-Sweatshop Movement.” Jill Esbenshade, University of California at Berkeley.
- “Working Class Solidarity Across Borders.” David Bacon, Journalist/Photographer.
- “Hands Across the Border.” Haydee Urita, University of California at Los Angeles and ENLACE; and Veronica Carrasales, University of California at Los Angeles and ENLACE.
- Discussant: Ben Hensler, AFL-CIO Solidarity Center, Washington, D.C.

### **Tour #6: Sweat Shops**

Monday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 10:00 AM. Bus/walking tour of Los Angeles’ Fashion District and Related Areas. Limited to 30 participants. See program for more details.

Organizers: Ku-Sup Chin and Robert J.S. Ross.

### **Joint Session: PEWS and Labor and Labor Movements Section-in-Formation**

**Session # 26: Globalization and Labor:** Saturday, August 18<sup>th</sup>, 8:30 AM, Hilton Anaheim.

Organizers and Presiders: Richard P. Appelbaum, University of California at Santa Barbara and Leslie C. Gates, University of Arizona.

- “Implications of the Globalization of Industry for the US Labor Movement: Towards a True Internationalism.” Edna Bonacich, University of California at Riverside.
- “Twenty-first Century Labor Movements in World Historical Perspectives.” Beverly Silver, Johns Hopkins University.
- “Regionalization, Migration and Labor Unrest in China.” Young-Jin Choi, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- “The None Too Invisible Hand of Global Capitalist Restructuring: Chinese Privatization and State-Owned Enterprise Workers’ Collective Self-Organization.” Stephen Pillion, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

## **Section Members' Scholarly Work: Publications, Grants, Awards, 2000-2002**

Multiple-authored publications are listed only once, and by first author.

(Graduate Students and Post-Doctorates denoted in **BOLD**.)

### **Anner, Mark S.**

- 2000. "Local and Transnational Campaigns to End Sweatshop Practices" in Michael Gordon and Lowell Turner, eds. *Transnational Cooperation Among Trade Union*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. Pp. 238-255.
- 2001. "Labor and Economic Globalization in Eastern Europe and Latin America." *Labor Studies Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 1, Spring: 22-41.
- 2000. "The International Trade Union Campaign for Core Labor Standards in the WTO." *Working USA: The Journal of Labor and Society*, 4(5), Summer.
- 2002. "Segmented Production, Networked Solidarity: Labor Transnationalism in the Latin American Auto and Apparel Industries." Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University.

Arrighi, Giovanni. 2000. (see Silver, Beverly.)

Brown, Cliff.

- 2000. "The Role of Employers in Split Labor Markets: An Event-Structure Analysis of Responses to AFL Organizing in Gary and Chicago, 1917-1919." *Social Forces* 79 (2): 653-681.
- and John Brueggemann. 2000. "Strategic Labor Organizing in the Era of Industrial Transformation: A Comparative Analysis of Steel and Coal, 1870-1916." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 32 (4): 541-576.

Bruggeman, John. 2000. (see Brown, Cliff.)

Clawson, Dan. 2001. (see Gerstel, Naomi.)

Cornfield, Daniel B. and Randy Hodson (editors). 2002. Worlds of Work: Building an International Sociology of Work. New York: Plenum.

**Cranford, Cynthia.** 2001. "Labor, Gender and the Politics of Citizenship: Organizing Justice for Janitors in Los Angeles." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Southern California.

Dreiling, Michael. 2001. Solidarity and Contention: The Politics of Class and Sustainability in the Conflict over NAFTA. New York: Garland.

Eimer, Stuart. 2001. (see Ness, Immanuel.)

Rick Fantasia.

- 2001. "The Myth of the Labor Movement" in Judith R. Blau (ed.) The Blackwell Companion to Sociology. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- "Dictature Sur le Proletariat: Strategies de repression et travail aux Etats-Unis." ["Dictatorship Over the Proletariat: Strategies of Repression and Work in the United States".] *ACTES de la recherche en sciences sociales* 138, Juin 2001: 3-19.

Fonow, Mary Margaret. 2002) Forging Feminism in Steel: Women's Activism in the United Steelworkers of America. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gerstel, Naomi and Dan Clawson. 2001. "Union Responses to Family Concerns," *Social Problems* 48 (2) May.

Hodson, Randy.

- 2000. "Disorganized, Unilateral and Participative Organizations: New Insights from the Ethnographic Literature." *Industrial Relations* 40 (2) April.
- (editor). 2000. Marginality, Volume 9 in Research in the Sociology of Work. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.
- 2001. Alumni Award for Distinguished Teaching, Ohio State University.
- 2001. Dignity at Work. London: Cambridge University Press.
- and Teresa A. Sullivan. 2001. The Social Organization of Work, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- 2002. (see Cornfield, Daniel B.)

- National Science Foundation, "Analyzing Organizational Ethnographies" January 2002 to December 2003. P.I.: Randy Hodson.
- McCammon, Holly J. 2001. "Labor's Legal Mobilization: Why and When Do Workers File Unfair Labor Practices?" *Work and Occupations* 28 (2):143-175.
- Ness, Immanuel and Stuart Eimer, ed. 2001. Central Labor Councils and the Revival of American Unionism. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Prechel, Harland. 2000. Big Business and the State: Historical Transitions and Corporate Transformation, 1880s-1990s. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rudy, Preston.**
- 2001. Dissertation Fellowship, Institute for Labor and Employment, University of California.
- 2002. "Labor, Globalization and Repertoires of Contention: A Comparison of Justice for Janitors in Three California Cities." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at Davis.
- Scipes, Kim.**
- 2000. "Detrimental Development: The Global Economic Crisis and the Philippines." *Indicator South Africa: The Barometer of Social Trends* [University of Natal, Durban], Vol. 17, No. 1, March: 87-90.
- 2000. "Book Review: Taking Care of Business: Samuel Gompers, George Meany, Lane Kirkland, and the Tragedy of American Labor by Paul Buhle." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 105, No. 6, May: 1772-1774.
- 2000. "It's Time to Come Clean: Open the AFL-CIO Archives on International Labor Operations." *Labor Studies Journal*, Vol. 25, No. 2, Summer: 4-25
- 2001. First Prize, Graduate Student Paper Competition, Conflict, Social Action and Change Division, Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP) for paper, "Theorizing Ideological Forms of Economic Trade Unionism in North America: A Comparative Empirical Test--Unions in Chicago's Steel and Meatpacking Industries and Their Approaches to Race Relations, 1936-1954."
- 2001. Rue Bucher Memorial Award for Graduate Student Qualitative Research Proposal, University of Illinois at Chicago.
- 2001-2002. University Fellowship. University of Illinois at Chicago.
- 2002. "Business versus Social Unionism: Trade Union Conceptualizations in Chicago's Steel and Meatpacking Industries and Their Effects on Racial Oppression, 1933 to 1955." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Shostak, Arthur B., ed. 2001. The CyberUnion Handbook: Transforming Labor through Computer Technology. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Silver, Beverly and Giovanni Arrighi. 2000. "Workers North and South". Socialist Register 2001: Working Classes, Global Realities (edited by Leo Panitch and Colin Leys). New York: Monthly Review Press: 53-76.
- Stepan-Norris, Judith and Maurice Zeitlin. 2002. Left Out: Reds and America's Industrial Unions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sullivan, Teresa A. (see Hodson, Randy.)
- Zeitlin, Maurice.
- and L. Frank Weyher. 2001. "'Black and White, Unite and Fight': Interracial Working-class Solidarity and Black/White Employment Equality," *American Journal of Sociology*, September 2001.
- 2002. (see Stepan-Norris, Judith.)

## Call for Papers

*Work and Occupations* is seeking papers. *WO* is a scholarly, sociological quarterly that publishes original research in the sociology of work, employment, labor, and social inequality in the workplace, labor market, and labor force. For details, contact Dan Cornfield, editor, [daniel.b.cornfield@vanderbilt.edu](mailto:daniel.b.cornfield@vanderbilt.edu).

## RESOURCES

Below are some resources that may be of interest to Section members, but are not generally well-known. Although not a systematic listing, it is hoped that future issues of *In Critical Solidarity* will include additional resources for all of us. Please send any listing that you would like considered for the next issue to the Editor, Kim Scipes, at [sscipe1@icarus.cc.uic.edu](mailto:sscipe1@icarus.cc.uic.edu). Thank you!

- **RC 44, Labor Movements Research Committee**, International Sociological Association (ISA). The Research Committee's mission is to encourage international research on labour movements, with a focus on their role both in industrial relations and in the political arena. Membership is open to any person engaged in research into Labour Movements or in Labour Movement activities. For further information, please contact the Secretary and Newsletter Editor, Professor Edward Webster at the Sociology of Work Program, Witswatersrand University, Johannesburg at [029edw@muse.wits.ac.za](mailto:029edw@muse.wits.ac.za). The ISA will be having their next World Congress of Sociology in July 2002 in Brisbane, Australia.
- **Labor Studies Division, Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP)**. This Division annually sponsors the Harry Braverman Award for the best graduate student paper(s) in Labor Studies. To get involved in the Division, please contact the Chair of the Division, Heidi Gottfried, Wayne State University, at [Heidi.Gottfried@wayne.edu](mailto:Heidi.Gottfried@wayne.edu).
- **United Association for Labor Education (UALE)**. Members of UALE include union- and university-based labor educators. (UALE was founded in 2000, in a merger of Workers Education Local 189 and the University and College Labor Educators Association.) It organizes an annual labor educators' conference in conjunction with the AFL-CIO, and publishes a quarterly journal, *Labor Studies Journal*, that primarily addresses contemporary issues facing today's labor movement (The editors describe the journal as being "multidisciplinary" and "which seeks submission based on research about work, workers, labor organizations, and labor studies and worker education in the US and internationally"). *Labor Studies Journal* is being upgraded, has two new co-editors, Paul Jarley of the University of Kentucky and Bruce Nissen, Florida International University, and a new editorial board. For more information, contact Paul at [pjarl2@pop.uky.edu](mailto:pjarl2@pop.uky.edu). The journal recently did an issue on "Unions in the Global Economy" (Spring 2001)— this and other back issues are available from Sarah Etherton, Managing Editor, at [setherto@wva.edu](mailto:setherto@wva.edu).
- ***Mobilization, An International Journal*** is one of the premier journals devoted to research on social movements around the world. Its editor, Hank Johnston, is particularly eager to consider papers on labor. For further information, please contact Hank at [Hank.Johnston@sdsu.edu](mailto:Hank.Johnston@sdsu.edu).
- **Illinois Labor History Society (ILHS)**. This is one of the premier labor history repositories in the country, with a website that might be of interest: [www.kentlaw.edu/ilhs](http://www.kentlaw.edu/ilhs). The mission of the ILHS is "to encourage the preservation and study of labor history materials of the Illinois Region, and to arouse public interest in the profound significance of the past to the present." They have a US labor history curriculum that is available, as well as a number of labor-related books (Illinois and elsewhere) that can be ordered.
- **Chicago Historical Society**. Interested in the Haymarket Events? Check out the new CHS website, which includes thousands of contemporary documents from 1886-87 that are currently on-line, and are located at the Haymarket Affair Digital Collection, [www.chicagohistory.org/hadc/index.html](http://www.chicagohistory.org/hadc/index.html).