THE SEVENTH GENERATION

In our every deliberation, we must consider the impact of our decisions on the next seven generations.

-- From the Great Law of the Iriquois Confederacy

Which Labor, Which Community?

On May 12, the largest union demonstration in years hit New York City streets. Workers from the public sector, services, and construction trades came together to demand that city and state surpluses go to raise worker pay instead of tax breaks for the rich. Even the police union was there.

This is yet another sign that organized labor may be regaining some of its militance and working together on political strategy.

But something’s missing here. The massive presence and unity of labor was sorely missed in recent demonstrations against police brutality and homophobic violence. Some unions have been outspoken in support of community issues of concern to progressive planners in the city. But most have not. Where are the city unions in the struggles over the concentration of waste transfer stations, bus depots and industrial sites in communities of color? The campaign to save community gardens? Where is the union of planners on the govern-
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IMMIGRANT ECONOMIES AND NEW YORK CITY’S GARMENT INDUSTRY

Challenges for Community Development

By Tarry Hum

Despite its dramatic and continued decline, apparel production remains the largest manufacturing industry in New York City. It is viable, in large part, due to the mass influx of new immigrants “sweating” it out in cramped, poorly ventilated factories for a piece-rate that averages a dollar or so per assembled garment. The government employs a “carrot and stick” approach to the declining garment industry - rewarding legitimate firms with subsidies and technical assistance, while investigating and
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Labor and Community: Bridging the Gap

THE UNCERTAIN FUTURE OF WORKER OWNERSHIP: TWO DECADES OF LESSONS

By Len Krimerman

Worker-owned enterprises, sometimes called "worker cooperatives," have a long history, even in the United States. But they face an uncertain future.

In May, 1971, Philadelphia's Journeyman Carpenters started the nation's first working-class cooperative. A century or so later, the Knights of Labor were advocating industrial cooperatives as a way to replace the capitalist wage system; about 130 such enterprises were inspired by this trade union movement. And in the late 1930s, plywood in the Northwest was largely produced by medium-sized cooperatives, the assets of which were owned and controlled by their workers.

These bursts of cooperative economic activity, however, suggestive of a different vision of world, did not survive. Within a decade or two, those plywood cooperatives in Oregon and Washington state had become so "successful" that their original worker-owners began to work less and less, they hired "second class" wage labor instead of adding new owners, and in most cases eventually sold out to conventional corporations, reaping immense profits on their initial investments.

On the other hand, many cooperatives simply lacked the business acumen or, more crucially, the money, to compete effectively on capitalism's extremely uneven playing fields. Thus, by the mid-1970s the idea of extending direct democracy into the American workplace - each worker having one and only one vote on crucial issues facing their enterprise - hardly seemed within reach.

America Discovers Mondragon

This, however, was soon to change, as Americans began to "discover" a unique European phenomenon. It was called "Mondragon," after the small, mountain- surrounded Basque town where it started. At that point, Mondragon was a 25-year-old association of worker owned and controlled enterprises that produced a wide range of high tech products including bases, robotics, refrigerators and stoves. It was more productive than its capital-controlled rivals in the same sectors. It was spinning off new, but always interconnected, cooperatives at a remarkable rate, and had developed internal sources of health insurance, retirement benefits, and education and training. Moreover, in the early 1960s, it created a novel (to us) economic institution, the Caja Laboral Popular, or "People's Labor Bank." The Caja functioned as an economic development vehicle. It enabled existing coops to expand and compete, prospective ones to be carefully assessed and, if found feasible, to survive and prosper. The bank made capital available at affordable rates and provided business assistance to the network's cooperative firms.

What were the lessons of Mondragon?

First, that workers themselves can be a source of capital, by reinvesting some or all of their profits as owners. The Mondragon coops insist that worker-owners invest in their own firms, first by agreeing to weekly deductions from wages, then by postponing their share of annual profits until they leave the firm. In these ways, worker-generated capital becomes available to reinvest in new or improved technology and additional lines of production.

Second, Mondragon was not a set of isolated or disconnected trees, but a mutually supportive forest. Firms were connected to other firms, through co-production and co-marketing, and to "support" organizations which provided them with essential forms of financial, business, legal, and educational assistance.

Workers themselves can be a source of capital, by reinvesting some or all of their profits as owners.

News of Mondragon's success fueled the "new wave" of worker ownership in this country. It began in 1975 with the formation of a Funding and Educational Development Organization (FEDO). FEDO's aim was to build, within the wasteland culture, an economy based on liberating worker democratic participation and worker ownership.

A few dozen FEDO activists set about to transform a few mid-sized firms in the Northeast, and eventually the entire American economy. In those initial and heady days, we sometimes fancied ourselves an undercover vanguard sur- reptitiously replicating Mondragones-like federations from Maine to California. Our aim was not to set up and operate democratic workplaces, but to construct support systems for them. In time, we imagined surpassing even the Basques by reaching into the inner city and the labor and environmental movements, providing women and men equal access to ownership, and linking up worker owners-
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Worker-owned enterprises, sometimes called "worker cooperatives," have a long history, even in the United States. But they face an uncertain future. In May, 1971, Philadelphia's Journeyman Carpenters started the nation's first working-class cooperative. A century or so later, the Knights of Labor were advocating industrial cooperatives as a way to replace the capitalist wage system; about 130 such enterprises were inspired by this trade union movement. And in the late 1930s, plywood in the Northwest was largely produced by mediumsized cooperatives, the assets of which were owned and controlled by their workers. These bursts of cooperative economic activity, however, suggestive of a different vision of worklife, did not survive. Within a decade or two, those plywood coops in Oregon and Washington state had become so "successful" that their original worker-owners began to work less and less; they hired "second class" wage labor instead of adding new owners, and in most cases eventually sold out to conventional corporations, reaping immense profits on their initial investments. On the other hand, many cooperatives simply lacked the business acumen or, more crucially, the money, to compete effectively on capitalism's extremely uneven playing fields. Thus, by the mid-1970s the idea of extending direct democracy into the American workplace - each worker having one and only one vote on crucial issues facing their enterprise - hardly seemed within reach. 

America Discovers Mondragon 

This, however, was soon to change, as Americans began to "discover" a unique European phenomenon. It was called "Mondragon," after the small, mountain- surrounded Basque town where it started. At that point, Mondragon was a 25-year-old association of worker owned and controlled enterprises that produced a wide range of high tech products including bases, robotics, refrigerators and stoves. It was more productive than its capital-controlled rivals in the same sectors. It was spinning off new, but always interconnected, coops at a

remarkable rate, and had developed internal sources of health insurance, retirement benefits, and education and training. Moreover, in the early 1960s, it created a novel (to us) economic institution, the Caja Laboral Popular, or "People's Labor Bank." The Caja functioned as an economic development vehicle. It enabled existing coops to expand and compete, prospective ones to be carefully assessed and, if found feasible, to survive and prosper. The bank made capital available at affordable rates and provided business assistance to the network's cooperative firms. What were the lessons of Mondragon? First, that worker themselves can be a source of capital, by reinvesting some or all of their profits as owners. The Mondragon coops insist that worker-owners invest in their own firms, first by agreeing to weekly deductions from wages, then by postponing their share of annual profits until they leave the firm. In these ways, worker-generated capital becomes available to reinvest in new or improved technology and additional lines of production. Second, Mondragon was not a set of isolated or disconnected trees, but a mutually supportive forest. Firms were connected to other firms, through co-production and co-marketing, and to "support" organizations which provided them with essential forms of financial, business, legal, and educational assistance. Workers themselves can be a source of capital, by reinvesting some or all of their profits as owners. 

News of Mondragon's success fueled the "new wave" of worker ownership in this country. It began in 1975 with the formation of a Funding and Educational Development Organization (FEDO). FEDO's aim was to build, within the wasteland culture, an economy based on liberating worklife, democratic participation and worker ownership. A few dozen FEDO activists set about to transform a few mid-sized firms in the Northeast, and eventually the entire American economy. In those initial and heady days, we sometimes fancied ourselves an undercover vanguard sur- reptitiously replicating Mondragonesque federations from Maine to California. Our aim was not to set up and operate democratic workplaces, but to construct support systems for them. In time, we imagined surpassing even the Basques by reaching into the inner city and the labor and environmental movements, providing women and men equal access to ownership, and linking up worker-
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Labor and Community: Bridging the Gap

The massive deindustrialization of New York City has been accompanied by a simultaneous reindustrialization in the form of downsizing manufacturing, sweatshops, and industrial homework. Immigrant Asian and Latino workers are concentrated in these labor-intensive industries which produce garments, textiles, furniture, electronics, and footware. Close to three-quarters of New York City’s garment production workers are from the People’s Republic of China, Dominican Republic, Mexico, or South Korea. Increasingly, multi-ethnic immigrant neighborhoods in New York’s outer boroughs, namely Brooklyn and Queens, have become important garment production sites as the corporate real estate market has expanded into historic manufacturing districts. Many immigrant contractors have moved their operations from Manhattan’s Chinatown to escape rising rents and unionized wages.

Sunset Park has emerged as a key production site in New York City’s apparel industry. Since the early 1980s, a growing segment of Sunset Park’s neighborhood economy has been fueled by small Asian and Dominican immigrant-owned garment factories. There are approximately 500 to 600 garment factories in Sunset Park employing a labor force of well over 10,000 workers, the majority of whom are Chinese, Dominican, and Mexican immigrant women. An estimated one in two garment firms in Sunset Park is a sweatshop. An investigation into Sunset Park’s garment industry conducted by the Brooklyn District Attorney’s office in 1996 brought public attention to the prevalence of substandard work environments including blocked fire exits, lack of ventilation, and exposed wires. Community protests continue to expose numerous incidents of worker exploitation such as the withholding of wages in Sunset Park’s garment industry.

Recognizing the growth potential of Brooklyn’s garment industry due to transportation links, underutilized industrial spaces, and a ready labor supply, the Brooklyn Borough President conducted a study, to “identify the role that government can play in assisting Brooklyn’s garment industry to move into the twenty-first century.” The key recommendation was to develop a garment manufacturers incubator. In mid-summer 1997, Sunset Park was designated the site for the incubator.

The planning and development of the incubator suggests that Asian and Latino immigrants and their community development needs have been effectively marginalized. The garment manufacturer’s incubator is not intended to move the immigrant-dominated segment of the garment industry into the 21st century. Instead, Asian and Latino workers will continue to eke out a living under the harsher conditions well into the new millennium.

Sunset Park’s Immigrant Economy

In both the scholarly and popular press, Sunset Park, Brooklyn has recently been touted as an example of immigrant-driven neighborhood regeneration. Designated a poverty area in the 1970s, Sunset Park was described as “an old dying industrial neighborhood.” The influx of Chinese and Dominican immigrants in the early 1980s transformed the demographic, cultural, and economic life of Sunset Park. The primary engine for Sunset Park’s renewal is the ethnic economy comprised of small immigrant-owned retail and manufacturing firms.

While immigrant economic activity is central to the reversal of Sunset Park’s economic decline, this new prosperity is countered by uneven growth characteristics of ethnic enclave economies. Immigrant working and jobless poverty, the expansion of sweatshop economies, and the criminalization of employment relations are also part of the economic life of Sunset Park.

The garment manufacturers incubator is not intended to move the immigrant-dominated segment of the garment industry into the 21st century. Instead, Asian and Latino workers will continue to eke out a living under the harsher conditions well into the new millennium.

The incubator is Community Economic Development?

While community participation helped to get an incubator for Sunset Park, the goal of creating a garment center with a comprehensive approach to building a viable neighborhood economy has not been met. The Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce has been commissioned to coordinate and manage the development of the incubator, now named Brooklyn Mills. The proposed benefits include the reduction of operating costs and, most importantly, access to technology and technical assistance in export and marketing. The Brooklyn Borough President has allocated more than $400,000 and the New York State legislature has committed an additional $240,000 for the project.

Brooklyn Mills will be located in a New York State Economic Development Zone, tenants will also benefit from tax savings for purchasing equipment or hiring new employees.

Approximately 27,000 square feet will be renovated to house Brooklyn Mills, scheduled to open in July 1999.

The current plan calls for six to ten tenant firms. The tenant selection criteria favor small manufacturing firms that demonstrate the potential to internalize all aspects of garment production from design to production. In a sense, however, Brooklyn Mills is not a true incubator since the tenants will not be startups, but rather firms that are vertically integrated with strong ties to the fashion industry.

Despite the involvement of Sunset Park’s Garment Industry Task Force, Brooklyn Mills felt like a “closed door deal.”

With the exception of an invitation to the official announcement of Brooklyn Mills, Xie noted that community leaders have received no news at all about its planning and development. In developing strategies to increase the competitiveness of New York’s garment industry in the global marketplace, economic strategies are geared towards firms that are positioned to benefit from production technologies, innovation, and cost efficiencies. The more prevalent form of garment production is in New York is, however, based on the cheap labor of risk-taking immigrant business owners and their co-ethnic workers. Since the emphasis is to internalize production in fairly established small manufacturers, Sunset Park’s incubator contractors and workforce are effectively closed off from establishing linkages to Brooklyn Mills resources.

Without some planning and economic development strategies, small immigrant contractors will continue the “low road” of garment production where marginal profits are based on squeezing labor such that slavery is not a far-fetched metaphor for immigrant work conditions.

The development of Brooklyn Mills is instructive in how the state intervenes in immigrant communities. On the one hand, the state acts as surveillance and policing entity to regulate the conditions in the sweatshop economy. While enforcement of labor standards is necessary, the state...
Hum/Continued from Page One

policing sweepstrokes to enforce minimum labor standards.

Sunset Park, Brooklyn is targeted for both the carrot and the stick. A series of raids conducted in 1996 focused public attention on its growing sweatshop economy and in 1998, it was designated to receive public funding for the development of a garment manufacturers incubator. But while the Asian and Latino immigrant community in Sunset Park may feel the stick, it is highly unlikely that they will dine on the carrot.

New York City’s Garment Industry

The massive deindustrialization of New York City has been accompanied by a simultaneous reindustrialization in the form of downgrading manufacturing, sweatshops, and industrial homework. Immigrant Asian and Latino workers are concentrated in these labor-intensive industries which produce garments, textiles, furniture, electronics, and footwear. Close to three-quarters of New York City’s garment production workers are from the People’s Republic of China, Dominican Republic, Mexico, or South Korea. Increasingly, multiracial immigrant neighborhoods in New York’s outer boroughs, namely Brooklyn and Queens, have become important garment production sites as the corporate real estate market has expanded into historic manufacturing districts. Many immigrant contractors have moved their operations from Manhattan’s Chinatown to escape rising rents and an uninviting work environment.

Sunset Park has emerged as a key production site in New York City’s apparel industry. Since the early 1980s, a growing segment of Sunset Park’s neighborhood economy has been fueled by small Asian and Latino immigrant-owned garment factories. There are approximately 500 to 600 garment factories in Sunset Park employing a labor force of well over 10,000 workers, the majority of whom are Chinese, Dominican, and Mexican immigrant women. An estimated one in two garment firms in Sunset Park is a sweatshop. An investigation into Sunset Park’s garment industry conducted by the Brooklyn District Attorney’s office in 1996 brought public attention to the prevalence of substandard work environments including blocked fire exits, lack of ventilation, and exposed wires. Community protests continue to expose numerous incidents of worker exploitation such as the with- holding of wages in Sunset Park’s garment industry.

Recognizing the growth potential of Brooklyn’s garment industry due to transportation links, underutilized industrial spaces, and a ready labor supply, the Brooklyn Borough President conducted a study, to “identify the role that govern- ment can play in assisting Brooklyn’s garment industry to move into the twenty-first century.” The key recommen- dation was to develop a garment manufacturers incubator. In mid-summer 1997, Sunset Park was designated the site for the incubator.

The planning and development of the incubator suggests that Asian and Latino immigrants and their community development needs have been effectively marginalized. The garment manufacturer’s incubator is not intended to move the immigrant-dominated segment of the garment industry into the 21st century. Instead, Asian and Latino workers will continue to eke out a living under the harshest conditions well into the new millennium.

Sunset Park’s Immigrant Economy

In both the scholarly and popular press, Sunset Park, Brooklyn has recently been touted as an example of immigrant-driven neighborhood regeneration. Designated a poverty area in the 1970s, Sunset Park was described as “an old dying industrial neighborhood.” The influx of Chinese and Dominican immigrants in the early 1980s transformed the demographic, cultural, and economic life of Sunset Park. The primary engine for Sunset Park’s renewal is the ethnic economy comprised of small immigrant-owned retail and manufacturing firms.

While immigrant economic activity is central to the reversal of Sunset Park’s economic decline, this new prosperity is countered by uneven growth characteristics of ethnic enclave economies. Immigrant working and jobless poverty, the expansion of a sweatshop economy, and the cashabilization of employment relations are also part of the economic life of Sunset Park.

The garment manufacturers incubator is not intended to move the immigrant-dominated segment of the garment industry into the 21st century. Instead, Asian and Latino workers will continue to eke out a living under the harshest conditions well into the new millennium.

Labor and Community: Bridging the Gap

ing, cutting, and assembling have been outsourced to many different countries in search of the cheapest labor.

Hypercompetition encourages immigrant contractors to outbid each other in production costs and timeline, which then is passed on to their workers in minimal piece rates and 12 hour workdays. In Sunset Park, immigrant women labor under substandard conditions in direct competition with their overseas counterparts in Asia, the Caribbean, and Latin America.

Sunset Park’s Community Board initiated a Garment Industry Task Force in June 1996 to address the growing informal garment industry. Comprised of representatives from UNITE (Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees), Kings County Apparel Association (a group of Chinese garment shop owners), and community groups, the Garment Industry Task Force represented a unique, albeit tenuous, forum for immigrant workers, employers, and the community at large to discuss workplace issues. Upon release of the Brooklyn Borough President’s report, the task force saw an opportunity to secure resources to address Sunset Park’s garment industry. In addition to enhancing competitiveness, the Garment Industry Task Force advocated that “critical attention will be paid to the cultural, social, and economic aspects of workers’ lives to accommodate the needs of the large number of Asian and Latino employees working within the industry.” Their vision of the garment incubator addressed broader community development needs pertaining to the immigrant working poor.

Incubator = Community Economic Development?

While community participation helped to get an incubator for Sunset Park, the goal of creating a garment center with a comprehensive approach to building a viable neighborhood economy has not been met. The Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce has been commissioned to coordinate and manage the development of the incubator, now named Brooklyn Mills. The proposed benefits include the reduction of operating costs and, most importantly, access to technology and technical assistance in export and marketing. The Brooklyn Borough President has allocated more than $400,000 and the New York State legislature has committed an additional $200,000 for the project. Since Brooklyn Mills will be located in a New York State Economic Development Zone, tenants will also benefit from tax savings for purchasing equipment or hiring new employees.

Approximately 27,000 square feet will be renovated to house Brooklyn Mills, scheduled to open in July 1999. The current plan calls for six to ten tenants firms. The tenant selection criteria favor small manufacturing firms that demonstrate the potential to internalize all aspects of garment production from design to production. In a sense, however, Brooklyn Mills is not a true incubator since the tenants will not be startups, but rather firms that are vertically integrated with strong ties to the fashion industry.

Apparel remains the largest manufacturing industry in New York City and is central to the economy of neighborhoods such as Sunset Park. Although there was initially great enthusiasm about the development of a garment center, community leaders are disappointed. In fact, there is a sense of betrayal. Despite the involvement of Sunset Park’s Garment Industry Task Force, Brooklyn Mills, in the words of Chang Xie, Executive Director of the Chinese Planning Council, felt like a “closed door deal.”

With the exception of an invitation to the official announcement of Brooklyn Mills, Xie noted that community leaders “have received no news at all” about its planning and development.

In developing strategies to increase the competitiveness of New York’s garment industry in the global marketplace, economic strategies are geared towards firms that are positioned to benefit from production technologies, innovation, and cost efficiencies. The more prevalent form of garment production in New York is, however, based on the cheap labor of risk-taking immigrant business owners and their co-ethnic workers. Since the emphasis is to internalize production in fairly established small manufacturers, Sunset Park’s immigrant contractors and workforce are effectively closed off from establishing linkages to Brooklyn Mills resources. Without some planning and economic development strategies, small immigrant contractors will continue the “low road” of garment production where marginal prof- its are based on squeezing labor such that slavery is not a far-fetched metaphor for immigrant work conditions.

The development of Brooklyn Mills is instructive in how the state intervenes in immigrant communities. On the one hand, the state acts as surveillance and policing entity to regulate the conditions in the sweatshop economy. While enforcement of labor standards is necessary, the state
ment’s lack of commitment to community planning. When will the building trades advocate as strongly for low-income housing and affirmative action as they do for their union pay? One of the biggest problems for communities of color is the growth of the prison-industrial complex in exurban and rural areas, a trend benefiting the construction trades and corrections officers — two well organized sectors of the labor force. When will there be a union drive against that giant market and unequal system? Some unions have consistently gone beyond the narrow interests of their membership in wages and benefits and taken strong and principled stands on social issues. Others haven’t. So when we talk about labor and community, which labor are we talking about?

Community without Labor

And which community are we talking about? While important sectors of labor ignore communities, many communities are hostile or indifferent to labor. In any case, communities are by nature diverse and reflect a wide social spectrum. Like the broader society, they tend to be dominated by elites. And all too many community organizations are downright exclusionary.

Community planners should be on the side of labor but most are not. Most aren’t in unions. Planners deal with land use and development, industrial location, transportation between workplace and residence, and the environmental impacts of economic development. They focus on the spatial organization of production and services. But they rarely look inside production and at exploitation in the workplace. Planners should be concerned about every aspect of the lives of the people they are planning with and for, and there’s nothing more central to our lives than work.

Some planners have distinguished themselves by countering the false dichotomy between jobs and the environment. Some have raised questions about the quality and distribution of jobs in discussions about community economic development schemes. Some have helped to stop factory closings and worked against union-busting privatization schemes. But most planners don’t think of themselves as part of labor and swallow the myth that they’re independent professionals. They work for government, which puts forth the

myth of neutrality, or their clients, who demand loyalty. Urban planners, we’re told, aren’t supposed to get involved in union issues — wages, job security, benefits, or the workplace environment. They’re not to interfere (can any one?) with the sanctity of corporate planning. Urban planners are taught to plan comprehensively for and with communities; but the communities they work with are strictly territorial — neighborhoods and towns — and they usually don’t include organized labor. When it’s time to hold a participatory planning party, unions aren’t invited.

Labor without Community

It’s only natural that unions deal mainly with bread and butter issues — wages, benefits and the workplace environment. Their main job is to protect their membership through collective bargaining and, increasingly, the provision of union-financed services. Some unions provide quality health care, housing and social services to their members. Many go beyond this to support national reforms, like universal health care, that would benefit the entire working class, and some have been outspoken in support of civil rights and environmental issues.

The isolation of organized labor from community issues is part of the history of conservative trade unionism characterized by the American Federation of Labor (AFL). The building trades, which are directly concerned with community development, have been notoriously conservative. In some places they are still white enclaves. They promote urban growth at all costs, and overlook the environmental damage done by homebuilders, highways and gigantic pork barrel public works projects. They talk about the need for jobs, but not about who gets the jobs, whether workers are producing anything useful for society, or whether the jobs enrich the lives of workers. Devoid of militancy, they won’t stand in the way of the bull-dozer unless it’s to drive it themselves. (Tarry Ham’s story in this issue points to the problems involved with a union’s support for a government economic development scheme that doesn’t address the issue of structural inequality.)

To be sure, there are signs of a turnaround in labor. The AFL-CIO’s new leadership has started to organize the unorganized. The Labor Party and some key unions have tried to get union politics out from under the heel of the Democratic Party. But it’s not easy to put together a labor program that’s not totally tied to trade unions.
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ment’s lack of commitment to community planning. When will the building trades advocate as strongly for low-income housing and affirmative action as they do for their union pay? One of the biggest problems for communities of color is the growth of the prison-industrial complex in exurban and rural areas, a trend benefiting the construction trades and corrections officers -- two well organized sectors of the labor force. When will there be a union drive against this disinvestment and unequal system?

Some unions have consistently gone beyond the narrow interests of their membership in wages and benefits and taken strong and principled stands on social issues. Others haven’t. So when we talk about labor and community, which labor are we talking about?

Community without Labor

And which community are we talking about? While important sectors of labor ignore communities, many communities are hostile or indifferent to labor. In any case, communities are by nature diverse and reflect a wide social spectrum. Like the broader society, they tend to be dominated by elites. And all too many community organizations are downright exclusionary.

Community planners should be on the side of labor but most are not. Most aren’t in unions. Planners deal with land use and development, industrial location, transportation between workplace and residence, and the environmental impacts of economic development. They focus on the spatial organization of production and services. But they rarely look inside production and at exploitation in the workplace. Planners should be concerned about every aspect of the lives of the people they are planning with and for, and there’s nothing more central to their lives than work.

Some planners have distinguished themselves by countering the false dichotomy between jobs and the environment. Some have raised questions about the quality and distribution of jobs in discussions about community economic development schemes. Some have helped to stop factory closings and worked against union-busting privatization schemes.

But most planners don’t think of themselves as part of labor and swallow the myth that they’re independent professionals. They work for government, which puts forth the myth of neutrality, or their clients, who demand loyalty. Urban planners, we’re told, aren’t supposed to get involved in union issues -- wages, job security, benefits, or the workplace environment. They’re not to interfere (can any- one?) with the sanctity of corporate planning. Urban planners are taught to plan comprehensively for and with communities; but the communities they work with are strictly territorial - neighborhoods and towns - and they usually don’t include organized labor. When it’s time to hold a participatory planning party, unions aren’t invited.

Labor without Community

It’s only natural that unions deal mainly with bread and butter issues - wages, benefits and the workplace environment. Their main job is to protect their membership through collective bargaining and, increasingly, the provision of union-financed services. Some unions provide quality health care, housing and social services to their members. Many go beyond this to support national reforms, like universal health care, that would benefit the entire working class, and some have been outspoken in support of civil rights and environmental issues.

The isolation of organized labor from community issues is part of the history of conservative trade unionism characterized by the American Federation of Labor (AFL). The building trades, which are directly concerned with community development, have been notoriously conservative. In some places they are still white enclaves. They promote urban growth at all costs, and overlook the environmental damage done by homeowners, highways and gigantic pork barrel public works projects. They talk about the need for jobs, but not about who gets the jobs, whether workers are producing anything useful for society, or whether the jobs enrich the lives of workers. Devoid of militancy, they won’t stand in the way of the bull-dozer unless it’s to drive it themselves. (Terry Ham’s story in this issue points to the problems involved with a union’s support for a government economic development scheme that doesn’t address the issue of structural inequality.)

To be sure, there are signs of a turnaround in labor. The AFL-CIO’s new leadership has started to organize the unorganized. The Labor Party and some key unions have tried to get union politics out from under the heel of the Democratic Party. But it’s not easy to put together a labor program that’s not totally tied to trade unions.
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ORGANIZING A CHILDCARE UNION IN PHILADELPHIA

By Peter Pltegoff

“Tis an awesome gathering.” Kim Cook, a union organizer from Seattle, smiled as she looked around the meeting room of the National Union of Hospital and Health Care Employees in Philadelphia in mid-June. Just one month earlier, this affiliate of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) had chartered the new United Child Care Union.

Cook and two dozen others from around the nation met for a day-long strategy session on organizing Philadelphia’s childcare industry. In the room were childcare workers, union and community organizers, employment development specialists, and policy advocates.

Childspace Cooperative Development Inc. (CCDI), a Philadelphia-based developer of worker-centered childcare enterprises, co-sponsored the gathering with a local think-tank. CCDI is a driving force behind this unusual organizing campaign, mobilizing employers and employees alike.

CCDI is best known for developing worker-owned daycare centers that create better childcare jobs and careers, while giving parents and community residents a say in their operation. Its strategy is also one of “replication”: CCDI builds on the knowledge gained creating one enterprise to form others within the same industry. Two Childspace centers in Philadelphia were the start, and now there are centers in Denver and the San Francisco Bay Area.

The organizing campaign reflects how worker ownership can lead to broader strategies of change.

The unionizing campaign reflects how worker ownership can lead to broader strategies of change. By aligning with unions, CCDI and its worker cooperative affiliates provide labor with an entry point for organizing the childcare workforce. They envision building a movement to empower childcare providers, in a service sector atomized by underfunding, low wages, few benefits, and limited career opportunities. It’s a natural alliance.

Childcare employers and the union face a shared dilemma, due in part to inadequate funding. “You can’t just organize workers to get more money because there is no more money,” explains Denise Dowell, CCDI’s Director of Organizing and Training and a leader in the Philadelphia campaign. Simply organizing and bargaining for better wages and working conditions in the childcare context makes little sense - even childcare employers who want to do the right thing can hardly afford to make ends meet. Sharnah Kurland, a community organizer with Rhode Island’s Direct Action for Rights & Equality (DARE), suggests that the industry as a whole has to change.

“You have to look from the outset on how to structure the childcare industry - not just how to organize the workers.” Deeper change requires more than a new union.

That’s where the idea of organizing the employers comes in. With an employer perspective and a commitment to workers, CCDI can take the lead in building an employers’ association alongside the workers’ union, an initiative the brand new union endorsed at its founding convention in May. CCDI can serve as a potential bridge between employers and the nascent union. What would organizing the employers achieve? The association - composed of owners of for-profit centers, directors of non-profit centers, and self-employed home daycare providers - might create pooled benefit funds allowing all childcare providers in the area to buy affordable health insurance or pensions. It might bargain a master contract with the new union (as do employers in Seattle), or at least agree upon baseline standards. Together with the union, the employers could fight government cutbacks and wage sufficient support for childcare workers and the day-care centers that employ them.

Yet the unlikely alliances reflected at the Philadelphia meeting present daunting challenges, and not just the ones arising from labor-management tensions. The divergent interests of corporate chain daycare, community-based nonprofits and home-based caregivers will make organizing a single employers’ group difficult. On the labor side, the persistent competition among unions organizing the same workforce, and the checked relationship between unions and worker-owned companies in the past, suggest some uneasy combinations. Unions and worker cooperatives often operate in different worlds, largely oblivious of one another. As for the unions, it is no small achievement that the June strategy session witnessed real cooperation among organizers from a Service Employees

Continued on Page Eight
EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP -- ESOPS

By Corey Rosen

If you’ve worn Gore-Tex lately or flown on United Airlines, you’ve patronized a company most of whose stock is owned widely by its workers, through employee stock ownership plans, or ESOPs. During the last decade, the number of ESOPs and their control of assets has boomed. ESOPs now exist in about 11,000 U.S. companies, and in about 2,500 of them employees are the majority shareholders. An ESOP is a kind of employee benefit plan. Shares are given at least to all full-time employees who have worked for a minimum of one year. Allocations are based on relative pay (but with a cap at $160,000 or, in one-third of the cases, a more equal formula such as seniority or a lower pay cap). When an employee leaves the company, he or she can sell the shares on the market (if there is one) or back to the firm at a price set by an outside appraiser (if there is no market).

Employers give up wages for their ESOP in about 2% of the cases, and other existing fringe benefits are reduced around half the time. Contrary to popular impression, only about 1% of all ESOPs are set up to save a failing company. The vast majority of ESOPs are in “closer held” companies (those whose stock had previously been owned by one or a few people), rather than ones whose stock is publicly traded. And the percentage of stock owned by employees is typically much higher in private than public companies. But on average the public companies are larger, so half the total workers with ESOPs are in publicly traded firms. About 50% of the ESOPs in private firms are used to buy out an owner of a successful company; the rest are typically used by companies primarily as an employee benefit.

Worker Control and Company Performance

ESOPs are governed by a trustee appointed by the company’s board. In all publicly traded companies, employees must be able to directly the trustee on how to vote their shares, while in closer-held companies, it is up to the company to decide. Employees have been given full voting rights in only about 40% of those cases in which they own a majority of the stock. When workers own most of the stock and have full voting rights, they have the potential to elect their own board members, but often vote for whoever was already on the board. Non-management employees are represented on the company board in only 4% to 5% of ESOPs.

ESOP companies are much more likely to set up employee participation programs, such as self-managing teams, than are those without ESOPs, according to surveys in Michigan and Ohio. But probably a third of all ESOPs do little, if anything, to involve employees in work-level decisions.

In a 1987 study by the National Center for Employee Ownership, we found that participative ESOP firms grew 5% to 11% faster with their plans than they would have without them. Several subsequent studies have confirmed this relationship. Of course, there are risks for workers, since not all employee ownership plans succeed. About 0.8% of all ESOPs have gone bankrupt, for instance, harming workers’ retirement savings.

Corey Rosen is the Executive Director of the National Center for Employee Ownership in Oakland, California <www.nceo.org>. Reprinted with permission from the joint issue of Dollars & Sense and Geo, Sept./Oct. 1998.
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has failed to allocate resources to proactively pursue alternative economic development strategies. This is reflected not only in the question of whether conventional economic development tools such as a business incubator is a meaningful form of public investment for Sunset Park, but also in how community involvement in the development process was marginal and token at best. In part, a new challenge is to define community-based asset building in a neighborhood where small business ownership is common but the goals of equity, workforce development, and community wealth remain elusive.

Tarry Hum is Assistant Professor in the Department of Urban Studies at Queens College, CUNY and visiting scholar at the Asian/Pacific/American Studies Program at New York University.
Pitegoff/Continued from Page Seven

International Union (SEIU) local in Seattle, a United Auto Workers local in western Massachusetts, and an AFSCME local in Minnesota, all engaged in organizing childcare workers, as well as national staff from AFSCME and SEIU. The head of the AFL-CIO's Working Women's Department and the organizing director of the national Center for the Child Care Workforce both came from Washington D.C. to join the meeting. Add the employer perspective of Childspace day care cooperatives, and all the parties in finance and economic development, and the result is a potentially powerful but volatile mix.

Despite notable success stories, worker ownership is not an end in itself. For many of us in the field of worker ownership in the 1970s and 1980s, "worker capitalism" was never our goal. We wanted instead to alter power relations and apply principles of democracy to the workplace, not just putshares of stock in the hands of workers. Today, the childcare union effort stands out as an example of worker cooperatives committed to economic and social change beyond their own enterprises.

Peter Pitegoff is Professor and Vice Dean at the State University of New York at Buffalo School of Law. Reprinted with permission from the joint issue of Dollars & Sense and Geo, Sept./Oct. 1998.
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ship to the struggles of all excluded and disempowered groups.

It was not quite in the cards. FEDO persisted after two short years, but not before it had assisted several worker buyouts on the East Coast. It persisted, mainly from internal strains and stresses. Some members felt its five scatered chapters (Boston, Connecticut, Philadelphia, Washington, and Ithaca) lacked a common and concrete agenda; others felt that its central staff was insufficiently responsive to the needs and priorities of local chapters.

In FEDO's wake, more durable technical assistance organiza-tions arose, animated by a similar vision. The first of these, the Industrial Cooperative Association (now the ICA Group) of Boston, formed in 1978, is still alive and well, and still uncompromising in its support for democratically owned and run workplaces. Other technical assistance groups have now joined the ICA, and today worker-owned firms and ESOPs receive valuable support in virtually any part of the country.

A Guardedly Optimistic Assessment

In 1991, Frank Linderfeld and I assessed the first 15 years or so of this would-be transformative economic activity. Examining cooperative enterprises in diverse sectors from textiles to steel mills to teacher-managed public schools, we reached a guardedly optimisti-cian conclusion: the "new wave" of worker ownership in the United States displayed unique strengths that gave it the potential to challenge corporate domination. There was a nationwide contingent of savvy and well-trained technical assistance providers to whom worker cooperatives could turn for assistance. There was support from several unions, notably the Steelworkers. An initiative to replicate Cooperative Home Care Associates, the Bronx-based service cooperative (owned and controlled by 200-plus low income women), had been launched in several cities. And some revolving loan funds serving coops had been establis hed. Employee-owned firms had entered virtually all sectors, and were faring at least as well as conventionally owned firms. All of this, and lots more, had materialized in less than two short decades.

This budding movement was hardly problem-free. Like other progressive struggles, it had a severe capital shortfall and its far-flung advocates and activists knew little of one another and hardly ever worked collaboratively. It had failed almost entirely to develop internal sources of education for, or about, worker ownership. There were few if any places where those willing to work for a democratic economy could acquire the expertise to start, run, expand, or finance successful enterprises.

Where are we now?

Today the picture and the prospects seem more murky. On the plus side are several encouraging developments. The Ohio Employee Ownership Center's steady growth into a large network of industrial, highly democratic, and mutually supporting ESOPs is a powerful reminder of what can be done within the crusty shell of the evil empire. It should help point the way for other regional or state-wide networks. The union-led efforts to replicate the Childspace day care cooperatives in Philadelphia, described here by Peter Pitegoff, and similar efforts to replicate the home health care cooperatives in New York City, suggest that worker cooperatives can succeed in the service
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EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP -- ESOPS

By Corey Rosen

If you've worn Gore-Tex lately or flown on United Airlines, you've patronized a company most of whose stock is owned widely by its workers, through employee stock ownership plans, or ESOPs. During the last decade, the number of ESOPs and their control of assets has boomed. ESOPs now exist in about 11,000 U.S. companies, and in about 2,500 of them employees are the majority shareholders. An ESOP is a kind of employee benefit plan. Shares are given at least to all full-time employees who have worked for a minimum of one year. Allocations are based on relative pay (but with a cap at $160,000 or, in one-third of the cases, a more equal formula such as seniority or a lower pay cap). When an employee leaves the company, he or she can sell the shares on the market (if there is one) or back to the firm at a price set by an outside appraiser (if there is no market).

Employees give up wages for their ESOP in about 2% of the cases, and other existing fringe benefits are reduced around half the time. Contrary to popular impression, only about 1% of all ESOPs are set up to save a failing company. The vast majority of ESOPs are in "closely held" companies (those whose stock had previously been owned by one or a few people), rather than ones whose stock is publicly traded. And the percentage of stock owned by employees is typically much higher in private than public companies. But on average the public companies are larger, so half the total workers with ESOPs are in publicly traded firms. About 50% of the ESOPs in private firms are used to buy out an owner of a successful company; the rest are typically used by companies primarily as an employee benefit.

Worker Control and Company Performance

ESOPs are governed by a trustee appointed by the company's board. In all publicly traded companies, employees must be able to direct the trustee on how to vote their shares, while in closely-held companies, it is up to the company to decide. Employees have been given full voting rights in only about 40% of those cases in which they own a majority of the stock. When workers own most of the stock and have full voting rights, they have the potential to elect their own board members, but often vote for whoever was already on the board. Non-management employees are represented on the company board in only 4% to 5% of ESOPs.

ESOP companies are much more likely to set up employee participation programs, such as self-managing teams, than are those without ESOPs, according to surveys in Michigan and Ohio. But probably a third of all ESOPs do little, if anything, to involve employees in work-level deci-sions.

In a 1987 study by the National Center for Employee Ownership, we found that participative ESOP firms grew 8% to 11% faster with their plans than they would have without them. Several subsequent studies have confirmed this relationship. Of course, there are risks for workers, since not all employee ownership plans succeed. About 0.8% of all ESOPs have gone bankrupt, for instance, harming workers' retirement savings.

Corey Rosen is the Executive Director of the National Center for Employee Ownership in Oakland, California <www.nceo.org>. Reprinted with permission from the joint issue of Dollars & Sense and Geo, Sept./Oct. 1998.
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has failed to allocate resources to proactively pursue alterna-tive economic development strategies. This is reflected not only in the question of whether conventional economic development tools such as a business incubator is a meaning-ful form of public investment for Sunset Park, but also in how community involvement in the development process was marginal and token at best. In part, a new challenge is to define community-based asset building in a neighborhood where small business ownership is common but the goals of equity, workforce development, and community wealth remain elusive.

Torry Hum is Assistant Professor in the Department of Urban Studies at Queens College, CUNY and visiting scholar at the Asian/Pacific/American Studies Program at New York University.
WORKER COOPS

By Chitra Somayaji

Cooperatives come in several types: producer-owned, consumer-owned, and worker-owned, the last being our focus here. Unlike ESOPs, pure worker cooperatives are 100% controlled by the worker-owners, normally on a one-person one-vote basis (although some cooperatives have hired additional employees who are not owners).

Worker-owned cooperatives are most prevalent in bookstores, building/renovation firms, retail food stores, bakeries, restaurants, and plywood manufacturing. Estimates for the number of worker cooperatives in the United States today range from 150 to 1,000. In 1991 the ICA Group in Boston counted 154 cooperatives with 6,545 members (ICA also estimated that there were 87,000 employees in majority-owned ESOPs, and 68% of them gave the worker-owners full voting rights). According to a survey done by Dick Gilber of the Southern Appalachian Cooperative Organization and others, about two-thirds of the worker cooperatives have less than 25 members.

Accurate data on cooperatives is difficult to find because the cooperatives are different from other corporations in how they register with the government. Both the IRS and the Department of Labor, which keep track of ESOPs, ignore cooperatives. Hence the only way to collect information on them is through surveys, a method which is both expensive and unreliable. In general, coop businesses have the same success rate as other businesses, according to experts like Carol DiMarcello of ICA, but their failures receive more attention because of their unique form of control. Failures tend to result from three causes - market competition, lack of capital, and personnel problems.

Seventh Generation/Continued from Page Eleven

makes commuting to work unhealthy and adds to the economic and health costs that workers pay for holding a job. Community planners need to work with organizations of labor, including unions, as a cornerstone in participatory planning. Housing and economic development projects shouldn’t undercut the wage gains and benefit packages won by organized labor. Planners should keep alive the vision of a future in which labor controls planning for production and consumption in a healthy urban environment.

-- Tom Angotti

WORKER COOPS BY THE NUMBERS

Number of worker-owned cooperatives 154
Number of members 6,545
% of cooperatives in which all workers are owners 60%
Median* annual sales revenues per coop $500,000
Average annual sales per coop $6,000,000**
Average number of members per coop 43
Distribution of cooperatives by size of membership
1-10 members 37%
11-25 26%
26-50 12%
51-100 7%
101 or more 17%
Distribution by industry type
retail 29%
manufacturing 28%
food related businesses 23%
large-scale manufacturing 12%
printing and publishing 11%
building/renovation 10%
books 7%
arts/crafts 5%

* half of cooperatives make more than this, half less.
** higher than median due to a few much larger cooperatives.

Urban Renewal - A Guide

Find a small moderately developed country with a nasty president who has human rights problems (Iraq and Serbia are already taken). Bomb them back to underdevelopment. Bomb military targets. Bomb industry and infrastructure. Bomb civilians and call it collateral damage. Keep bombing. Boycott and bomb. Bomb several countries at the same time. Spend the budget surplus on bombs. Say bombing protects human rights and everyone will believe you: bomb your way to credibility. Learn to chant, "Give bombs a chance!" If you ever stop the bombing, redevelop the property for the highest and best use.

Seventh Generation/Continued from Page Six

Challenges for Labor and Community

One of the most difficult challenges facing unions in future years will be breaking away from the industrial workforce model that both unions and corporations have protected in their contracts. The entrance of women in the workforce has raised demands from workers for more flexible work schedules, even while businesses see flexibility as an instrument for greater exploitation. Another challenge is for unions to be just as concerned about consumption as they are about the production process. The working class in this country is enslaved to consumerism, and lavishes products that are unhealthy and addictive, from SUVs to television to soda. Submission to consumerism weakens labor, robs workers of their wage gains and degrades the quality of life.

It’s worth looking at the efforts to build and sustain communities in which labor begins to take control of capital. In this issue, Len Krimerman’s article on worker-owned enterprises, Peter Pitegoff’s article on a worker-owned childcare cooperative, and the other pieces on worker-owned cooperatives offer a window into what could possibly be an economic world governed by labor. Community development corporations represent another form of economic association. It is important that planners study these experiences and help sustain the knowledge and experience gained from them.

How can such alternative economic institutions foster cooperative relationships among labor without reproducing all the negative characteristics of capitalism — narrow profit-driven behavior, overproduction, displacement and insecurity? Can labor’s organizations respect the diverse needs of the working class instead of replicating capitalism’s wasteful and destructive growth machine?

The challenge for communities and community planners is to focus more on how communities can foster healthier and more humane work environments. Auto dependence
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PN99 Planners Network 1999 Conference
Bridging the Gap Between Labor and Community
June 17-20, 1999
University of Massachusetts, Lowell, Massachusetts
Preliminary program as of May 1, 1999 — subject to change

For detailed information and registration information, CALL 617-983-3202. Email: <marie.kennedy@umass.edu> or <chris_silly@uml.edu> or visit http://www.plannersnetwork.org

Thursday through Sunday, June 17-20 — Coburn Hall
- Registration, Video Screenings, Exhibits, Literature Tables, Democracy Wall

Thursday, June 17
- 3:00 pm Community Tours (mini-buses will leave from UMass Lowell)
  - Boston: United for a Fair Economy
  - Lawrence: Merimack Valley Project
  - Lowell: Coalition for a Better Acre
- 6:00 Light Dinner
- 7:00 Agitarte—Labor-Community Hip Hop

Friday, June 18
- 8:00 Continental Breakfast
- 9:00 Welcome and Orientation
- 10:00 Successful Strategies—concurrent workshops
  - The E-Team: Community-Labor Sponsored Job Training
  - Women’s Institute for Leadership Development
  - Sustainable Development
  - Industrial Retention—Worker Buyouts and Local Organizations
  - Affordable Housing and Labor-Community Coalitions
  - Community Standards for New Development
  - Fighting Shutdowns—Protecting Good Jobs in the Community
  - The Right to Organize
  - The Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists and Technicians
- 11:15 Lunch
- 1:15 Cultural Tools—concurrent workshops
  - Dramatizing Income Inequality
  - Art to Enhance Demonstrations and Rallies
  - Popular Theater
  - Poetry
  - Singing
- 3:00 Building New Connections—concurrent workshops
  - Immigration Issues in Labor and Community
  - Job Training for Immigrant Workers
  - Occupational Health and Safety
  - Job Creation in Environmental Industries
  - The Transportation-Jobs Connection
  - Labor-Community Electoral Coalitions

Labor and Community: Bridging the Gap

Friday, June 18 (continued)
- Fighting Privatization in Social Services
- Labor and Community in Post-Soviet Europe
- From the Garment Trade to Workfare
- Organizing around Contingent Work
- Planners in Unions
- 5:00 Tribute to Bennett Harrison
- 5:45 Dinner
- 6:45 Challenges and Prospects for Labor-Community Alliances
  - Bill Fletcher, Education Director, US AFL-CIO
  - Gilda Haas, Director, Strategic Action for a Just Economy
- 9:00 Hip Hop Presentation with Agitarte

Saturday, June 19
- 7:30 Continental Breakfast
- 9:00 Community Relations with the Building Trades: The Boston Case
- 11:15 Working Through Conflicts and Challenges—concurrent workshops
  - Labor-Community Coalitions Around Job Training
  - Building Coalitions Across the Class Divide
  - Organizing Against Sweatshops
  - Unions, Communities and the Growth Machine
  - Welfare Rights and Labor
  - Union Labor vs. Affordable Housing?
- 12:45 Lunch
- Planners for Equal Opportunity (PEO) Revisited
- 2:15 Strategies for the Future—concurrent workshops
  - The Politics of Training
  - New Models for Immigrant and Multiracial Organizing
  - Environmental Justice
  - Bottom-Up Regionalism
  - Full Employment
  - Living Wage
  - Building Trust Between Labor and Community
  - Linking Labor and Community in the Global South
  - Labor Organizing Moving into the 21st Century
- 4:00 Strategies for the Future
  - Kathy Casavant, Secretary-Treasurer, Mass AFL-CIO
  - Teresa Cordova, Associate Professor, University of New Mexico
  - Lydia Lowe, Co-Director, Chinese Progressive Association and Workers Center
- 6:00 Dinner
- 7:00 Erminia Maricato, Lessons from Brazil’s Labor-Community Alliance
- 8:00 Dance Party

Sunday, June 20
- 7:30 Continental Breakfast
- 9:00 Barriers and Strategies—Participant-Organized Workshops
- 11:15 Planners Network Business Meeting (with box lunch)
- Afternoon:
  - Lowell National Historical Park Canal Boat Tours
  - Historical Tour of Nashua, NH
Labor and Community: Bridging the Gap

Friday, June 18 (continued)

- Fighting Privatization in Social Services
- Labor and Community in Post-Socialist Europe
- From the Garment Trade to Workfare
- Organizing around Contingent Work
- Planners in Unions
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- 6:45 Challenges and Prospects for Labor-Community Alliances
  - Bill Fletcher, Education Director, US AFL-CIO
  - Gilda Haas, Director, Strategic Action for a Just Economy
- 9:00 Hip Hop Presentation with Agitarte

Saturday, June 19

- 7:30 Continental Breakfast
- 9:00 Community Relations with the Building Trades: The Boston Case
- 11:15 Working Through Conflicts and Challenges—concurrent workshops
  - Labor-Community Coalitions Around Job Training
  - Building Coalitions Across the Class Divide
  - Organizing Against Sweatshops
  - Unions, Communities and the Growth Machine
  - Welfare Rights and Labor
  - Union Labor vs. Affordable Housing?

- 12:45 Lunch
- Planners for Equal Opportunity (PEO) Revisited
- 2:15 Strategies for the Future—concurrent workshops
  - The Politics of Training
  - New Models for Immigrant and Multiracial Organizing
  - Environmental Justice
  - Bottom-Up Regionalism
  - Full Employment
  - Living Wage
  - Building Trust Between Labor and Community
  - Linking Labor and Community in the Global South
  - Labor Organizing Moving into the 21st Century

- 4:00 Strategies for the Future
  - Kathy Casavant, Secretary-Treasurer, Mass AFL-CIO
  - Teresa Córdova, Associate Professor, University of New Mexico
  - Lydia Lowe, Co-Director, Chinese Progressive Association and Workers Center
- 6:00 Dinner
- 7:00 Erminia Marcatto, Lessons from Brazil's Labor-Community Alliance
- 8:00 Dance Party

Sunday, June 20

- 7:30 Continental Breakfast
- 9:00 Barriers and Strategies—Participant-Organized Workshops
- 11:15 Planners Network Business Meeting (with box lunch)

Afternoon:
- Lowell National Historical Park Canal Boat Tours
- Historical Tour of Nashua, NH
CALIFORNIA

Chinoowns Community Development Center seeks a Housing Project and Portfolio Manager. Reporting to the Director of Housing, the portfolio manager is responsible for assisting in the planning, development, administration, and oversight of the Center’s portfolio of affordable housing programs. The position requires knowledge of and experience in affordable housing development, finance, funding, and administration, as well as proficiency in grant writing, community development, and housing policy. Bachelor’s degree preferred. Must be able to work with residents and other community stakeholders to develop and implement successful housing programs. Salary range: $50,000-$60,000. Deadline for application: October 31, 2019. For more information and to apply, please visit the Center’s website.

COLORADO

The Native American Rights Funds seeks a Systems Administrator. This position is responsible for the technical support and maintenance of the Fund’s IT systems and for ensuring the Fund’s compliance with all applicable data privacy and security regulations. This includes managing hardware, software, network, and security systems. Bachelor’s degree in Information Technology or related field preferred. Experience working with Microsoft Azure and AWS preferred. Salary range: $50,000-$60,000. Deadline for application: September 30, 2019. For more information and to apply, please visit NARF’s website.

FLORIDA

The Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning is seeking a Program Chair for the Journal of Planning Education and Research. The position requires a commitment to the journal’s mission and to the planning profession. Applicants should have at least 10 years of experience in planning education and research. The successful candidate will be a strong leader with excellent communication and interpersonal skills. The Program Chair will serve a three-year term, renewable for one additional term. Deadline for application: October 1, 2019. For more information and to apply, please visit the Association’s website.

MINNESOTA

The City of Minneapolis seeks a City Planner I. The successful candidate will be a creative and innovative thinker with strong writing and presentation skills. Experience in planning and development, with a focus on economic development, is preferred. Bachelor’s degree in urban planning or related field required. Salary range: $50,000-$60,000. Deadline for application: September 27, 2019. For more information and to apply, please visit the City’s website.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Nashua Regional Planning Commission seeks a Transportation Planner. The successful candidate will be a self-starter with strong analytical and organizational skills. Bachelor’s degree in urban planning or related field required. Salary range: $50,000-$55,000. Deadline for application: September 30, 2019. For more information and to apply, please visit the Commission’s website.
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Labor and Community: Bridging the Gap

June 6-9, 1999: Canadian Institute of Planners (CIP) Conference "The City and its Region" will take place in Montreal, Canada. The theme will be "rapid urban growth, globalization of markets, public-private part- nerships, and reforms in municipal govern- ments." More info: 416 161 Alberta St., Suite 801, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1R 7A9; phone 800-207-2128; e-mail: montreal99@cip.ca; Website: <www.cip- icpc.ca>


June 10-10, 1999: Building Bridges: Getting to the Point, the 15th Annual National Income Energy Conference and the 15th Annual National Funds Fuel Network Conference will be held to bring back all conferees in Pittsburgh, PA. For more info contact 614-460-6900 or 412-451-5087.

June 9-23, 1999: Urban Design and Planning in Cuba, a program offered by Lynn Virginia Kogut. The focus of this program is urban design and planning under colonial, republican, and revolu- tionary Cuba, the making of Cuba's changing political economy; and the new economy. Salary range $20-30K. Send for more info. Contact <chrissi@umiacs.edu >

Events and Conferences

May 26-29, 1999: Neighbors USA Conference "Building Neighborhoods Block by Block - Community Building Workshops, neighborhood tours of Madison, speeches, receptions, and cultural events. For more info contact: Neighbors USA, 1530 Sherman Ave., Madison, Wisconsin 53722-2732; phone: 608-242-4434; Website: <www.neighborsusa.org>

JUNE 3-6, 1999: Association for the Study of Food and Society and the Agriculture, Food, and Human Values Society will hold a joint annual meeting at Ryerson Polytechnic University in Toronto, Ontario. For info and submissions contact: Marie Powers, Food and Human Values Administration, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada N1G 2W1; phone: 519-824-3086; E-mail: mgowers@vax.uoguelph.ca; Website: <www.ryerson.ca/foodstuff/index.htm>

Golsheim, Germany: The Future of Industrial Regions - Regional strategies and local action towards sustainability. For more info, phone 49-671 361 79 09; E-mail: nicor@cfrt.bart; Website: <www.soc.titech.ac.jp/golserp>. November 11-14, 1999: The Association for Women in Development workshop "The International Forum "Leading Solutions for Equality and Justice" to be held in Alexandria, Egypt. For more info <www.iwisd.org > or <www.iwisd.org/ >

November 18-22, 1999: Biennial Conference on Planning History in Washington, DC. The conference is on all topics of the history of urban, regional, or community planning. For more info: Prof. Christopher Silver, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 831 South Goodwin Avenue, Champaign, Illinois 61820. Phone 217-333-4555; E-mail: silver@uiuc.edu.

CALL FOR PAPERS

The International Making Cities Livable Conference announces a call for papers and invitation to exhibit for the 25th IMCL Conference "Progress and Challenges" in Seoul, Korea on September 23 and the 26th IMCL Conference in Charleston, SC on March 15-18, 2000. The IMCL conference is Cyberpace, Y2K and the Sustainable City. The Charleston conference will be in conjunction with the誰'ts 30th International Conference, PO Box 7586, Carmel, CA 90712 or fax 831-634-5136.

WEBSITES/ELECTRONIC SERVICES

The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) is conducting a major update of the online Compendium of Sustainable Development Indicator Initiatives (SDII). The Compendium is an infor- mation tool that includes over 140 different ini- tiatives detailing measurement methods, indica- tors, experts and publications. The purpose is to promote mutual learning, synergies and alliances. Those who wish to include descrip- tions of their measurement initiatives in the Compendium, can easily do so by using our online form available at Website: <ciidae/measure/sdii.html>. For more info <www.ciidae/itd/Website: <www.ciidae/itd/>. For more info contact: 916-278-8803; Website: <www.ryerson.ca/foodstuff/index.htm>

The Association for Women in Development workshop "The International Forum "Leading Solutions for Equality and Justice" to be held in Alexandria, Egypt. For more info <www.iwisd.org > or <www.iwisd.org/ >

November 11-14, 1999: The Association for Women in Development workshop "The International Forum "Leading Solutions for Equality and Justice" to be held in Alexandria, Egypt. For more info <www.iwisd.org > or <www.iwisd.org/ >

November 18-22, 1999: Biennial Conference on Planning History in Washington, DC. The conference is on all topics of the history of urban, regional, or community planning. For more info: Prof. Christopher Silver, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 831 South Goodwin Avenue, Champaign, Illinois 61820. Phone 217-333-4555; E-mail: silver@uiuc.edu.
ALLIANCE FOR JUSTICE CALLS FOR FIRST MONDAY CELEBRATION

We invite you to join the Alliance for Justice, and key housing and homelessness groups, including Poverty & Race Research Action Council, National Low Income Housing Coalition, and the National Coalition for the Homeless, on October 4th in its sixth annual First Monday celebration of public interest work. The Alliance for Justice is an association of 50 civil rights, consumer, and environmental organizations. The Alliance works to advance the cause of justice for all Americans, to strengthen the nonprofit sector’s influence on public policy, and to cultivate civic participation among young people.

First Monday was conceived in 1994 as an annual campaign to inspire young people to pursue public interest work. It has become a year-long project that engages students in shaping public opinion on important policy issues, strengthens the work of activists by bringing increased visibility to their efforts, and conducts concrete organizing and advocacy projects on pivotal national issues.

This year is the 50th anniversary of the 1949 Housing Act in which Congress declared that the nation required “...a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.” First Monday 2019 will examine three components of the housing crisis: the lack of affordable housing, housing discrimination, and homelessness. We are expanding our program beyond our traditional focus on undergraduate and law schools to include schools of social work and urban planning. The Alliance will produce a film exploring the themes of First Monday, to be made available for campus events, law firms, bars associations, grant makers, and public interest organizations.

For information contact:
Alliance for Justice
2000 P Street N.W., Suite 712
Washington, DC 20006
202-822-6070

Future Issues

July/August 1999 Immigration Issue
Guest Editor: Arturo Sanchez DEADLINE: July 1

September/October 1999 Growth Machine Issue
Guest Editor: Dick Platkin DEADLINE: September 1

Ann Forsyth will guest edit a future issue on Technology.

Feature articles of 500 to 1500 words are always welcome. Please submit articles, notes, updates, and resources typed and double-spaced. Submissions on disk or by email are greatly appreciated. Send to the Editor at <angotti@pratt.edu> or Planners Network, 379 DeKalb Ave., Brooklyn, NY 11205.
ALLIANCE FOR JUSTICE CALLS FOR FIRST MONDAY CELEBRATION

We invite you to join the Alliance for Justice, and key housing and homelessness groups, including Poverty & Race Research Action Council, National Low Income Housing Coalition, and the National Coalition for the Homeless, on October 4th in its sixth annual First Monday celebration of public interest work. The Alliance for Justice is an association of 50 civil rights, consumer, and environmental organizations. The Alliance works to advance the cause of justice for all Americans, to strengthen the nonprofit sector’s influence on public policy, and to cultivate civic participation among young people.

First Monday was conceived in 1994 as an annual campaign to inspire young people to pursue public interest work. It has become a year-long project that engages students in shaping public opinion on important policy issues, strengthens the work of activists by bringing increased visibility to their efforts, and conducts concrete organizing and advocacy projects on pivotal national issues.

This year is the 50th anniversary of the 1949 Housing Act in which Congress declared that the nation required “...a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.” First Monday 1999 will examine three components of the housing crisis: the lack of affordable housing, housing discrimination, and homelessness. We are expanding our program beyond our traditional focus on undergraduate and law schools to include schools of social work and urban planning. The Alliance will produce a film exploring the themes of First Monday, to be made available for campus events, law firms, associations, grant makers, and public interest organizations.

For information contact:

Alliance for Justice
2000 P Street N.W., Suite 712
Washington, DC 20006
202-822-6070
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Guest Editor: Arturo Sanchez
DEADLINE: July 1

September/October 1999 Growth Machine Issue
Guest Editor: Dick Platkin
DEADLINE: September 1

Ann Forsyth will guest edit a future issue on Technology.

Feature articles of 500 to 1500 words are always welcome. Please submit articles, notes, updates, and resources typed and double-spaced. Submissions on disk or by email are greatly appreciated. Send to the Editor at <tango@pratt.edu> or Planners Network, 379 DeKalb Ave., Brooklyn, NY 11205.
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YOUR LAST ISSUE?

Please check the date on your mailing label. If it is JUNE 1998 this will be your last issue unless we hear from you RIGHT AWAY! See page 19 for contribution suggestions.

MOVING?
Please send us your new address.