

In Critical Solidarity

Newsletter of the American Sociological Association's Section on Labor and Labor Movements

Volume 8, Number 2

July 2008

Co-Chairs

Edna Bonacich

University of California Riverside

Jill Ebenshade

San Diego State University

Chair-Elect

Michael Schwartz

Stony Brook University, SUNY

Past Chair

Rick Fantasia

Smith College

Secretary-Treasurer

Bruce A. Nissen

Florida International University

Council

Carolina Bank Muñoz

Brooklyn College, CUNY

Jennifer J. Chun

University of British Columbia

Steven H. Lopez

Ohio State University

Student Representative

Rachel Meyer

University of Michigan

Section Homepage

<http://www.laborstudies.wayne.edu/ASA>

Website Editor

George P. Mason

Wayne State University

Newsletter Editorial Collective

Ruth Braunstein

Russell Ferri

Jeff Goodwin

Michael A. McCarthy

New York University

Message from the Chairs

Race and racism have obviously affected the development of working-class movements in the United States. From its inception, this country depended on the theft of land from the indigenous population and the employment of an enslaved African population for the production of its commercial raw materials. The free wage-labor force, almost synonymous with "white labor," suffered from exploitation in the developing capitalist economy and formed trade unions to fight for rights and decent treatment. But white workers faced a special challenge in deciding how to respond to slavery and to the racism that accompanied it and that spread its effects to free blacks as well as to other groups of color.

We all know that the labor movement's handling of the race question in the past is not something we can be proud of, with a few scarce exceptions. Certainly progress has been made on many fronts, but there are still large sore spots. Our Section reflects this problem in our membership. We tend to be heavily white, and while we have reasonable Asian and Latino membership levels, given their general underrepresentation in the ASA, a number of these members have international backgrounds and interests, while the number of local minorities remains small. African Americans are especially underrepresented in the Section.

Continued on page 2

In this Issue

Action Alert: Convention Workers	2
Opinions	2
ASA Information	14
Book Reviews	23
Publications and Announcements	29

In order to change this dynamic, we decided to team up with the Association of Black Sociologists and devote our biannual miniconference to the issue of Race and Labor (go to p. 14 for the full schedule of events). Of course, we can't predict how successful the miniconference will be, and usually these things have little lasting effect. But we hope that enhanced attention will be given by the Section to race issues in the future, and that a relationship with the ABS will continue to grow. If we can hold even one session each year on race and labor, either at the ABS or ASA meetings, or both, something of value will have been accomplished. Here's to hoping it will happen!

To register for the miniconference, go to:
<http://www.asanet.org/cs/conferences/conferences>.

Edna and Jill

Support ASA Convention Workers

Aramark food service workers at the Boston convention centers are in a labor dispute, and they need our support. Please take a minute to click on the link below and register your support:

<http://www.thepetitionsite.com/petition/45277250>
3 (in place of street address, just insert your college or university)

If you think you might be willing to be part of a delegation to present the petition signatures to convention center management, please email Dan Clawson, clawson@sadri.umass.edu, and he will be in touch with you when a time is fixed for that delegation.

The dispute is NOT at the hotels the ASA will be using, but at the convention center that is connected to those hotels and is part of the same complex. The ASA has already taken a stand in favor of the workers, and posted a statement on the ASA website.

Conditions for the convention center workers are much worse than those for hotel workers. For example, those hotel workers who work at least 20 hours a week get health insurance at a very low cost (\$4 per week for an individual) whereas for convention center workers the health insurance is so expensive that only 20 out of 342 have benefits. Hotel workers also have negotiated a pension plan; convention center workers don't have one. The workers recently conducted a strike because Aramark, the employer, had been threatening union activists and had fired two members of the negotiating committee. The National Labor Relations Board has issued a complaint against the employer for interfering with employees in the exercise of their legal rights.

For more information, go to the website of hotel workers Local 26, which contains the ASA statement and news stories:

<http://www.bostonhotelunion.org/news.html>

The Battle for Labor's Future

The SEIU's Andy Stern has an ambitious plan. Not everyone is on board.

Nelson Lichtenstein
UC Santa Barbara

When an internal fight at a trade union erupts into the news, American culture has a ready frame. It's Marlon Brando versus Lee J. Cobb in "On the Waterfront" once again, perhaps updated by a recent episode of "The Wire," set among the corrupt and gritty longshoremen of the Baltimore docks. Or it's a modern-day retelling of the Jimmy Hoffa/Teamsters story, destined to end in another mysterious gangland murder.

But there are no shiny suits or pinkie rings in the conflict at the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), the big, fast-growing organization

of janitors, hospital workers and public employees that has more than 650,000 members in California alone. All the *dramatis personae* are idealists who came out of the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s, and although turf battles and dues money are certainly on the agenda, the real question they are debating is the road forward for the American trade union movement. Leading the cast is Andy Stern, the SEIU's national president since 1996. A Pennsylvania SEIU activist in the 1970s, Stern was put in charge of union organizing efforts in the 1980s, just as President Reagan and other resurgent Republicans helped stiffen corporate management's hostility to trade unionism. The SEIU was one of the few unions that continued to grow in those difficult times, sparked by militant organizing campaigns such as the Justice for Janitors movement, which had its epicenter in Los Angeles.

Stern, now 57, has been a bold, impatient leader, which has earned him a spot on the cover of almost every mass circulation magazine, including *Business Week* under the query "Can This Man Save Labor?"

Stern's ambition is to transform and revive American unionism. In 2005, he led several big unions, including the SEIU, the Teamsters and the United Food and Commercial Workers, out of the AFL-CIO. In their new coalition, known as Change to Win, Stern pushed each of the unions to devote a qualitatively large proportion of their resources to organizing, even if it meant reducing the number of staff who "serviced" existing members. He insisted that unless unions such as the SEIU achieved a far higher degree of "density" in specific industries, such as healthcare, they wouldn't be strong enough to raise wages and working conditions for everyone.

Stern also has made it clear that he sees the U.S. economy as a single integrated system in which the status of labor is closely related to the structure of capitalism. This has led the SEIU to take great interest in issues that once would have been considered irrelevant to what went on at the

bargaining table, such as how to regulate private equity firms, which now control companies that employ more than a million workers in industries the SEIU seeks to organize. Stern has sought to strike deals, or at least open negotiations, on a variety of employment-related issues with politicians and businessmen, including Wal-Mart's H. Lee Scott and Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, who have often been hostile to unionism.

But Stern's ambitions have not been universally applauded. For instance, the California Nurses Association (CNA), the union representing 80,000 registered nurses across the country, has been a highly vocal critic of and competitor to the SEIU, denouncing what it sees as Stern's willingness to trade away nurse staffing ratios and other labor standards for organizing agreements with hospital chains that are viewed as anti-union.

In recent months, the CNA and the SEIU have competed for the allegiance of nurses not only in California but in Las Vegas hospitals and in medical facilities throughout Ohio. The clash has been bitter, with the SEIU charging that the nurses organization is a "union buster" at the same time the CNA claims that SEIU organizing tactics pave the way for management-dominated "company unionism."

Within the SEIU itself, Stern is facing a revolt by United Healthcare Workers West (UHW), the 150,000-member California local that is led by Sal Rosselli, a former nursing home worker who has been a union leader since 1988, when he won an insurgent campaign to rebuild what was then Local 250 in the Bay Area. In the years since, Rosselli has been a pioneering militant, organizing nursing homes, hospitals and home-care workers throughout California.

Rosselli once worked cooperatively with Stern, but tensions have arisen in recent years over what the UHW considers an SEIU effort to sideline local leaders in hospital and nursing home contract negotiations. Rosselli and others at the UHW are just as sophisticated as Stern, but they

take a darker view of their business and political adversaries.

Thus Rosselli objected to Stern's endorsement of Schwarzenegger's proposed health insurance plan, which the UHW chief, like many other unionists in California, considered far too friendly to insurance company interests. The plan was never enacted.

Stern and Rosselli are playing familiar roles in our labor history. When American corporations became giant institutions more than a century ago, trade unions were soon forced to mirror their centralized structure in order to bargain for better wages and benefits. But centralizing union authority in Pittsburgh, Detroit or Washington came at a price. United Auto Workers President Walter Reuther, for instance, who was every bit as ambitious and imaginative as Stern, faced a constant rumble of discontent from the big auto locals in Flint, Fremont and Dearborn. Local unionists insisted that regardless of the success Reuther enjoyed bargaining with Henry Ford II or planning the Great Society with LBJ, the union's first and most essential duty was to make sure that dignity and safety did not vanish from their arduous, if well-compensated, life on the assembly line.

Similarly, Rosselli and his supporters (not all of whom are in the UHW) argue that the very meaning of unionism will be bleached out of the SEIU unless local voices are once again made potent. "I want a movement of workers governed by workers for workers," said Rosselli, "to be in control of their relationship with their employer, to be in control of the political direction of their union."

But Stern and his allies within the SEIU believe that with a Democratic Party landslide in the offing this November, unions are on the verge of an historic breakthrough. This is not the time for what they label "Just Us" unionism devoted to the advancement of the wages and working conditions of those already enrolled in a labor organization.

All this will be fought out at the SEIU national convention in Puerto Rico. Rosselli and his UHW supporters will put forward resolutions calling for more local control of contract negotiations, organizing and finances, as well as direct, union-wide election of national SEIU officers (rather than selection by convention action). They are unlikely to win any votes there, but if the issues they have raised become part of the general discussion within the labor movement and the larger progressive community, these rebels will have shown that union democracy and union growth are not incompatible.

Nelson Lichtenstein is a professor of history at UC Santa Barbara, where he directs the Center for the Study of Work, Labor and Democracy. This piece originally appeared in the Los Angeles Times.

SEIU: How Democratic?

Dan Clawson
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

For the first time in a generation or more, SEIU is facing a substantial movement by internal dissidents seeking to push through democratic reforms. This push has a two-fold character.

One prong is the very public resignation by Sal Roselli, the head of United Healthcare Workers – West (UHW), the third largest local in SEIU, from his position on SEIU's national Executive Committee. When he resigned, and since, he raised issues about the course that is being pursued by national SEIU. With the backing of the UHW executive board, the local has created a highly visible web site, paid for an ad in the *New York Times* and ads on prominent blogs, and is putting the issue of democracy on the agenda for the SEIU convention. The other prong is SMART (SEIU Member Activists for Reform Today), a rank-and-file movement with the potential to create an on-going TDU-like internal opposition in SEIU.

National SEIU leaders insist that they too "are committed to unity, strength, and respect for democracy in our union." A letter, signed by 70 local leaders who together represent more than 80 percent of all SEIU members, insists:

"Constructive discussion about how to strengthen our union is absolutely essential. But it also carries with it a very serious responsibility to respect decisions made by democratic majority, whether they have to do with strategy, resources, structure, or local union jurisdiction. No local union leader, no matter what their individual objectives may be, should try to jeopardize the strategies developed and democratically approved."

"Democracy," however, can be a slippery concept. Employers insist that the only "democratic" way to bring in a union is through an NLRB election – one where union organizers are forbidden to set foot on the premises, employers force members to attend captive audience meetings, supervisors interrogate employees, and pro-union activists often get fired. Union activists regard these elections as a totally undemocratic sham, and SEIU has pioneered alternatives to the NLRB election.

Union democracy can be a similarly contested concept. It's worth considering some of the national SEIU practices that trouble dissidents. Central to the debate is the many ways the national SEIU leadership can intervene in the activities of an existing local, together with the creation of mega-locals. Everyone agrees that if a local is outright corrupt, or mob dominated, the national union needs to intervene to clean up the mess and restore democracy.

However, national SEIU leaders intervene in union locals for many other reasons. If a local is ineffective, and fails to organize new members, it might be put into trusteeship. If nearby locals have overlapping jurisdictions, with each local containing both building service and hospital workers, new locals may be created to bring together all the hospital workers in one local and

all the building service workers in another local. In practice, however, both the criteria for such actions and the ways they should be carried out are neither clear nor straightforward. What workers have a community of interest? When does it make sense to move workers from one local to another? Which locals are ineffective, and by what criteria? To what extent do the answers to those questions depend on an assessment of the local leadership – and in making that assessment, is it possible to separate out considerations of the extent to which the local leaders support national SEIU leaders' policies?

There are a variety of ways in which elected local leaders can be replaced by "interim" leaders appointed by the national SEIU leadership. The most straightforward is if the local is placed into trusteeship. According to the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act, when a local is placed in trusteeship there must be an election within 18 months. However, if there is a more thoroughgoing reorganization, with substantially new locals created, then the appointed interim leader may stay in office for three years prior to holding an election. And if the local is simply merged out of existence, it may be that no new leadership election is necessary.

Consider the difficulties faced by rank-and-file workers who want to run for office against the newly appointed interim leader. In any election, donations may only be made by SEIU members, but they can be made by SEIU members anywhere in the country. In most SEIU locals, appointed staff have the option of becoming SEIU members, and most do so. This means that the rank-and-file workers are likely to be pitting their ability to raise funds within the local against a national network of staff and appointed leaders. Staff members around the country could, at the urging of their supervisors, write checks for \$100 each.

That financial inequality is magnified by SEIU's move to huge mega-locals including workers from many different worksites. Large locals by themselves need not be anti-democratic: the Ford

River Rouge plant of the 1940s and 1950s had some of the most vibrant union democracy in the labor movement, but all 80,000 workers were at one location, making it comparatively easy to reach them. In contrast, when SEIU created Local 888 in Massachusetts, although there were less than 13,000 members, they were in 223 different units.

The appointed leader of such a mega-local controls the extent to which people from many different work sites are brought together. In the 888 case the appointed interim leader, Susana Segat, held no local-wide meetings for either members or leaders, and when others made efforts to bring different groups together Segat intervened to prevent this. A rank-and-file opposition ran against Segat, but found it difficult to know to whom to connect at the many constituent units, much less to actively make those connections.

If staff were simply staff they would be forbidden to campaign for one side or the other. But SEIU permits appointed staff to be members, so they can campaign for a candidate. This problematic arrangement creates a potentially strong network for the appointed leader; as a newly created local, the appointed head of 888 had almost three years in office prior to the election. In the post-election complaint filed by the rank-and-file slate, they charged that the campaign timeline allowed candidates less than 10 days to campaign for office, much of the insurgent slate literature did not arrive at members' homes until after they had cast their ballots even though the local had provided membership lists to the American Arbitration Association weeks earlier, the union newsletter with candidate statements did not arrive until after many members had cast their ballots, and the local website did not post candidate information until nearly a week after the ballots had reached member homes.

If two locals are merged, the rules are if anything more undemocratic. Suppose a 10,000 member local has been a thorn in the national leadership's side. If the national leadership proposes merging

that 10,000 member local into a 50,000 member local, the vote on whether to do so pools the results from all 60,000 members. If every member of the 10,000 person local votes against the merger, it could still go through with a large majority, and the "small" local would have been merged out of existence. Similar rules make it possible to move one unit of a local into another local – so a rebellious local could have a large fraction of its membership moved elsewhere. The national SEIU leadership has put in place a process that might lead to this result for the rebellious UHW local; one of UHW's proposed convention resolutions is that mergers not take place unless approved by a majority of both the unit being moved and the unit receiving the transfer.

A reasonable response to this might be: Well, as possibilities these sound potentially troubling, but how frequently does the issue arise? If it is rare indeed for leaders to enter office as a result of being appointed by the national leadership, all this may be a non-issue. Unless trusteeships, mergers, and re-organization become routine events, and unless the appointed leaders end up staying in office past their interim periods, then there is no sense getting too concerned.

Recognizing that there is room to contest how to classify particular cases, the UHW website claims that a majority of the members of the national SEIU Executive Board are either staff or people who initially came to office through appointment. Thus when 70 local leaders who together represent more than 80 percent of all SEIU members call on dissidents "to respect decisions made by democratic majority," and ask that "no local union leader . . . jeopardize the strategies developed and democratically approved," these calls need to be read with an understanding about the extent to which the Executive Board is itself controlled from the top.

In conclusion I want to note that democracy in unions is not the only issue, and the national SEIU leadership is absolutely right to insist on "Justice for All" in preference to "just us"

unionism. They are right that if the labor movement does not dramatically increase its membership and power it won't be able to advance workers' interests – a point I also made in my 2003 book, *The Next Upsurge: Labor and the New Social Movements*, a book with high praise for many SEIU initiatives. (And a point that UHW endorses – they proclaim themselves the fastest growing local in SEIU.) My own union is hyper-democratic at the state-wide level, and our 105,000 members make us roughly equivalent to an SEIU mega-local – but we are complacent, ineffective, oriented to servicing and defensive battles instead of advancing our own vision or building our strength and alliances. I agree as well that many of the SEIU appointed leaders are people of color, and a large majority of the appointees are highly capable people totally devoted to advancing the interests of workers.

But most of these leaders did not come out of the local they represent, and may never have worked a day in their life at any of the jobs that members hold. These appointed leaders owe their loyalty to those above them, not to those who (ultimately) elect them. Something important is lost if "the union" is smart people appointed from above. As the great American labor leader Eugene Debs said: "Too long have the workers of the world waited for some Moses to lead them out of bondage. He has not come; he never will come. I would not lead you out if I could; for if you could be led out, you could be led back again. I would have you make up your minds that there is nothing you cannot do for yourselves." These are the issues that SEIU members will be debating at the convention and beyond.

Dan Clawson is the author of The Next Upsurge: Labor and the New Social Movements. He is professor of sociology at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, where he was president of the faculty union. This piece originally appeared at MRZine.com.

An Historic Time for Labor

Velina Petrova
American Rights at Work

When we return to our campuses and classrooms this fall, we will be able to say something to our students and colleagues which has not been true since at least 1947: this is an historic time for labor.

After decades of declining union membership in the United States, growing numbers of people without health insurance, a skyrocketing gap between CEO pay and workers' pay, and a shrinking middle class, labor is on the move again. The labor community's top priority is the passage of the most significant piece of labor legislation since the Wagner and the Taft-Hartley Acts – the Employee Free Choice Act.

Originally introduced by Rep. George Miller (D-CA) and Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-MA) in 2007, the bill passed the House easily, but then faced an implacable filibuster in the Senate. It also faced the express promise of a veto by George W. Bush. After the next president takes office, the bill will be reintroduced and will hopefully gain a more positive hearing, as all Democratic presidential candidates made a point of endorsing the Employee Free Choice Act at length.

The Employee Free Choice Act would punish employers for intimidation tactics they use to keep workers from joining a union and would expedite the contract process once a union is in place. It would increase penalties against employers who illegally fire or otherwise retaliate against workers during a union organizing campaign. Research by many of our colleagues has found that 25 percent of employers illegally fire pro-union workers; 51 percent illegally coerce workers into opposing unions with bribery or favoritism; and 91 percent force employees to attend one-on-one anti-union meetings with their supervisors.

Also, the Employee Free Choice Act would require employers to recognize unions when a majority of workers have signed cards in support of the union. Under the current law, employers can force workers to endure a sham election even after a majority have signed cards, effectively dictating the way workers should organize. Finally, the bill would allow workers to request federal mediation if they can't negotiate a first contract within 90 days of bargaining, in order to avoid employers' attempts to bargain in bad faith and indefinitely delay the contract process.

Labor has made the passage of this bill its top priority as a critical way to address workers' economic standing and America's broken labor law. Research by the Center for Economic Policy Research indicates that unionization raises the wages of the typical low-wage worker by 20.6 percent. And unions give the biggest boost to low-wage workers because these are the workers that have the least bargaining power in the labor market. The effort to pass this legislation has been gaining momentum, with numerous members of the progressive community signing on and making the Employee Free Choice Act part of the new agenda for the country. As we go back to our campuses and classrooms this fall, let's consider what we can teach our students and colleagues about the historic opportunity we have to achieve meaningful labor law reform in the United States.

For more information on the Employee Free Choice Act and for a cache of research on labor law, please visit www.americanrightsatwork.org or contact Velina Petrova, Ph.D., Research Analyst, at 202-822-2127 x115 or vpetrova@americanrightsatwork.org.

*"Freedom is never granted; it is won.
Justice is never given; it is exacted."*

- A. Philip Randolph

Election 2008: The Presidential Campaign and the Irony of NAFTA

Kathleen C. Schwartzman
University of Arizona

Some assert that the North American Free Trade Agreement has a "blowback" (unintended negative consequences of earlier government actions) and that it is American job loss. Perhaps the real NAFTA blowback is illegal immigration.

The first NAFTA blowback

In the face of rolling job losses, critics of NAFTA have identified that treaty as the cause of factory flight. In one recent case, the link is apparent. On May 31, 2008, Ford Motor Company announced its intent to invest \$3 billion in a new plant in Mexico and to eliminate a shift and extend summer shutdowns in each of its American truck plants. In other cases, such as the recent announcement by General Motors of its plan to close several plants, the link is not clear. While there does not seem to be a political will to prevent factory flight, some have called for a treaty "renegotiation." NAFTA supporters, in contrast, conclude that protectionist policies would be a disaster for the global economy. According to Investor's Business Daily (Feb 28, 2008), this focus on shuttered American factories is nothing more than demagoguery and a failure of Democratic leadership on trade issues. The next president will most likely address the problems of the economy without reference to NAFTA or this blowback.

The second NAFTA blowback

The real blowback is the rise in illegal immigration. Take the case of poultry. It is a cruel irony of NAFTA that the United States exports tons of poultry to Mexico, while Mexico exports thousands of migrants to the United

States, some of whom find jobs in American poultry plants.

In the first half of 2008, “Operation Streamline” was in full swing. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents arrested thousands of immigrants. In March alone, there were over 9,000 immigration prosecutions. In crackdowns from California to Virginia, agents found document fraud and immigration violations in private homes, restaurants, employment agencies, and factories. Poultry plants figured prominently among these raids, and Mexican immigrants were a significant percentage of those found in the plant raids at Pilgrim's Pride Corp. and Tyson.

Tyson had been the target of an earlier ICE (formerly INS) undercover action referred to as “Operation Everest.” This massive undercover operation resulted in a 2001 Department of Justice federal indictment that charged Tyson with racketeering and immigration law violations. Managers were accused of a 7-year scheme (1994 to 2001) to recruit and hire hundreds of illegal immigrants from Mexico and Guatemala for their plants. No Tyson executives were convicted, but a former employee was. According to the investigators, as many as one third of the workers at some Tyson plants were illegal immigrants.

Since the mid-1990s, immigrants have increasingly found jobs in the poultry industry. The U.S. General Accounting Office estimated that in 2003, 42 percent of the nation's workers in the meat and poultry industry were Hispanic. We may agree that these are “jobs that nobody wants” but prior to the mid-1990s Hispanic migration to the Southeast, Anglo and African-Americans filled these jobs.

“Operation Streamline” targeted a wide range of industries and locations. The mention of poultry serves to point to an irony of NAFTA. As expected, U.S. poultry exports to Mexico increased following NAFTA. The U.S. exported 5.74 times more poultry to Mexico in 2006 than it did in 1989. U.S. producers benefitted from the treaty because they were technologically more

advanced and could meet a rising Mexican demand.

Where is the NAFTA blowback? The case, already argued for imported sugar and corn, can be made for poultry. The volume of U.S. poultry entering Mexico contributed to the transformation of the industry and the countryside. Mexican medium and large producers, represented by the National Union of Poultry Producers (UNA), anticipated the negative effect of NAFTA on their industry and in 2003, persuaded the Mexican government to undertake a partial tariff rescheduling. In 2003, Mexico negotiated a five-year extension, protecting its market from U.S. chicken legs and quarters. This protection expired on January 1, 2008, some fourteen years after NAFTA. Poultry now enters Mexico duty-free. Medium and small producers have had a difficult time competing. In 1994, following the peso devaluation and NAFTA, many medium producers were absorbed by larger ones or went bankrupt. Small producers discontinued their backyard subsistence production.

From a purely theoretical point of view, this is an applaudable economic advancement. Mexican consumers benefitted from the U.S. capacity to produce more efficiently and cheaply. In signing NAFTA, Mexico announced its commitment to modernize the countryside. Then President Carlos Salinas de Gortari said “Mexico wants to export goods, not people,” we should export tomatoes, not tomato pickers. In contemplating a rural modernization, the government held that – if farmers cannot be efficient, they should stop being farmers. Many, in fact, have embarked on that path and only stopped after they crossed the U.S.-Mexico border.

Authors estimate that the rural population is around 20 million, and constitutes somewhere between from one-fifth and one-fourth of the total population. According to official sources, in 2002, 80 percent of rural farmers were poor and half of Mexicans who lived in rural zones lived in extreme poverty. In 2001, the Mexican government passed a five-year plan (*El Plan*

Nacional de Desarrollo Sostenible 2000-2006) which acknowledged the condition of poverty in the countryside and continued the work of the 1995-2000 Program for Agriculture, livestock, and rural development. It established a primary emphasis on livestock. The laws, plans and programs (often in response to petitions from livestock producers) designed credits and other means at the disposal of the government to try to reinstate some livestock producers who were driven out of production due to marginal profit.

The current Secretary of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fish, and Nutrition (SAG-ARPA) expresses concern about the high rates of poverty in the countryside. In 2007, SAGARPA promoted a Special Program for Food Security. It offers technological assistance for subsistence family production, which would include diverse livestock and vegetables. SAGARPA views small scale poultry production as one option for addressing the financial and nutritional poverty of rural inhabitants. They even produced pamphlets describing how to construct chicken coups! PROCAMPO, another Mexican program to assist rural inhabitants, was extended by President Calderón beyond its initial expiration date of January 1, 2008, until 2012. Who knows if Mexico can reconstruct the scaffolding of rural survival that predated NAFTA.

When rural subsistence is precarious, and when urban areas no longer offer sufficient industrial jobs to absorb those displaced, where do inhabitants go? They migrate! The incoming U.S. president will most likely address the problem of the immigration but without reference to NAFTA or this blowback.

Conclusion

Did the North American Free Trade Agreement lead to the unanticipated flow of migrants? Undermined poultry production is an infinitesimal part of an enormous economic crisis for Mexican farmers. However, the irony—the presence of illegal Mexican immigrants working in the U.S. poultry factories and the rise of U.S.

poultry exports to Mexico—highlights some troublesome linkages that need to be revisited.

Kathleen C. Schwartzman is an Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Arizona. She is interested in the consequences of globalization for semiperipheral countries. Her recent work examines the effects of financial markets on Brazil's autonomy to deal with poverty and housing, and her current work explores the interactions of NAFTA, immigration, and the fate of U.S. labor.

Journalists Give Workers the Business

How the Mainstream Media Ignores Ordinary People in Economic News Coverage

David Madland

Center for American Progress (CAP)

A CAP Study finds that mainstream media coverage of a range of economic issues is biased toward business over workers.

The mainstream media has a profound impact on politics, helping everyday Americans determine what topics people think are important, shape how they feel about issues, and even how they vote.

Alternative media outlets such as blogs and social networking sites have proliferated in recent years, yet most people still receive their news from the mainstream media, which is especially true for economic news. This report focuses on how the mainstream media covers the economy, a subject where fundamental political questions arise about how income is generated and allocated among individual Americans and the businesses and companies they work for and sometimes invest in. Specifically, in its coverage of economic issues, does the media provide a balanced

discussion of who gets what and why? Or, instead, is coverage biased toward a particular interest group?

Based on a unique, quantitative study, this report finds that media coverage of economic issues is biased and consistently fails to live up to expectations of balance and fairness. On a range of economic issues, the perspective of workers is largely missing from media coverage, while the views of business are frequently presented. The findings are based on analysis of coverage of four economic issues—employment, minimum wage, trade, and credit card debt—in the leading newspaper and television outlets in 2007.

Included in this analysis is coverage by the *Los Angeles Times*, *New York Times*, *U.S.A. Today*, *Wall Street Journal*, and *Washington Post*—the five papers with the largest circulation nationwide—alongside the three major TV broadcast networks, ABC News, CBS News, and NBC News, as well as the three leading cable news networks, CNN, FOX News, and CNBC. The four economic issues were chosen because they represent a range of economic issues that impact ordinary citizens and that many citizens have defined opinions about.

Following is a highlight of the report's findings:

- Overall, representatives of business were quoted or cited nearly two-and-a-half times as frequently as were workers or their union representatives.
- In coverage of both the minimum wage and trade, the views of businesses were sourced more than one-and-a-half times as frequently as those of workers.
- In coverage about employment, businesses were quoted or cited over six times as frequently as were workers.
- On only one issue that we examined, credit card debt, was coverage more balanced, presenting the perspectives of ordinary citizens in the same proportion as those of business.

Biased coverage matters for three primary reasons. Our belief in democratic debate demands informed citizens, and requires that different points of view are allowed to be heard. Journalistic standards of objectivity call for balanced coverage. And, perhaps most importantly, media coverage influences people's opinions and behavior.

Critics often claim that the media has a political bias, with most of the debate focusing on whether the media is liberal or conservative, and whether coverage favors Democrats or Republicans. This debate, while important, ignores a more fundamental question about which points of view are allowed to be heard at all.

Because the model of objective journalism calls for sources, not journalists, to give opinions about news, quotations and citations are the way journalists tell their stories. Who journalists choose to include in their stories sets the range of debate, and determines the kinds of perspectives the public is allowed to hear. The mainstream media represented in the range of publications surveyed for this report serves as a gatekeeper, amplifying the voices of some while making it more difficult for others to reach a mass audience.

Although the media cannot and should not give equal credence to each and every perspective, both journalistic standards and our expectations for democratic debate call for the media to accurately represent all sides of a story and allow the major players to have a voice. We should expect, for example, that balanced coverage of economic issues would commonly include the perspectives of both business and workers.

After all, these groups represent primary actors in the economy. Each has a significant interest in the topic, and each group often, but certainly not always, has a defined point of view.

Of course, different businesses and different groups of workers boast complex inter-relationships—as bosses and workers, as holders of equity in companies either directly or through

pension funds and mutual funds, or as citizens in local communities where businesses are based and workers live and work. These inter-relationships are not easily quantified, yet the four economic issues chosen to survey in this paper illustrate a profound bias in favor of business over workers in mainstream press coverage.

Indeed, the report's findings of biased sourcing may not be surprising to those who follow the media closely. But they are stark and raise serious questions about whether the media is fairly covering economic issues, whether the media is living up to its own standards, and whether the media is properly serving democracy.

There are many potential explanations for this kind of biased coverage, all of them probably true to some degree. The influence of corporate ownership and advertisers, the decline of the labor beat and "shoe-leather" journalism, the failure of unions to effectively communicate with the media, and the personal and political biases of reporters and editors are all common and reasonable explanations.

But the best explanation for the kind of bias described in this report is that journalists have a preference for elite sources, such as government or business representatives, over ordinary citizens. In short, it is just easier for a reporter to talk to a professional, such as a business spokesperson, than to find a good quote from a worker or ordinary citizen who does not represent a set interest group.

This is not to say that mainstream reporters do not talk to average workers or individual citizens for their stories. Coverage of pure consumer issues, for example, often give the perspective of ordinary citizens equal treatment—often in conflict with business interests that deliver consumer goods and services. Indeed, the results of the survey show that on the one economic issue that is also a consumer issue—credit card debt—reporters do seek out ordinary citizens for their stories.

The other three economic issues surveyed in this report show that in economic coverage of the news by the mainstream press there is a decided preference for elite sources, especially business representatives. More importantly, the report suggests that, whatever the source of bias, it can be overcome. If editors and journalists actively seek out the perspective of workers, as they do for consumers, media coverage of the economy would significantly improve.

The entire report is available at:

http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2008/06/pdf/world_without_workers.pdf

The Supreme Court's Hostility to Organized Labor

*Now Management Can Use Tax Money in
Anti-Union Campaigns*

David Macaray

To anyone interested in the future health of organized labor, they should know that it just took a decided turn for the worse. On Thursday, June 19, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a California law which had made it illegal for employers to spend state-provided funds in their propaganda campaigns to discourage employees from voting for union representation.

By a 7-2 vote (Justices Breyer and Ginsburg were the two dissenters), the Court overruled the U.S. 9th District Court of Appeals and declared that, by infringing on an employer's right to "free expression," the California state law was unconstitutional.

The measure, known as California Assembly Bill 1889, was the first one of its kind to be passed in the United States. However, since its passage, in 2000, ten other states, including New York and Florida, have gone on to enact similar laws. As a

consequence of this decision, all of those state laws are unenforceable.

In effect, the ruling means that a business which regularly receives taxpayer funds (such as a nursing home) is permitted to use those funds—to spend that money—on its efforts to keep a labor union out, to prevent a union from representing its employees. Let’s run that by again, slowly: Unions aren’t allowed to use state money in their recruitment drives, but management *is allowed* to use it in their attempt to keep them out?

If that sounds a bit, well, *one-sided*, that’s exactly how it seemed to Justice Breyer, who noted that the courts generally give state legislatures “broad authority to spend [taxpayer] money” any way they choose. According to Breyer, if Californians choose not to have their tax money used in management campaigns to keep the unions out, “why should they be conscripted into paying?”

In response to the argument that the law was a violation of the Constitution’s freedom of speech provisions, Breyer retorted that what the state of California was saying, in effect, was, “Go ahead, speak, speak . . . just not on our nickel.” Apparently, that line of reasoning wasn’t compelling enough to persuade his fellow jurists, not even Justice Souter or Justice Stevens.

The original lawsuit was filed in 2002 by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber won a decision in federal court and, later, had it upheld by a three-judge panel of the 9th Circuit. But in 2006, the full 9th Circuit Court of Appeals overturned the panel’s decision, ruling that allowing businesses to use taxpayer to combat unions violating the “neutrality” of labor law. With the blessings of the Bush administration, the Chamber of Commerce took the matter to the Supreme Court.

The implications of this decision are enormous and, frankly, ominous. No one has ever tried to say that management didn’t have the constitutional right to attempt to make its case

against having its employees join a labor union, so long as that case was presented legally, without intimidation, deception or coercion. The only thing labor ever wanted was a fair shot at reaching the workers directly, on a level playing field.

But this Supreme Court decision is a whole other deal. By allowing management to use taxpayer-supplied government money in its anti-union campaign, it turns democracy on its head. It becomes a case of the People’s money being used to fight the People.

How is this arrangement to be regarded in any way as “neutral”? And how can anyone say with a straight face that this constitutes a level playing field? In truth, it’s one more example of the Court’s deep-seated hostility to labor.

David Macaray, a Los Angeles playwright and writer, was a former labor union rep. He can be reached at dmacaray@earthlink.net. This piece originally appeared at counterpunch.org, June 23, 2008.

Undocumented Workers: Workers’ Common Cause

Elena Delavega
University of Houston

There are an estimated 12 million undocumented workers in the United States. ICE, the enforcement arm of immigration services, caught 166 in Houston last week, and a total of 276,912 undocumented workers were removed in 2007. The raids and arrests make ICE look like they are doing their work, anti-immigration groups give themselves pats on the back, and the government claims to be working for the American people.

The reality is that the number of undocumented workers caught is negligible compared to the workers that are here. In 2007, ICE removed 2.3 percent of estimated undocumented workers in the country. There is work, there are employers

willing to hire them, and there are generally no penalties for employers who hire undocumented workers. So the situation continues, basically unabated.

But also the reality is that the situation hurts everyone. No worker can be safe, no worker can have his or her security and dignity, as long as there are second- and third-class workers anywhere. When any group of workers has no rights, all workers suffer. When any group of workers is afraid of complaining, no worker can complain safely. And the second-class status does not only apply to undocumented workers. Workers who have work permits are not allowed to leave their employer, or they lose their work permits and they must either leave the country or become undocumented themselves. As a result, these workers do not complain or defend their rights. What rights?

Clearly, restrictive immigration laws do not work. They only serve to create an underground market, a black market for labor that results in greater worker oppression and marginalization. When a worker has to eat and feed his children, he or she will take whatever crumbs are tossed his way. Workers are not little things that can be put in a box until the conditions are right for them to enter the labor market again. Workers must remain alive, and to do so, they are forced to accept unacceptable conditions. Some of those conditions may include dangerous work in unregulated circumstances.

Restrictive immigration laws also have the purpose of keeping workers in their home countries, where the salaries are low and conditions inhumane. Companies, on the other hand, have no such restrictions. Big industrialists close factories in countries where workers earn more, and open them in countries where workers earn much less. The sad thing is that instead of focusing on the millions of jobs that are lost through factory closures, workers blame the workers who are here.

Only when workers are free to move, when they are free to go to where they can choose the conditions of their employment, where they have rights, freedom, and dignity, will workers be humanized.

Workers need to recognize that it is not the other workers who are hurting them, but the social conditions that allows capital to choose the conditions under which it will work but denies the worker the same. And we need to stop labeling the work of some a crime. If a worker's honest work is a crime, then all workers are in danger of being labeled criminals.

Section-related events at the ASA Conference

Miniconference on Race, Labor and Empire

Boston, Massachusetts
August 1-2, 2008

Organized by the Labor and Labor Movements Section of the ASA and the Association of Black Sociologists; co-sponsored by the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of Northeastern University and by the following ASA Sections: Asians and Asian America; Latino/as Section; Marxist Section; Political Economy of the World System; Race, Class and Gender; and Racial and Ethnic Minorities.

Theme: Race has a long history of being a basis of division among workers in the United States. The history of the U.S. labor movement provides many examples of racial exclusion. Yet despite this exclusion, people of color have been, and continue to be, among the staunchest supporters of unions and other labor organizations. While the history of racism in the U.S. labor movement has been well documented, there has been little analysis about the more recent role of people of color in the labor movement. In fact, most of the

official labor movement has shied away from discussing “race” at all, fearing that it is a divisive topic. But racism (including its “color-blind” version) continues to be a problem in many unions. Divisions have occurred not only between whites and people of color, but between various groups of color. Moreover, unions often want to work with communities of color but fail to create true and equal partnerships with them. The time has come to explore these and similar issues openly and honestly.

The “race question” is part of a larger context of imperialism and colonialism. Scant attention has been given to the role of imperialism, especially U.S. imperialism, both past and present, in defining and intervening in the lives of all working class people. Such imperialism, in the form of neoliberal economic policies, contributes to increasing global inequalities, including the development of offshore production based on intensified labor exploitation, and to the creation of dispossessed workers who have been forced to migrate because their survival has been threatened.

A central goal of this miniconference is to bring together academics and activists who are interested in the intersection of race, labor, and empire. We hope to stimulate discussion, research, and policy development with the aim of producing a more sustainable and just labor movement.

Directions to the Race, Labor and Empire miniconference:

By subway: Green Line E line (outbound) to the Northeastern stop on Huntington Avenue. It is a two block walk from there to 40 Leon Street, the O’Bryant African American Institute.

By foot: From the Sheraton or Hilton Hotels: Head southeast on Dalton Street to Belvidere Street; turn left and walk .2 miles to Huntington Avenue; at Huntington, turn right and walk past the Marriott and Colonnade Hotels.

From the Colonnade Hotel:

Head southwest on Huntington Avenue/Avenue of the Arts/Rt-9 for .6 mile; turn left at Forsyth Street (at midpoint of Northeastern University campus) and go .1 mile; turn right at Greenleaf Street and go 266 feet (thru campus); turn left at Leon Street and go .1 miles to 40 Leon Street, the O’Bryant African American Institute.

Program

Friday, August 1

6:30-7 pm. *Gathering*

7-9 pm. *Dinner and Plenary*

Organizers: Dan Clawson and Deirdre Royster

Moderator and MC: Deirdre Royster, Black Studies and Sociology, the College of William and Mary

Featuring: Jerome Scott, Founder and Director, Project South; Saru Jayaraman, Restaurant Opportunities Center; General Baker, founding member the League of Revolutionary Black Workers

Location: The O’Bryant African American Institute at Northeastern University, 40 Leon Street, Boston

(Please RSVP to Jill Esbenshade at jesbensh@mail.sdsu.edu if you plan to attend.)

Saturday, August 2

8-9 am. *Gathering and Welcome*

Jill Esbenshade and Rod Bush

9-9:45 am. *Opening Keynote*

Bill Fletcher, Jr, Executive Editor of BlackCommentator.com (www.blackcommentator.com), and former Assistant to AFL-CIO President John Sweeney, “Labor and the Racial Trip-Wire.”

9:45-11:15 am. *Session: Theorizing Race and Capitalism/Imperialism*

Organizer: Rod Bush

Kelvin Santiago-Valles, SUNY Binghamton,
 “Racialized capitalist accumulation in the historical long-term: The continuing significance of Oliver C. Cox.”

Edna Bonacich, University of California, Riverside,
 “Race and the U.S. Labor Movement: A Continuing Challenge.”

Cynthia Lucas Hewitt, Morehouse College,
 “Soul to soul: Alternative paradigms of solidarity to race, nation, class, and gender.”

Agustin Lao-Montes, University of Massachusetts, Amherst,
 “Contending Pan-Africanisms in the Americas: Imperial multiculturalism against radical hemisphere Black politics.”

Discussant: Robert Newby, Central Michigan University

11:30 am-1 pm. *Session: Dividing Lines: How Capital, States, and We Ourselves, Divide Us*

Organizers: Carolina Bank Muñoz and Dorian Warren

Steven Steinberg, Queens College and CUNY Graduate Center,
 “Neoliberal immigration policy and its impact on African Americans.”

Steven Pitts, University of California, Berkeley,
 “To remake our world: Forging Black-Brown unity in the age of immigrants.”

Margaret Grey, Adelphi University,
 “‘Are They Taking Our Jobs?’ Black-Brown Tensions in the Workplace.”

Phil Thompson, MIT,
 “After Katrina: Race, immigration and labor in global cities.”

1-2 pm. *Lunch*

Chair: Hector Delgado, University of La Verne
 Presentation of prize for best work on Race, Labor and Empire

2-3:30 pm. *Concurrent Panels*

Comparative Racial Capitalisms: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on How Race Matters for Global Capital

Organizers: Ching Kwan Lee and Steve McKay

Jane Collins, University of Wisconsin, Madison,
 “Neoliberal and Neoconservative Imperialisms and Race, in Milwaukee and Mexico.”

Robin Archer, London School of Economics,
 “Race and Unionism in Settler Communities in Australia and California.”

Steve McKay, University of California, Santa Cruz,
 “Imperialism, Labor and Racial Formation Concerning Filipino Merchant Seafarers.”

Moon-Kie Jung, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign,
 “Inter-Racial Labor Organizing on Hawaiian Plantations.”

Beyond Union Organizing: Mobilizing around Race and Labor

Organizers: Rachel Meyer and Anna Guevarra

Dorian Warren, Columbia University,
 “Contesting Neoliberalism in the City: Race, Class, and Anti-Wal-Mart Campaigns in Chicago and Los Angeles.”

Sarah Swider, University of Wisconsin,
 “Recognizing Difference and Recreating Unions: Migrant Domestic Workers in Hong Kong.”
 Alliance to Develop Power Workers Center/Casa Obrera, Springfield, MA.

Discussant: Rachel Meyer, University of Michigan.

Racializing Capitalism: Gender, Sexuality and the Politics of Labor

Organizers: Jennifer Chun and Robyn Rodriguez

Bridget Kenny, University of Witwatersrand, “Recognizing race: South African service workers’ post-apartheid gendered politics.”

Renisa Mawani, University of British Columbia, “The racial impurities of global capitalism: The politics of labor, interraciality, and lawlessness in British Columbia’s salmon canneries.”

Bruce Nissen and Sherman Henry, “The legacy of racism: A case study of continuing racial impediments to union effectiveness.”

Enobong Hannah Branch and Melissa Wooten, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, “Who gets to work? Race, gender, and the notion of ‘appropriate’ labor.”

3:45-5:15 pm. *Closing Workshop: Building an Inclusive and Just Labor Movement*

Open discussion led by Bill Fletcher Jr.

Section-Related ASA Panels and Sessions

Thursday, July 31, 7-9 pm, Boston Marriott Copley Place

Plenary Panel: The Future of the American Labor Movement

Session Organizer: Arne L. Kalleberg, University of North Carolina

Presider: Marshall Ganz (Harvard University)
 Panelist: Steven Greenhouse (*The New York Times*)

Panelist: Sara Horowitz (Freelancers Union)
 Panelist: Bruce Raynor (Unite Here)
 Discussant: Marshall Ganz (Harvard University)

The 103rd Annual Meeting opens on the evening of July 31 with a panel presentation featuring Steve Greenhouse of the *New York Times*; Sara Horowitz of the Freelancers Union (NYC) and Bruce Raynor of Unite Here. The panel will discuss the future of the American labor movement. Organized labor has been on the decline for decades and the working class as a whole has suffered consequently. As we close another decade and experience the end of the current presidential administration, our chronic problems have become an acute crisis. Can ways be found to turn this around, to rebuild a labor movement that can defend and advance the interests of American working people? One hopeful sign is that a serious discussion is emerging in both leadership circles and among the ranks about the future direction of labor. Join us as the panelists engage in a frank, wide ranging exchange of ideas.

Friday, August 1, 8:30 am - 9:30 am, Boston Marriott Copley Place

Roundtables on Labor and Labor Movements

Table 1. Labor Transition and Change in a Globalizing Economy

Session Organizer: Barry Eidlin (University of California- Berkeley)

“Labor Market Transformation, Globalization, and Metropolitan Earnings Inequality,” Michael E. Wallace (University of Connecticut), Gordon William Gauchat (University of Connecticut)

“Transnational Labor Rights Regulation: The Limits and Potential of International Framework Agreements,” Mark P. Thomas (York University)

“Whither Redistribution: The Changed Relationship between Centralized Collective

Bargaining and Wage Inequality under Neoliberalism,” Lucio Baccaro (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), John-Paul Ferguson (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

Table 2. Labor on the Margins: New Strategies

Session Organizer: Barry Eidlin (University of California- Berkeley)

“Organizing Workers in the Space Between Unions: Union-Centric Labor Revitalization and the Role of Community-Based Organizations,” Richard Sullivan (Illinois State University)

“Recent Pronouncements by the Opposition in Colombia: Labor Day 2007,” Julian Andraos Riveros Clavijo (Universidad del Rosario-Colombia), Mayra Alejandra Umaña (no), Adriana Scarpetta (Universidad del Rosario-Colombia)

“*La Barda*: Documenting Conditions and Exploring Change at Santa Barbara's Labor Line,” Michele Wakin (Bridgewater State College)

Table 3. Labor Rights and Repertoires

Session Organizer: Barry Eidlin (University of California- Berkeley)

“By What Right do Chinese State Enterprise Workers Fight for Rights?,” Stephen Pillion (St. Cloud State University)

“Contending Repertoires,” Manjusha S. Nair (Rutgers University)

“The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the U.S. Labor Movement,” M. Brigid O'Farrell (George Washington University)

Table 4. Theorizing Labor Conflict

Session Organizer: Barry Eidlin (University of California- Berkeley)

“Bringing the Urban Back In: Reconstructing Theories of Strike Mobilization,” Chris Rhomberg (Yale University)

“Defining Them and Us: The Dynamics of Framing Contests that Occur During Union Organizing Drives,” Jeremy E. Baker (The Ohio State University)

Table 5. Labor, Academia, and the Internet

Session Organizer: Barry Eidlin (University of California- Berkeley)

“An Analysis of a Text-Based Information Academic Web Page: Internet Usage at the ASA Section on Labor and Labor Movements,” George P. Mason (Wayne State University)
Section members interested in learning more about our section’s web presence and how to improve it are encouraged to attend this presentation.

Friday, August 1, 10:30 am - 12:10 pm, Boston Marriott Copley Place

The Alliance Between Labor and the Democratic Party: Who Benefits?

Session Organizer: Michael Schwartz (Stony Brook State University)

Presenters:

Barry Eidlin, University of California, Berkeley, “Class Conflict, Policy Development, and the State: Explaining the Postwar Divergence of Canadian and U.S. Unions”

Joyce Rothschild, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, “Why the Democrats Have Never Supported the Worker Cooperative Model”

Nancy DiTomaso, Rutgers University, “Post-civil Rights Politics and Party Realignment: Race, Religion, Class, and Culture”

Commentator: Rhonda Levine, Colgate University

Friday, August 1, 10:30 am - 12:10 pm, Boston Marriott Copley Place

Open Refereed Roundtable

Session Organizer: Gregory Wayne Walker (Lock Haven Univ. of Pennsylvania)

“Legacies and Possibilities: Challenges Facing the Australian OHS Profession in a Post-Industrial World,” Debra F. Moodie-Bain (University of Western Sydney), Zina O’Leary (University of Western Sydney)

“Migrant workers in low-skilled employment: assessing the implications for Human Resource Management,” Robert MacKenzie (Leeds University), Chris Forde (Leeds University)

“Strikes Work: UMUA Local 369’s Victory at NStar,” Tom Juravich (University of Massachusetts)

“The Effect of Union Density on the Wage Gap in Manufacturing: 1949-1997,” Ann Shirley (University of Oregon), Caleb Southworth (University of Oregon, Eugene)

“The Formation of Labor Responses to Globalization: The Case of the CFDT in France,” Marcos Ancelovici (McGill University)

“Women’s Labor Force Status and Globalization: A Cross-National Study,” Debarashmi Mitra (Delta State University)

“Space Invaders: Scheme Conditions and Category Reconfiguration in Union Organizing Drives, 1961-1999,” John-Paul Ferguson (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

Friday, August 1, 12:30 pm - 2:10 pm, Boston Marriott Copley Place

Plenary Panel: Reinventing the American Dream

Session Organizer: Arne L. Kalleberg (University of North Carolina)

Presider: Arne L. Kalleberg (University of North Carolina)

Panelist: Christopher Jencks (Harvard University)

Panelist: Bob Kuttner (*The American Prospect*)

Panelist: Donna Shalala (University of Miami)

Globalization, the spread of neo-liberal political ideology, and growing population diversity are three of the major drivers producing change in work and society in the 21st century. Increasing inequality and insecurity have made the attainment of a good job, a comfortable retirement, home ownership, affordable health care, and a better future for one’s children problematic for millions of Americans. The percentage of people living in poverty remains high despite the economic boom of the 1990’s, and the middle class has become increasingly vulnerable. A distinguished panel—featuring Christopher Jencks (Harvard University), Robert Kuttner (from *The American Prospect*), and Donna Shalala (President of the University of Miami)—will engage in a discussion on reinventing the “American Dream.”

Friday, August 1, 2:30 pm - 4:10 pm, Sheraton Boston

Changing Labor Markets, Changing Strategies: Worker Organizing Outside of Traditional Collective Bargaining Frameworks

Session Organizers: Daisy Rooks (Rutgers University) and Steven McKay (University of California - Santa Cruz)

“Community Unionism in Japan: similarities and differences of region-based labor movements between Japan and other industrialized countries,” Akira Suzuki (Hosei University)

“From Economic to Political Mobilization: Working-Class Organizing Targets the State,” Rachel Meyer (University of Michigan)

“From Shop Floor to Ethnic Group Organizing: The Pilipino Workers’ Center,” Nazgol Ghandnoosh (University of California, Los Angeles)

“Of Catharsis and Community: Bicycle Messengers and Organizational *mise en scène*,” Benjamin William Stewart (New York University)

Friday, August 1, 2:30-4:10 pm

Presidential Panel: Decent Work, Decent Jobs: Globalization and Employment Conditions around the World

Organizer and Presider: Naomi Cassirer, International Labour Organization

Panel: Daniel Vaughan-Whitehead, International Labor Organization
Sangheon Lee, International Labor Organization
Naomi Cassirer, International Labor Organization
Deirdre McCann, International Labor Organization
Discussant: Lucio Baccaro, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

The ILO is a specialized agency of the United Nations, formulating international labor standards and providing technical assistance on the full range of labor and employment issues. In this panel, ILO officials will discuss findings on changes in working conditions and job quality around the world, in the context of globalization. The panel will cover the elements that form the core of the employment relationship and determine the quality of working life; wages, working time, work organization, and work-family balance. The panel will speak both to research efforts and findings and to national and workplace policies and programs for improving the quality of work.

Friday, August 1, 4:30-6:10 pm, Sheraton Boston

Precarious Workers in Africa

Session Organizer: Rina Agarwala (Johns Hopkins University)

“Wage Labor, Precarious Employment, and Social Inclusion in the Making of South Africa's

Post-Apartheid Transition,” Franco Barchiesi (Ohio State University)

“Strong Union, Weak Labor Force: Responses of the South African Labor Movement to Marginalization in the Labor Market,” Ben Scully (Johns Hopkins University)

“Out of Precarity: Politics of Casualization in Africa's Chinese Enclaves,” Ching Kwan Lee (University of Michigan)

Discussant: Amy Hanser (University of British Columbia)

Discussant: Peter B. Evans (University of California, Berkeley)

Saturday, August 2, 10:30 am-12:10 pm

Presidential Panel: The Meaning of Work: What Is Work?

Organizer: Magali Sarfatti Larson, Temple University

Presider: Arne Kalleberg, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill

Panel: Ronald Dore, Cavanazza, Veggio
Richard Sennett, London School of Economics
Arlie Hochschild, University of California-Berkeley

Saturday, August 2, 12:30 pm - 2:10 pm, Sheraton Boston

Thematic Session: Comparative Labor Movements

Session Organizer: Gay W. Seidman (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Presider: Gay W. Seidman (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Panelist: Rina Agarwala (Johns Hopkins University)

Panelist: Mark Anner (Cornell University)

Panelist: Hagen Koo (University of Hawaii)

Discussant: Gay W. Seidman (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Globalization presents new challenges to labor movements everywhere, perhaps especially in the developing world, where economic restructuring has complicated labor's choices. How have labor movements responded? What kinds of new strategies are movements pursuing? To what extent and how are labor movements able to help shape development strategies as the Washington consensus seems to be fraying around the edges?

Saturday, August 2, 2:30-4:10 pm

Presidential Panel: Outsourcing Labor: The Social Construction of Individual, Organizational, and Field-Level Effects

Organizer and Presider: Alison Davis-Blake, University of Minnesota

Panel: Joe Broschak, University of Arizona
Susan Houseman, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research

Vicki Smith, University of California, Davis
Discussant: Rose Batt, Cornell University

This session is organized around three broad themes of the effects of outsourcing for individuals, organizations, and organizational fields. Our panelists, all well-respected scholars in the area of nonstandard work or outsourcing, will make a general set of comments about one or more of these levels of analysis. A theme that ties all of the panelists' work together is that the consequences of outsourcing at the individual, organizational, and field level are all socially mediated and socially constructed. All of the panelists will provide some insights into how processes of cognition and social construction shape the consequences of the outsourcing of work.

Sunday August 3, 8:30 am, Sheraton Boston

Regular Session: Labor/Labor Movements

Session Organizer: William Canak, Middle Tennessee State University

Presider: John-Paul Ferguson, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

“Community Unionism as a Revitalization Strategy? A British Case of Innovation,” Ian Greer, Ian Greenwood and Mark Stuart, University of Leeds

“Newer Immigrants, Same "Old" Unions?: Exploring Barriers to Immigrant Incorporation in the Building Trades,” Alice B. Gates, University of Michigan

“Union Members Who Vote for the Republicans,” Tracy Fang-Hui Chang, University of Alabama-Birmingham

“Voice within Voice: Union Member Responses to Dissatisfaction with their Union,” Peter Gerard Gahan, Monash University

Discussant: Lucio Baccaro, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Sunday, August 3, 12:30 pm

Plenary Session: Globalization and Work: Challenges and Responsibilities

Panelists: Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Michael Piore, and Erik Olin Wright

Sunday, August 3, 2:30-4:10 pm

Presidential Panel: From “Industrial Sociology” to “Sociology of Work”

Organizer: Jennifer Platt, University of Sussex
Presider: Michael Burawoy, University of California, Berkeley

Presenters: Michael Rose, University of Bath
Jennifer L. Pierce, University of Minnesota
Jennifer Platt, University of Sussex
Charles Crothers, Auckland University of Technology, Mervyn Horgan, York University, Toronto

The session will focus on the history of the sociology of work, mainly in the USA. In reviewing different aspects of that history, the papers will raise issues such as the field's relation

to general sociology, how far its changes over time have responded to changes in society or to changes internal to sociology, the extent of real change as topics, conceptualizations and methods have changed, and the factors which have led to such changes.

Sunday, August 3, 4:30 - 6:10 pm, Sheraton Boston

Thematic Session: Comparative Gender Theory: Power, Politics and Work Transformation

Organizer: Heidi Gottfried, Wayne State University

Presider: Judy Wajcman, Australia National University

"Comparing Gender Regimes: Globalization, Complexity and Contested Modernities," Sylvia Walby (Lancaster University, UK)

"Gendered Capitalism, Corporate Non-Responsibility, and Neo-Liberal Restructuring," Joan Acker (University of Oregon)

"Framing Gender Equality: Contextual Constraints and Strategic Choices?" Myra Marx Ferree (University of Wisconsin)

"Revisiting Agency in Feminist Theory: Global Lessons From Organizing Domestic Workers," Raka Ray (University of California, Berkeley)

A proliferation of feminist scholarship has contributed to comparative theories on gender, power, politics and work transformation. Yet, there are few opportunities for dialogue among feminists specializing in different sociological areas of inquiry. The proposed panel seeks to provide a forum for exchange and discussion on a topic of central concern. The list of panelists includes scholars who have written extensively about these themes but have different starting points, ranging from political sociology, historical comparative sociology, social movements, organizational sociology, and work sociology. By bringing together feminists prominent in many

ASA sections, the panel has the potential of appealing to a large and a diverse audience as well as advancing sociological theorizing about class and gender inequalities.

Monday, August 4, 8:30 am - 10:10 am, Sheraton Boston

Thematic Session: Entrepreneurship in Comparative Context

Organizer: Howard E. Aldrich (University of North Carolina)

Presider: Howard E. Aldrich (University of North Carolina)

Panelist: AnnaLee Saxenian (University of California, Berkeley)

Panelist: Alejandro Portes (Princeton University)

Panelist: Martin Ruef (Princeton University)

Panelist: David Stark (Columbia University)

Over four panelists will look at the phenomenon of entrepreneurship from an international and comparative perspective. Immigrants have historically played an important role as entrepreneurs in their host societies, and several panelists will talk about recent developments on the international migration front and how they affect entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship has also buried historically, and one of our panelists will examine entrepreneurship in the American South in the 19th century. Finally, economic transformation in post-socialist nations has sparked a resurgence of entrepreneurship in those countries and we will examine that development.

Monday, August 4, 12:30 pm - 2:10 pm, Boston Marriott Copley Place

Thematic Session: Paths of Resistance: Work Regimes and Global Protest

Session Organizer: Vicki Smith (University of California, Davis)

Panelist: Jeff Goodwin (New York University)

Panelist: Ching Kwan Lee (University of Michigan)

Panelist: Gay W. Seidman (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Discussant: Gianpaolo Baiocchi (University of Massachusetts-Amherst)

The sociologists on this panel will discuss alternate forms of resistance to economic and labor regimes. Each of these scholars specializes in international research and brings a unique perspective to different forms of protest: what causes them, who participates in them, and the consequences of social and collective protest. As traditional forms of labor militance (such as strikes and the formation of labor unions) increasingly fail to yield substantive democratic outcomes for workers and citizens, it is important to understand the recourses that people around the world have to challenge institutions and relations of power.

BOOK REVIEWS

Which Way Forward for Labor? A Review of *Solidarity Divided*

Steven Sherman

Provoked by the continuing crisis of organized labor after the departure of the Change to Win coalition of unions from the AFL-CIO in 2005, Bill Fletcher, Jr. and Fernando Gapasin have produced a new book, *Solidarity Divided: The Crisis in Organized Labor and A New Path toward Social Justice*. Hopefully the text will inspire debate, both within the labor movement and the Left. *Solidarity Divided* compliments Kim Moody's *U.S. Labor in Trouble and Transition*, also produced after the split. But the two books focus on different aspects. Moody delineates the features of the current U.S. industrial structure to highlight where labor might organize most effectively. On the other hand, Fletcher and Gapasin highlight the politics of the unions to raise questions about the fundamental purpose of labor unions. Ultimately, they outline an alternative labor movement that would possess only the most limited family relation to the current national union federations.

They foreground a number of problems with the current union movement – its lack of democracy and space for debate; the inertia of its structures, which tend to swallow reform efforts; and the limited horizon of its political vision. All of these are related. American unions, in a tradition dating back to Samuel Gompers, imagine themselves, for the most part, as fighting for the wellbeing of their members, rather than the working class. The narrowness of this perspective has led unions to accommodate themselves to racism and sexism, rather than to undo them, and to swim with the (permanent) Cold War tide that structures politics in the U.S., thus participating in regular purges of the Left. Until recently the unions had a wholly uncritical relationship to American foreign policy, and that has changed in only the most limited ways. In the past few years, American unions no longer aided and abetted right-wing union movements abroad (for the most part), but they still remain mute about the role of the U.S. in the wider world. Fletcher and Gapasin identify a number of moments when a political leadership could have effectively intervened – for example, the national union movement did successfully back the unjustly persecuted Charleston 5, but then did nothing to learn from the victory or use it to energize a largely demoralized movement. Another example is the Los Angeles Manufacturing Project (LAMAP). This effort attempted to combine the strengths of unions, ethnic communities, and universities to organize workers in the strategic Alameda Corridor, the primary access point for Pacific Rim goods and the site of about 300,000 manufacturing jobs. The unions ultimately offered only limit support, because this was seen as an initiative from "outside." Yet it was difficult to see how the inspiration for bringing together the varied coalition envisioned could have come from within the unions. Katrina is another example: a political union movement might have intervened to shape the debate about aid, reconstruction, etc. But contemporary unions mostly react to such disasters through depoliticized volunteer efforts.

Fletcher and Gapasin discuss the rise of John Sweeney and the departure of the Change to Win coalition in considerable detail. They are slightly more sympathetic to Sweeney than to Andy Stern (the leader of SEIU, who led the charge of Change to Win out of the AFL-CIO), but they write with great frustration about both (they also note that failures of leadership are rarely simply the fault of "misleaders," but often are rooted in the material bases of their power, though they don't really use this to illuminate the leaders of the unions, beyond noting the way they are often prisoners of the bureaucratic traditions they embody). They see Sweeney as a genuine reformer, and offer some praise for his educational initiatives and his willingness to move the unions into a little more combative stance, epitomized by his speech about globalization at the anti-racism conference in Durban. Yet Sweeney's politics were also limited – in that same speech, he carefully avoided any reference to American foreign policy. As a political figure, Sweeney was unable to control the narrative unfolding during his tenure. For example, those who would later leave the AFL-CIO on the grounds that it was not committed to organizing had earlier attacked Sweeney's efforts to devote national resources to organizing on the grounds that it was wasteful. The authors seem to be less sympathetic to Stern – at one point, they suggest the push for "consolidation" among the Change to Win federation is an effort to preserve the leadership as a domain of white male privilege. Stern is portrayed as something of a neo-Gompersian figure who cravenly seeks only to expand his union, while simply accommodating himself to all reactionary political currents swirling about him. They are dismissive of Change to Win's emphasis on workers who are less directly affected by globalization than industrial workers, regarding this as basically illusory (although one could point to similar tensions in the union movements of other countries, on which an analysis of how union leaders embody larger dynamics, rather than simply "mislead," might have been usefully brought to bear).

Perhaps their greatest frustration is that the crisis that triggered John Sweeney's ascension, and later the split, did not produce a meaningful, inclusive debate about the direction of the labor movement.

Virtually all the discussions were held among the top leaders, and even those discussions were inadequate. They include as an appendix a proposal that circulated about how to create a productive discussion within the labor movement, but this proposal was ignored. Thousands of comments from union members on a message board were not meaningfully integrated into the discussion or used as the basis for a deeper debate. The split itself was announced as a *fait accompli* before the AFL-CIO convention when more grassroots members might have been able to offer their opinions. And so the labor movement has been divided, but a rich discussion about its purpose and future has been tabled.

As a way forward, Fletcher and Gapasin advocate "social justice unionism." This envisions unions joining together with other working-class organizations to fight for the broad interests of the working class, locally, nationally, and internationally. Union membership and contract negotiation would be considered but one element of the picture. This movement would also enter into the fray on such questions as health care, the uses of urban space (affordable housing, parks, etc.), transportation, the creation of a sustainable economy and society, structural unemployment, and so forth. Unions would both reach out to oppressed racial and ethnic communities as a solidarity resource in struggle and join the fight against racism and sexism as the path towards a more inclusive and just society. The authors see some hope in labor-community alliances that have formed but argue for a much broader purpose for these alliances than the single-issue campaigns and support work they have typically pursued. They believe these alliances can be remade into "workers' assemblies," which can struggle for "consistent democracy" in all aspects of American life. They see the municipal level as more amenable to this sort of organizing than the national unions or federations. Thus a

revitalization of the Central Labor Councils is crucial.

While heartening, this agenda begs questions of agency. Although there is more room to maneuver at the local level, union locals are by no means autonomous from the nationals, and they would likely be reined in if they departed too radically from the traditional practices of trade unionism. Furthermore, the community organizations unions might seek as allies are, for the most part, not vital, grassroots social movements. In practice, they are primarily non-profits and religious institutions, which, not unlike unions, bureaucratically advocate for members' interests and are often ambivalent about triggering mobilizations and constrained by funding considerations in the language they use (the challenges of creating combative social movements in this context was well discussed in *The Revolution Will Not be Funded*). Fletcher and Gasparin call on the Left to intervene to make the transformation they desire, but they themselves concede that the Left is extremely weak, fragmented, and amorphous and that leftists acting individually are more likely to get sucked into the status quo practices of organizations than remake them.

I want to end by making a couple of suggestions about how the Left can constitute itself as a more assertive force within the U.S., thus perhaps creating the context to begin to transform the current union federations into a labor movement of the sort Fletcher and Gasparin advocate for. A broader Left could offer support to its members as they sought to build workers' assemblies and could help them share nationally what is working and not working. One step would be for the remaining anti-capitalist/socialist groupings to enter into some sort of umbrella organization. This might include (but is not necessarily limited to) the Communist Party, the ISO, Solidarity, Freedom Road, and the Green Party (there are a few socialist organizations which remain entirely unreformed in their commitment to sectarian intervention and almost cult-like in their internal organization; their participation would not be so

welcome). Although important political questions divide these groups, creating a space for some engagement and debate should not be so difficult (at the municipal level, some of these groups already work together). Regardless of how they feel about working with the Democrats on electoral campaigns (for example), these groups are much closer to each other in terms of political vision than to any other tendencies in American political life. Surely none seriously believe that, alone, they can constitute a vanguard or even a viable third party. An umbrella organization would immediately expand the networks of all involved, increase the capacity of the socialist Left to make an impact, and make the socialist Left more attractive to unaffiliated leftists hesitant about adhering to a narrow sect.

It would likely also improve the quality of debate all around. A second potential site of American Left renewal is the U.S. Social Forum (surprisingly absent from Fletcher and Gasparin's analysis). In terms of the network of groups who mobilized for it last year in Atlanta, it resembles those the authors see as constituting workers' assemblies (community organizations, unions, workers' centers, etc.). The great danger of social forums is that they simply turn into a pleasant retreat for those on the Left, rather than a spur to more effective forms of organizing. But in part because it is much less well endowed financially than the unions, and lacks a full-fledged bureaucracy, the question of what the Social Forum can be is still an open one. If the Social Forum were to act as something of a popular university, it could help to revitalize the Left in the U.S. I envision it being the site of pulling together diverse (in terms of racial composition, geography, economic sector, etc.) networks into working groups to examine questions like the role of unions or the relation of social movements to elected officials (some similar work is taking place in contexts related to the World Social Forum). The Social Forum itself would provide a readymade public to debate the findings, so that they would not simply disappear into the endless pile of proposals and published books. To transform the union federations into a working-class movement, we do not need a sectarian Left

supremely confident in its "scientific" ability to offer answers to all political questions; but we do need a national network of like-minded people with the means to debate and support each other.

Steven Sherman is a sociologist who lives in New York City. He maintains the website lefteye-onbooks.org. This piece originally appeared at MRZine.com.

Labor Mobilization in Wartime Japan

Kelli M. Rucker

A review of Paul H. Kratoska, editor, *Asian Labor in the Wartime Japanese Empire: Unknown Histories* (M.E. Sharpe, 2005). 456 pages. \$94.95 cloth, \$36.95 paper.

Between 1937 and 1945 Japan advanced its imperial control over the masses of East Asia. Aided by its aggressive labor policies, millions of East Asian workers were uprooted and lured to destinations far from home—imprinted with false hopes of escaping the habitual privations common to peasant workers. In exchange for their labor, a contract generally lasting two years, workers were promised ample food, decent wages, adequate medical care, and sanitary living provisions, yet were supplied with starving rations, little to any compensation, and inhabitable shelter. In combination with the unchartered environment where laborers were assigned to work, they became highly susceptible to disease and infection. By the end of the war, mortality rates of 45 percent were commonplace, and many of the survivors, if not all, were in convalescence.

Asian Labor in the Wartime Japanese Empire: Unknown Histories guides us through this unfettered journey of the Showa period, exposing Japan's draconian recruitment tactics in procuring its insatiable wartime labor demand. In unmasking these ploys, Kratoska allows us to glean exceptional insight into Japan's hegemonic

idealism towards a united East Asia and with it, the genesis of the coolie—a slave laborer.

“The Japanese saw themselves as the natural leaders of East Asia, so it seemed only appropriate that other Asians on the lower rungs of the regional ladder should be willing to sacrifice, even to the extent of giving their lives, to achieve the goals of winning a ‘sacred’ war and establishing East Asian co-prosperity.”

Sadly, this apotheosis of co-prosperity never came to fruition.

Manchuria and North China

With a significant portion of the workforce diverted to wartime efforts and the remainder directed at stabilizing the Japanese economy, Japan embarked on labor recruitment endeavors beyond their borders, beginning with Manchuria and North China. Initially intended as volunteer only, Japan's labor schemata gradually transformed into conscription, and eventually coercion, as the burgeoning labor demands of the war progressively consumed volunteer recruits. Concomitantly, labor eligibility requirements were modified to include elementary school and university students, prisoners, and women.

Such an expansive labor demand permeated and ultimately ravaged the economies where labor had been substantially usurped. Since labor was the driver in Japan's war preparations, there grew an imbalance between usage of these resources and labor skills dedicated to domestic farming, industry, and educational needs. Additionally, if labor was unavailable in designated areas, labor policies commonly dictated that workers be transported, oftentimes hundreds of miles from their homes by boat, to work in rural labor camps where manpower was sparse. It was also not unusual for land area natural resources to be completely exploited. As these augmentations to Japan's labor policies begin to solidify, there emerged a convergence of hegemonic ideals, comparable to Gramsci's theory of intellectuals and hegemonic praxis.

According to Gramsci, all men are intellectuals to a certain degree. This either takes the form of their profession or activities outside of their profession, such as a philosopher or artist (that contribute to society). It further delineates into varying levels of intelligence (intellectual strata), largely divided by occupational specializations. Gramsci cites Italy as an example. The rural bourgeoisie produce state functionaries and professional people, whereas the urban bourgeoisie produce technicians of industry. These strata are mostly an outgrowth of historical processes, as opposed to the “terrain of abstract democracy” which promulgates free will. The former suggests a predetermination of roles and positions in society, which transforms into specializations of intelligentsia.

Similar to these strata and specializations were the coolie and *batou* system introduced into Japan’s wartime construction industry. An intricate hierarchy comprised of coolie workers and their boss, the *batou* primarily facilitated the recruitment process and regulated the wages of his recruited workers, which was split between his hefty compensation for recruitment duties. Kratoska describes this network as indirect labor management. Since the Japanese had substantially expanded its labor mobilization efforts, it increasingly depended on local liaisons to recruit and control workers. The recruitment process usually worked in tandem with Japan’s increased occupation of East Asian territories. Japanese officials demanded labor, the *batou* recruited laborers, and the laborers in return fueled the Japanese hegemonic goals of greed and domination.

All matters of dispute, wages, and labor procurement were handled by the *batou*—a modern day labor activist—who also served as the laborers’ negotiator in matters concerning their work assignments. The basic unit of a *batou* network was about 15 workers and could swell up to 200 workers, incorporating a hierarchy with as many as 3 chief *batou* and various sub-*batou* units. Workers without a *batou* may be forced

into the casual labor market and become “lumpen” or dispensable and mistreated. On both accounts, a laborer with or without a *batou*, was considered a coolie—part of the unskilled labor mass.

Workers whom management considered “ignorant” and “dishonest” were intellectually scrutinized using scientific experiments, mainly consisting of standardized aptitude tests, which employed a variety of methods—experimental psychology, anthropology, physiology and physiognomy (*kanso gaku*), where features such as the shape of jaw bones, distance from eye to ear, were measured and analyzed to determine personality and competency. Kratoska underlines this minutia through an invidious description of the physical traits of the Shandong people of China, relayed by a Japanese scientist, “thick skulled people of low culture and ability with strong backs and powerful grips...a large jaw, a cranial circumference of 55 centimeters, a facial length from 1.35 to 1.4 times the line of the lower jaw, prominent cheekbones, stupidity, big teeth, a bridge of the nose that indicated docility and submissiveness, barbarity,” all of which purportedly made them more inclined for physical labor. Beyond marking the coolie as inhuman and civilly incorrigible, he was also subjected to open disdain and ridicule, common strategies used to pound the worker into submission.

Korea

As a leading superpower, Japan had distinguished itself as one of the esteemed classes of intellectuals and the remainder of East Asia as its sub-strata intellectual and non-intellectual subordinates. In maintaining this status quo, torture and psychological conditioning were used to convert independent East Asian ideals into that of pro-Japanese. Of those subjugated, most noteworthy were the Koreans, who were forced to adopt Japanese style names, exclusively speak the Japanese language, and become indoctrinated with the Japanese mantra of imperialism. Utsumi Aiko elucidates the differential treatment between

the volunteer Korean soldiers and the conscripted Korean soldiers, the former having been infused with Japanese patriotism, and the latter being forcibly adapted to it.

Unlike the conscript soldiers, the military volunteers were educated in the Japanese language and way of life, and were therefore afforded greater opportunities in upward career mobility. The conscripted soldiers, on the other hand, were poorer in quality by comparison. They were not as proficient in the Japanese language, nor aspired to be, and were evaluated by lower physical requirements than the military volunteers (e.g., volunteers were required to be 160 centimeters tall, whereas conscripts only needed to be 155-152 centimeters tall). Given the compulsory nature of their enlistment, conscripted soldiers were maladjusted to military life and did not perform well in active duty, motivating severe punishments and executions for cavalier mishaps.

Korean student recruits were of yet another ilk. As part of the reformation of the Korean into Japanese *laissez-faire*, Korean students were encouraged to enroll in Japanese Universities, enduring taunts and derisions by fellow classmates and commonly referred to as *yanbanjin* (barbarians) by their professors. When in 1943 a decree was approved to allow military service eligibility to male university students, many Koreans, embittered by their prejudicial treatment, turned a deaf ear, but with the announcement of Koiso Kuniaki of the government-general of Korea, pleading with its citizens that the fate of Korea would be uncertain unless Koreans volunteered for Japanese military service, many Korean students felt they had no choice but to enlist, hoping their patriotic enthusiasm might alleviate Japanese racist attitudes. They soon discovered this approach was futile. The quality of their lives proved to be just as humiliating and disparaged as they were outside of Japan's military camp.

Aiko's depiction of these discriminatory practices is accentuated with an accompanying photo of

Korean enlistees, lined up, wardrobed in waistline white sheets, and solemnly waiting physical inspection by a Japanese grandee—envisioning such a scene naturally conjures up images of American slave auctions, as hundreds upon thousands of slaves were measured, poked, prodded, and individually branded for their quality in stamina, obedience, and sexual performance—now vestiges of an imperialist Asian military practice, both with similar goals—labor control.

Vietnam

In Gramsci's hegemony, the relationship between the intellectuals and the masses is not as direct as with producers and society, but has a tenuous balance that is mediated by the innate fabric of society and creations of superstructures (gradation levels of intellectuals). These formations are further divided into factions of civil ("private") and political society ("the state"), corresponding with the function of hegemony—where the intellectuals are the dominant group's deputies, exercising organization through "direct domination" or command, via "the state." However, Gramsci emphasizes that this should not be misconstrued as a means to an end, and the masses should not be left at their current status. Indeed, the end goals of hegemony are far-reaching, and aim to develop the masses toward intellectual progress. This is where Japan has failed.

Tran My-Van's chapter, "Working for the Japanese: Working for Vietnamese Independence, 1941-45," underscores the Machiavellian tactics of Japanese officials in attempting to siege colonial influence from the French. Cooperating with two local religious organizations, which were also highly opposed to French rule, the Japanese built an alliance, and in exchange for repression against the French, the Vietnamese agreed to provide the Japanese with intelligence on local affairs, and labor for Japanese construction projects.

Exposure of Japan's Potemkin village surfaced immediately after Vietnamese soldiers defeated the French. Japanese forces swiftly appointed themselves to Vietnam's most senior government positions, and instead of curbing French occupation, allowed all French public servants and technicians to retain their posts. With Japan's pretense of independence and solidarity now effaced, Vietnamese optimism of sovereignty was not only crushed, but crucified, as they witnessed the last bastion of their hope lampooned, tormented, and assassinated.

The non-intellectual, according to Gramsci, is the man of the masses. He is faced with a duality—an analysis comparable to W.E.B. DuBois's ideology of the American Negro, characterized as a "double consciousness"—that is inherently at odds to its role in being apart from the intellectual. Still, he endures in silence, in limbo, like a wretched soul caught in between this life and the next, not quite certain of his dual existence and perpetually ignorant of his own faculties. Thus, the non-intellectual has finally reached the state of hegemonic praxis—private society is now completely absorbed within the State, by which he has psychologically conformed to accept his inferior destiny.

The coolie, the man a part of the mass, was lured by a false hope of freedom. He believed, like Gramsci's non-intellectual, that his labor (obedient or forced) under Japan's tutelage could liberate him from an inescapable life of poverty, discrimination, or both. *Asian Labor in the Wartime Japanese Empire: Unknown Histories* is a true homage to the coolie and his struggle to elevate his status within the boundaries of the hierarchal mass, a step toward an equal footing with the intellectuals, and like Gramsci, Kratoska unravels this inherent conundrum—the coolie, similar to the non-intellectual, is not equipped to function among the ruling class (intellectuals), but only conditioned to accept his fate. By doing so, he is liberated from his dual nature, vis-à-vis, between striving toward his potential or remaining complacent. To enhance our critique on these oppositional paradigms of emancipation

and constraint, we will need to continually examine the historical confluence of labor policy with comparative hegemonic influences from the West and the East, matriarchal genocide and sexual slavery, African slave and Asian coolie. This book sets the stage for such a comprehensive analysis and with it, memorializes the slave laborer, bringing his pilgrimage to light, and laying his spirit to rest.

PUBLICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Globalization and Labor: Democratizing Global Governance

By **Dimitris Stevis** and **Terry Boswell**

July 2007, 220 pages, Paper ISBN 0-7425-3785-4 / 978-0-7425-3785-9 \$27.95

Unions have long been a central force in the democratization of national and global governance, and this timely book explores the role of labor in fighting for a more democratic and equitable world. In a clear and compelling narrative, Dimitris Stevis and Terry Boswell explore the past accomplishments and the formidable challenges still facing global union politics. Outlining the contradictions of globalization and global governance, they consider the implications for global union politics since its inception in the nineteenth century. The authors place this key social movement in a political economy framework as they argue that social movements can be fruitfully compared based on their emphases on egalitarianism and internationalism. Applying these concepts to global union politics across time, the authors consider whether global union politics has become more active and more influential or has failed to rise to the challenge of global capitalism. All readers interested in global organizations, governance, and social movements will find this deeply informed work an essential resource.

"A significant and timely contribution that will advance the urgent debate swirling around the relationship between labor and global governance."

—Robert O'Brien, McMaster University

"This thorough and clearly written book is an essential read for those who wish to understand the dilemmas and challenges faced by trade unions and other social movements in the contemporary world. The authors analyze the range of actions and policies available to the union movement with both realism and sympathy."

—Jeffrey Harrod, ISHSS, University of Amsterdam

"Wide-ranging and authoritative, this book is one of the best available guides to trade union theory and practice in the era of globalization. Stevis and Boswell resist temptations to advocate empty radical policies and instead build carefully on current trade union and labor movement strategies to construct a viable multilevel transformative strategy. If you are to read one book on labor and global governance, this is the one!"

—Ronaldo Munck, Dublin City University

Dimitris Stevis is professor in the Department of Political Science at Colorado State University. Terry Boswell (1955-2006) was professor in the Department of Sociology at Emory University.

* * *

Maria Cristina Morales, 2008. "The Ethnic Niche as an Economic Pathway for Dark-Skinned Latina/os: Labor Market Incorporation of Latina/o Workers," *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science* (August 2008).

* * *

Joel Stillerman and **Peter Winn**, editors, Special Issue, *New Studies/New Organizations; Labor Organization in Latin America and Beyond. International Labor and Working-Class History* 72, 1 (Fall 2007).

Contents:

Joel Stillerman and **Peter Winn**, "Introduction: New Studies/New Organizations; Labor Organization in Latin America and Beyond"

Mark Anner, "Forging New Labor Activism in Global Commodity Chains in Latin America"

Sonia M.K. Guimarães, "Brazil's Telecom Unions Confront the Future: Privatization, Technological Change, and Globalization"

Salvador A.M. Sandoval, "Alternative Forms of Working-Class Organization and the Mobilization of Informal-Sector Workers in Brazil in the Era of Neoliberalism"

Aviva Chomsky, "Globalization, Labor, and Violence in Colombia's Banana Zone"

Kenneth M. Roberts, "The Crisis of Labor Politics in Latin America: Parties and Labor Movements during the Transition to Neoliberalism"

M. Anne Pitcher, "What Has Happened to Organized Labor in Southern Africa?"

Paul W. Drake, "Organized Labor's Global Problems and Local Responses"

Eric Hershberg, "Globalization and Labor: Reflections on Contemporary Latin America"

* * *

Sarah Hernandez, Associate Professor at New College of Florida, has been awarded a Fulbright Scholar grant to lecture and do research at Universidad de Guadalajara in Mexico during the 2008-09 academic year. Hernandez will explore the relationship between Mexican and U.S. unions, identifying the factors that facilitate and prevent their collaboration.