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In the current neo-liberal economic and political climate, the labor movement faces immense challenges for survival and efficacy. As a massive redistribution of wealth upward has occurred, poverty is growing along with low-wage and insecure employment. The labor movement is developing new strategies that incorporate community organizing and local community issues into its issues as it organizes low-wage workers, often urban residents. Among these are living wage campaigns, community benefits agreements, and building regional progressive power. Many opportunities for collaboration with social work and involvement by social workers, particularly community practitioners, exist in these developments.

KEYWORDS collaboration, community, labor unions, labor–community coalitions, social work

The moment we cease to hold each other,
The moment we break faith with one another,
The sea engulfs us and the light goes out.

James Baldwin

INTRODUCTION

The current neo-liberal economic climate presents enormous challenges for labor unions. As organizations that represent working peoples’ interests in the workplace and the larger society, they face uphill battles in all realms of activity within the United States and on a global scale. After decades of
lax enforcement of labor law in the United States, particularly in regard to the right to organize, and with setbacks on the legislative and political fronts, American unions are struggling to maintain themselves. Employers are unabashed in pursuing antiunion strategies, increasingly exporting jobs, using contingent and part-time labor, and pitting local communities across the globe against each other in contests to attract industry and jobs. To confront the myriad issues that workers endure in this increasingly globalized, polarized, and complex economy and hostile political environment, unions are transforming the ways in which they approach their mission. Among their innovations, they are turning increasingly toward community-based strategies to achieve goals and win concrete victories for members. Utilizing community organizing tactics to address workplace issues by forming community–labor coalitions, these strategies are serving to broaden labor’s base and reinvent the labor movement.

Because the share of the U.S. workforce that belongs to unions peaked at approximately 34% in the mid-1950s, there has been a steady erosion of labor’s strength. In recent accounts (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009), just 12.4% of the U.S. workforce was represented by a union. For the private sector, the percentage of unionized workers was only 7.6% and is decreasing each year, threatening to render organized labor powerless in the face of ongoing global economic change that undermines workers and their communities. This dismal figure is somewhat offset by more robust union density in the public sector where 36.8% of workers are represented by unions. Beyond the fundamental issues of workplace conditions, salaries and wages, benefits, safety, and dignity, a weakened labor movement also augurs a weaker set of broad social protections, a paltry social welfare state, and great disparities of income.

WHY GLOBALIZATION MATTERS: NEO-LIBERALISM AND THE RISE OF INEQUALITY

Globalization generally refers to a wide-ranging, cultural, and historical process focused on international trade and is typically associated with the rise and dominance of capitalism as a global phenomenon. A central critique of globalization is that it has been a major cause of (global) poverty and inequality as capitalism expands worldwide. Although economic growth and “free trade” policies have brought increased investment and prosperity for some, the benefits have not been evenly distributed. Thus not only has globalization created an increasingly homogenized world run by corporations barely accountable to governments, it has also failed to adequately address widespread poverty or create sustained economic growth and equitable development in many developing countries. Ironically, this process has also facilitated a loss of jobs and declining living
standards in the West, as cheaper global labor and “foreign” goods have undercut workers in developed nations.\(^1\)

David Held (2003) noted that a “Washington consensus” emerged by the 1990s whereby the United States and international development agencies, notably the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank, aggressively promoted global “free trade” policies as the desired method to spur economic growth. To access economic aid and maintain good trade relations with the West, developing countries were increasingly pushed to lower trade barriers, deregulate markets, limit social expenditures, encourage privatization of state functions (thus transferring assets from the public to private sphere), seek balanced budgets, and promote tax reform, which in practice meant lowering tax rates on the wealthy. Some combination of these practices has been “economic orthodoxy” for more than 20 years under the rubric of “neo-liberalism.”

Significantly, many of these same policies have been applied to the U.S. economy and in other developed countries, fueling an attack on organized labor and regulated working conditions to promote the interests of multinational corporations and global capital. Thus, though globalization and neo-liberalism are touted as the desired path to prosperity and mobility, these processes have adversely affected workers in developed and developing countries. In the case of the United States, this is evident in the growth of inequality in the American economy, the decline of labor unions, and the continued assault on social protections and the U.S. welfare state.

Since the 1970s, key indicators have tracked stagnating wages and deteriorating working conditions for the majority of U.S. workers, and a simultaneous transfer of wealth to the most affluent members of society. Between 1980 and 2005, for example, the share of gross personal income of the top 1% of income earners more than doubled (Piketty & Saez, 2003).\(^2\) Despite strong economic and job growth in most of the 1990s, average wages and incomes for nearly all workers held steady or declined as income and wealth inequality rose. This reflects a longer, ongoing trend of concentration of income and wealth in the United States. Between 1979 and 2004, the wealthiest households (the top 1%) witnessed an after-tax income gain of $554,000 (176%); the middle one-fifth saw an after-tax income gain of 21% ($8,500) over the same period, while the income of the poorest one-fifth rose only 6% ($800) (Sherman & Aron-Dine, 2007). In 2004 alone the after-tax income of the wealthiest 1% of U.S. households increased $146,000, while the income of the bottom one-fifth of households rose $200 (less than 1.5%).

The incidence of poverty in the United States—12.6% in 2005—has increased since 2000 in spite of a broad economic recovery (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 2006), while overall poverty rates have remained relatively constant for 30 years. Growing numbers of workers, including college graduates, are forced to work as part-time or contingent labor. More than 17% of U.S. workers were employed in part-time positions in 2005. Although the number of workers earning a low wage has decreased
since 1995, nearly one in four workers earned “poverty-level” wages in 2005 (Mishel, Bernstein, & Allegretto, 2007).

Of note, the growing trend of inequality can be traced directly to public policy decisions. By the mid-1970s, the U.S. economy was marked by slow growth, high inflation and unemployment, and declining corporate profits. In response, leading corporate and government officials argued that reviving the U.S. economy required dismantling key social and regulatory agreements negotiated during the Great Depression and New Deal. This led in the late 1970s to the deregulation of utilities and large industries like transportation, thereby reducing state oversight of major corporate activities (Rachleff, 2006). Starting in the 1980s, tax rates on the highest income earners were cut by more than one half, reflecting bipartisan congressional support for “tax relief” for the wealthy and backing for a general process of economic restructuring. Thus began a trend, which continues, of the redistribution of income from the working and middle class to the wealthy. The federal tax cuts enacted in 2001 and 2002, which largely aided the most affluent Americans, have only worsened income and wealth inequality.

Levy and Temin (2007) found that the 1980 election of Ronald Reagan marked a critical turning point in this process. Following nearly three decades of a “grand bargain” between the working-class and corporate America, when labor unions were at the peak of their strength, government has retreated in its effort to more broadly distribute and protect economic gains. Since then, the trend of mass upward mobility has been reversed, as gains in worker productivity for nearly all segments of the workforce have not been matched by increased income and compensation. Instead, Levy and Temin argued that rising income inequality has coincided with changes in institutional behavior, as key aspects of the “Washington consensus” were applied to the U.S. workforce.

As a result, the postwar Golden Age has been replaced by a coordinated assault by government and the corporate sector on key aspects of the social compact with unions: regulatory oversight of key industries, minimum wage guarantees, higher wages and compensation, and negotiated limits on work hours and the right to organize. Efforts to dismantle the welfare state, especially programs serving the most destitute and vulnerable, have also gained momentum since the 1970s under the rubric of reducing welfare “dependency” and fostering self-sufficiency. The 1996 landmark welfare reform act, which eliminated the federal guarantee of public assistance for poor women and children by requiring that poor mothers enter the labor market, typified this effort. Indeed, U.S. welfare policy in this period has emphasized labor force attachment strategies (a “work-first” policy), few public training options, and minimal attention to economic and political power disparities.

Fisher and Harding (2008) also suggest that the rise of free-market ideology, devolution, and “privatization” strategies reflect a conscious political
strategy. Rather than an empirically driven effort to increase economic growth and efficiency, and address poverty and inequality, such schemes instead reflect an effort to shred the social safety net, undermine workplace regulations, and eliminate key state protections for vulnerable groups. “Privatization refers not only to transferring governmental operations and roles over to business, but also to the reorientation of political, social, economic, and cultural institutions to corporate needs, values, goals, and leaders” (p. 16).

UNION STRATEGIES TO MEET THESE CHALLENGES

The labor movement is attempting to meet these challenges in an assortment of ways. Many union leaders realize that if the labor movement does not identify and implement new strategies for survival in an era of neo-liberalism, it could become irrelevant. A significant period of change in the mid-1990s began to breathe new life into the U.S. labor movement. An insurgent slate led by John Sweeney from the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) won the leadership positions in the American Federation of Labor–Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) in 1996. New, younger activists from the ranks of innovative unions and other social movements assumed key positions within the AFL-CIO. Changes also occurred within individual unions and on the local and regional levels of the labor movement. As a result, for more than a decade there have been ongoing efforts to restructure the organizational apparatus of labor, to create innovative models of organizing and collective bargaining, and to engage more strategically in political and other activities to revive organized labor. Frustrated with the pace of these changes, in 2005 several unions left the AFL-CIO and formed a new federation, Change-to-Win, to concentrate more deeply on strategic organizing and union growth. The AFL-CIO itself continues to try to maximize resources by encouraging local labor councils and state federations to consolidate and think strategically about economic conditions in their regions. In many of these endeavors one critical factor has been the recognition of shared community and workplace interests; it is often difficult to separate workers’ concerns into strictly workplace issues versus “outside” issues of the community.

One depiction of the change within the labor movement is that of a “shift from business [unionism] to social movement unionism” (Turner & Hurd, 2001). This refers to a change from the complacent and demobilized U.S. labor movement of the 1950s to 1980s to a more active unionism based on member involvement and mobilization, intensified organizing and a broader vision for labor in society. “Business unionism,” with its focus on collective bargaining, contract enforcement, and services to members, downplayed membership participation, much less a progressive social role for unions. This transformation is uneven, and there is not unanimity as to the
extent, direction or outcomes from this ongoing process (Katz, 2001). However, of necessity, this shift is proceeding. It is revealed through labor participating in urgent issues such as immigration rights, living wage campaigns, and community benefit agreement campaigns; by U.S. unions forming international relationships with unions and labor organizations in other countries; and by labor’s involvement in local community organizing in the United States. Turner and Hurd (2001) suggest:

“Activists and leaders, however, have much more in mind than a simple turnaround in declining union membership. What many of them seek is nothing less than a widespread, full-fledged social movement unionism, one that can translate at the appropriate time into an even wider social movement coalition—with environmental, religious, human rights, consumer, women’s groups and others—fueled by two decades of growing inequality. (pp. 20–21)

Organized labor faces so many disparate economic and social trends that mirror the larger political economy that it is difficult to make generalizations about how to approach unique problems in distinct economic sectors. Depending upon the industry, unions and the labor movement may be engaged in working with immigrant workers, low-paid service workers, homecare workers in diffuse work locations, professional workers, graduate students, industrial workers, public sector workers, and an increasingly diverse workforce on the basis of gender, ethnic, and racial constituencies. The challenge is how to fashion specific strategies and campaigns to address the diversity of issues and concerns.

Johnston (2001) situates the revival of the labor movement in the framework of an expansion of citizenship and in the variety of citizenship movements that “seek to develop public institutions that defend and rebuild local communities in an increasingly globalized public order” (p. 35) (not to be confused with issues of immigration status). These movements, evident domestically and across the globe, encompass rights expansion, democratic participation, claims-making upon authorities at all levels, and demands for social and economic justice. He discerned four focal points within contemporary U.S. labor relations for labor’s revival under the rubric of economic citizenship: (1) public employment issues, (2) low wage work in numerous industries with high concentrations of African American and immigrant labor, (3) corporate employment in large organizations, and (4) the growth of part-time work, independent contractors, and temporary services. These trends all converge in their impact on local communities, as well as on individual workers and groups of workers, so that the current resurgence of the labor movement is bound up with a “new emphasis on local organizing and local political action based on neighborhoods as well as workplaces” (p. 55).
For example, public workers’ struggles help determine the quality of life and what is thought of as the public interest. Plant closures, capital flight, and concessionary bargaining are issues that adversely affect their larger communities. The struggles of immigrant workers are interwoven with struggles in the local communities in which they live. The issues of temporary or contingent workers also take on many local dimensions.

Accordingly, recent urban economic justice contests are increasingly led by labor and community alliances over issues such as the enactment of living wage ordinances, local economic development projects, and larger social inequalities, including the effects of the health care crisis and low-wage work in general. These issues are changing the terrain of urban politics, affecting the agendas of politicians and becoming increasingly conspicuous in communities across the country.

Various unions have reached out to local communities since the 1980s to gain support in the context of the corporate and political conservatives’ assault on labor, but often these approaches were ad hoc in manner. These earlier labor–community coalitions arose when plants threatened to close or strikes were imminent. Unions had to forge common ground with local groups with whom they may or may not have worked very closely. Relationships had to be established quickly to meet the looming crisis in order to educate community groups about the issues, the potential local impacts, and how they all could work together (Brecher & Costello, 1990; Simmons 1994). Community forces, with their own agendas and organizing models, often had (and still may have) little familiarity with unions or the labor movement. Thus, it was not an easy endeavor and by no means an inevitability that such coalitions could persist. As the crises for labor deepened, from the Reagan era to the present, the terms of these battles had to be translated into problems that would have community-wide impact and fought outside the worksites—in the realms of public opinion and political agendas.

Innovative labor organizations are now creating campaigns that depend upon local community organizing and that incorporate community issues, particularly in larger cities. Urban economic development reveals issues of low-wage workers and generates movements around wages, community impacts, and the nature of development (e.g., the effects of “big-box” projects). These campaigns respond to the loss of good manufacturing jobs, with high union membership and livable wages, and job growth in service sector work. Although some service sector jobs offer high-wage, high-skill employment, much of it is low-wage, temporary, and part-time, with little opportunity for career development and advancement, low unionization, and few to no fringe benefits. Many low-wage workers work two or more jobs and still remain in the ranks of the working poor, relying on supplementary public benefits to get by. The stark differences in living standards between the affluent and working poor are most apparent in large cities where significant opportunity fortuitously exists for labor and community organizations to come together.
Living Wage Movements

One movement that takes many local forms is support for living wage campaigns. This involves municipalities, county government, public authorities, and in some cases colleges and universities enacting local laws or adopting policies that require service contractors or developers (and their contractors and subcontractors) who do business with the locality or entity, or who receive tax breaks or development agreements with the locality or entity, to pay their workers wages substantially higher than the minimum wage. Often living wage ordinances encompass two wage levels, one level for those companies that provide health benefits and a higher level for those that don’t (e.g., a living wage of $11 to $12 per hour may pertain to companies providing health benefits, whereas the wage might be $14 to $15 per hour for those not offering health benefits). Over 140 living wage ordinances have been passed, and an additional 115 are under way (ACORN Living Wage Resource Center, n.d.). These successful initiatives are the result of campaigns that include labor, community organizations, clergy and faith-based organizations, students, and others.

In many instances unionized workers and labor unions do not directly benefit from living wage campaigns because their wages and benefits are already higher than those mandated in the ordinances. However, public sector employees and their unions have historically fought privatization or “contracting out,” so raising the wages of service workers in the firms who might potentially compete for contracts is one way to begin to level the playing field, besides lifting incomes of low-wage workers. Living wage ordinances do not necessarily apply to large numbers of workers and can be problematic to implement without vigilance by the groups that organize for their passage. Yet they are one method by which a local community can take a specific action to stem the proliferation of low-wage work that is financed by public dollars. Moreover, it is the experience of building coalitions, pressuring local politicians, doing battle with business lobbyists who oppose these measures—the “stuff” of community organizing—that is energizing, inspiring, and helpful in creating new relationships and collectively exercising power to make gains for low-wage workers.

Community Benefits Agreements

Community Benefits Agreements (CBAs) take the notion of a living wage ordinance and extend it to have broader effects. CBAs are generally the outcome of intensive organizing that brings together labor, community, religious, environmental, and other forces to demand specific benefits from economic development efforts in local communities. They involve “(m)easurable, permanent improvements to the lives of community residents, particularly those in low-income neighborhoods across the nation through
economic development” and are “(l)egally binding agreements, policies, and principles between developers and coalitions of community organizations, addressing a broad range of community needs” (The Partnership for Working Families, n.d., n.p.). Typically these agreements encompass several provisions including employment, with commitments for local hiring, the right to organize, and job training; housing, with commitments to construct affordable housing; the use of “smart growth” measures, and provision of services such as daycare, recreation, and other amenities; environmental mitigations, including attention to visual appearance of the project, open space, parking and traffic problems, and environmental impact studies of the development project. Because CBAs are unique to local circumstances, they vary by locality. In some instances, provisions may involve youth and education, health services, or other issues. In return for signing the agreements, community and labor groups support developers’ plans before city councils, zoning authorities and other entities, thus eliminating contentious struggles that often occur between developers and local residents over displacement and gentrification effects of urban development.

CBAs do not come easily, and the organizing for them requires commitment of time, development of significant trust among the respective groups involved, a willingness to engage with political actors and developers, and multiple mobilizations of local residents. Once CBAs are negotiated, enforceability and implementation issues can be immensely challenging.

Some of the first CBAs were won in California between 1999 and 2002. Two of the better known include those in the Los Angeles area for the Staples development (a large development project adjacent to the Staples Center) and the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) modernization plan. The Staples CBA covers a project that includes a hotel, theater, expansion of a convention center, housing development, entertainment, restaurants, and retail outlets. Community groups under the umbrella of the Figueroa Corridor Coalition for Economic Justice won commitments for a community park and other recreation needs, a goal that 70% of jobs in the project would pay at the city’s living wage, consultation on tenant selection for the housing, first source hiring for low-income individuals and people displaced by the project, affordable housing opportunities, and developer-funded residential parking (Gross, 2005). In the LAX CBA, provisions include a local hiring program, $15 million for job training, funds for soundproofing affected schools and residences, retrofitting diesel construction vehicles to curb pollution, funds for health impact studies of airport operations on surrounding communities, and increased opportunities for local, minority and women-owned businesses (Gross, 2005). However, CBAs may not always be a panacea, as revealed by a recent example in New Haven, Connecticut, between Yale-New Haven Hospital and a coalition of community groups and labor unions. Despite signing an agreement with the SEIU enabling a union-organizing
campaign, the hospital was found in violation of the agreement by an arbitrator. However, the arbitrator did not issue a collective bargaining order, and the union maintains that the hospital’s actions so poisoned the atmosphere that an organizing campaign is doomed, and the hospital remains unorganized.

Regional Power Building

Regional power building is a concept that encompasses the labor movement’s foray into urban and regional politics to build the type of power typically exercised by corporate interests and their networks and institutions. Purposely invoking the notion of the “urban regime” from theories of urban politics (Stone, 1989; Stone & Sanders, 1987), regional power building is envisioned as “entering the realm of the urban regime,” the network of public authorities and power holders outside government (“News Headline,” n.d, p. 1). The object is for labor to move from simply being an interest group in local and regional politics to actually forging new regimes with a labor-community agenda at the core:

Regional power building attempts to put into place the strategies and capacities needed for labor to build such broad dimensions of power (as have corporations). The model aims to move organized labor from having access to those in public authority to becoming part of a new governing coalition. Rather than simply isolated public policy wins, regional power building defines the overall agenda that frames public action and debate. Power building grows labor’s ability to offer and publicize a broad social vision that in turn provides the context for the expanded union organizing and decisive political change. (“Program Notes,” 2007, p. 1)

Depending upon the source, several elements are involved in regional power building, all of which rest on community organizing. A recent analysis of successful examples outlines three elements: deep coalition building, development of a progressive regional agenda, and aggressive political action (“Program Notes,” 2007). An expanded statement about regional power building is contained on the Building Regional Power Research Network Website (http://www.powerbuilding.wayne.edu) and also articulated by Reynolds (2007) that involves six elements: deep coalition building (particularly with communities of color), preparing for governance through aggressive political action, building the capacity to shift the public debate and articulate a progressive economic development agenda, organizing in which policy action organizations can provide essential research and agenda development, leadership development through specially developed curricula on regional economic issues, and tangible victories based on enhanced organizational capacity of the groups involved (“News Headline,” n.d.; Reynolds,
Regional power building entails building new progressive local regimes in which labor and community groups are central partners in economic development, and business interests are reduced to one voice among many. This development also incorporates social and ecological issues, a renewed sense of the public role in social welfare, and the central role of workers’ rights to unionize to produce economic health and democracy.

Generally, the vehicle of a central labor council or a state or regional labor federation provides significant leadership in these efforts from labor’s ranks. The national AFL-CIO has provided leadership training for its affiliate organizations to develop local labor leaders who can contribute to this power building agenda. Additionally, a successful leadership training initiative known as the Civic Leadership Institute (CLI) was first pioneered in the San Jose, California area by a policy-action organization, Working Partnerships USA, to forge labor and community consensus on regional issues. Similar policy-action centers exist in a number of cities across the United States that are also launching CLIs. These institutes bring labor and community leadership together for six to eight weekly discussions with local academic and policy leaders to begin to shape a common discourse and set of priorities for a regional economic agenda. These efforts help establish and grow relationships at the local level.

The policy-action centers and leadership development activities have their own networks and sources of funding, and they are attempting to do the base building that can counter what the political right has done through its networks and political action. Moreover, the centers partner with and rely on community organizing with allies such as ACORN and other grassroots organizing-focused local groups to pursue their goals. Although many of the examples above suggest CBAs as a policy goal, other campaigns under the regional power building rubric have involved immigrant rights, health care, or similar issues.

IMPLICATIONS FOR COMMUNITY ORGANIZING AND SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE

The overwhelming power held by nation-states and corporations, and the abuse of power at the expense of the working and middle class, may at times seem impervious to change. Yet as the previous discussion reveals, a variety of local responses to neo-liberalism represent viable alternatives to the current economic and political order. Indeed, these examples indicate that serious analysis and creative strategies are emerging from the labor movement with varied forms of success.

For social work, this has several implications, especially regarding community-based change efforts. Of significance, the revitalized labor movement is focused on socially excluded groups such as low-wage workers and racial minorities, historic social work “constituencies.” These union-led
innovations hinge on community-organizing strategies in terms of developing shared agendas and reciprocal relationships with local community forces. This provides community social workers multiple opportunities for collaboration with organized labor to challenge workplace and community concerns. In addition, many of the organizing tactics used in organized labor’s current efforts—door-to-door canvassing and mobilization, petitions, rallies, lobbying, public protest and other displays of power—are central to community organizing and thus familiar to many community social work practitioners, particularly in urban areas.

Moreover, the examples of living wage movements, CBAs, and labor organizing are reminiscent of previous economic justice movements that included the social work profession. Although the post-WW II history of social work reflects ambivalence about identification by social workers with the working class, previous generations of social workers did identify as workers and pursued unionization strategies directly and in support of those seeking to join labor unions (Selmi & Hunter, 2001; Walkowitz, 1999). Other postwar efforts involving social workers also reveal an explicit class consciousness and support for organized labor (Andrews & Reisch, 2002), while social service professionals, including social workers, were involved in efforts to confront inequality in the welfare system (Piven & Cloward, 1993).

Yet despite a resurgence of union organizing and social justice efforts, in recent decades social work has played a less visible role in directly promoting economic justice initiatives. We think a number of current opportunities exist to reverse this trend and reinvigorate social work involvement in labor–community organizing campaigns. Indeed, the profession has recently begun to more actively address questions of economic justice. This includes attempts to expand social work union membership (Scanlon & Harding, 2005), involvement by settlement house workers in antisweatshop organizing campaigns (Fabricant & Fisher, 2002), and social work participation in an antipoverty/economic human rights campaign (Baptist, Bricker-Jenkins, & Dillon, 2000). These types of community-based organizing campaigns seem a logical fit within labor’s quest for a new vision of economic and social democracy.

Certainly coalitions of social work, community organizations, and organized labor can be an effective basis of advocacy for the needs of low-wage workers, those relying on public benefits, immigrants, and similar disenfranchised groups. Social workers can also participate in these economic rights campaigns as residents of local communities. For community practitioners, employment opportunities arise in these coalitions, including in policy-action organizations. In social work education, curriculum areas can be developed that encompass economic rights, labor’s contributions to economic justice, and social workers’ involvement in unions. Given labor’s rediscovery of its community roots, the insights from social work can be a significant complement in forging a more just society.
NOTES

1. A broad literature suggests that globalization encompasses cultural, social, and political processes as well, but this discussion focuses primarily on the economic aspects of this process.

2. Updated figures through 2005 are available on the Website for Emmanuel Saez: www.econ.berkeley.edu/~saez/index.html

3. A useful Website that maintains information on local living wage movements is sponsored by Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN; www.livingwagecampaign.org)

4. For information on Community Benefits Agreements, The Partnership for Working Families sponsors a useful Website: www.communitybenefits.org

5. Civic Leadership Institutes are assisted by the organization Building Partnerships USA (see www.building-partnerships.org). The national network of policy-action organizations is The Partnership for Working Families (www.communitybenefits.org)
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