

Globalization and Cooperative Activity among National Labor Unions and National Environmental Organizations in the United States

*David Foster STEELE**

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the cooperative activity between national labor unions and national environmental organizations in the United States on issues associated with globalization. Past researchers have advocated the need for organizations that makeup the labor and environmental movements to work together, but do they? It is hypothesized that globalization issues may be a key factor for cooperative activity between national labor unions and national environmental organizations. The conducted research does find some evidence to support this claim. Industrial labor unions and politically oriented environmental organizations appear to be most active in working together on globalization issues. Associated with working together is the need for organizations to adopt a social justice frame that other organizations can support. The article concludes with a discussion of the importance of permanent, federative arrangements between national labor unions and national environmental organizations.

Keywords: Globalization, Social Movements, Labor Unions, Environmental Movement, Coalitions

* Austin Peay State University

National labor unions and national environmental organizations make up two of the largest and most respected social movements in the United States. Organizations in both movements work to address and challenge how the costs and benefits of the capital production process are distributed across society (Buttel, Geisler, & Wiswall, 1984; Obach, 2000; Rose, 2000; Siegmann, 1985). Many researchers now call for organizations across movements to work together, including national labor unions and national environmental organizations. Derber (1998: 31) states:

The new populism is emerging today as a coalition of four movements: labor, the "Third Sector" community movement, identity movement of race and gender, and the environmental movement. The goals of all four require a systemic challenge to corporate sovereignty, and none will be able to succeed without sustained collaborative strategies....

Reynolds (1999) cites Brecher and Costello (1990), Fisher and Kling (1993) and Simmons (1994, 1997, 1998) as conveying the need for unions to "build coalitions with their communities and other progressive organizations" (Reynolds, 1999: 54). Boggs (1990) and Broad (1995) echo the importance of labor building coalitions. Boggs (1990: 302) suggests that "radical social change depends upon a convergence of labor struggles and popular movements around feminism, ecology, peace and social equality". Broad (1995: 79) states that the

"best long-run option for labor is increasing social movement unionism through which labor combines with other social movements....in a general struggle for social justice" and suggests labor join with "feminists, environmentalists, peace activists, aboriginal people and others to achieve a more rational and humane world order"

Burton (1998), Foster (1991), Obach (2000), Rose (2000), Schnaiberg and Gould (1994), and Tokar (1997) believe that environmental organizations must form coalitions with labor unions and incorporate social concerns into their organizational agendas for any success at confronting capital. Schnaiberg and Gould (1994: 160) suggest that building coalitions with labor and other social movement groups will allow them to combine in a way that gives them a "greater chance of dominating the (political) agenda, through political veto power over economic elites and their government supporters".

If organizations that make up the labor and environmental movements could find a way to cooperate, they could become a significant force for social change (Boggs, 1990; Obach, 2000; Rose, 2000). This possibility of

increasing their effectiveness by working together is best explained by Obach (2000: 295) when he states:

When divided, they (labor and environmental movements) represent relatively weak movements compared to the power wielded by those private entities charged with the exploitation of workers and nature. Yet, allied they represent a force capable of offering a significant counterweight to their mutual adversaries. Such an alliance would represent a movement capable of bringing about dramatic social change.

Many researchers suggest that for progressive social change to occur in the United States organizations that comprise the various social movements must combine their forces. But do national labor unions and national environmental organizations work together across movements? Can they work together across movements? Particularly, is globalization an issue that can lead to them working together?

Neo-Liberal Economics and Globalization as a Factor for Coalitional Activity

Buttel et al. (1984) suggest that the need for cooperation between labor and environmentalists grew during the 1980s with the promotion of neoliberal economics and the intensification of globalization. They explain that the need for cooperation between national labor unions and national environmental organizations grew due to the conservative shift of American politics that advocated the deregulation of business, particularly environmental and labor rules. This focus on deregulation is prevalent today and may be a catalyst for environmental organizations and labor unions to seek coalitions and alliances to preserve the gains they made in previous decades (Buttel et al., 1984: 15). These Reagan era attacks on labor and environmental regulations during the 1980s are associated with the restructuring of the United States economic system in response to the intensified globalization of trade (Berberoglu, 1990, 1992; Rose, 2000).

After World War II and until the 1980s, capital, the state and labor operated as a coalition that supported and was being perpetuated by economic growth (Schnaiberg, 1980: 212). Cable and Cable (1995) discuss that labor's inclusion in the "growth coalition" resulted from labor's structural position in society in which they rely on the corporate class for jobs. Cable and Cable explain that in the past, improvements for laborers have not occurred from a redistribution of profits but from an increase in profits due to the expansion of production. Ross (2000) refers to the growth coalition as the "golden age

model” when high economic growth allowed for labor unions, employers and government to act as allies. Rose (2000: 91) explains that labor’s participation in the growth coalition cost the labor movement “its broader social agenda” and made the labor movement “unprepared for the hostile environment of the 1980s” created by the intensification of globalization (See also Dewey, 1998; Obach, 2004).

Workers also supported the policies of capital out of the need for short-term economic survival (Cable & Cable, 1995). Their support has often been gained by job blackmail, with capital threatening to cease operations if workers do not support their policies (Kazis & Grossman, 1991). Because the focus of labor unions is on the need to improve the economic conditions of workers, they have supported the expansion of production in the past as it resulted in higher wages for highly skilled technical workers. However, with the intensification of globalization, the benefits of expanding the production process is less effective in increasing the economic standing of workers (even highly skilled workers) in the United States, thus diminishing the power and success of labor unions in the United States (Obach, 2004; Ross, 2000).

Globalization allows business to move labor activities around the globe to where items can be produced most cheaply. The increased ability of business to relocate production has reduced the power of labor and has resulted in the expulsion of labor in the United States from the growth coalition. As the expulsion process began in the 1980s, labor unions that were first to realize the effects of globalization started to consider working together with environmental organizations (Buttel et al, 1984; Jackson & Wright 1981; Obach 2004). Boswell and Stevis (1997: 300) suggest that globalization is leading labor unions to expand their agenda to include "issues of gender, environment and community to mobilize support beyond their union base". Ross (2004: 305) expands this to explain that “globalization forces the labor movement on the defensive, and impels it to seek out new allies, in community and action and in politics”. National environmental organizations are potential allies for addressing globalization as they work to oppose globalization because of its increase in international pollution and destruction of natural environments. Gould, Lewis, and Roberts (2004: 99) see globalization as creating the possibility for collaboration between national labor unions and national environmental organizations.

Evans (2001: 5) explains that globalization is “aggressively subordinating an ever wider range of social relationships to market transactions and trying to make decision making power synonymous with market power”. By focusing on market power as the dominating factor in decisions, issues of justice or

fairness supported by environmental and labor organizations are lessened. Evans (2001: 4) argues that globalization is forcing the labor movement to “think of itself again as a social movement”.

Evans sees globalization as a common issue for many movements, particularly the labor and environmental movement, as they oppose the corporations that benefit from the current structure of globalization. Evans (2001: 5) states:

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

Podobnik and Reifer (2004), Wallerstein (1990) and Starr (2000) encompass the labor movement and the environmental movement as part of an anti-systemic movement against globalization that is working to create a more egalitarian world concerned about protecting community values. Wallerstein (1990, 45) states that many movements in the world today share a common bond because “they reject the injustices created by the capitalist world system”. Buttel and Gould (2004) and Gould et al. (2004) consider globalization an important component to possibly allow national labor unions and environmental organizations to work together because it provides a common language or critique against neo-liberal economic policies, current international institutions and corporate power. This “common bond” or “critique” of globalization should provide national labor unions and national environmental organizations the opportunity to work together as they face a common threat (Hodge & Anthony, 1988; Shefner, 2001).

Research

This research is an effort to begin the mapping of the social space for cooperative activity between national labor unions and national environmental organizations by discovering if globalization is an issue they share, and what type (if any) activities they have participated in to address issues associated with the concept of globalization collectively. Two research activities were conducted that provide evidence of the issues linking

national labor unions and national environmental organizations. From 2002–2004, I conducted a document analysis of the websites of seven national environmental organizations and seven national labor unions. The national environmental organizations chosen were: the Center for Health, Environment and Justice (CHEJ), Environmental Defense, Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace USA, National Audubon Society, The Nature Conservancy, and the Sierra Club.

The logic of choosing these organizations is twofold. First, these national environmental organizations represent the broad continuum of interests and activities (lobbying organizations, direct action organizations, land and wildlife preservation organizations and toxic waste organizations) of national environmental organizations as presented by Mitchell, Mertig and Dunlap (1992). Second, the sample includes three environmental organizations (Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth and Sierra Club) Dreiling (1998) identified as previously working with national labor unions against the passage of NAFTA, a global issue of common interest to both movements. This action is taken to assure that the national environmental organizations that are most likely to be involved with national labor unions are included in the study, allowing for greater understanding of activities occurring between them.

The seven national labor unions chosen for this study were the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union (HERE), International Brotherhood of Teamsters (Teamsters), Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union (PACE), Service Employees International Union (SEIU), United Farm Workers of America (UFW), and the United Steelworkers of America (USWA).

Included in this study is a division between industrial/manufacturing unions and service unions. USWA, Teamsters, and PACE are unions whose members are involved in the Industrial/manufacturing process. AFSCME, SEIU, and HERE are national labor unions that represent the growing union membership oriented toward service positions in society. I also included the UFW because their members work directly in the agriculture industry which is a work process close to nature and therefore expected to provide many opportunities for overlap between the concerns of workers and environmental issues.

Dreiling (1998) identified environmental leanings in the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union (OCAW) (which merged with the

United Paper Workers Union (UPIU) in 1999 to form PACE), USWA, Teamsters, and SEIU in his study of NAFTA. Dewey (1998) and Gordon (1998) identify the OCAW, UFW and USWA among the unions adopting a pro-environmental stance during the 1960s. Dreiling (1998) and Johnston (1994) discuss how service unions like AFSCME and SEIU have been a driving force for reform in the American Federation of Labor - Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO). They have reinvigorated unions and encouraged unions to consider taking up social issues, like the environment, which are viewed as potentially important issues for improving the quality of life for their membership (Dreiling 1998).

The second technique implemented in this study is the interviewing of high ranking officials of five national labor unions and five national environmental organizations (plus an official from the AFL-CIO) in 2003. The officials interviewed represent HERE, PACE, SEIU, UFW, USWA, Audubon Society, CHEJ, Friends of the Earth, Nature Conservancy, and one interviewee from a national environmental organization that preferred to remain anonymous. These organizational officials occupy high ranking positions within each organization and are privy to the decision making process of their respective organizations. They have a keen insight into the activities of their organization, which includes their relationships or cooperative activities with other national organizations.

Findings of Coalitional and Federative Arrangements

Identification of cooperative activities among the selected national labor unions and national environmental organizations related to globalization is made by discovering the coalitional arrangements and federative arrangements as defined by Warren (1967). The project identifies the coalitional and federative arrangements that occurred between the selected national labor unions and environmental organizations from 1999 to June 2004. Evidence of coalitional arrangements among these organizations, where organizations agree to cooperate on an ad hoc basis, includes such activities as: joint statements, letters of endorsement, joint planning of protest events, and joint conferences. Federative arrangements between national labor unions and national environmental organizations are composed of federative or permanent, self-sustained organizations created by national labor unions and national environmental organizations in pursuit of agreed upon goals.

Coalitional Arrangements

The AFL-CIO is included among the organizations participating in coalitional and federative arrangements. While collecting data for this project it became apparent that much of the cooperation between national labor unions and national environmental organizations includes the AFL-CIO. In fact, many of the joint activities between national labor unions and national environmental organizations are presented only on the AFL-CIO's website. Therefore, a decision was made to acknowledge the AFL-CIO's inclusion in coalitional and federative arrangements. Richard Trumka, the Secretary-Treasurer of the AFL-CIO was interviewed for this study as a result of the inclusion of the AFL-CIO. As indicated by Table 1, the selected national labor unions and national environmental organizations participated in 15 coalitional arrangements that are related to globalization issues.

Federative Arrangements

Four federative arrangements are associated with globalization issues from 1999 to June 2004. They are the Citizens Trade Campaign, the Coalition for Environmentally Responsible Economies, the Alliance for Responsible Trade and the International Right to Know Campaign (See Table 2).

The Citizens Trade Campaign is an organization whose main purpose is trade reform. The Citizens Trade Campaign formed in 1992 and includes labor and environmental organizations who originally came together to oppose the North American Free Trade Agreement or NAFTA (Dreiling, 1997, 1998, 2001; Citizens Trade Campaign, n.d). The Citizens Trade Campaign deals with a wide variety of trade issues. For example, their website presents concerns for NAFTA, CAFTA (Central America Free Trade Agreement), FTAA (Free Trade Area of the Americas), the WTO (World Trade Authority) and Fast Track Authority for the President of the United States. The Citizens Trade Campaign expresses its commitment to trade reform by stating (Citizens Trade Campaign, n.d., What is Citizens Trade Campaign? section, para.1):

	A	A	H	P	S	T	U	U	A	C	E	F	N	G	S
	F	F	E	A	E	E	F	S	A	H	N	R	R	A	I
	L	S	R	C	I	A	W	W	D	E	V	I	T	E	E
	-	C	E	E	U	M	A	A	U	J	I	E	U	E	R
Coalition activity	C	M				S			B		R	N	R	N	R
	I	E				T			O		D	E	P	A	
	O					E			N		S		E	A	C
						R			S		F		E	A	C
						S			O				E	C	L
									C					U	B
FTAA Call to Action (Miami Protest 2003) (AFL-CIO, 2003a)	X	X		X		X		X				X			X
Tell Us the Truth Tour (Fair Trade 2003) (Tell Us the Truth, n.d)		X				X		X				X			X
March to Miami Campaign (FTAA Protest 2003) (USWA, 2003a)	X	X						X							X
Rapid Response Conference in Miami (FTAA Protest 2003) (USWA, 2003b)								X				X			
Letter to Robert Zoellick (U. S. Trade Representative 2003) (AFL-CIO, 2003b)		X				X		X				X		X	X
Support Apollo Alliance (2003) (Apollo Alliance, n.d.a; Greenhouse, 2003)	X	X		X	X	X		X						X	X
Oppose Drilling in ANWR (LEAPS) (2002) (LEAPS n.d)					X			X							X
Principles of Unity on Trade and Investment (AFL-CIO 2002a)	X	X		X		X		X				X			X
Stop Fast Track Authority (Joint Statement 2001/2002) (AFL-CIO, 2002b; Teamsters, 2001b)	X	X		X		X		X				X			X
World Bank Reform (Joint Report April 2002) (AFL-CIO, 2002c)		X										X	X		
Cross Border Trucking (2001) (Teamsters, 2001a)						X						X			X
Oppose China's Trade Practices Protest (2000) (AFL-CIO, 2000)	X	X				X		X				X			
Seattle WTO Protests (1999) (Teamsters, n.d)	X					X		X				X		X	X
Alliance for Sustainable Jobs and the Environment ^a (Alliance for Sustainable Jobs and the Environment, n.d.)		X		X	X	X		X		X		X			X
Climate Change Conference (1999) (AFL-CIO, 1999)	X	X		X	X			X				X		X	X
Total	1	8	0	6	4	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	4	1
	1					0		3				2			2

^a The Alliance for Sustainable Jobs and the Environment is a coalition that members of labor unions and environmental organizations have established to work together. Labor and environmental organizations are not members of this coalition per se, only individuals within these organizations. However, many of the national organizations appear to be supportive of the Alliance for Sustainable Jobs and the Environment.

Table 1: National Labor Unions and National Environmental Organizations Working Together in Coalitional Arrangements

	A	A	H	P	S	T	U	U	A	C	E	F	N	G	S
Federative organizations	F	F	E	A	E	E	F	S	U	H	N	R	A	R	I
	L	S	R	C	I	A	W	W	D	E	V	I	T	E	E
	-	C	E	E	U	M	A	U	J	I	E	U	E	R	R
	C	M			S			B		R	N	R	N	R	
	I	E			T			O		D	D	E	P	A	
	O				E			N		D	S		E		
					R					E			A	C	
					S			S		F			C	L	
								O					E	U	
								C					B		
Alliance for Responsible Trade	X											X			
Citizens Trade Campaign					X	X					X				
Coalition for Environmentally Responsible Economies	X									X	X			X	
International Right to Know Campaign	X				X						X			X	
Total	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	2

Table 2: National Labor Unions and National Environmental Organizations Working Together in Federative Arrangements

We are united in a common belief that international trade and investment are not ends unto themselves, but instead must be viewed as a means for achieving other societal goals such as economic justice, human rights, healthy communities, and a sound environment. The rules which govern the global economy must reflect the views and needs of the majority of the world's people on issues such as jobs, wages, the environment, human rights, food and consumer safety, access to essential services, and public health.

The Teamsters, the USWA and Friends of the Earth are organizations included in this study that are members of the Citizens Trade Campaign. Dreiling (1998) identifies both the Sierra Club and SEIU as members of the Citizens Trade Campaign during its formation against NAFTA. However, neither of these organizations is presently listed as members of the Citizens Trade Campaign on its website.

The Coalition for Environmentally Responsible Economies (CERES) is an organization established in 1989 that brought together social investors, corporations, environmental groups and other groups that represent the public interest to improve the reporting and practices of environmental management in corporations (CERES, n.d.a). The 10 CERES Principles that endorsing companies commit to follow are: (1) protecting the biosphere, (2) creating a sustainable use of natural resources, (3) reducing and properly

disposing of waste, (4) conserving energy, (5) protecting employees from environmental, health, and safety risks, (6) producing environmentally safe products and services, (7) maintaining and restoring environmental health and safety, (8) informing the public of environmental dangers caused by the company, (9) assuring that each company's Board of Directors and CEOs is committed to the CERES principles, and (10) auditing the company's adherence to these principles annually and producing a publicly available report of the audit. (CERES, n.d.b, Principles section, para. 2-10). The CERES Principles are used to create a more informed corporate investor and to change the organizational culture of companies that participate by encouraging them to adopt environmentally sustainable practices. Many environmental organizations and public interest groups participate in CERES. The AFL-CIO, Environmental Defense, Friends of the Earth, and the Sierra Club are the organizations included in this study that are members of CERES.

The Alliance for Responsible Trade (ART) is another organization that focuses on trade that formed during the fight over NAFTA (Dreiling, 1997, 1998, 2001; Alliance for Responsible Trade, n.d). The Alliance for Responsible Trade focuses on global trade issues like NAFTA, CAFTA, and FTAA. The organizations in this study that participate in the Alliance for Responsible Trade are the AFL-CIO and Friends of the Earth. During the formation of the Alliance for Responsible Trade, Greenpeace was a member. However, Greenpeace is no longer listed as a member of ART on their website. This may have occurred as a result of strained relations with the AFL-CIO. Dreiling (1998: 64) suggests that:

The AFL-CIO, however, never established close relations to Greenpeace, reflecting the variance in the tactical dispositions and absence of common relations among the respective organizations.

Why do both the Citizens Trade Campaign and the Alliance for Responsible Trade exist? Dreiling (1998) suggests that the difference between these organizations is that the Citizens Trade Campaign focused on the NAFTA fight as a national issue and the Alliance for Responsible Trade took a more 'internationalists' focus on the NAFTA issue. This is demonstrated by the efforts of the Alliance for Responsible Trade to work with other international organizations. The Alliance for Responsible Trade is a member of the Hemispheric Social Alliance which advocates alternatives to the present trade agreement model. International organizations that the Alliance for Responsible Trade partners with include such groups as Mexican Action Network on Free Trade, Action Canada Network and the Brazilian Association of NGOs (Alliance for Responsible Trade, 2000).

The International Right to Know Campaign is an effort by a coalition of more than “200 environmental, labor, social justice and human rights organizations” that demands U.S. Companies report environmental, labor and human rights practices at their international plants (International Right to Know Campaign, n.d., What is IRTK? section, para.1). The International Right to Know Campaign hopes to achieve this goal by passing a law that extends the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act of 1986, which allows communities and workers in the United States access to this type of reporting, to all communities in the world in which U.S. companies operate. This campaign incorporates the issues of trade, corporate accountability and health dangers associated with human exposure to toxic chemicals. The International Right to Know is concerned with globalization because it attempts to affect the practices of U.S. corporations as they operate around the world by requiring them to disclose environmental and labor practices to all communities affected by the production process. Partners of the International Right to Know Campaign include the AFL-CIO, Friends of the Earth and the Sierra Club. The Teamsters also act as an endorsing organization of the International Right to Know Campaign (International Right to Know Campaign, n.d).

These four federative arrangements related to globalization demonstrate that national labor unions and environmental organizations not only share issues associated with globalization, but that some of the national labor unions and national environmental organizations have committed to working on together in permanent endeavors to address these issues. The AFL-CIO, the Teamsters, USWA, Friends of the Earth, and the Sierra Club are involved with at least one of the federative arrangements associated with globalization issues. However, there may be some distancing occurring on this issue for some organizations. Greenpeace is no longer associated with the Alliance for Responsible Trade, the Sierra Club and SEIU are no longer associated with the Citizens Trade Campaign and the International Right to Know campaign appears to no longer be active as the URL for their website no longer provides information about the campaign.

National Labor Unions and National Environmental Organizations with High Levels of Cooperation

The national labor unions that have the highest levels of cooperation with national environmental organizations are the AFL-CIO (11 coalitional, 3 federative), USWA (13 coalitional, 1 federative) and the Teamsters (10 coalitional, 2 federative). It is important to recognize that the USWA and the Teamsters are “industrial” unions and that the AFL-CIO represents most industrial unions in the United States. Their efforts to cooperate with

environmental organizations may result from the detrimental effects current global trade polices have created for union workers and the environmental dangers experienced in the workplace. These findings refute a claim by Burton (1986: 293) that “service and government employee unions have brought environmental issues greater respectability within the labour movement”. The findings support the claim made by Siegmann (1986: 324) that “during the 1970s, industrial unions were more supportive of proenvironmental policies than service unions”. Today, industrial unions appear to still have a stronger tie to national environmental organizations.

The environmental organizations with the highest levels of cooperation with national labor unions are Friends of the Earth (12 coalitional, 4 federative) and the Sierra Club (12 coalitional, 2 federative). It is important to recognize that these two environmental organizations focus on political lobbying as identified by Mitchel et al. (1992). Their cooperative activities with national labor unions may be the result of Friends of the Earth’s and the Sierra Club’s ability to participate in more political activities than other national environmental organizations because of their 501(c)(4) status. The Internal Revenue Service 501(c)(4) status associated with aspects of these environmental organizations and the Internal Revenue Service 501(c)(5) status of national labor unions allows them to “engage in an unlimited amount of lobbying, provided that the lobbying is related to the organization’s purpose...and engage in political campaigns on behalf of or in opposition to candidates for public office provided that such intervention does not constitute the organization’s primary activity” (Reily & Allen, 2003, L2). Hodge and Anthony (1998) suggest that laws governing organizational activity can affect cooperative activity between organizations. Friends of the Earth and the Sierra Club may overcome this limitation by creating politically active components to their national organizations.

The AFL-CIO, USWA, Teamsters, Friends of the Earth and the Sierra Club work together not only because they have overlapping issues but because they have framed those issues in a way that allows them to incorporate the concerns of other organizations. By framing their issues in a way that allows them to work together, these organizations can benefit by sharing resources and become stronger politically.

The national labor unions and environmental organization with medium or low levels of cooperation are AFSCME, SEIU, PACE, UFW, Greenpeace USA, Environmental Defense, and CHEJ. The inability of the organizations with medium and low cooperation to have high cooperation may be due to the frames they have adopted, calling into question the benefits of

dedicating resources to cooperative actions between national labor unions and national environmental organizations.

Dreiling (1997, 1998, 2001), Obach (2000, 2004), Rose (2000) and Siegmann (1985) identify the adoption of a social justice frame as a key component as to whether or not national labor unions and national environmental organizations will work together. They suggest that labor unions must adopt a social movement unionism frame and environmental organizations must adopt an environmental justice frame to link their concerns for social justice. While a social justice frame is necessary for national labor unions and national environmental organizations to work together, it does not guarantee success for their goals because of the power of business and government to oppose them.

Richard Trumka of the AFL-CIO explains the importance of a social justice frame for labor unions that try to work with national environmental organizations and the opposition sometimes experienced by government when implementing a social justice frame by stating (R. Trumka, personal communication, October 22, 2003):

Instinctively, I think the American public gravitates toward fair treatment. If you can show someone is being treated unfairly, the majority of Americans generally rally around that person. They demand a fair treatment for people. So, when you are talking about social justice, if you can define an issue in terms of fairness or unfairness of the issue, Americans respond. Now, that doesn't mean that the politicians always respond, because truth, right and wrong generally does not matter to them. No, I shouldn't say generally. Sometimes it doesn't matter to them. You can be as right as the day or morning sun and still not win on an issue because the powers are aligned against you. Money has a very, very strong influence at the federal level and probably the state level as well. Being right is not always enough.

This position is echoed by Leo W. Gerard of the USWA when he states (L. Gerard, personal communication, March 24, 2003):

Unfortunately in the current political environment in Washington, the administration seems unresponsive to those (social justice) issues. But that doesn't prevent us from carrying on that fight because we believe social justice is a foundation of this country. This country is based on the concept of liberty and justice for all.

National environmental organizations who try to work with labor unions try to adopt an environmental justice frame that extends to social justice. David Waskow of Friends of the Earth explains the social justice position of national environmental organizations when he states (D. Waskow, personal communication, May 6 & 7, 2003):

Our (Friends of the Earth's) purpose is not only to defend the environment but also to seek social justice. We often work at the nexus of social and environmental issues. We don't see environmental issues as being separated from other social issues. For example, in the context of international policy work we are concerned about the ways in which environmental degradation hurts people - in developing countries especially - and how social injustice and economic inequity are tied up with environmental harm.

For national labor unions and environmental organizations to work together they have to extend the framing of their issues in a way that allows them to cooperate with other organizations (Snow, Rochford, Worden, & Benford, 1986). While labor unions are concerned with economic justice (Acuff, 2000) and environmental organizations focus on environmental justice (Capek, 1993), both can be encompassed in a social justice frame because the focus of both movements is based on the principles of "citizenship rights, the democratic process and respect" (Capek, 1993: 8). Acuff (2000; para. 8) suggests that embracing a wider social justice perspective allows organizations to work with their natural allies who are all fighting injustice and that only by working together will victory be achieved.

While sharing a social justice frame provides national labor unions and environmental organizations the ability to create the social space necessary to work together, it does not guarantee that national labor unions and environmental organizations will be able to work together.

The lack of federative arrangements reduces the ability of national labor unions and environmental organizations to work together. Without federative arrangements, cooperation between the two movements is temporary and often loses momentum. Richard Trumka of the AFL-CIO advocates the maintenance of federative arrangements. He explains (R. Trumka, personal communication, October 22, 2003):

I think it is essential. It has to be two-way working coalitions (between national labor unions and environmental organizations), where both parties benefit from the coalition and they have to be long lasting. The thing we have not done well in the past is keep coalitions intact. We have allowed

them to atrophy over the years and as a result.....they have been disbanded after the issue passes. What we are trying to do now is build coalitions that are continuous - that transition from issue to issue and don't fall down but do become a two way street. I subscribe to the idea that we need more permanent coalitions among movement organizations. Particularly in a global economy, the interests of any group will be subordinated unless you are in coalition with several organizations. Otherwise, your voice is not heard. There is a continuous need not only to have the coalitions operating but also to keep them from atrophying as they did in the past.

David Waskow of Friends of the Earth echoes this point when discussing the importance of the Citizens Trade Campaign in keeping partner organizations committed to the issue of trade. He says (D. Waskow, personal communication, May 6 & 7, 2003):

The Citizens Trade Campaign is much more of the context in which we do very serious ongoing work in a coalition... But there are other times like now that partner organizations have a whole slew of organizational priorities on their plate and trade slips down a bit. The Citizens Trade Campaign acts as a conduit to keep trade pushed up to the top in terms of what kind of work that each organization is doing.

Federative arrangements have lower rates of participation than coalitional arrangements. To be effective working together national labor unions and environmental organizations need to increase organizational membership in federative organizations and create new ones when necessary. Schnaiberg and Gould (1994) identify the importance of creating permanent alliances between labor and environmental organizations as essential to the success of promoting a strong social agenda. A present difficulty with creating new federative arrangements is the framing of overlapping issues between national labor unions and national environmental organizations. As long as issues are framed in a way that limits the ability of organizations associated with the two movements to connect with each other, their ability to establish federative arrangements will remain sparse.

Conclusion

Previous research suggests that cooperative activity between organizations from various social movements (particularly the labor movement and environmental movement) is needed for social change and social movement success (Derber, 1998; Boggs,1990; Obach, 2000; Rose, 2000). From the findings of the document analysis and interviews from 2002–2004, it appears that globalization issues allow for cooperative activity between national

labor unions and national environmental organizations in the United States. Using Warren's (1967) typology, 15 coalitional arrangements and 4 federative arrangements are discovered between national labor unions and national environmental organizations associated with issues of globalization. The AFL-CIO, USWA (more commonly known today as the USW since merging with PACE in 2005) and the Teamsters are the national labor unions most likely to work with national environmental organizations on globalization issues. The Sierra Club and Friends of the Earth are the national environmental organizations most likely to work with national labor unions on globalization issues. These findings suggest that industrial unions and environmental organizations focusing on lobby activities are most likely to work together. These organizations also appear to be more willing to adopt a wider social justice frame or perspective on issues of concern which may provide them with a greater number of potential allies.

The lack of federative arrangements between national labor unions and national environmental organizations is also of concern. Three federative arrangements examined by this study associated with globalization, the Alliance for Responsible Trade, the Citizens Trade Campaign, and CERES continue to be active today. At least one new federative arrangement associated with globalization and officially endorsed by the USW and the Sierra Club, the Blue Green Alliance, began in 2006 (Sierra Club, 2006) and one coalitional arrangement, the Apollo Alliance, appears to be transitioning into a federative organization (Apollo Alliance, n.d.b). Future studies will need to reexamine the cooperative activity between national labor unions and national environmental organizations. Specifically, they will need to assess how globalization continues to affect and/or is affected by the efforts of national labor unions and national environmental organizations to work together to promote social change.

REFERENCES

- Acuff, S. (2000). The struggle for economic justice. *Labor Studies Journal*, 25(1), 7-9.
- Alliance for Responsible Trade (ART). (n.d.). *Who we are*. Retrieved March 28, 2004, from http://www.art-us.org/Who_We_Are.html
- Alliance for Responsible Trade (ART). (2000). *Hemispheric Social Alliance*. Retrieved March 28, 2004, from <http://www.art-us.org/LiberateText.html>
- Alliance for Sustainable Jobs and the Environment. (n.d.). *Houston principles of the Alliance for Sustainable Jobs and the Environment*. Retrieved October 1, 2002, from <http://www.asje.org/houston.html>

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO). (1999). *Labor and environmental organizations discuss climate change*. Retrieved August 12, 2003, from <http://www.aflcio.org/mediacenter/prsptm/pr05061999.cfm>

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO). (2000). *15,000 working women and men rally at U.S. Capitol to tell their members of Congress: "No blank check for China"*. Retrieved August 12, 2003, from <http://www.aflcio.org/mediacenter/prsptm/pr04122000.cfm>

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO). (2002a). *Coalition of 135 groups voice opposition to fast track letter to Senate calls push for fast track "backwards-looking"*. Retrieved August 12, 2003, from <http://www.aflcio.org/mediacenter/prsptm/pr05062002.cfm>

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO). (2002b). *Principles of unity on trade & investment*. Retrieved August 12, 2003, from <http://www.aflcio.org/issuespolitics/globaleconomy/principles.cfm>

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO). (2002c). *Unions, environmental, religious groups call for World Bank reforms*. Retrieved August 12, 2003, from <http://www.aflcio.org/issuespolitics/globaleconomy/ns04172002.cfm>

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO). (2003a). *FTAA call to action*. Retrieved August 12, 2003, from <http://www.aflcio.org/issuespolitics/globaleconomy/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&PageID=23761>

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO). (2003b). *Letter to the Honorable Robert Zoellick*, Retrieved August 12, 2003, from <http://www.aflcio.org/issuespolitics/globaleconomy/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&PageID=21973>

Apollo Alliance. (n.d.a). *About the Apollo Alliance*. Retrieved January 25, 2004, from http://www.apolloalliance.org/about_the_alliance/

Apollo Alliance. (n.d.a). *About the Board of Directors*. Retrieved June 24, 2008, from http://www.apolloalliance.org/about_board.php

Berberoglu, B. (1990). *Political Sociology: A comparative/historical approach*. Dix Hills, N.Y.: General Hall.

Berberoglu, B. (1992). *The legacy of empire: Economic decline and class polarization in the United States*. New York: Praeger.

Boggs, C. (1990). Economic conversion as a radical strategy: Where social movements and labor meet. In J. Brecher & T. Costello (Eds.), *Building bridges: The emerging grassroots coalition of labor and community* (pp. 302-309). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Boswell, T., & Stevis, D. (1997). Globalization and international labor organizing: A world-system perspective. *Work and Occupations*, 24(3), 288-308.

- Brecher, J., & Costello, T. (1990). *Building bridges: The emerging grassroots coalition of labor and community*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Broad, D. (1995). Globalization and the casual labor problem: History and prospects. *Social Justice*, 22(3(61)), 67-91.
- Burton, D. J. (1986). Contradictions and changes in labour response to distributional implications of environmental-resource policies. In A. Schnaiberg, N. Watts & K. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Distributional conflicts in environmental-resource policy* (pp. 287-314). Aldershot, England: Gower Publishing.
- Buttel, F. H., Geisler, C. C., & Wiswall, I. W. (1984). *Labor and the environment: An analysis of and annotated bibliography on workplace environmental quality in the United States*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Buttel, F. H., & Gould, K. A. (2004). Global social movement(s) at the crossroads: Some observations on the trajectory of the anti-corporate globalization movement. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 10(1), 37-66.
- Cable, S., & Cable, C. (1995). *Environmental problems, grassroots solutions: The politics of grassroots environmental conflict*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Capek, S. M. (1993). The "environmental justice" frame: A conceptual discussion and an application. *Social Problems*, 40(1), 5-24.
- Citizens Trade Campaign (CTC). (n.d.). *What is Citizens Trade Campaign?* Retrieved January 21, 2004, from <http://www.citizenstrade.org/about.php>
- Coalition for Environmentally Responsible Economies (CERES). (n.d.a) *About us: overview*. Retrieved November 9, 2003 from <http://www.ceres.org/about/main.htm>
- Coalition for Environmentally Responsible Economies (CERES). (n.d.b) *Our work: The CERES principles*. Retrieved November 9, 2003 from http://www.ceres.org/our_work/principles.htm
- Derber, C. (1998). Populism. *Social Policy*, 28(3), 27-31.
- Dewey, S. (1998). Working for the environment: Organized labor and the origins of environmentalism in the Untied States, 1948-1970. *Environmental History*, 3(1), 45-63.
- Dreiling, M. (1997). Remapping North American environmentalism: Contending visions and divergent practices in the fight over NAFTA. *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*, 8(4(32)), 65- 98.
- Dreiling, M. (1998). From margin to center: Environmental justice and social unionism as sites for intermovement solidarity. *Race, Gender & Class*, 6(1), 51-69.
- Dreiling, M. (2001). *Solidarity and contention: The politics of security and sustainability in the NAFTA conflict*. New York: Garland.
- Evans, P. (2001). Why renewed interest in the labor movement? *In Critical Solidarity*, 1(1), 4-6.
- Fisher, R., & Kling, J. (1993). *Mobilizing the community: Local politics in the era of the global city*. New Park, CA: SAGE.

- Foster, J. B. (1991). Capitalism and the ancient forest. *Monthly Review*, 43(5), 1-16.
- Gordon, R. (1998). "Shell no!" OCAW and the labor-environmental alliance. *Environmental History*, 3(4), 460-488.
- Gould, K. A., Lewis, T. L., & Roberts, J. T. (2004). Blue-Green coalitions: Constraints and possibilities in the post 9-11 political environment. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 10(1), 91-116.
- Greenhouse, S. (2003). *Unions back research plan for energy*. Retrieved June 21, 2003, from The Campaign for America's Future Web site: http://www.ourfuture.org/issues_and_campaigns/energy_independence/nyt_6_6_03.cfm
- Hodge, B. J., & Anthony, W. P. (1988). *Organization Theory* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- International Brotherhood of Teamsters (Teamsters). (n.d.). *What is the Seattle ministerial?* Retrieved August 15, 2003, from http://www.teamster.org/wto/what_is_seattle_ministerial.htm
- International Brotherhood of Teamsters (Teamsters). (2001a). *Hoffa: Teamsters part of diverse coalition on cross-border trucking*. Retrieved June 30, 2004, from <http://www.teamster.org/01newsb/hn%5F010820%5F2.htm>
- International Brotherhood of Teamsters (Teamsters). (2001b). *Labor coalition urges Hastert to stop fast track*. Retrieved August 15, 2003, from http://www.teamster.org/01newsb/hn_011107_3.htm
- International Right to Know Campaign. (n.d.). *What is IRTK?* Retrieved March 24, 2003, from http://www.irtk.org/what_is_irtk.html
- Jackson, A., & Wright, A. (1981, October). Nature's banner: Environmentalists have just begun to fight. *The Progressive*, 26-32.
- Johnston, P. (1994). *Success where others fail: Social movement unionism and the public workplace*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Kazis, R., & Grossman, R. L. (1991). *Fear at work: Job blackmail, labor, and the environment* (New Edition ed.). Philadelphia, PA: New Society Publishers.
- Labor-Environment Alliance for Planetary Solidarity (LEAPS). (n.d.). *What is LEAPS?* Retrieved January 25, 2004, from Corporate Campaign Web site: <http://www.corporatecampaign.org/whatleap.html>
- Mitchell, R. C., Mertig, A. G., & Dunlap, R. E. (1992). Twenty years of environmental mobilization: Trends among national environmental organizations. In R. E. Dunlap & A. G. Mertig (Eds.), *American environmentalism: The U.S. environmental movement, 1970-1990* (pp. 11-26). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Obach, B. K. (2000). *Social movement alliance formation: Organized labor and the environmental movement* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin - Madison, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences*, 61(8), 3381-A.

- Obach, B. K. (2004). New labor: Slowing the treadmill of production? *Organization & Environment*, 17(3), 337–354.
- Podobnik, B., & Reifer, T. E. (2004). The globalization protest movement in comparative perspective. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 10(1), 3–9.
- Reily, J. F., & Allen, B. A. B. (2003). *Political campaign and lobbying activities of IRC 501(c)(4), (c)(5), and (c)(6) organizations*. Retrieved June 26, 2004, from the Internal Revenue Service Web site: <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-teg/eotopicl03.pdf>
- Reynolds, D. (1999). Coalition politics: Insurgent union political action builds ties between labor and the community. *Labor Studies Journal*, 24(3), 54–75.
- Rose, F. (2000). *Coalitions across the class divide: Lessons from the labor, peace, and environmental movements*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Ross, G. (2000). Labor versus globalization. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 570, 78–91.
- Ross, R. J. S. (2004). From antisweatshop to global justice to antiwar: How the new left is the same and different from the old left. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 10(1), 287–319.
- Schnaiberg, A. (1980). *The environment: From surplus to scarcity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schnaiberg, A., & Gould, K. A. (1994). *Environment and society: The enduring conflict*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Shefner, J. (2001). Coalitions and clientelism in Mexico. *Theory and Society*, 30(5), 593–628.
- Siegmann, H. (1985). *The conflicts between labor and environmentalism in the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Siegmann, H. (1986). Discussion: Environmental policy and trade unions in the United States. In A. Schnaiberg, N. Watts & K. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Distributional conflicts in environmental-resource policy* (pp. 315–327). Aldershot, England: Gower Publishing.
- Sierra Club. (2006, June). *Sierra Club, United Steelworkers announce 'Blue-Green Alliance' good jobs, clean environment, safer world cited as uniting principles*. Retrieved May 2, 2008, from <http://www.sierraclub.org/pressroom/releases/pr2006-06-07.asp>
- Simmons, L. (1994). *Organizing in hard times: Labor and neighborhoods in Hartford*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Simmons, L. (1997, November). *New developments in community-labor coalitions in Connecticut*. Paper presented at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning 39th Annual Meeting, Ft. Lauderdale, FL.
- Simmons, L. (1998, May). *Issues in building community-labor alliances*. Paper presented at the University and College Labor Education Association\AFL-CIO Education Department Conference: Building the 21st Century Labor Movement, San Jose, CA.

Snow, D. A., Rochford, E. B., Worden, S. K., & Benford, R. D. (1986). Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review*, 51(4), 464–481.

Starr, A. (2000). *Naming the enemy: Anti-corporate movements confront globalization*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Tell Us the Truth Tour. (n.d.). *Homepage*, Retrieved June 26, 2004, from http://www.tellusthetruth.org/index_home.html

Tokar, B. (1997). *Earth for sale: Reclaiming ecology in the age of corporate greenwash*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

United Steelworkers of America (USWA). (2003a). *Broad coalition joins AFL- CIO's Trumka for launch of nationwide actions to opposition to FTAA*. Retrieved June 30, 2004, from <http://www.uswa.org/uswa/program/content/550.php>

United Steelworkers of America (USWA). (2003b). *Rally and march to protest FTAA meet blatant police repression*. Retrieved June 30, 2004, <http://www.uswa.org/uswa/program/content/776.php>

Wallerstein, I. (1990). Antisystemic movements: History and dilemmas. In S. Amin, G. Arrighi, A. G. Frank & I. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Transforming the revolution: Social movements and the world-system* (pp. 13–53). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Warren, R. L. (1967). The interorganizational field as a focus for investigation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12(3), 396–419.

