

The Arithmetic of Decline and Some Proposals for Renewal

By Peter Olney

New Labor Forum -- Spring/Summer 2002

In 1999 the New Voice leadership of the AFL-CIO and its affiliates announced an organizing goal of one million members per year. In both 2000 and 2001, it has failed to attain that ambitious goal. Some will smugly eulogize the New Voice organizing program. Defenders of the program will lodge its failures with the vast majority of the union affiliates who have failed to appropriate the needed staff, money, training, and resources to organize the unorganized.

Sadly the lines of debate are drawn and caricatured between "capacity builders" and "movement builders." Capacity builders scream for more resources as the solution. Movement builders cry out for a more democratic and bottom-up movement that places less emphasis on numbers and more stock in the quality of our organizations.

While both perspectives have merit, they incorrectly assess the real capacity of the AFL-CIO to generate massive new organizing. Capacity builders exaggerate the ability of the federation to force the affiliate unions to organize. Movement builders do not grasp that any movement is built on specific program and structure, not idealized dreams.

This paper argues for an action program that builds on the existing strength and competency of the trade unions to birth a broad movement that enhances the existing affiliates and creates new worker forms when necessary to build organizational density and worker power.

The Organizing Ledger

The high-water mark of union power measured by density (union membership as a proportion of the workforce) was 1955 when the AFL and the CIO merged. Unions represented 35 percent of the private sector workforce. When John Sweeney was elected president of the AFL-CIO in November of 1995 the labor movement represented 14.9 percent of the overall workforce and 10.4 percent of the private sector. Sweeney and his slate swept to power on a pledge to reinvigorate the trade unions through "changing to organize" and through a new aggressive political program.

Six years out and the organizing results are in. Despite the fact that the AFL-CIO has shamed, coaxed, and cajoled its affiliates to focus resources on organizing, overall

federation membership has dropped 68,000 in the last five years. The percentage of the workforce represented by the labor movement (the AFL-CIO and independents) has declined from 14.9 percent in 1995, the last year of Lane Kirkland's stewardship of the AFL-CIO, to 13.5 percent in 2001. (1)

As much as many on the Left may wish to critique the limited numerical accomplishments and the ultimate quality of the organizing, this kind of broad-based discussion, debate, and focus on organizing did not exist prior to John Sweeney's ascension to the presidency of the AFL-CIO. Fifty-eight of the sixty-six affiliated unions of the AFL-CIO now have organizing directors. Even the Horseshoers Union has an organizing director and it's not Roy Rogers! Prior to the New Voice it would have been inconceivable to have a serious discussion about hiring rank-and-file organizers with most of AFL-CIO affiliates. Now even a traditional building trades union like the Ironworkers had a national organizing program adopted at its convention in August 2001.

Numbers Don't Lie But . .

Ironically, many of the perceived failures of the New Voice, particularly in the area of organizing the unorganized, are a result of the emphasis on numbers. To the extent that accountability is furthered by the focus on numbers this is an advance over empty platitudes. Union density is a tricky concept. Density numbers are subject to obvious cyclical and structural changes. The business cycle that results in sharp drops in employment can negate the net numerical effect of powerful organizing. The same is true for dramatic structural changes in the economy.

While density remains one measure of union power it is not all determining. Witness the power of the French labor movement to engage in powerful strikes and job actions on a national level with a density level of only 9.1 percent in 1995. (2) Obviously qualitative questions of strategic sectors, class consciousness, and history of struggle play a vital role in measuring the power of a labor movement.

The much heralded strategic initiatives of the initial years of the New Voice have, for the most part, flopped. Large-scale sectoral or geographic initiatives like the strawberry workers in California or the Building Trades Organizing Project (BTOP) in Las Vegas or Seattle Union Now (SUN) have come to ruin.

However, the biggest hole in the organizing program has been the inability to launch serious initiatives in the manufacturing and logistics (transport and storage) sectors, two of the most strategic sectors of the economy that are crucial to labor's overall power and place in society. Some glaring examples of this hole: The much publicized and much needed "heavy metal" merger of the Autoworkers, Machinists, and Steelworkers was wrecked on the rocks of personal power politics.(3) The Los Angeles Manufacturing Action Project (LAMAP) was a multiunion industrial organizing project focused on the largely Latino immigrant workforce in Los Angeles County. After initial interest in the waning days of the Kirkland era, the affiliates failed to fully embrace the program and it

died in early 1998. The Teamster's Overnite national trucking organizing campaign, even with a half million dollars in assistance from the AFL-CIO, has failed. The Teamsters and East and West coast longshore unions have not to date mounted a serious drive to organize the 40,000 short haul truckers who are the key link along the distribution chain between the ports and warehousing.(4)

Much of the recent growth in density has occurred among service sector workers, especially in health care. This growth is important because it builds unions among women and people of color who now represent a majority of the ranks of organized labor, and because health care in particular is the fastest growing sector of the economy. Yet a labor movement that wants to challenge the employers must be present in the means of production and distribution. To its credit the AFL-CIO has carried out internal debate over maintaining "core jurisdictions" in an attempt to keep manufacturing unions focused on their traditional sectors and out of health care.

A Few Do the Most

Only a few of the member unions of the Federation have the critical mass of membership necessary to generate the serious resources needed to run a national organizing program. In both 1998 and 1999 eighteen member unions of the AFL-CIO accounted for 98 percent and 97 percent respectively of all organizing.(5) The unions most often cited as having serious and effective organizing programs are Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees (HERE), Service Employees International Union (SEIU), American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), United Auto Workers (UAW), Communications Workers of America (CWA), Union of Needletraders, Industrial, and Textile Employees (UNITE), United Steel Workers of America (USWA) and American Federation of Teachers (AFT). While this is a small number of unions, their combined membership is 5,540,000, about 40 percent of the full membership of the AFL-CIO.(6)

Of the over \$28 million of the AFL-CIO's Strategic Organizing funds distributed from 1997 through 2000, over \$16 million was distributed to the eight unions cited above—two of these affiliates (SEIU and HERE) received over \$9 million between them. A few unions, therefore, are doing the bulk of the organizing. For the most part these are the same unions that were organizing before the New Voice and are now pushing the whole federation and all its affiliates to take up the organizing challenge.(7) SEIU, for instance, in 1998 and 1999 exceeded its designated share of the one million new members goal by almost double.(8)

The verdict on the New Voice with respect to organizing is the old refrain under Lane Kirkland: "The Federation doesn't do organizing, the affiliates do." Rather than critically pouncing on New Voice leaders who promised to organize millions and failed to deliver, it is time to argue for a practical program that envisions a more realistic role for the AFL-CIO while pushing the envelope on a progressive agenda for labor. Such a program

encourages the federation to promote the growth of those already aggressively organizing, to continue to urge others to start organizing, and to recognize that new forms of organization may be necessary.

The program set out below is not original but a synthesis of many cutting edge ideas advanced by labor practitioners and observers over the last several years. The elements that could revitalize union growth are labor law reform, new forms of organizing, building solidarity among unions, understanding the economic issues of the manufacturing complex, focusing on race and immigrant issues, and planting organizers in the workplace.

Labor Law Reform

The election of George W. Bush as president notwithstanding, the political ledger is considerably more positive than the organizing one. The Sweeney leadership has continually emphasized that ultimately political power rests on density and the size of the labor movement, yet despite the declining density numbers AFL-CIO political clout has been on the rise. This is partly due to campaign finance laws that have heightened labor influence, but mainly due to a new, smart, and aggressive political operation. The AFL-CIO exercises its considerable political muscle locally in places such as Los Angeles, and nationally by delivering Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin for an uninspiring candidate like Al Gore.

In the 2000 election the votes of union households accounted for 26 percent of the total. This contrasts with a 1996 figure of 19 percent. In year 2000 4.8 million more union households voted than in 1992. In 2000, labor's campaign to elect 2,000 union members exceeded its goal by 500 members. The AFL-CIO convention meeting in Las Vegas in early December 2001 mandated that 5,000 union members be elected to political office in 2002.

Despite all this political muscle, it was very telling that Senator Paul Wellstone's bill S. 1102 introduced this summer did not even receive mention let alone the support of the federation or its affiliates. S. 1102 would reform the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) by remedying many of the problems that organizers in the trenches encounter day in and day out. It provides for card check elections and arbitration for first contracts, two reforms that would dramatically increase labor's ability to get recognition and first contracts.

The AFL-CIO Voice@Work program has railed against labor law violators and abusers, and it has dramatized the difficulties of organizing under the present legal regime. Yet the federation has failed to advance a comprehensive labor law reform initiative, nor has it supported legislators like Wellstone and Congressman Bernie Sanders

(I) of Vermont who have done just that. Opposing views within the AFL-CIO have left labor leaders unable to create a legislative plank to fight for.

Some successful organizers have no patience with a discussion of labor law reform. Their view is that if unions just get out and organize regardless of the law, forcing confrontation and unrest, the establishment will respond with labor law reform to contain the unrest. This is a vulgar understanding of the relationship between reform in the superstructure and mass activity.

The 1934 West Coast longshore strike is a sharp illustration of this relationship. Harry Bridges and his colleagues had been active for years on the docks in San Francisco and up and down the West Coast. When the 1934 National Industrial Recovery Act was passed and provided the basic protection of “being able to form organizations of their own choosing” (later to become Article 7 of the NLRA passed in 1935), this opening gave San Francisco longshoremen the ability to break the company unionism that had long dominated the docks. They launched one of the seminal CIO battles, culminating in a successful general strike.

The political machinery of the AFL-CIO operating within the Washington beltway has concluded that because of the Republicans in power in Congress and the White House, no labor law reform is possible. But if labor doesn’t start now to educate its members about the need for such reform, then we won’t be able to pass bills when the political climate shifts to favor labor. Debate should begin on the nature of legal reform.(9) Labor can disagree on the shape of reform, but it must agree on the need to do it. No organizing on a significant scale can be done without it.

It is encouraging to see labor begin to use the political superstructure to facilitate organizing on a state and regional level. The Right to Organize law authored by Assemblyman Gil Cedillo and passed in California prohibits state monies from being used to finance antiunion campaigns. Such leverage laws hold promise for creating a more favorable organizing terrain through the use of the legislative process.

Regardless of the waning density numbers, the federation’s huge electoral apparatus is well suited to conduct this battle on the local, state, and federal levels—if it unites with community allies, as it has before, to defeat right to work initiatives and paycheck protection schemes.

New Forms for New Times

“We need to see organizing from a different perspective. Workers organize in order to gain a measure of respect, better their standard of living, and achieve some stability in employment. They do not join unions to maintain the union. . . . Therefore we need to ask a different question: ‘What type of organization do workers want to create, in order to accomplish their objectives?’”

The above remarks by Frank Emspak frame the challenge of new organizing succinctly and articulately.(10) Labor needs to study the ways that workers are actually resisting their employers and the forms of organization that serve that resistance.

In fact, much of the growth of major organizing internationals like SEIU and AFSCME has occurred through the affiliation of existing employee organizations, mostly in the public sector. These gains are treated as a legitimate part of the union's growth numbers. Many large-scale organizing drives in the private sector rely on existing employee associations and networks. CWA assisted a precollective bargaining organization among the 10,000 customer service representatives that it eventually organized at US Airways. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters (IBT), victory among 3,000 Continental mechanics grew out of an employees' association that had existed since the days of Frank Lorenzo and Eastern Airlines.

Shostak and Freeman have written about the potential for cyber unionism and hooking workers into new organizational forms through the Internet.(11) These presentations fixate on technological tactics, however, rather than striving to make Emspak's larger strategic point.

Labor needs to break out of the box of majority unionism and collective bargaining, and think about creating new unions and hybrid forms that build on the existing strength of the affiliates of the AFL-CIO.(12) CWA has pioneered in this approach with the affiliation and promotion of Alliance@ibm and WashTech in Seattle. Both these organizations have won major victories regarding pensions and benefits for independent contractors. These are catch basins that bring workers together based on common occupations and issues, and they enable the CWA to build for the future.

Workers who are part of these efforts need to be counted as new members. Their activity and commitment is often higher than that of longtime members in stable collective bargaining situations. Union leaders are ecstatic if they can get 5 percent of our union members to a meeting. How ironic that associations and mutual aid societies are often turning out more that 50 percent of their membership on a regular basis, but they don't count in the official measures of density and worker power!

The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) affiliated the independent San Francisco Bike Messengers Association (SFBMA) in 1998. This was an independent mutual aid society founded by workers in the same day urgent delivery courier industry. The affiliation provided for the SFBMA to pay International per capita for fifty members and join with the ILWU in organizing specific companies into an ILWU local for collective bargaining purposes and eventually a master contract. Two years later two major courier companies were under contract and drives were starting in two more. The SFBMA remains an independent organization that the union participates in and promotes, again as a fertile organizing base for the industry drive.

The South Bay Labor Council in San Jose, California, has established a craft association for high technology temps. Together@work provides professional training and job placement assistance for a sector of employment where the labor movement has no density. These workers should be counted as an official part of the labor movement. They also need to be given a real role as members, voters, and officers of existing unions. Labor needs to experiment with these forms everywhere as a way to build base and power in industries where it has no density.

Every drive at a large-scale employer that ends in defeat through an NLRB election needs to be continued by assigning resources to maintain minority organizations affiliated with the parent union.

Finally, industries or regions where density is low or nonexistent need to be systematically assessed for the existence of association and other nascent worker organizations. Where none exist, community-based workers' centers or immigrant assistance organizations could assist individual employees on workplace problems with the goal of establishing some kind of organization.

New Organizing is Not a Panacea

Bringing in millions of new workers is important, but the quality of that organizing and the fate of those workers once organized is the key to building power. Furthermore the sector in which these employees labor is also an important variable. Manufacturing and logistics remain crucial to labor's power.

Also important is how labor builds solidarity and unity for the contract struggles of its existing members in key industrial sectors. In 2000 the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor did an admirable job of building multiunion support for the contract battles of thousands of janitors, public employees, and metro bus and train operators. This metro contract solidarity needs to be replicated in every major urban area. Nothing spurs organizing and a positive image for the unions more than a winning strike that builds community solidarity. This was and should be a principal focus of the central labor bodies: strike support and solidarity.

Similarly on a national level the contract negotiations in key sectors of the economy need to be a focus of AFL-CIO resources. In the context of the post-September 11 patriotic zeal for national security, the Longshoremens on the West Coast face a monumental challenge in renegotiating their contract that expires on July 1, 2002. If the power of the ILWU is weakened, a key labor link in the logistics chain will be weakened. This battle provides the AFL-CIO with an ideal opportunity to coordinate the involvement of other unions whose members' economic welfare is directly linked to the outcome of ILWU's negotiations.

All remember the powerful impact of the successful Teamster strike at UPS in the summer of 1997. Such contract fights are absolutely crucial to organizing new members and are powerful schools of consciousness for existing members. As John Sweeney said, "This successful strike against UPS was worth a million house calls."

The strike has been maligned since the disastrous PATCO story of 1981 and is in danger of becoming a lost art. When strikes are won they are the single most powerful weapon that labor has, but organizing is not the sole solution to labor infirmities. The AFL-CIO might set a far more powerful context for new organizing if the existing members received the full power of the AFL-CIO solidarity apparatus in key conflicts with employers.

Manufacturing and Logistics

In 1999 when the SEIU succeeded in organizing 74,000 home care workers in Los Angeles County, the outcome was heralded as one of the most significant organizing victories since the breakthrough at Flint, Michigan, in 1937 for the United Auto Workers. While the numbers may be comparable, the strategic significance is not. The home health care campaign was an innovative example of leveraging public power to create an employer.(13) It brought together workers paid by the state who were historically treated as independent contractors and forged them into a labor organization. This was a far cry from a strategic breakthrough in the most important manufacturing sector of the economy that created a new and progressive union, the UAW. If auto workers strike, the economy crumbles. If home care workers strike, they hurt their own relatives and the poor and indigent.

Labor needs to reestablish a strategic focus on organizing in manufacturing and in logistics (means of distribution). This is the historic basis of labor's power, and labor cannot reestablish its power without organizing here. The task is daunting. In the period from 1985 until 2000 there was net loss in manufacturing of one million jobs. In the same period there was a two million loss in union membership in manufacturing.(14) The late 1970s and early 1980s saw a massive downsizing in basic industries and the rationalization of manufacturing production. Bluestone and Harrison described this phenomenon in their famous work, *The Deindustrialization of America*.(15) The choice of title was unfortunate, however, because while manufacturing represents only 17 percent of employment in the economy, America is not deindustrialized. Manufacturing continues to matter and continues to be a key employment sector.(16)

Most industrial unions have given up on organizing manufacturing workers. Short-term survival strategies have replaced a long-term focus on defending their jurisdictions in core industries. Anecdotal wisdom says that all manufacturing is mobile and if an employer hasn't moved yet it certainly will when the union comes knocking. This analysis is wrong and it has paralyzed an aggressive approach to organizing manufacturing.

When in-depth sector and subsector analysis is done, the factors that cause a manufacturer to stick with a location are revealed. It's popularly thought that the wage gap is the only determinant of locational decisions, ergo don't organize and don't press for contract improvements. Business schools teach, however, that location decisions are far more multifaceted.

Some factors organizers should consider, that manufacturers do consider, are product perishability, availability of goods needed in manufacturing, quality control, and vulnerability to strikes.

Analysis of the tortilla industry in Los Angeles County reveals that Mexican capital is investing in plant and equipment in the Los Angeles basin to produce fresh tortillas for the second largest Mexican market in the world, Southern California. This is a nonunion manufacturing sector that employs 6,000 workers.

Every major urban center in the country has a viable metal service industry that prepares metal to specification for construction, machine tools, and other manufacturing. The garment industry remains the largest employer in Los Angeles County. Therefore Los Angeles has a viable textile converter industry that cuts and dyes fabric for garment manufacturing in the L.A. basin.

Design centers need to be close to production to monitor quality. Also, garment manufacturers of quality high fashion goods find a far-flung production creates problems for on-time delivery of garments, which typically have in a very short-cycled fashion season.

As corporations have pursued efficiency through contracting out and the externalization of costs and liabilities, they have become more vulnerable to strategic strikes. "Kanban," or just-in-time inventory, means that a strike at a key auto parts supplier can cripple the production chain of major auto producers.

The AFL-CIO's considerable research and analysis acumen can help organizers figure out which pieces of the manufacturing complex are organizable, taking into account the above mentioned factors and others that mitigate mobility. Further, the federation needs to spotlight and develop trade policy that deals with some of the macrofactors that spur the dumping of cheap manufactured goods into the U.S. market. The devaluation of many foreign currencies have shuttered part of the domestic capacity of industries like steel, resulting in painful job losses in the Midwest.

Organizing also needs to study sectors that produce, but are not traditionally thought of as manufacturing, like software and film production. High technology and biotechnology jobs are often classified as service when in fact much of this work is production.

Similarly, the other power point of the economy, the means of distribution, needs to be examined and attacked. Here the problems of runaway capital are less severe, but the employer class has cooked up all kinds of contracting and temp schemes to defeat unions. Trucking, air freight, courier, and warehousing are all strategic sectors of the economy that require our analysis and attention.

One of the great strategic obstacles for the labor movement has been the organization of the South. This challenge can only be met by thinking outside the box on the issue of form of organization and grasping the issue of strategic focus in key industries. Black Workers for Justice, a black-led community labor organization based in North Carolina has long pioneered in building organization among workers, particularly in the public sector, even where there are no collective bargaining rights. Such strategies are the only way to think about building organizations in key industries like "transplant auto" and shipping and transportation.

The recent battle of the Charleston Five conducted by a black-member and black-led ILA Local 1422 gives hope for a labor renaissance in the South.(17) The level of community involvement in this historic victory holds out lessons and inspiration for taking on again the task of large-scale organization in the southern United States.

The newfound focus on organizing among people of color, especially new immigrants, has been heartening. The AFL-CIO has reversed its traditional stance vis-à-vis the border and withdrawn its support for the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, which provided for harmful employer sanctions that have been wielded by antiunion employers to destroy organizing drives. This reversal represented a sea change in labor's stance on immigrants. Rather than defending its ranks thru exclusivity, labor has chosen to build power through an inclusive policy on immigration.

The victories among new Latino immigrants in Los Angeles and the creation, sustenance, and promotion of Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance (APALA) are worthy achievements for a federation whose membership has been predominately nonwhite male since 1995. In that year 8.33 million union members were white males and 8.93 were nonwhite males and females, both white and nonwhite. Many organizing drives have capitalized on the link of race and class and emphasized the civil rights character of the struggle to unionize. Organizing programs like the Stamford, Connecticut, multiunion project have consciously forged the immigrant/labor link.

The group that is overwhelmingly represented in labor ranks is the African-American community. While African-Americans represent 11 percent of the population, they make up 17 percent of the organized labor movement. Attitude polling always reveals that African-American workers, male and female, are the most supportive of union organization.(18) African-Americans are concentrated in key sectors of the economy, particularly public sector, transportation, and utilities. Certain unions have a high preponderance of black membership and a significant chunk of black leadership.

How to tap this potentially dynamic demographic needs serious study. Labor should look at industries with high concentrations of black members and focus the resources of the AFL-CIO on creating projects that join black trade union leaders and members of black community organizations to organize sectors with a preponderance of black workers. This is the most powerful community economic development strategy that can be put in gear today. The common culture and history of struggle of the black community needs to be moved into labor's column.

Salting Workplace Organizers

The AFL-CIO has raised its profile among the intelligentsia by uniting with long lost allies on the campuses to draw new energy and vigor into its ranks. The Organizing Institute and Union Summer have trained and encouraged thousands of students to join the labor movement while convincing many rank-and-file members to take up the organizing mission. Journals like this and others have sprung up to debate openly the questions of policy and practice in the labor movement without the harsh recriminations of earlier eras.

The AFL-CIO's Organizing Institute has done a masterful job of moving many students and workers into organizing as a vocation. The missing ingredient in a broad-based plan to organize key industries is an emphasis on "salting" or planting organizers in key workplaces and industries.

Many dedicated progressives have salted in basic industries and workplaces in this country. Most of them are from the 1960s antiwar civil rights generation, and many have risen to positions of power in the unions and the AFL-CIO. Salting was one factor in much of the labor upsurge of the 1930s when communists, socialists, and other progressives "industrialized" to build worker power in the mines, mills, and fields of the United States. This, more than hiring young people as organizers, is the way to promote large-scale organization. Nothing can replace the presence of these politicized organizers in the workplaces of America.(19) Nothing can replace this experience in teaching young organizers, largely from a nonworking class experience, what the working class is about and how to talk and especially listen to workers. Salting needs to become fashionable again for young people politically committed to reinvigorating the labor movement.

These are some modest proposals for reinvigorating the organizing mission of the AFL-CIO and progressives working to build union power. Capacity building is important and not to be scoffed at, but its limitations at delivering on its promise and moving a program have become obvious. Movement building rhetoric without meat on the strategic bones is an exercise in sideline carping while the organizers in the trenches are out giving their sweat and energy to reenergize a moribund movement in very difficult times. The discussion needs to extend into new territory and reclaim the effective tools from the past as we recommit to building this labor movement in the new millennium.

Notes

(1) In order to maintain present percentages of the workforce, labor must organize 350,000 to 400,000 workers per year. In order to grow by 1 percent of the workforce, the affiliates must together organize one million workers per year! The AFL-CIO reports 463,000 new members organized in 2001.

(2) 1997–98 ILO World Labor Report

(3) A new super union representing more than a million manufacturing workers is being launched in Great Britain. Amicus—the Latin word for friend—has been formed from a merger between the Amalgamated Engineering and Electrical Union and the Manufacturing Science and Finance Union. The new union will be the second biggest in the country and the biggest in the private sector and manufacturing.

(4) The AFL-CIO convention in Las Vegas in December 2001 highlighted a jurisdictional agreement between the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA), ILWU and IBT, but to date only two full-time organizers are working on a “campaign” to organize 50,000 workers throughout the United States.

(5) SEIU, AFSCME, IBT, United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UFCW), AFT, UAW, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW), CWA, USWA, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAM), Laborers' International Union of North America (LIUNA), Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical & Energy Workers International Union (PACE), HERE, UNITE, American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), Bakery, Confectionery, Tobacco Workers and Grain Millers International Union (BCTGM), Sheet Metal Workers International Association (SMW), United Farm Workers of America (UFW).

(6) Figures cited here are from “AFL-CIO Organizing Program and Progress: January–June 2000,” AFL-CIO Organizing Department

(7) These same unions participated in founding and supporting the Organizing Institute under Lane Kirkland

(8) The federation has challenged its affiliates to organize seven new members per hundred of their existing membership. This number is derived from a calculation that yields one million new members per year.

(9) Ed Bruno, Peter Kellman, and James Pope have argued in their paper “Towards a New Labor Movement” (Labor Party Discussion Document, December 3, 2001, earlier version available on line at http://www.igc.org/pa/documents/lpd_laborlaw.html) for scrapping the NLRA and going back to the Gompers-era stance of asserting labor rights to organize under the Anti-Slavery 13th amendment. Others want to preserve the core

Section 7 rights and shed all the other sections. Some say that all the Taft-Hartley amendments of 1947 need to be scrapped.

(10) Speech given to the School for Workers, University of Wisconsin, December 1997

(11) Arthur B. Shostak, *Cyber Union: Empowering Labor Through Computer Technology*, M.E. Sharp, Armonk, 1999. Richard B. Freeman, "Will Unionism Prosper in Cyber-Space? The Promise of the Internet for Employee Organization," *Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics*, August 2001.

(12) Clyde Summers, "Union without a Majority—A Black Hole?" *Chicago-Kent Law Review*, Chicago, Vol. 66, No. 3 (1992).

(13) SEIU joined with community and political allies to restructure the independent provider system to provide higher wages and benefits for workers through the establishment of a public authority county by county in California.

(14) Jack Metzgar, "Blue-Collar Blues: The Deunionization of Manufacturing," *New Labor Forum* Spring/Summer 2002.

(15) Barry Bluestone and Bennett Harrison, *The Deindustrialization of America*, Basic Books, New York, 1981.

(16) See Stephen Cohen and John Zysman, *Manufacturing Matters*, Basic Books, New York, 1987 and Eamon Fingleton, *In Praise of Hard Industries*, Houghton Mifflin, New York, 1999.

(17) See an excellent article by Local 1422 President Ken Riley, "How Our Local Bonded with the Community," *Labor Notes*, December 2001.

(18) Some have pointed out that the high African-American density numbers are a result of the high concentration of black employment in the public sector. Of course, black public sector employment is the product of considerable social upheaval and class struggle!

(19) In this issue, see: Carey Dall and Jono Cohen, "Salting the Earth: Organizing for the Long Haul," *New Labor Forum*, Spring/Summer 2002.