“Is GSU Apparel Made in Sweatshops?”: The Student Anti-Sweatshop Campaign at Georgia State University

A Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in the College of Arts and Sciences Georgia State University

2002

by

Takamitsu Ono

Committee:

_____
Dr. Behrooz Ghamari-Tabrizi, Chair

_____
Dr. Charles L. Jaret, Member

_____
Dr. Ian C. Fletcher, Member

_____
Date

_____
Dr. Ronald C. Reitzes
Department Chair

Table of Contents

"'Workers of the World Unite!'

will become more than just a hackneyed slogan;

it'll become the only way to survive."

– Former Representative Cynthia A. McKinney, August 2000[1]

Introduction

Seattle, Washington D.C., Davos, Quebec City, Prague, and Genoa: Many people have become familiar with these cities' names because the cities, perhaps unhappily, hosted some of the major "anti-globalization"[2] or global justice demonstrations in the recent history. How about these names: Durham, Madison, Eugene, Middlebury, Tucson, and Atlanta? These are some of the American cities where one can find campus-based student anti-sweatshop campaigns launched by chapters of United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS). In fact, this student anti-sweatshop movement has been an integral part of the larger global justice movement and has arguably been no less important than those better known global justice demonstrations, though involving fewer participants.

This student movement to improve poor working conditions in factories around the world where college-logoed apparel is produced spread like a wildfire to as many as 200 campuses across the United States and Canada over the last several years (Featherstone and United Students Against Sweatshops 2002). Its intensity and size drew

[1] This is from her op-ed article circulated by one of her staffers on the Internet in August 2000. Both *Philadelphia Inquirer* and *Los Angeles Times* apparently rejected to run it during the Republican and Democratic National Conventions, according to this staff person. The text is available from the researcher.

[2] I will put "anti-globalization" in a quotation mark because of my belief that most people in the movement do not oppose globalization *per se*. Rather, they are opposing a particular model of globalization, namely

wide media attention. *The New York Times* referred to it as "the biggest surge in campus activism in nearly two decades" (Greenhouse 1999b). Other observers said it is "the largest wave of student activism to hit campuses since students rallied to free Nelson Mandela by calling for a halt to university investments in South Africa more than a decade ago" (Appelbaum and Dreier 1999:71).

I have been associated with United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) since 1999, engaging in the campaign at Georgia State University (GSU) in Atlanta. A small group of students and supporters have been out on campus to raise awareness of the problem of sweatshops and their relationship to the GSU-licensed apparel sold in the two bookstores and worn by some staff members and athletes of Georgia State University. We have tried to pressure the GSU administration to take steps to minimize the possibility in the future that the GSU apparel is manufactured under inhumane working conditions in this country or abroad.

As the current form of globalization encourages the GSU licensees to outsource the clothing manufacturing process to hundreds of factories around the world, consumers and students at GSU are linked with the people around the world who sew the GSU clothing. Equipped with some benefits of globalization, such as Internet and e-mail, the activists at GSU have tried to institute a system at GSU so that violations of basic human and workers' rights can be minimized at GSU licensees' contracting factories across the globe. The activists also developed an awareness of this issue as a part of the globalization process and cultivated a sense of solidarity with workers in apparel

---

"neoliberal globalization" or "corporate globalization," though many would say they are opposing

producing regions. This thesis is a sociological attempt to define this still on-going collective activity as a part of a larger global social movement.

First, I will clarify the phenomenon called "globalization" in its cultural, political, and economic manifestations. But, as the current form of globalization creates injustices, inequalities, and undemocratic governance around the world, countless people have stood up to resist them – some more visible and successful than others. I will in particular demonstrate how contemporary globalization since the 1970s has generated and maintained sweatshops and how people around the world, though focusing on the ones in the United States, have resisted in the movement against sweatshops. We will also look at some effects of this anti-sweatshop movement.

Second, in the context of the larger global movement of "globalization from below"[3] and the anti-sweatshop movement, I will describe United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) in some detail. After situating the national and historical context of USAS, I will delve into descriptions and sociological analyses of some aspects of the campus anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University (GSU) from early 2000 to May 2002 to show in detail how "globalization from above" has locally been resisted. I

---

capitalism in any form. My personal preference is to call the global justice movement.

[3] Brecher, Costello, and Smith (2000) define this term as the worldwide resistance since the 1970s against "globalization from above" or free market capitalism, with varied goals and in varied forms, but unifying "to bring about sufficient democratic control over states, markets, and corporations to permit people and the planet to survive and begin to shape available future" (p. 15). It could be, however, that terms can cover conservative "globalization from below," such as global Islamic fundamentalism, to create a self-determined community separate from "western globalization."

hope to capture what social theorist James Jasper (1997:64-67) calls the "artfulness"[4] or human creativities of the GSU campaign.

I will describe and analyze how and why the GSU anti-sweatshop campaign began, how it has sustained itself for two years, and how it has created some effects and why. In doing so, I will look into some analytical concepts of social movements. These include: (a) mobilizing structures (a network of supporters, resources we have generated, and tactics and strategies we have tried to carry out); (b) framing and ideology; (c) identities and emotions; and (d) political opportunity structures (opportunities to advance or hinder our goals in the GSU power structure). I will then identify and try to explain some effects of this campaign on the GSU community and the campaign activists. I will close the thesis with speculation about the future of this GSU campaign.

My argument is that the GSU campaign has not met with success in attaining its goals primarily because, despite its diligent efforts, it has to this date failed to build strong mobilizing forces on campus to compel the GSU administration to accept or make concessions to our demands. A solid mobilizing structure could have created favorable political opportunities for the campaign to help attain our goals.

I demonstrate that a number of factors have prevented the formation of strong mobilizing structures. They include class and racial backgrounds of the GSU students,

[4] "Artfulness" is a state in which "[p]eople are aware of what they are doing, they make plans and develop projects, and they innovate in trying to achieve their goals" (Jasper 1997:65). So, protestors "rethink existing traditions in order to criticize portions and experiment with alternatives for the future, in both large and small ways. They also offer ways of getting from here to there" (Jasper 1997:65). They "experiment with novel ways to think, feel, judge, and act" (Jasper 1997:66). As Jasper notes, this "artfulness" is not freewheeling activities. They are both enabled *and* constrained by historical and situational contexts – structures and cultures (see also Hays [1994] for a discussion of the relationship between structure, culture, and agency).

their weak identification with GSU, the commuter school setting of the campus, the lack of progressive political culture at the university, the lack of direct evidence connecting sweatshops with GSU, the lack of economic resources to invite outside speakers, and the limitation of the main organizer of the campaign. In the study of social movements, it is important to account for the "failure" as much as the "success" of a given movement. I hope that this thesis will contribute to the understanding of social movements by examining why the GSU campaign has not been successful yet.

A Methodological Consideration

With regard to my research method, I directly participated as the main organizer in the activities of the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University. I actively participated in all of our meetings and other activities, including informational tabling and teach-ins. This is a form of participant observation, or observing the phenomenon under study while participating in such a phenomenon. Specifically, I was basically a "participant-as-observer" (Babbie 1995:284), once I decided to study this campaign. In other words, I directly observed the phenomenon under study while actively and genuinely participating in such activities as a full participant while notifying other participants that I was also engaged in research and observation. Soon after I decided to research the campaign for my thesis perhaps in the early spring of 2001, I notified to all regular participants and many temporary participants, but not GSU administrators we came to contact with, that I was researching on it. I did so by notifying them verbally in an informal way or/and later by e-mailing them to ask to answer questionnaires.

Some may raise the question of objectivity. That is, by actively participating in a phenomenon the researcher is observing, the researcher may "go native" or identify with the viewpoints and interests of participants and lose the attitude of detachment to conduct a research objectively (Babbie 1995:284). I defend my position at two levels. One is the myth of total objectivity of the researcher. As many scholars of science studies and epistemology have demonstrated, any research is always influenced by power-laden specific historical, cultural, political, institutional, biographical, and situational contexts and practices as to what and how the researcher can(not) or should(not) "see" and report (Brown 1993; Daly 1997; Fuller 1997; Harding 1998; Seidman 1996; Sprague and Kobrynowicz 1999; Van Maanen 1988). However, it does not mean that any research attitude will do just because all research is power-laden and not completely objective. While acknowledging the limitations, any scientific research should be conducted with an attitude of being critical, reflexive, and ethical about assumptions, behaviors, and consequences of the researcher and the research (Hertz 1997). It also suggests that multiple and critically reflexive perspectives and methods can be used to generate accounts to best understand the "reality" under study since there is no method to grasp the unchanging, unshakable Truth.

Second, I think this argument of employing multiple perspectives and methods supports the use of the direct participant observation method because it has an advantage to understand a "reality." Because of my full involvement in the campaign, it can be argued that I can construct a closer appropriation of the reality, in contrast to a researcher who does so from outside a direct context. Although, as I mentioned, I revealed to other

participants at one point that I was studying this campaign, I believe that the influence on the participants to change their "natural" behaviors has been minimal. It is because I have been the main figure in the GSU campaign, and because I believe I did not change myself in any noticeable way in the campaign as a researcher. In recollection, while involving in the campaign activities, I often even forgot that I was actually researching. In this sense, I suspect other participants were not too conscious of being observed to change their "natural" social behaviors. It is also partly because I did not tell them that I was researching on the campaign every time I met them, or I did not post an e-mail, indicating my research every time I posted a message on the campaign e-mail listserv (i.e., I notified them only once or twice). I do not believe either that I asked formal "research questions" to the participants or even took notes solely for my research during our campaign activities so that the participants may have sensed some awkwardness and might have changed their behaviors.

I also examined other primary and secondary campaign materials. They include the messages of most e-mails posted on two e-mail listservs that the GSU campaign used,[5] campaign literature, an e-mail survey to a number of active participants in the campaign (see Appendix I), and media accounts of the campaign. Much of the accounts came from my memory. With these materials, I can trace the chronology of the GSU campaign and analyze some sociological dimensions.

[5] I had a complete access to one of them used from August 2000 until May 2002. However, I was able to read only some e-mails from the previously used (September 1999-Spring 2000) listserv for Georgia students working on the anti-sweatshop campaign at a few schools because the whole listserv had been erased by the time I tried to read them.

Fundamentally, this research might be to grasp what sociologist Michael Burawoy (2000) calls "grounded globalizations" (p. 341) of the participants. In other words, it is to reconstruct "real," grounded experiences of people or actors in their global spatial and temporal contexts, guided by particular theoretical and ideological frameworks.

Chapter 1 – Globalization

Clarifying the Meanings of "Globalization"

The term, "globalization," became the buzzword of the 1990s in many parts of the world, including the United States, three decades after the word appeared in *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language* in 1961 (Scholte 2000:43). The term has been used in and out of academia, but the meaning of the word varies depending on who uses it. This pattern of multiple meanings holds true even in social science in the western world, which has produced a mushrooming number of publications on this topic over the last decade (Guillén 2001:235), based on academic disciplines and theoretical and ideological perspectives (see Guillén 2001; Held and McGrew 2000; Kellner 2002; Nash 2000:47-99; Robertson 2001; Sassen 1998; Scholte 2000).[6]

Although there are many theoretical and ideological conceptions of "globalization," many concur that the phenomenon of "globalization" is not new if the term is loosely defined as "a process leading to greater interdependence and mutual

[6] For example, economics tends to focus on economic aspects of multinational corporations, banks, and technologies since the 1970s while sociology tends to concentrate on conditions of modernity and postmodernity, particularly industrialization, urbanization, and nation-states since the 19th century (Nederveen Pieterse 2001:23). Political science tends to study relations among nation-states and international institutions and forums, such as the United Nations (UN), the Organization of Petroleum

awareness (reflexivity) among economic, political, and social units in the world, and among actors in general" (Guillén 2001:236). Carruthers and Babb (2000:182-85) point out, for example, the existence of ancient kingdoms and empires as well as "world" religions, such as Christianity, Islam, and Buddhism, in Africa, Asia, Europe, and the Americas, many centuries ago. Immanuel Wallerstein ([1983] 1995) analyzed inherently expanding capitalism around the globe since the 15th century. This world system of capitalism has been predicated on the international division of labor – "core" and "peripheral" states, which rely on each other to accumulate capital relentlessly in favor of the "core" states while "semi-peripheral" states being autonomous. He also argues that capitalism creates an ideology of universalism, which is to justify self-interested rationalization as Truth (Wallerstein [1983] 1995:80-82).

Jan Aart Scholte (2000:44-56) introduces several conceptualizations about "globalization" and argues that "internationalization," "liberalization," "universalization," and "westernization" are not new (see also pp. 62-88 for a long history of globalization based on his notion of "supraterrotoriality," which is discussed below). As to the "internationalization" of cross-border activities of people, goods, ideas, and interactions, Scholte (2000:15, 44) refers to the oft-cited 1996 book, *Globalization in Question*, by Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson to point out that the degrees of cross-border migration, direct investment, finance, and trade in the late nineteenth century West were proportionately equivalent to those of the current era. "Liberalization" or deregulation of government laws to create an "open" world economy is redundant

---

Exporting Countries (OPEC), and the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the discipline of law

because of earlier times of widespread liberalization like the third quarter of the nineteenth century (Scholte 2000:45). He also considers "universalization" as old if it is defined as "the process of spreading various objects and experience to people at all corners of the earth" (p. 16). He cites the transcontinental spread of human species starting a million year ago, world religions, and transoceanic trade for evidence (p. 45). Further, "westernization," "modernization," or "Americanization" is not new if we consider imperialism and colonialism.

Scholte (2000) contends that only "supraterritoriality," "deterritorialization," or "a proliferation of social connections that are at least partly – and often quite substantially – detached from a territorial logic…." (p. 47), is distinctively new in the contemporary phase of globalization in the last several decades (pp. 46-50). This supraterritoriality or "transworld simultaneity and instantaneity" (Scholte 2000:49) manifests in areas of communication (e.g., Internet and fax), markets (e.g., global commodities like Coca-Cola), production (e.g., transborder intra-firm trade within a global company), finance (e.g., "a round-the-world, round-the-clock foreign exchange transactions" [p. 52]), money (e.g., "global" currencies like U.S. dollars, and withdrawal of money from thousands of ATMs in local currencies across the world), organizations (e.g., transborder business coalitions through joint ventures, subcontracting, and franchises), social ecology (e.g., ozone depletion), and consciousness (e.g., the notion of the "global village") (pp. 50-56).

---

examines international treaties, agreements, and customary practices.

Beside the debate on the newness of globalization, some analytical distinctions concerning globalization can be made based on its cultural, political, and economic aspects. I summarize each of these below.

Cultural Globalization

"Cultural globalization" deals with "the displacement, melding, or supplement of local cultural traditions by foreign or international ones" (Carruthers and Babb 2000:182), "principally as a result of the mass media, but also because of flows of people in migration, tourism, and the emergence of 'third cultures' associated with the personnel of global economic and political institutions (Nash 2000:52-53).[7] This results in changes in practices and meanings of "local" life, including the sense of self, human relations, and citizenship (Nash 2000:52-53).

However, it is much more contentious how exactly and to what extent these changes occur (Guillén 2001:252-54). At the one end, many argue that the change has been to homogenize local cultures around the world, especially in the mold of American culture, even though few would argue for the existence of a single world culture, as Nash (2000:71) suggests. The global village, Americanization, monoculture, McWorld, Coca-Colonization (Nash 2000:84), and McDonaldization (Ritzer 1996) are terms often used to express this view. Many analysts, particularly Marxian scholars, attribute the cause of homogenization and standardization to commodifying, marketing, and profit-making

[7] "Third cultures" refer to "sets of practices, bodies of knowledge, conventions and lifestyles that have developed independent of nation-states" (quoted in Bhattacaryya, Gabriel, and Small 2002:130). These are cultures of the "cosmopolitan transcultural class" who are affluent and mobile across nation-state borders.

practices of global capitalism by global corporations and corporate media (Applbaum 2000; McChesney 2001; Tomlinson 1999:81-88). Others say that they are an effect of modernity in more general (Guillén 2001:251-52; Nash 2000:65-67; Tomlinson 1999:89-97)

Turning Point Project, a coalition of U.S. progressive activist organizations, for example, created a series of advertisements that criticized corporate globalization. One of their advertisements in the late 1999, titled "Global Monoculture," began with these sentences to criticize homogenizing effects of economic globalization:

> A few decades ago, it was still possible to leave home and go somewhere else: the architecture was different, the language, lifestyle, dress, and values were different. That was a time when we could speak of cultural diversity. But with economic globalization, diversity is fast disappearing. The goal of the global economy is that all countries should be homogenized. When global hotel chains advertise to tourists that all their rooms in every city of the world are identical, they don't mention that the cities are becoming identical too: cars, noise, smog, corporate high-rises, violence, fast food, McDonalds, Nikes, Levis, Barbie Dolls, American TV and film. What's the point of leaving home?

Another advertisement decried how people's minds around the world are being shed of diversity in the mold of American culture and deprived of critical thinking by watching TV at least several hours a day (Turning Point Project 2000). It also pointed out that these TV programs are created by increasingly concentrated hands of global, often American, corporate media (who also own films, newspapers, books, music, advertising, etc.) and their corporate sponsors who essentially promote the same message in countless commercials: "*Buy something. Do it now. Commodities are the answer*" (emphasis original). They reasoned that homogenization of minds occurs because:

> TV is capable of unifying thoughts, feelings, values, tastes and desires to match the needs of the institutions who send the images. These are giant corporations, whose ideals of Utopia are invariably commodity-oriented, urban, technology-oriented, and indifferent to nature. The net result is a homogenized *mental* landscape that nicely conforms to the franchises, freeways, suburbs, highrises and clearcuts of an [*sic*] homogenized physical world (emphasis original).

As a result:

> The act of sitting and watching TV is quickly replacing other ways of life and other value systems. People are carrying the same images that we do, and craving the same commodities, from cars to hairsprays to Barbie dolls. Television is turning everyone into everyone else. It's cloning cultures to be like ours.

In his popular book, *The McDonaldization of Society*, a noted social theorist, George Ritzer (1996) similarly contends that modern everyday life in many parts of the world is increasingly operating on four principles that dictate the management of fast food restaurants: efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control. It has occurred not only in restaurant businesses, but also in education, work, health care, leisure, politics, families, and sex. These "rational" principles, however, inevitably produce "irrationality of rationality" – deskilling, prepackaged or standardized choice, erosion of authenticity, environmental degradation, among others (see also Ritzer 2002).

At the other end, many theorists say that things are more complicated. Kate Nash (2000:71-88), for example, makes a case for cultural globalization as "postmodernization" (see also Antonio and Bonanno 1996:12; Antonio and Bonanno 2000:55-56; Tomlinson 1999). She argues that there has been a significant relativization and pluralization of "Western culture" and its values. Today, these are less likely to be considered "universal" and the yardstick against which other cultures or "the Other" were

measured and toward which they are told to make "progress." In the process of decolonization and economic development, multiple economic and political centers have gradually emerged outside the historical "West," and this has changed the cultural dominance by "the West" in the world (Nash 2000:72-73).

Within the "West," immigration from former colonies and other places has increased, and strong social movements by subordinated groups (e.g., women, Blacks, and gays) have demanded their recognition, particularly in the last several decades. As a result, new identities have gained more legitimacy in society, and hybrid, diaspora cultures, which frequently keep their relationship with people in their countries of origin, have formed within the "West," often in opposition to dominant national cultures of places to which they have immigrated (Nash 2000:72, 76, 79-80).

Another concept of cultural globalization is "glocalization" (Robertson 1995, 2001:462; Nash 2000:85-88). It means that effects of globalization manifest in and through local cultures since globalization always manifests at the concrete, "local" level. An example is ways in which goods and services by multinational corporations are modified to suit the tastes and sensibilities of local cultures (i.e., "micro-marketing"), as indicated by various flavors of Coca-Cola products around the world (Nash 2000:85-86). Local consumers and agents often interpret and appropriate "global culture" in locally specific ways (Nash 2000:86-87). Tomlinson (1999) cites an example of Coca-Cola "creolization" in locality:

> No imported object, Coca-Cola included, is completely immune from creolization. Indeed, one finds that Coke is often attributed with meanings and uses within particular cultures that are different from those imagined by manufacturer. These include that it can smooth

> wrinkles (Russia), that it can revive a person from the dead (Haiti), and that it can turn copper into silver (Barbados)…. Coke is also indigenised through being mixed with other drinks, such as rum in the Caribbean to make *Cuba Libre* or *aguadiente* in Bolivia to produce *Ponche Negro*. Finally, it seems that Coke is perceived as a "native product" in many different places – that is you will often find people who believe the drink originated in their country not in the United States (P. 84).

Moreover, people at the local level may invent local "traditions" in response to global market and culture (Nash 2000:86-87). Contemporary Japanese notions of *kokusaika* (internationalization) and *furusato* (native place) in this context may be in a dialectical relationship, as anthropologist Jennifer Robertson (1997) points out. Revitalization of religious fundamentalism, ethnic nationalism, and xenophobia around the world can also be interpreted as "local" reactions to globalization (Daley 2001; McMichael 2000:207; Nash 2000:87-88).

The homogenizing and heterogenizing effects of globalization are not necessarily contradictory. An interpretation in part relies on where and how one looks at such influences. One could make a general observation, therefore, that globalization is both homogenizing and heterogenizing in that globalization tends to homogenize the material environment by way of global capitalist products and media. But people at local level have some space to interpret and appropriate meanings of such products based on their cultural and biographical experiences (Tomlinson 1999:83-84). Thus, it would be simplistic to say that "hegemony is prepackaged in Los Angeles, shipped out to the global village, and unwrapped in innocent minds" (quoted in Tomlinson 1999:84).

Political Globalization

"Political globalization" pertains to the issue of governance – institutionalized ways in which formal rules in society are created, maintained, and transformed. It involves the state and transnational and sub-national political institutions (both public and private).[8] The term, political globalization, can be defined as "the internationalization of 'relations for the concentration and application of [institutional political] power'" (Carruthers and Babb 2000:182; also see Scholte 2000:132-58, 267-72).

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the modern state emerged in Western Europe. Developed as nation-states, they claimed to rule over a bounded territory and people within it, backed up by the monopoly of military forces and consent of their citizens (Held and McGrew 2000:9).[9] Particularly over the last century, however, groups of states have created a number of transnational political institutions and agreements to deal with issues that could not adequately be handled by a single state. The issues might have been the world military order, world security, human rights, or transborder environmental issues. Those new rules often override those of the state or require cooperation of the state (Nash 2000:54). Some examples are the International Labor Organization (ILO) in 1919, the United Nations (UN), the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the Bretton Woods institutions (the International Monetary Fund

[8] The state is a system of government which can be defined as "a fluid grouping of institutions with unstable boundaries, all of which are constantly engaging in negotiating their tasks and capacities, both internally, with other state actors, and externally, with representatives of other social and economic groups" (Nash 2000:261). The state is always open to contestation and reformation (Nash 2000:261), even though such a possibility might often be very negligible. For different types of the state in relation to society and market, see Ó Riain (2000:188).

[9] In social science literature, a "nation" means a sense of peoplehood or community among inhabitants inside a given state territory, in relation to foreign nations and their peoples. Each nation is said to have a common history and particular characteristics of its own, including language, customs, sensibilities, religion, or race (Calhoun 1997:4-5; Scholte 2000:161-62). Thus, nation-states are political and cultural entities at the same time.

[IMF] and the World Bank) in 1944, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949, Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in 1967, and the European Union (EU), which originated in the 1958 Treaty of Rome and created by the 1992 Treaty of Maastricht. Also, particularly in the recent several decades, the state has often been subjected to deregulation and privatization of state agencies and services, as well as to demands by emerging relatively autonomous non-governmental organizations and other groups from inside and outside the state. As an indication, in 1909, 37 intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and 176 international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) existed while in the mid-1990s, there were close to 260 IGOs and nearly 5,500 INGOs (Held and McGrew 2000:11).

Many analysts (Held and McGrew 2000:11-13; Nash 2000:261-62; Scholte 2000:132-58) observe that this changing political power arrangement especially in the last several decades has shifted state power over many aspects of its domestic social, political, and economic decision-making process upward to supranational arrangements (e.g., the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD] and the World Trade Organization [WTO]) and downward to local governments and private groups (e.g., the World Association of Major Metropolis, Oxfam, and the World Economic Forum). The nation-states are thus increasingly finding themselves in a multilayered system of global governance. The state sovereignty has therefore significantly been undermined, and it has effectively ended the Westphalian international system based on state sovereignty (Held and McGrew 2000:13; Nash 2000:54-56;

Scholte 2000:134-38).[10] However, although its influence in general is decreasing, the state is still the primary actor in global and domestic governance by dominating the authority on coercive force and law, and by making key policy decisions, such as increasing "competitiveness" of domestic economy in the global economy, which may ironically further undermine the power of the state over the long run (Antonio and Bonanno 2000:60; Nash 2000:56; Scholte 2000:133-34, 157; Sites 2000).

Economic Globalization

The debate over the extent to which, and how, globalization has eroded or strengthened (Robertson 2001:462-63) the influence of nation-states cannot be made adequately without considering the economic aspect of globalization or the "global economy" (see also Guillén 2001:247-51). Economic globalization refers to "the increasingly integrated and interdependent system of capital-labor flows across regions, between states, and through transnational corporations and international financial institutions, in the form of capital investments, technology transfer, financial exchanges, and increased trade, as well as the various forms of the deployment of labor, by which global accumulation takes place" (Moghadam 1999:130).

The current dominant form of the global economy since the 1970s has been shaped by the principles of "neoliberalism," "free market/trade," or "post-fordism" (Harvey 1989). The main doctrinal elements of neoliberalism include deregulation, privatization, liberalization of trade, the shift to export-oriented economy, and promotion

[10] In principle, state sovereignty claimed to "supreme, comprehensive, unqualified and exclusive rule over its territorial jurisdiction" (Scholte 2000:135) even though it did not always fit with this definition in practice.

of private business initiatives by means of subsidies, loan guarantees, and protection of private property rights (Antonio and Bonanno 2000:52-53).

At one level, this global economy provides material rewards disproportionately to the collective interests of transnational corporations and financial investors, while it imposes sanctions, including coercion, on violators of the rule (Evans 2000:230). At another level, neoliberalism is ideological. This dominant neoliberal thought argues that the implementation of the neoliberal doctrines will lead to overall economic growth often measured by GNP and will contribute to eventual economic equality, freedom, and democracy that will benefit all citizens (Antonio and Bonanno 1996:16; Evans 2000:230). Proponents argue, for example, that the successful economic development of the newly industrialized countries in Asia, such as Taiwan and South Korea, is the proof of the viability of the free trade and market.[11] By the late 1990s, there has been a general consensus across much of the political spectrum on the superiority of neoliberalism over other economic models in many parts of the world (Antonio and Bonanno 2000:49). Other perspectives are often considered to represent "special interests" or to misunderstand how the world really works (Evans 2000:230).

Sociologist Philip McMichael (2000) distinguishes two historical periods regarding the overall economic development strategies implemented in the world since

[11] But, they fail to mention that major national powers had geopolitical interests in these countries in the context of the Cold War and anti-communism (McMichael 2000:83, 84, 86). These countries received disproportionate investment from the United States and Japan, and had access to their huge and growing markets at least until the mid-1970s when other "developing" countries could not yet compete to export such materials. Their authoritarian governments effectively suppressed dissents and created a "good business environment." They owned or aided fledging key domestic industries and protected them from foreign competition. These are in addition to the factor of often-mentioned Confucian culture, such as the

the end of World War II. They are the "development project" from the end of World War II to the 1970s and the "globalization project" since the 1970s. The "development project" aimed for nation-state-based managed economic growth premised on domestic industrialization (including agriculture) and import substitution.

During the 1970s, however, a series of developments led to the gradual adoption of neoliberalism. I will highlight six important factors. First, the U.S. dollar was separated from the value of gold, and the floating exchange rate was instituted in 1971. This was the demise of the post-war Bretton Woods system which had maintained stable currency exchanges between trading countries based on the U.S. dollar (McMichael 2000:47-50, 115). These changes gave an incentive to corporations and financial investors to diversify and circulate investments across the globe. This was to reduce the risk of loss and maximize profitability from changing currency values (McMichael 2000:117).

Second, massive loans were made to countries in the Global South[12] during the 1970s (McMichael 2000:114-15),[13] but they turned into the "debt regime" since the 1980s, owing to several factors in the early 1980s. They include diminished money circulation to stem the fall of the U.S. dollar value, higher interest rates, restricted credit, a recession in the Global North to which the Global South had exported products, and

---

strong work ethic and obedience to authority (see also Cohen and Kennedy 2000:179-86; Leonard 1992; Ong, Bonacich, and Cheng 1994:10-12). See also Brohman (1995) for a general critique of neoliberalism.

[12] Due to the lack of better terms, I will use the term, "the Global South" to collectively denote less politically powerful and less economically developed nations. In contrast, I will use the "Global North" to mean more politically powerful and more economically developed nations, particularly the Group of Seven (G-7)(the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Japan, Italy, and Canada). I prefer these terms to the "Third World" and the "First World" just because "First World" and "Third World" were coined in the context of the Cold War and because they sound hierarchical and paternalistic.

falling primary export commodity prices from the Global South (McMichael 2000:113-46). Third, the New International Economic Order by the Group of 77 (mostly formerly colonized countries in the Global South), which demanded more equitable global economic redistributions, fell apart as the economic polarization within the Global South divided the group's coherence (McMichael 2000:121-25). This helped the Global North and the newly created Group of Seven (G-7) to control global politics and economy.

Fourth, economic recessions due to the major oil crises in the 1970s and increased competition from the newly industrialized countries and Europe resulted in a profit squeeze of U.S. companies and forced them to come up with some plan to survive (Antonio and Bonanno 1996:38). Fifth, new technologies in communication, transportation (e.g., containerized ships), and credit and monetary systems were developing. They have contributed to the "time-space compression" (Harvey 1989)[14] that enhances capital mobility and coordinates faster and less expensive processes of production, distribution, and consumption across distant geographical scales (Carruthers and Babb 2000:187-89, 191-92).

Sixth, the ideology of "neoconservatism" – anti-tax, anti-regulation, anti-income/wealth redistributions via the state – was developing in a couple of powerful states, namely the United States and Britain (Antonio and Bonanno 2000:38; Ong et al. 1994:19-21). It selectively incorporated the "laissez-faire" principles of classical liberal thought, including Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Thomas Malthus, and Herbert Spencer,

---

[13] The amount of loans increased from $2 billion in 1972 to $90 billion in 1981 (McMichael 2000:114-15).
[14] This term, according to David Harvey (1989), refers to "the time horizons of both private and public decision-making have shrunk, while satellite communication and declining transport costs have made it

and argued that governments can best promote economic growth by raising productivity in industry and efficiency in markets (the "supply-side" economy) (Tonkiss 2001:253-54). Its dominance effectively discredited Keynesianism that had been popular since the end of World War II and that had encouraged to create demands by way of government spending and progressive tax (Cohen and Kennedy 2000:68).

The major outcome of these events was the formation of neoliberalism, "the globalization project," or the political, economic, and ideological condition in which economic development is regulated increasingly by powerful nations and global institutions and markets based on the neoliberal principles rather than by individual nation-states themselves (McMichael 2000:187). We can identify a number of broad trends and consequences below, including the new global division of labor; "global cities"; dependence on paid labor of women, children, and immigrants; countries' various domestic strategies to attract foreign investment while fostering the "race to the bottom"; roles of neoliberal global institutions and agreements; prominence of financial capital; expanded roles of transnational corporations; still powerful, yet unequal, states' roles to shape the global economy; widening income and wealth gaps within and between nations; and deterioration of the environment and living standards of millions of people on earth.

Neoliberal economic globalization has formulated the new global division of labor (Mittelman 2000:41-57; Sage 1999:208). The global division of labor refers to a condition in which countries, regions, cities, and local labor markets have historically

---

increasingly possible to spread those decisions immediately over an ever wider and variegated space" (p.

been stratified to perform certain types of production and distribution tasks by certain social groups. For example, in the colonial division of labor from the sixteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century, colonized countries in Africa, Asia, Central and South America and elsewhere were forced to extract raw materials, such as spices, tobacco, cacao, sugar, and cotton, and sent them to colonizing European countries (McMichael 2000:8-13). In turn, colonizing countries processed them into industrial products to be consumed by its populations and colonized peoples.

What is new in this phase of economic globalization in the last several decades is the enhanced flexibility of a global division of labor that is increasingly regulated by global institutions and markets. Locations at the high end of the global hierarchy tend to specialize in work that requires higher skills and reward with higher salary, such as financing and marketing. At the other end, there are locations, including former centers of manufacturing and port cities, where women and recent immigrants of color disproportionately perform lower-skilled and lower-paid work, such as service work, street vending, domestic work, sex trade, agricultural work, and assembly work, in either formal or informal labor markets (Salazar Parreñas 2000; Sassen 1994, 2000:86). In particular, informal sectors and homework, which are unregulated by the state, have expanded under neoliberal globalization because of increasing deregulation, economic polarization, bidding up of business costs (e.g., rents and services), economic insecurity, and gendered expectation of domesticity of women (Chang 2000; Enloe 1990:154; Sassen 1994, 1998:153-69, 2000; Ward and Pyle 1995:46-51).

---

147).

Especially in “global cities,” such as New York, London, and Tokyo, the complex divisions of labor and power, or the “geography of centrality and marginality” (Sassen 2000:82), can be observed in a close geographical proximity. “Global cities” are primarily “key sites for the advanced services and telecommunications facilities necessary for the implementation and management of global economic operations” (Sassen 1994:19; see Smith 1999 for a critique).

Dispersed economic activities around the globe still require centers to coordinate and control them. This work, however, happens on the ground in territorially concentrated places with a vast physical infrastructure like telecommunication and computer facilities and by people like managers and highly specialized service providers (e.g., those who provide legal, financial, economic forecasting, accounting, and advertising services) (Sassen 1994, 1998, 2000). In these “global cities” of major financial and business centers, professional classes particularly concerned with the financial and specialized service sectors tend to be more visible and “overvalorized.” The operation of global cities, however, requires a large amount of low-skilled, often low-paid, work, such as cleaning building, washing dishes, landscaping, and delivering goods and services. This type of work, however, is typically less visible, undervalued, and “devalorized” (see also Chang 2000).

Moreover, growing income and wealth gaps and an unbalanced spatial distribution of growth particularly prominent in global cities polarize consumption patterns and business operations that cater for respective consumers (Sassen 1994, 1998, 2000). A growing number of both poor and middle-class immigrants form their own

communities. They tend to formulate transnational identities and generate solidarity, conflicts, and potentially politics to demand entitlements (Sassen 2000).

Numerous countries near the bottom of this stratification of the new global division of labor have created more than 200 export processing or "free trade" zones, where an estimated four million people, mostly women, labored in the early 1990s (McMichael 2000:94; Pyle 1999:87). This has been a way to enhance their "comparative advantage"[15] and to attract foreign investors and companies. Foreign corporations are allowed to pay little or no taxes and may receive governmental subsidies (e.g., credit and infrastructure). The U.S. Agency for International Development has also spent hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars in the forms of loans, grants, and advertisements since the mid-1970s to promote the development of free trade zones and foreign investment by U.S. firms (Connor et al. 1999; Kernaghan 1997).

Companies in these zones can import raw materials duty-free and export assembled products to consumer markets with minimal taxes. The workers typically engage in relatively low skilled assembly work, such as manufacturing garments and textiles, shoes, toys, and electronic parts.[16] They also perform office administration and data entry and processing work. Worker rights and environmental regulations, which may exist outside these zones, are often waived within these enclaves (McMichael 2000:94). Critics often charge that these jobs benefit workers and local communities only

[15] The concept, "comparative advantage," was coined by English political economist David Ricardo to mean that each country has specializations of goods production, and that trades of those goods that were produced more efficiently (i.e., with lower costs) bring overall prosperity (McMichael 2000:162; Mittelman 2000:35-36).

[16] In Mexico, Central America, and the Spanish-speaking Caribbean, these assembly factories are often called *maquiladoras* or *maquilas*.

minimally. Workers cannot upgrade their skills or build their human capital, and they do not earn much money to contribute to the local economy. The hosting governments receive relatively little revenue through taxes while subsidizing the operations (Thompson 2001a; Whalen 2002:64).

Some of these economically poor countries, like the Philippines, even encourage their citizens to migrate to countries in the Global North to earn remittances for their families and, indirectly, for their home countries' economies. About six million Filipino/as, for example, work overseas in 130 countries as contract workers in such occupations as domestic and construction workers and have earned an estimated $5.7 billion (McMichael 2000:204; Salazar Parreñas 2000). Two-thirds of Turkey's trade deficit in the 1990s was erased by remittances from Turkish "guest workers" abroad (McMichael 2000:204).

As indicated, the new global division of labor has greatly relied on women's and children's (Bales 1999; Franklin 2002) waged labor for direct capital accumulation. This "feminization" of waged labor is based in part on economic necessity of women to earn household incomes, in part on market demand for flexible and "cheap" labor, and in part on more receptivity to women's waged labor in society (Cheng 1999). Importantly, the creation of such a labor force is filtered through often contradictory and shifting cultural presuppositions and justifications about sexuality, marriage, feminine respectability, appearance, dress, race, religion, and reproduction that are enacted situationally (Salzinger 1997) by employers, family members, government, male workers, and even

women themselves (Enloe 1990:160-66; Freeman 2000:10-11; Pyle 1999:166; Raynolds 2001; Scholte 2000:250-52).

These cultural schema and practices, embedded in local social contexts, often contribute to confining girls and women in lower-skilled and lower-waged work even among "professional" female workers who tend to cluster in less paid and less prestigious jobs, such as teachers and nurses rather than lawyers and physicians (Cheng 1999:221; Freeman 2000; Moghadam 1999:136-38; Scholte 2000:253). For example, women workers can be paid lower than male workers because they are considered secondary wage earners in the family. If they are single, they may not deserve a lot of money because they are presumed to be supported by their fathers and to make "pin money" for themselves. People often assume women's ability and willingness to work hard on typically repetitive and monotonous tasks. These tasks can be feminized and devalued because women are believed to perform such tasks "naturally" or "traditionally" without specifically acquired skills. Interestingly, this reasoning is often used against U.S. female, often unionized, apparel workforce to move production to lower-wage regions around the world (Collins 2002). Clothing firms often claim they can ostensibly find abundant female laborforce with competent sewing skills in those places, as opposed to American women who increasingly do not learn how to sew in childhood. Women are also believed to be more docile and less likely to resist (Pyle 1999:87, 162-66). Yet, it may take threats or coercion against girls and women to maintain labor discipline and order.[17]

[17] In addition, gender composition of workforce may change over time in response to changing conditions. Evidence suggests that increasing numbers of men work in *maquiladoras* in the 1990s (Scholte 2000:252), and that the gender of majority of pineapple field workers in Dominican Republic changed from women to men (Raynolds 2001).

Transnational institutions, such as the World Trade Organization (Danaher and Burbach 2000:97-140; Working Group on the WTO/MAI 1999), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank (Danaher 2001:72-135; 50 Years Is Enough n.d.), and international trade agreements and regionalism, such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the Asia-Pacific Economic Conference (APEC), often promote neoliberal political economic structures worldwide. Since the debt crisis beginning in the early 1980s, for instance, the IMF and the World Bank have made loans with strings attached to debtor countries. These countries have been forced to implement Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) that are intended first to stabilize macro-economic indicators like inflation rates, government budget, and trade deficits. Then, they restructure the economy to promote growth by becoming more "competitive" in the world market in order to pay back the debts. More than 70 countries of the Global South undertook 566 SAPs from 1978 to 1992 (McMichael 2000:134).

SAP policies include privatizing public services like water, electricity, and telephone; cutting government spending on social programs like education, housing, health care; eliminating price subsidies on daily necessities like rice; devaluing national currencies to promote exports; reducing tariffs and regulations on foreign investors; raising interest rates to attract foreign investments; freezing wages to invite foreign investment and decrease export prices; and promoting a model of an export-led economy to earn foreign currencies (Chossudovsky 1997; Danaher 1994; McMichael 2000:126-33; Pyle 1999:93-96; Schaeffer 1997:83-101). To repay debts, debtor governments often exploit natural resources to an unsustainable level through such methods as extensive

logging, mining, and overfishing (McMichael 2000:158). Ghana, for example, exported timber worth from $16 million in 1983 to $99 million in 1988 under the World Bank's SAPs. Its tropical forest shrunk to a mere 25 percent of its original size (McMichael 2000:158). Southern debtor countries collectively paid back, with interest, almost $12.5 billion *a month* to Northern creditors from 1982 to 1990, according to scholar activist Susan George (1994:29). Yet, they in fact accumulated 61 percent *more* debts in 1991 than in 1982 (George 1994:30).

Consequently, the policies have disproportionately hurt lower classes, women, and children who would have more likely benefited from the welfare state, public-sector jobs, stronger enforcement of labor and environmental laws, the forest for their supplementary food, fuels, and medicine, and lower interest rates for loans and credits (Sassen 2001). Philip McMichael (2000) documents some devastating effects of the IMF's SAPs in the mid-1980s on Mexico:

> As part of the IMF loan rescheduling conditions in 1986, food subsidies for basic foods such as tortillas, bread, beans, and rehydrated milk were eliminated. Malnourishment grew [to about 40 percent of the population]. Minimum wages fell 50 percent between 1983 and 1989, and purchasing power fell to two-thirds of the 1970 level. The number of Mexicans in poverty rose from 32.1 to 41.3 million, matching the absolute increase in population size during 1981 to 1987. By 1990, basic needs of 41 million Mexicans were unsatisfied, and 17 million lived in extreme poverty (P. 131).

Furthermore, many small businesses and farms have disappeared because of decreasing governmental subsidies, weakening price control on products, rising prices of import technology and products, rising interest rates, dropping commodity prices in the world market due to the flooding of the market with exports, and/or widening domestic

market penetration of big foreign corporations (McMichael 2000:158, 169). The export-led growth policy encouraged commercial agribusiness to grow cash crops like shrimp, coffee, and flowers to the world market rather than small farmers to harvest basic staple crops for the domestic market (Araghi 1995:356; Cavanagh, Anderson, and Pike 1996:102-103). This has deepened the population's dependency on the world market for basic foods (Araghi 1995:356; McMichael 2000:63-65). Demonstrations and riots have occurred in many countries. As a result, contrary to the justification of SAPs by the IMF and the World Bank of "short-term pain for long-term gain" (Chossudovsky 1997:69), these effects undermine long-term economic growth (Pyle 1999:94) and foster the "debt boomerang," or negative repercussions to the Global North (George 1994:34), such as drug trafficking, declining exports to the Global South, and increasing emigration to the Global North (Cheng 1999:222; Daley 2001; Hondagneu-Sotelo and Cranford 1999; Ong et al. 1994:23-29).

Another example of disastrous effects of neoliberalism is the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which was signed between the United States, Mexico, and Canada in 1993 and put into effect in 1994. It was touted as a "win-win" policy of job creation and economic growth for both the United States and Mexico and resulting reduction that would reduce illegal migration from Mexico to the United States (Manning and Butera 2000:184-85). The reality, however, has been rather the opposite of what was intended. For example, despite increasing foreign investments to Mexico from almost $4 billion Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) per year before NAFTA (1990-1993) to nearly $10 billion FDI a year afterwards (1994-1998)(Manning and Butera 2000:189), an

estimated 28,000 small- and medium-sized Mexican businesses closed in the first three years of NAFTA, and the real value of daily minimum wage decreased from U.S. $4.62 in August 1993 to U.S. $3.91 in August 2000 (Manning and Butera 2000:193, 194). The wage gap between the United States and Mexico grew from 8-to-1 before NAFTA to 10-to-1 by the late 1990s (Manning and Butera 2000:196). During the first six years of NAFTA, furthermore, the United States has accumulated a $93 billion trade deficit with Mexico (Manning and Butera 2000:189). This exponential increase of imports from Mexico partly accounts for a massive job loss in the United States. The textile industry in the Southeastern United States, for example, lost 375,000 jobs since NAFTA (Bond 2001).

In this context of NAFTA and the *ejido* land reform of communal peasant land privatization in Mexico since 1992 (Manning and Butera 2000:198-200; McMichael 2000:140-42; Yetman 2000), increasing numbers of Mexicans from both the lower and middle classes have migrated to urban areas, particularly northern *maquiladora* regions on the U.S.-Medico border (see Thompson 2001a), and to *El Norte* (the North) – the United States – both legally and illegally (Manning and Butera 2000:201-202, 205). The displacement of small peasants from rural areas has accelerated globally since the 1970s, a process Araghi (1995) calls “global depeasantization.”

With enhanced capital mobility and the development of rapid communication networks, financial markets have become a key aspect of current globalization (Sassen 1994; Weiss 1999). Finance capital has been not only employed for productions in such sectors as agriculture and manufacture, but it has also increasingly become the means of

further capital accumulation in its own right through foreign exchange, securities, derivatives, and other financial instruments (Scholte 2000:116). It is estimated, for example, that more than $1.5 trillion is being transacted daily across state borders in the world (Brecher et al. 2000:2), and that foreign exchange transactions in 1995 generated an annual turnover of $300 trillion, compared to just over $5 trillion in world trade in the same year (Weiss 1999:138). Portfolio capital investment has increased in comparison to direct investment from roughly equal amounts in the 1970s to three times more by the 1990s (Scholte 2000:116-17). Yet the vast proportion of financial transactions in the largely deregulated financial markets is speculative and aimed for short-term profits rather than for long-term investment, and as a result the markets have been very volatile and often out of individual nation-states' control (Brecher et al. 2000:8; Scholte 2000:119; Weiss 1999:138). Financial volatility can negatively affect millions of people, as demonstrated, for example, in the aftermath of the Asian financial crisis of 1997 (McMichael 2000:232-35).

Furthermore, the increased capital mobility without strong labor law enforcement has had a chilling effect on organized labor in the United States and elsewhere.[18] According to recent research on the U.S. situation by Kate Bronfenbrenner (2000), even a mere threat of work relocation to more "business friendly" locations in other parts of the world has undermined unionization and collective bargaining, and resulted in the undercutting of workers' income, benefits, job security, and quality of life. In 2000, only 13.5 percent of the U.S. workforce or 16.3 million people were represented by organized

labor (Moberg 2001), a substantial decrease from the high of 35 percent in the 1950s (Greenhouse 1999d).[19]

In this climate, transnational corporations can more easily search for a condition that reduces costs, enhances profits, and increases market share. For instance, they either relocate their subsidiaries or contract out parts of their work to such places as export processing zones, where they can find a mixture of "business friendly" factors. These factors include cheaper labor with appropriate skills and high productivity, lower regulatory costs (e.g., tax and rents), more favorable real exchanges rates, lower rates of unionization, greater access to resources, political stability, geographical proximity to the market, and adequate infrastructure (e.g., roads, means of transportation, communication technology, and electricity)(Carruthers and Babb 2000:210; Connor et al. 1999; Freeman 2000; Pyle 1999:90). Many firms, particularly from South Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong, employ a "quota dodging" strategy (Connor et al. 1999). They manufacture products for export in countries, such as El Salvador and Burma, which have not reached their national export quotas to countries with a large consumer market (e.g., the United States)(Green 1998:10). Many corporations use offshore banking centers, which escape the reach of national and international regulations, to evade taxes and enhance flexibility

---

[18] The capital mobility varies from industry to industry. For example, the apparel and other manufacturing industries are among the most affected while hotel, transportation, and government would be less mobile.

[19] See Human Rights Watch (2000) for some case studies of how the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining is not adequately protected in the United States. The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), a U.S. government agency handling worker grievances and organized labor, reported that nearly 24,000 workers in the United States suffered reprisals in 1998 for exercising the right to freedom of association, a substantial increase from just over 6,000 workers in 1969 (Human Rights Watch 2000). See also U.S./Labor Education and Action Project, People of Faith Network, and United Students Against Sweatshops (1999), Connell (2001), Lobe (2002b) for union repressions.

and profits (Sassen 1994:26, 155; Scholte 2000:124-25). Also, corporations are often unaccountable to people who are negatively affected by corporate practices. As in Michael Moore's film, *Roger & Me*, which was about the fate of a General Motors plant in Flint, Michigan in the 1980s, companies can lay off loyal, long-time employees, relocate to other more "business friendly" places, and leave an entire city in shambles.[20]

Moreover, the number and power of transnational corporations have increased over the last several decades, and as indicated, they have been "the principal driving force behind globalization" in its current phase (Anderson, Cavanagh, and Lee 2000:66).[21] The United Nations reported that the number climbed up from 7,000 in 1970 to 60,000 in 1998, with 500,000 affiliates around the world (Anderson et al. 2000:66). A series of mergers, acquisitions, and bankruptcies in many industries has created oligopolies or market dominance by a handful of corporations (Scholte 2000:129-30), which can manipulate prices, often at the expense of smaller businesses and consumers, and lobby governments for a more "business friendly" environment. For example, the largest five companies in every major market usually recorded between 30 and 70 percent of all world sales by the mid-1990s (McMichael 2000:96) – 70 percent in consumer durables, 60 percent of air travel, over half of aircraft manufacture, more than 50 percent of electronics and electrical equipment, over 40 percent of global media, one-third of

[20] For some accounts of how major oil companies and the Nigerian government has collaborated to extract oil in southern Nigeria without consideration to serious damages to the environment and the people in the Niger Delta, see Campbell (2001), Everett (1998:1148-52), Goodman and Scahill (1998), and Human Rights Watch (1999).

[21] See also Sklair (2001) who argues that a transnational capitalist class, made up of corporate executives, state bureaucrats and politicians, professionals, and merchants and media, is emerging and controlling the process of globalization in part through promoting consumerism.

chemicals, and some 30 percent of insurance sales (Scholte 2000:129). In 1998, the ten largest firms controlled almost 70 percent of computer sales, 85 percent of pesticides, 86 percent of telecommunications, and two-thirds of the semiconductor industry in the world (Scholte 2000:129). Some fifty-one out of the top 100 largest economies in the world, including nation-states, are now corporations (Brecher et al. 2000:8).

In this context, countries underbid each other for foreign investments, resulting in a "race to the bottom" in which standards for working conditions and the environment, thus the overall quality of life in both the short and long run, are undermined (Brecher et al. 2000; Evans 2002). China, with its "business friendly" environment, is increasingly attracting investments with a "giant sucking sound" (Greider 2001). Meanwhile, Mexico is losing jobs to Asian countries, such as China and Vietnam, in part because Mexican workers' wages have risen "too high." More than 500 *maquiladoras* have closed down in the last two years, and about 250,000 workers have lost their jobs (Jordan 2002; Landau 2002). Thus, many call the current phase of globalization "corporate globalization."

Coupled with the power of corporations mostly based in the Global North, the nation-states in the Global North, particularly the United States, dominate governance over the global market. Privileged sectors in the Global North benefit from this domination to such a degree that many critics call the current form of globalization a form of "neo-imperialism" or "neo-colonialism," based on the neoliberal "Washington consensus" (Brecher et al. 2000:3; Levinson 2000), or "global apartheid"[22] (Booker and

[22] The term refers to "an international system of minority rule whose attributes include: differential access to basic human needs; wealth and power structured by race and place; structural racism, embedded in global economic processes, political institutions and cultural assumptions; and the international practice of

Minter 2001). However, no single actor, regardless of how powerful it is, is in total control of globalization.

To sum up, "globalization" is a complex, multi-dimensional condition and process that contains cultural, political, and economic aspects. It unevenly affects nation-states and civil society, and it is in turn influenced by differently powered nation-states and civil society.[23] For example, the Group of Seven generates over 60 percent of world economic output and dominates over 75 percent of world trade (Redclift and Sage 1999:135), while the world trade share by countries in the Global South decreased from 29 percent in 1980 to 24 percent in 1992 (Pyle 1999:84). Two-thirds of foreign direct investments to "developing" countries during the late 1980s went to just seven countries[24] while 47 "least-developed" nations received less than one percent during the same period (Pyle 1999:84, 90). The income ratio of the richest 20 percent of the world's population to the poorest 20 percent greatly widened from 30 to 1 in 1960 to 82 to 1 in 1995

---

double standards that assume inferior rights to be appropriate for certain 'others,' defined by location, origin, race or gender" (Booker and Minter 2001).

[23]Some other largely negative effects include insecurity of jobs and structural unemployment in the Global North (Antonio and Bonanno 1996:10-11; McMichael 2000:191-92. 197-201), human trafficking (Bales 1999; Murray 1998), transnational organized crime (Mittelman 2000:203-22), less biodiversity and environmental destruction, such as massive logging, global warming, soil erosion, water contamination, overfishing, and toxic waste dumping (Brecher et al. 2000:9; Idemudia and Shettina 1994) in part due to insatiable consumerism in the Global North (e.g., only 20 percent of the world's population in the richest countries consume 84 percent of world's paper) (United Nations Development Program [1999] 2000:345), the shortage of and inaccessibility to clean water in part due to privatization and commodification (Barlow and Clarke 2002), the widespread epidemic of HIV/AIDS particularly in the Global South (more than 33 million worldwide in 1998) in part due to growing travel and migration (United Nations Development Program [1999] 2000:344), promotion of militarism and arms trades to stabilize unrests and conflicts in order chiefly to protect business interests (Staples 2000), and a resulting massive loss of human life. And, sociologist Kevin Bales (1999) conservatively estimates in his book, *Disposable People*, that about 27 million people around the world are enslaved, mostly bonded labor, including in the Global North (p. 8). I do not claim that these effects are new or solely due to globalization. Other factors, such as historical domestic social, political, economic, and cultural conditions, do matter as well. But, it can be argued that these globalization effects have been intensified in the last few decades.

(Neubauer 2000:31). The UN Human Development Report in 1999 noted that more than 80 countries had per capita incomes lower than they had had a decade or more ago (Brecher et al. 2000:7).

In the context of neoliberal globalization, the influence of the state has generally been in decline and fragmented, as other actors, including transnational political institutions, transnational corporations, financial firms, and non-governmental organizations, have increased their power in varying degrees vis-à-vis the state (see Guillén 2001:247-51; Sites 2000). Increasing transnational migrations and growing global issues, such as global warming and human rights, have also weakened the state's regulative power (Robertson 2000:463). Increasingly, the state seems to be unable to formulate coherent, broad-based projects aiming for long-term goals (Sites 2000:130-35).

However, the state is generally the main actor in domestic and global political economy, as Linda Weiss (1999) argues that it maintains "managed openness."[25] Some states like the United States have more power and authority than others by, for example, having a disproportionate say in global institutions, such as IMF and World Bank (50 Years Is Enough n.d.).[26] By forming regional blocs, such as the European Union and NAFTA, states strategically attempts to strengthen their position in the global economy and politics (Mittelman 2000). As William Sites (2000) argues, the state is

---

[24] These seven countries were China, Malaysia, Thailand, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, and Colombia (Pyle 1999:84).

[25] Weiss (1999) argues that the state in general has options of "being open to the opportunities and benefits of international trade, capital, technology, and production networks, while maintaining prudent and responsible control of the national domain in order to foster wealth creation and furnish social protection" (p. 137).

[26] A vote of the Board of Executive Directors make decisions at the IMF and World Bank, but the voting power is determined by the level of financial contribution by each nation (50 Years Is Enough n.d.). The

"simultaneously [a] facilitator and victim of globalization" (p. 122). But, depending in part on their historically developed domestic political cultures and structures and in part on emerging local circumstances, the state reacts to globalization in varying ways (Sites 2000:125). And, within the state, some sectors, such as the Department of the Treasury, central banks, and the criminal justice system (i.e., law and order)(Ladipo 2001; Rosenblatt 1996 for the U.S. case), may have increased their power and authority in comparison to other agencies that deal with issues like health, education, and welfare (Guillén 2001:250-51; Sites 2000:132, 134-35).

The realities of "globalization" bear little resemblance to the popular notion of freewheeling, placeless, centerless movements of people, capital, and information orchestrated by a global invisible hand. Instead, it is a complex mixture of global meanings and practices allowed by the state to be less regulated and manifested in concrete social locations that are embedded in specific history, politics, culture, institutions, organizations, spaces, and economies. As sociologists John Guidry, Michael Kennedy, and Mayer Zald (2000) observe, "[t]his action [of globalization] originates some*where*, proceeds through *specific* channels, does some*thing*, and has concrete *effects* in *particular* places" (p. 3, emphasis original).

In the next section, we will further examine globalization by focusing on "sweatshops" – their emergence, characteristics, and maintenance in the context of neoliberal globalization. I will show how "sweatshops" are an integral part of the current global economy.

United States has roughly 17 percent of the vote, and the Group of Seven collectively holds 45 percent,

What Are "Sweatshops"?

Let me first define the term (see also Bender 2002 for the politics of definition). A "sweatshop" is a workplace where working conditions are significantly below acceptable standards (Dreier 2000). In such conditions, local, national, and international laws regarding workers' and human rights are often systematically violated. A number of such conditions can be identified: long working hours with mandatory overtime which could result in a sudden death from overwork (Pan 2002); starvation wages which cannot even meet the basic needs of family;[27] little or no benefits; withholding wages for weeks or months (Bao 2002:80-81); unsafe and unhealthy working conditions (e.g., exposed electrical wires, dirty and often broken toilets, poor ventilation, heat, no clean drinking water, toxic fumes [Eckholm 2000], and lack of adequate protective gear); constant pressure to meet high production quotas (often forced to take work home, if unfinished); increased rates of stress and injury among workers (Whalen 2002:60-61); arbitrary fees and fines (e.g., for long or frequent toilet visits or for a failure to meet production quotas)(Bao 2002:75); and child labor (Franklin 2002). Workers also often suffer from sexual harassment and verbal and physical abuse by supervisors, and women workers

---

effectively controlling the vote by a small number of countries.

[27] Five Columbia University graduate students produced a report that studied the wage level and the estimate for a "living wage" for the *maquila* workers in El Salvador (Connor et al. 1999). It reports that most Salvadoran *maquila* workers earn the legal minimum wage. But the minimum wage in El Salvador is in fact the extreme poverty line set by the government. That is, just to eat adequately as defined by the Salvadoran government, the workers would have to spend *all* their earnings for food for their family members (4.3 is the average family size in El Salvador in December 1998). No money would be left for other purposes, including housing, health care, education, transportation, and clothing. Of course, *maquila* workers cut corners and develop some coping mechanism to make ends meet and survive. As indicated in the "Economic Globalization" section, minimum wages around the world, including the United States, are

may be forced to take contraceptives and mandatory pregnancy tests (and may be fired if found pregnant). Factories are often surrounded by locked gates and barbed wire, and policed by armed guards. Factories often pollute the environment because they often drain raw sewage into river, discharge toxic chemicals like dye onto the surrounding environment, and burn unused shoe rubber in open air.[28] When workers complain or speak out against such conditions, they are likely to be repressed (e.g., intimidation, firing, blacklisting, death threats, or murders).[29] Most workers in such factories are young women of color, particularly in the range of 16-25 years old (see Enloe 1990:160-66, 1995).[30] Sweatshops are usually associated with apparel and shoe industries, but the phenomenon is more widespread.[31]

---

set low for the benefit of businesses and investment, often under an assumption that these investments will trickle down to ordinary people.

[28] I heard the dumping of jean dye from Alice who traveled to three Central American countries, and the rubber burning from Educating for Justice presenters at Emory University in April 2001. Educating for Justice people stayed for one month in Indonesia during the summer of 2000 with some local people who worked for Nike shoe factories.

[29] Working conditions at specific workplaces vary, of course.

[30] In the United States, about 70 percent of apparel and textile production workers are women, according to the Center for Economic and Social Rights (1999), and racial, ethnic, class, gender, and immigration status-based stratification can be observed as to who does what in the apparel industry (Bao 2002; Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:20; Horn 1996; Ward and Pyle 1995:48). For example, Bao (2002:72) observed the Chinese garment shop floors in Sunset Park in Bronx, New York. She writes that the two highest paid jobs (sorters and pressers) are almost always men. Trimmers, the lowest paid job, are virtually all women. But, undocumented male workers have taken up mostly female sewing work, and they are believed to be "less manly" (Bao 2002:73-74).

[31] Broadly interpreted, some examples of "sweatshops" include toy making (Press 1996), assembling electronic parts, clerical, typing, and telemarketing services (Freeman 2000; Nicholls 2001; Ward and Pyle 1995:48-49), car assembling work (Bacon 2000), metal clip making by forced prison labor in China (Rashbaum 2001), farmwork or "sweatshops without walls" or "sweatshops in the fields" (Smith-Nonini 1999; Greenhouse 2000b), shepherding in the western United States (Nieves 2001), trucking or "sweatshops on wheels" in the United States (Belzer 2000:ix), meatpacking work in Midwest (Schlosser 2001), diamond mining in African war zones (Harden 2000), unskilled workers on luxury cruise ships (Frantz 1999), sex industry (Crouse 2000; Kempadoo and Doezema 1998; Nagel 2000), prison labor in the United States (Lafer 1999; Light 2000; Rosenblatt 1996:30-31; Wong 2001), banana fields in Central America (Forero 2002a), and even white collar workers, such as part-time instructor jobs at "intellectual sweatshops" (Welsh-Huggins 2001), because of longer working hours, job insecurity, stress,

The origin of the term "sweatshops" comes from the pre-industrial subcontracting system where contractors "sweated out" or profited from the difference between the amount of money they received and the amount of money paid for wages and other costs (Appelbaum and Dreier 1999; Belzer 2000:5). "Sweatshop" conditions could be observed in the US apparel factories in large northeastern cities in the late 19th and the early 20th centuries.[32] However, I will focus on sweatshops in the last several decades in this thesis when apparel sweatshops have made a "come-back" since the 1970s (Bonacich 1998:466).[33]

For example, 1,800 workers at the Taiwanese-owned Chentex factory in Nicaragua's Las Mercedes Free Trade Zone sewed jeans for Kohl's Department Store (Sonoma label), J.C. Penny (Arizona), K-Mart (Route 66), Wal-Mart (Faded Glory), and the Pentagon's Army and Air Force Exchange (Greenhouse 2000d) for as long as 12 hours for six or seven days a week.[34] Yet they received as little as 30 cents an hour for a pair of jeans selling for $21-$34, while the Taiwanese company, Nien Hsing, reported a 29 percent profit increase in 1999. The workers' wages, even in the local standard, were

---

dissatisfaction, unrealistic employer expectations, and less time and energy for family in the last couple of decades (Fraser 2001; Willis 2001).

[32] In these sweatshops, workers were mostly recent immigrant young women of Italian and Jewish origin. They often protested and demanded better working conditions (Takaki 1993:288-97).

[33] Largely because of persistent organizing in the early decades of the 20th century, laws were enacted in the New Deal era. They include the National Labor Relations Act and Fair Labor Relations Act. By the end of World War II, apparel workers were among the most unionized in the U.S. labor force. Between the 1940s and 1960s, there was a "social contract" between companies and unions in which unionized mostly male workers received good wages and benefits in exchange for complying with the management (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:6). Thus, until the 1970s, apparel sweatshops had been significantly reduced, if not eliminated.

[34] Also see Gonzalez (2000) and visit the National Labor Committee at www.nlcnet.org for this Chentex issue.

too little to meet the basic needs of their families. Visitors from the United States (Ross and Kernaghan 2000) report about one worker's house:

> Christina's home is a ten-square-foot wooden frame; two of the walls are hung with plastic sheeting, while the others are constructed from cardboard boxes that once held shirts shipped from the free trade zone in Panama. Her shack has a dirt floor and holds one large bed and two chairs for herself and her husband and baby. Her toilet is a hole in the ground surrounded by a shower curtain hung from a rack. We are shocked to learn that her husband works seven days a week at another of the free trade zone plants, but even with his overtime they can afford only this bare shelter.

Representative Sherrod Brown, a Democrat from Ohio, also visited Nicaragua and met a worker couple and their three-year-old daughter "with discolored tops of her hair, probably from a protein deficiency" (Greenhouse 2000d).

The workers, 80 percent of whom are women under 21 years old, had to get permission to go to the toilet, and the time away from the machines were monitored. They were often verbally harassed to work harder and faster. Sociologist Robert Ross and activist Charles Kernaghan of the National Labor Committee (Ross and Kernaghan 2000) describe one worker who had a miscarriage because of abuses at the factory:

> "I lost my baby because *los Chinos* [the Chinese] abused me," she says. She is finishing the night shift…. This woman was pregnant in the spring. Her supervisor yelled at her when she lagged, calling her names like "dog face" and saying she was as dumb as a horse. She says, "I lost my baby in May, because they harassed me so much."

The workers were successful in forming one of Nicaragua's few independent unions in 1998. When they subsequently called for a wage increase of eight cents per pair of jeans they sewed, as agreed with the management when the union was formed in 1998, the management was unwilling to negotiate. To no avail, the union repeatedly asked the

Nicaraguan Ministry of Labor to mediate, largely because the government owed the Taiwanese investment so much – including the construction of several governmental buildings and a newly proposed $100 million Free Trade Zone industrial park by Nien Hsing. Thus, the workers decided to hold a one-hour work stoppage to make a statement in late April 2000. Next day, however, nine union leaders were fired on trumped-up criminal charges. In response, many workers held rallies and marches to protest the firings. In the following months, any worker who was in any way affiliated with the union or even related to anyone who was affiliated with the union was fired – over 700 in total. The management hired thugs to intimidate workers, put up barbed wire and surveillance cameras, and even formed a company union to deflect criticisms.

By the middle of 2000, news of the union busting reached activists in the United States and Taiwan. Concerned citizens in over 80 U.S. cities and the Taiwan Solidarity with Nicaraguan Workers, a newly formed Taiwanese coalition, soon began to put pressure on Kohl's and the Taiwanese government (Shao-hua 2000). Sixty-seven members of the Congress signed a letter to President Clinton in July 2000 (Greenhouse 2000d). Even Charlene Barshefsky, then U.S. trade representative, warned the Nicaraguan government in October 2000 that the U.S. government would rescind trade benefits to Nicaragua unless Chentex complied with labor laws (Greenhouse 2000d). The company remained stubborn, threatening to close down the factory and scrap the proposed $100 million investment for the new free trade zone. The situation was tentatively resolved in May 2001, when some union leaders and supporters were rehired.

Most sweatshop factories are found in the Global South,[35] but they can also be found in the Global North, including the United States.[36] The General Accounting Office (GAO), an investigative arm of the U.S. Congress estimated in 1994 that over one-third of New York's 6,500 apparel shops, 4,500 of Los Angeles's 5,000 shops, four-fifths of Miami's 500 shops, and many others in Portland, New Orleans, Chicago, San Antonio, and Philadelphia are sweatshops (Ross 1997a:12).[37] Many are unregistered factories that do not register their operation to the government and do not pay tax. But even among registered shops in southern California, for instance, only 39 percent complied with federal and state labor laws, including the wage and hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the average firm owed $3,631 back wages to workers (Cleeland 1999:A1).[38] Evidence of the systematic presence of sweatshops in the United States led Robert Reich, then Secretary of Labor, to say in 1995 that the U.S. garment industry is a "national disgrace" (Benjamin 2000:238).

Perhaps the most infamous sweatshop exposed to date in the United States was in El Monte, a suburb of Los Angeles (Louie 2001:228-30, 235-42; Su 1997). In 1995,

---

[35] Other examples include Nike contract factories in Indonesia (Luh 2001) and Vietnam (Landler 2000), Bangladesh sweatshops (Bearak 2001), Chinese factories (Eckholm 2001), and *maquiladoras* on the U.S.-Mexico border (Thompson 2001a).

[36] For example, see Bao (2002) for Chinese shops in Bronx, New York, Boal (1999) for an Appalachian factory sewing uniforms for the U.S. military, Bonacich and Appelbaum (2000) for Los Angeles shops, Scott (2002) for the Southern California clothing industry, Center for Economic and Social Rights (1999) for a New York shop producing for Dona Karan, Greenhouse (2001a) for a Samoan sweatshop, and Greenhouse (2001c) for a cap factory near Buffalo, NY, and Whalen (2002) for Puerto Rican and Dominican Republic women worked in New York City shops.

[37] Their definition of a "sweatshop" is "an employer that violates more than one federal or state labor law governing minimum wage and overtime, child labor, industrial homework, occupational safety and health, worker compensation, or industry regulation" (quoted in Ross 1997a:12).

[38] Center for Economic and Social Rights (1999) even reported that three-fourth of unionized shops in New York City violated laws about workers' rights. They note that the Union of Needletrades, Industrial, and Textile Employees (UNITE), AFL-CIO admitted that all is not well in the shops it represents. Xiaolan Bao (2002:88) also criticizes UNITE for its parochialism and culture of business unionism.

federal and state agents raided an apartment compound which was surrounded by barbed wire and patrolled by armed guards. They found 72 Thai immigrants forced to sew clothing for such retailers as May Department Stores, Nordstrom, Sears, and Target. One former worker tells how she was recruited, deceived, and ended up in the El Monte sweatshop:

> I came to the US in 1994. When I was still in Thailand[,] this person came to the village to recruit people to work at the shop in El Monte. He told me that the pay was very good. He said that if I wanted to come to the US, he would be able to arrange it for me for 125,000 baht [US$5,000] which I paid him.
>
> I came to the US with my friends, not with my family…. What happened to me after I came?…. As soon as I arrived in this country, they took me directly to El Monte [where] they basically told me I would have to work continuously, non-stop and only have a day off from time to time. This was completely the opposite of what I had been told in Thailand before coming here. In Thailand[,] they told us that we would work from 8am to 6pm every day, five days a week, and that we would have two days off every week…. After paying the $5,000 to get here, they told me I had to pay an additional $4,800. They said they would keep me as long as it took to pay off the $4,800 debt (Louie 2001:236-37).

The trapped, mostly young women worked for nearly 20 hours a day in dark poorly-lit garages. Eight to ten people were put into a bedroom that was designed for two. They slept for a few hours while rats and roaches crawled over them. Their communication with the outside world, such as phone calls and letters, was monitored. They were forced to purchase from management overpriced daily necessities like food and toiletries. Threats and violence were used to put the workers in compliance. As the same former El Monte worker recollects:

> The owners threatened to set the homes of our families on fire if we dared to escape because they knew where all of us were from, about our villages back in Thailand. Some people actually got punished. One

> person tried to escape but was unsuccessful; they beat him up pretty badly. They took a picture of him and showed it to all the other workers, to tell us what would happen if we tried to escape (Louie 2001:237).

Some workers had been enslaved in this shop for as long as seven years.

Successful community organizing prevented deportation by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and enabled the workers to win release from detention centers. The El Monte shop operators pled guilty in February 1996 (Su 1997:145), and the workers won over $4 million from several companies for whom they sewed clothing, including Montgomery Ward, Mervyn's, and Millers Outpost. Hiring some of the most upscale law firms in California, all of these companies initially refused to take any responsibility and actively sought to have the lawsuit dismissed (Louie 2001:230; Su 1997:148).

Accounting for the Emergence of Sweatshops

As early as the late 1950s, apparel manufacturers in the United States began to contract out parts of their work, particularly sewing to the Global South (Whalen 2002:65) although imports in 1968 still accounted for only three percent of the total U.S. consumption (Taplin 1996:201).[39] By the late 1990s, however, 60 percent of U.S. wholesale clothing was imported (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:9) from more than 60 nations (La Botz 2002). The question now is how and why, in the context of the

[39] See Whalen (2002) for the relocation of work to Puerto Rico by U.S. apparel companies starting in the late 1940s to take advantage of special policies for investors like tax exemptions and no applicability of the federal minimum wage.

neoliberal global political economy, the apparel industry has become the most globalized (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:9) and sweatshop-ridden industry over the last several decades.

The U.S. apparel industry has tried to enhance its "flexibility" in capital accumulation in order to reduce risks and costs and to be competitive in this fashion-based, seasonal business (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:14; Taplin 1996:198-99). On one level, manufacturers pursue organizational flexibility by contracting out work, particularly labor-intensive cutting, sewing, and trimming work (Bonacich 1996:319; Taplin 1996:200). This externalizes costs and risks, such as excess inventory and employee wages and benefits, potential lawsuits from employees, unionization, and lay-offs. The industry deals with limp materials that are not susceptible to automation – only human hands can sew them (Appelbaum and Dreier 1999:72; Taplin 1996:203) – this gives an incentive to contract this work out.[40]

Retailers, who sell apparel to consumers, reign at the top of the apparel industry hierarchy. By the late 1990s, just four retailers (Wal-Mart, Sears, K-Mart, Dayton-Hudson [which owns Target and Mervyn's]) dominated approximately two-thirds of the U.S. apparel market, after a series of bankruptcies[41] and mergers and acquisitions in the last two decades (Appelbaum 1996:305-306; Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:84-89). They squeeze profits upward while demanding speed and quality from manufacturers – retailers generally rake in as much as 50 percent of the retail price of clothing (Bonacich

[40] But there has been some limited automation in the assembly process, including automatic buttonholing, pocketsetting, band creasing and band stitching (Taplin 1996:211).

and Appelbaum 2000:1).[42] They often demand concessions like "markdown money" from manufacturers to try to secure profit margins (Kaufman 2002). The markdown money refers to the after-the-season payments to retailers from manufacturers in order to make up for whatever profits retailers lost by putting the apparel on sale. Such large retailers as Wal-Mart, Kohl's, and Target, are known to take advantage of economies of scale to drive prices down (Kaufman 2002). This pressures other retailers to do the same, but it also helps squeeze money upward to guarantee their profits.

In their study of the Los Angeles apparel industry, sociologists Edna Bonacich and Richard Appelbaum (2000) cite an apparel industry executive to make a point that retailers set the prices and control the pricing of their suppliers down to the bottom of the apparel industry hierarchy:

> [R]etailers know how many minutes it takes to sew a particular garment and calculate, on the basis of the minimum wage, how much they need to pay per garment in order to cover it. For large orders, however, retailers can simply cut back the price they are willing to pay, forcing the contractor to pay less than the legal minimum wage (P. 90).

This executive went on to say:

> [T]he pressure goes right down the line. Pricing starts from the retailer and moves down. It doesn't start from the bottom, from the real costs of making the garment. The retailer can always go down the street and find someone who can make it for less. The manufacturers and contractors are stuck. Everyone down the line is squeezed (P. 90).

---

[41] Bonacich and Appelbaum (2000) report, for example, that "[m]ore than 77,000 retail stores went out of business between 1991 and 1996; the failure rate among apparel outlets was two-thirds higher than the overall national retail failure rate" (p. 87).

[42] Retailers like The Gap and manufacturers like Guess can acquire as much as 80-85 percent of the retail price when they sell their own labels at their own stores and/or bypass manufacturers altogether and avoid paying a premium for brand names to manufacturers (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:2, 99-102).

New communication and transportation technologies enable particularly retailers to not only coordinate the production process through "global commodity chains"[43] (Appelbaum 1996:305) faster and cheaper, but also quickly respond to market conditions, such as fashion changes (Appelbaum 1996:306-307; Taplin 1996:203-204). Electronic Point of Sale systems, for example, permit retailers to monitor sales closely and reorder fast selling items with short lead times (Taplin 1996:204).

Manufacturers, ranked next in the hierarchy, take as much as 35 percent of the retail price (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:1).[44] In 1999, there were almost 17,000 apparel manufacturers and wholesalers in the United States, according to the American Apparel and Footwear Association (Kaufman 2002). They typically make designs, purchase textiles, grade, mark, arrange for production, and wholesale finished products to retailers (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:27-28; Taplin 1996:200, 208-209). But some well-known and better-financed manufacturers like Guess? Inc. also operate their own retail shops, in large part because they can absorb the big profit layer by becoming retailers themselves (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:29-30). Incorporation of new technologies in designing, layout, and cutting processes has allowed manufacturers to benefit in several ways (Taplin 1996:209-10). It deskills the work of skilled workers or even displaces the workers with fewer, less skilled workers to operate the machine. It reduces costs by limiting fabric wastage and by speeding up garment preparation.

---

[43] The term, "global commodity chains," means (a) "network[s] of labor and production processes whose end result is a finished commodity" (Appelbaum 1996:305).

[44] Of course, much goes to cover the costs of materials and other necessary operations to produce a finished garment. According to Bonacich and Appelbaum (2000:1-2), 22.5 percent out of 35 percent is spent for the fabric, and 12.5 percent goes to overhead and profit.

Contractors and subcontractors get about 15 percent of the retail price (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:1). Because setting up a small shop as a contractor requires relatively little capital and low skilled labor, entry into the business of cutting and sewing is not hard for "developing" countries and for many recent immigrants. The competition among (sub)contractors to underbid each other intensifies because, for retailers and manufacturers, "there is always someplace, somewhere, where clothing can be made still more cheaply" (Appelbaum and Dreier 1999:72) – resulting in further downward pressuring on the apparel cutting and sewing workers at the bottom.

At the bottom, workers on the shop floor or in their homes often collectively get only about 6 percent inside the United States and 1 percent elsewhere (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:2). The average garment worker in Los Angeles, according to the United States census, earned only $7,200 in 1990, less than 75 percent of the federal poverty line for a family of three in that year (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:4). Outside the United States, workers who sewed a $198 Liz Claiborne jacket at the Doall factory in El Salvador were paid just 74 cents for each jacket (or four-tenths of 1 percent of the retail price)(National Labor Committee 1999a:9).

The existence of a relatively abundant low-skilled impoverished labor force, not productivity, helps further reduce the power of these workers because substitutes, willing to work under very poor conditions, can be easily found.[45] They are often undocumented immigrants who are unable to speak the dominant language of their host countries. They

[45] In terms of productivity, Appelbaum and Dreier (1999) cite an analysis of *Business Week* that "although Mexican apparel workers are 70 percent as productive as U.S. workers, they earn only 11 percent as much as their U.S. counterparts; Indonesian workers, who are 50 percent as productive, earn less than 2 percent as much" (p. 72).

are paid not by the hour, but by the number of garments they handle. This piece rate encourages speed-up and competition among workers, especially given their meager wages and limited numbers of garment their employer get from manufacturers (Bao 2002:73, 74, 79). Their sewing task was deskilled several decades ago, as simpler, more standardized garments could be produced and their production could be broken down to specific tasks – with each worker responsible for a single task (Whalen 2002:54).

Racial, ethnic, gender, and other social differences among workers can be exploited by employers to maintain divisions and reduce the potential power of workers for solidarity. For example, the Cantonese-dominated Sunset Park Chinese shops often blame Fujianese workers (from Fujian Province in southeastern China) for worsening labor conditions and living conditions in the area (Bao 2002:82-85). This "finger-pointing" occurs among Chinese workers based on immigration status and regional and linguistic differences (Bao 2002:85). Another example is in the Caribbean. Taiwanese and South Korean management often have local Afro-Caribbean female personnel officers on the floor as racial, ethnic, and gender buffers to deflect tensions between local mostly female Afro-Caribbean workers and the management (Green 1998:37-39).

Moreover, retailers and manufacturers are not legally responsible for working conditions of their independently-owned contractors. They try to make sure that they evade any moral or legal responsibility (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:138-39). Manufacturers require their contractors to sign on the standard order form (the so-called Adams Form) supposedly absolving them of violations at their contractors' workplaces. However, they still own the fabrics being processed at contractors' factories –

technically, they just purchase services from contractors. They also regularly send quality-control inspectors to contractors' factories, particularly if their contractors are in the United States.

The emergence of sweatshops is taking place in the context of neoliberal government policies that encourage deregulation, privatization, liberalization of trades,[46] weak enforcement of labor laws,[47] and continued failure to establish effective international labor laws and regulations (Ayoub 1999; Baltazar 1998:707-14; Everett 1998). Under these circumstances, union organizing in this industry is very difficult, partly because retailers and manufacturers can easily shift orders to "less risky" contractors. Contractors can shut down their shops and reopen them somewhere else under different names – furthering the "race to the bottom" (Bonacich 1998; Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:13).[48]

---

[46] Some of the major multinational "free trade" agreements are the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which was created in 1947 (McMichael 2000:167-75) and grew into the 135-member World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1995 (McMichael 2000:175-76), Tariff Item 807 in the 1960s which collected tariffs only on the labor cost of U.S. components assembled abroad (Whalen 2002:57), 1973 Multi Fiber Agreement about quotas and trade routes (Ross 1997a:22) which became a part of agreements of the WTO set up (Green 1998:9), the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) of 1983 with nearly 30 Caribbean countries as a part of an anti-communist policy agenda in Central America (Green 1998:14-15; Heron 2002; Ross 1997a:22-23), North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) of 1994, and possibly in the near future, the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) to create a giant "free trade" zone in the North, Central, and South America (except Cuba).

[47] Even in the United States, enforcement is not strong, contrary to popular belief. Among many reasons, the government inspection agency is understaffed and underfunded (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:221-61). Costs of lawsuits are usually prohibitive for workers. Lawsuits take time so that a given union organizing campaign may be over by the time illegally fired workers who tried to organize their workplace are rehired (Bonacich 1996:322). In general, government agencies are afraid of driving factories out of their jurisdictions or out of business, and they are pressured more by business interests than worker advocates. As a result, they are generally in favor of business interests (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:261). See also Human Rights Watch (2000) for the weak enforcement of the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining in the United States.

[48] For an account of how Nike has moved their main contracting areas from Japan and South Korea in the early 1970s to Indonesia and Vietnam, see Sage (1999:208-209) and Anderson et al. (2000:58).

One result has been the decline of garment work jobs in the United States – from over 1.4 million workers in the early 1970s (the employment peak) to 0.78 million in the late 1998 – a 43 percent decline (Center for Economic and Social Rights 1999; Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:16).[49] The decline has been observed even in the current U.S. sweatshop capital, Los Angeles (Dickerson and Cleeland 2000).

The union representing these workers has been struggling with declining membership and weakening bargaining power. The Union of Needletrades, Industrial, and Textile Employees (UNITE), AFL-CIO, which grew out of the 1995 merger of two unions representing garment workers in the United States, had about 300,000 members in 1997. By contrast, the two former unions had a membership of 800,000 in the late 1960s (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:265). This decline helps put a further downward pressure on the bargaining power of the union and on working conditions for employees (Bronfenbrenner 2000).

Part of the reason that apparel production jobs have not entirely disappeared from the United States is that there are some benefits in keeping them here. I already mentioned the existence of fiercely competitive contractors, an abundant "cheap"

[49] Although the textile industry (which manufactures yarns, threads, and fabrics) is different from the apparel one (which cuts and sews clothing), see Bragg (2001) for an interesting account of how the recent closing of a textile mill in a small Alabama town may affect the lives of former workers. See also Bond (2001) for shrinking textile jobs in the U.S. Southeast. However, as Anderson, Schulman, and Wood (2001) show, the job loss in the U.S. textile industry has been much smaller because of industry-specific conditions. Imports of textile yarns and fabrics were 12.4 percent in 1995 (Anderson et al. 2001:48), compared to about 60 percent in the apparel industry. The 1986 Caribbean Basin Initiative allows companies to import finished apparel into the United States with a partial duty exemption if the fabric is made and cut in the United States (Anderson et al. 2001:48). Also, part of the reason lies in the strategy of textile companies in locality. They argue that "the U.S. textile industry is rebuilding its southern 'security zone' in the recent period of change and uncertainty by expanding its non-union workforce to include female, black, and Hispanic workers while contracting the total number employed through technological

immigrant labor force, and fairly lax law enforcement in the United States. Domestic production means that retailers and manufacturers can also avoid tariffs and quotas from imports altogether (Appelbaum 1996:311). The label can show an often-coveted "Made in the U.S.A." Geographical proximity to the consumer market still means a quicker turnaround from the time of an order, especially of fashion-driven, fast-changing designer and women's clothes, which require special sensitivity to changing market conditions (Taplin 1996:205).[50]

In U.S. territories like Saipan (McMichael 2000:99-100)[51] and American Samoa (Greenhouse 2001a), some federal laws, such as minimum wage, immigration, and customs, do not apply in the first place, let alone their adequate enforcement. In Saipan, for example, $3.05 is the minimum wage, foreign workers can be recruited to work under one-year renewable contracts as "guest workers" (fired and deported at whim), and imported fabrics and other materials are not checked at customs. Many of the almost 40,000 Saipan workers, mostly young women from southeast Asia sewing clothing for major U.S. companies, are indentured to pay back recruitment fees of up to $7,000.

Resisting "Globalization from Above"

A Gramscian perspective suggests that the "hegemony" or dominance of neoliberalism worldwide through consent and coercion is never complete. Not only are

---

modernization, by merging firms, and by shifting production to new locations within the south" (Anderson et al. 2001:48).

[50] To be competitive, retailers now change fashion lines for five or six seasons a year, compared to just two seasons years ago (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:29). This demands a quicker turnaround for manufacturers and constractors.

its dominant interests and policies never totally unified, but also neoliberal dominance faces constant questioning from many quarters (Evans 2000; Nash 2000:263-64). Collective challenges to the hegemonic project can be called "counter-hegemonic" projects that collectively resist "business as usual" at local, national, and global levels (Evans 2000). These "counter-hegemonic" projects are, moreover, constitutive of globalization in the sense that they are both shaped by globalization and shaping the direction of globalization (McMichael 2000:241; Nederveen Pieterse 2001:24).

Many kinds of "counter-hegemonic" projects can be identified in terms of strategic goals, targets, methods to achieve goals, tactics, and primary actors (Antonio and Bonanno 2000; Brecher et al. 2000; Broad and Cavanagh 1999; Nederveen Pieterse 2001:28-34; Starr 2000). For example, many groups organize for "retribalization" or for their own local, regional, national, and cultural identities to preserve and assert their communities and group recognition (Antonio and Bonanno 2000:63; McMichael 2000:242-44, 259-68).[52] In the Global South, revolts against the dominating agendas of the Global North have been fairly common occurrences.[53]

---

[51] Visit Global Exchange at www.globalexchange.org/economy/corporations/saipan/faq.html for the basic information about and a campaign for the Saipan sweatshop workers.

[52] This project for cultural identity can be conservative (e.g., right-wing populism) or progressive (e.g., "new social movements" based on culture and life-style). It may take benign forms like group meetings or violent forms such as wars. Both conservative and progressive sides tend to agree that ordinary citizens are victimized by monopolized individualistic economism and cultural destruction (Antonio and Bonanno 2000).

[53] In the 1970s, the poorest 77 countries formed the Group of 77 to demand more power and economic equity from the Global North (Brecher, Costello, and Smith 2000:11). The Bankok Declaration in the 1993 World Conference on Human Rights churned out an "Asian concept of human rights" that interprets international standards from their "Asian" perspective and prioritizes economic development over political and civil rights of the population (Baltazar 1998:695). And, famously, some representatives from the Global South refused to negotiate in the World Trade Organization ministerial in Seattle in late 1999 for what they perceived to be the domination of Northern countries in the decision-making process.

One can also find many collective actions by directly affected populations, such as worker protests for better wages and working conditions (Tait 2000), sex worker activism for safe sex, dignity, and other basic rights (Kempadoo and Doezema 1998), farmers mobilizing against corporate bio-piracy or "gene theft" that patent seeds that have been cultivated by farmers over generations (McMichael 2000:173-74), ordinary citizens protesting against "free market" policies (Forero 2002b) and austerity measures of the IMF and the World Bank (Caffentzis and Federici 2001),[54] sweatshop workers setting up mutual funds for necessities and emergencies (Bao 2002:77), and women's cooperatives and micro-credit projects in many parts of the world (McMichael 2000:295-96; Ward and Pyle 1995:51-53; see also Naples and Desai 2002).

Other actors may engage in "quiet encroachment," or forms of collective pragmatism to creatively adapt to the neoliberal social environment for their own very survival (Bayat 1997; Esteva and Prakash 1998; Nederveen Pieterse 2001:33-34). Examples include informal exchanges of goods and services of daily necessities and unorganized occupations of vacant housing by refugees. Some others try to cut or "delink" their ties with corporate-controlled national, regional, and global institutions and organizations to create locally-run, autonomous communities (Esteva and Prakash 1998; Starr 2000:111-46). In academia, the post-World War II dominant model of "development," based on the linear model of history and progress, techno-scientific methods, and Eurocentrism, has greatly been contested. Collectively called the "anti-development" or "post-development" paradigm, it rejects the "development" paradigm

[54] According to McMichael (2000), for example, "[b]etween 1976 and 1992, some 146 riots occurred in

and advocates local, grassroots initiatives based on their own values and knowledge (Esteva and Prakash 1998; see Kiely 1999; Nederveen Pieterse 2000 for critiques). This academic movement is often closely connected with grassroots movements outside the Ivory Tower.

Here, I would like to focus on the U.S. apparel anti-sweatshop movement as a part of the larger "anti-corporate" or "corporate accountability" movement to provide a more detailed context for the emergence of the student anti-sweatshop movement in the United States and its campaign at Georgia State University.

The Global Anti-Corporate and Anti-Sweatshop Movements

In the global environment of neoliberalism in which the role of state has generally been reduced in favor of business and financial interests without meaningful regulations at the global level, the power of corporations and finance has expanded and reached increasingly within and across state borders in the last few decades (Danaher 1996; Pellow 2001).[55] During the same period, there has been a great increase in the number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (Cohen and Rai 2001:8), and many of them have undertaken projects and services previously performed by governments (McMichael 2000:275).

In this context, it often has come to make more sense for social movements to directly target corporations and compel them to implement some form of policy change.

---

thirty-nine of the approximately eighty debtor countries" (p. 224)

[55] By 1993, there were over 15,000 transnational institutions of all kinds, 90 percent of them were created after 1960 (Cohen and Rai 2001:8).

In light of this fact, sociologist David Pellow (2001) argues for a "political economic process" model of social movements, as opposed to the state-centered political process model. The model stipulates that firms, rather than the state, are often the center of collective contentions. To attain their goals, social movements innovate their strategies and tactics at local, regional, national, and transnational levels in response to this changed power balance.

Firms are generally more vulnerable to collective mobilizations if companies have a wide name-recognition among the public because the sales of their products or services depend on branded company and product images as much as on product materials *per se* (Carruthers and Babb 2000:34-39; Klein 2000). As Sage (1999) observes, "[a] basic principle… is to go after the market leader" (p. 222). This is in part because they have the widest name recognition, and in part because activists hope that market leader's policy change will help convince other companies in the industry to do the same. If pressure groups can successfully tarnish a company or product image, corporations are likely to feel a real threat of hurting their profits such that they may negotiate with pressure groups and change their policy.

These activities are called "corporate campaigns" or "corporate accountability campaigns," and have existed at least since the 1970s (Broad and Cavanagh 1999; Cavanagh 1997:47; Manheim 2001). The goal of these campaigns is to reform the practices of private firms in such a way that these firms become accountable to the demands of affected populations and concerned consumers. The campaigns are typically grassroots in nature to raise public awareness, and they often use non-institutional means

to achieve their goals (e.g., street demonstrations and letter writing). This is partly because there is usually no solid ground for lawsuits,[56] and partly because organizers often believe grassroots mobilization, in contrast to legal campaigns by professionals, is good in itself for more democracy. Environmental justice movements,[57] for example, often directly negotiate with companies over environmental degradation and resulting community health problems due to company practices, such as toxic dumping and mining in their communities (Bullard 1993; Pellow 2001).

One of the most successful corporate campaigns has perhaps been the "fair trade" movement. It pressures companies to market food such as coffee, bananas, cocoa, honey, and sugar in Europe and North America that are made under decent working and environmentally friendly conditions around the world. In the year 2000, there were $100 million gross sales of "fair trade" products in North America, and the market is expanding (Lobe 2002a).

Another prominent corporate accountability movement is the apparel anti-sweatshop movement, particularly since the early 1990s (see Appendix II for the basic timeline focusing on the movement in the United States; Featherstone and United

---

[56] However, I am aware of some lawsuits as a strategic part of their campaigns (see Corn 2002; Everett 1998). Lawsuits use the Alien Tort Claims Act, created in 1789, which "allows alien plaintiffs to sue in the United States courts for torts committed in violation of the law of nations or a treaty of the United States" (Everett 1998:1124). In July 2001, for example, the National Union of Food Industry Workers filed several lawsuits against Coca-Cola and its bottling partners in Colombia with help from the United Steelworkers of America and the International Labor Rights Fund. The suits allege that the defendants were involved in killings of union leaders in Coca-Cola bottling plants in Colombia. For more information, see Ferriss (2002), Roston (2001), and the web-sites of Colombian Labor Monitor at www.prairienet.org/clm and Global Exchange at www.globalexchange.org/colombia.

[57] Since the early 1980s, environmental justice movements have mobilized constituents to attain social justice, social equity, cultural autonomy, and democratic decision-making power for their living environment and communities which suffer from environmental degradations and resulting health problems, often because of environmental racism (see Bullard 1993).

Students Against Sweatshops 2002:106; Manheim 2001; La Botz 2002). This movement, comprised of a number of autonomous campaigns and organizations in the United States and other parts of the world, primarily targets leading corporations in the apparel industry, such as Nike, Wal-Mart, and the Gap, Inc.[58] The movement publicizes the fact that much of the clothing bearing popular logos is produced by workers in sweatshops. It demands that retailers and manufacturers take responsibility for ensuring the dignity and human rights of these workers whether or not they are direct employees of these retailers and manufacturers.

In the largest apparel consumer market in the world (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:9), Americans bought 17.2 billion articles of clothing in 1998, a 16 percent increase from 1993 (Kilborn 1999).[59] Appealing to many of these consumers, the movement engages in a variety of strategies and tactics. They leaflet and picket in front of retailers. They pressure mass-purchasing groups (e.g., governments, sports teams, and churches) to adopt a purchasing guideline for their clothing. They challenge companies by becoming shareholders, organizing boycotts, working with elected officials for legislation,[60] and, if appropriate, filing lawsuits (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:301-309). They often dramatize the wide gap between the handsome incomes of these companies' CEOs

[58] For a good sample of major anti-sweatshop groups in the United States and elsewhere, visit Behind The Label at www.BehindTheLabel.org.

[59] In 1989-90 (latest figures available), Americans consumed the most clothing in the world (57.3 pounds per person), while the average of the world was 17.9 pounds. People in Latin America bought 12.8 pounds while 2.9 pounds was the figure for Africa (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:9). Many unused and undamaged clothes are being donated in the United States and often shipped back to the Global South for consumption (Kilborn 1999)

[60] For example, then Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney introduced two bills in 2000 (the Corporate Code of Conduct Act and the Truth Act of 2000). In April 2000, Representative Bernie Sanders introduced a resolution, Global Sustainable Development Resolution. Of course, given the ideological dominance of

(including salaries, bonuses, and stock options) and the meager wages of sweatshop workers. For example, in 1998, Millard Drexler of GAP earned $660 million, Paul Charron of Liz Claiborne received $7 million, and Nike's Phil Knight got $3 million (National Labor Committee 1999b:7). The heads of the 60 publicly traded apparel retailers make an average of $1.5 million a year (Appelbaum and Dreier 1999:74). By contrast, the hourly take-home pay of apparel workers in 1998 was 37 cents in Guatemala, 30 cents in Haiti, 28 cents in China, 17-37 cents in Romania, and $3-4 in the U.S. sweatshops, according to a pamphlet by the National Labor Committee (1999b:7).

They also point out that millions of dollars are often spent on advertising[61] and contracts with celebrities who wear logoed gear while workers making these clothes cannot even meet the basic needs of their families. In the Nike case, they spent $1.13 billion on advertising in 1998 (Sage 1999:209). Nike contracted with Michael Jordan for about $25 million per year (Schmit 1999) and with Tiger Woods for $100 million (five years) or $55,000 *a day*. According to a press release by the Thai Labor Campaign on November 14, 2000,[62] in order to earn $55,000, a Thai Nike worker would have to work for 38 years. A worker would need to work for 72,000 years to make $100 million.

Despite the tremendous odds (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:265-82), apparel sweatshop workers themselves often initiate organizing campaigns. In the United States,

---

"free trade," none of the measures have been passed. But, a number of U.S. municipalities, such as Durham, North Carolina, have passed some forms of anti-sweatshop procurement ordinances.

[61] See Cole and Hribar's "Celebrity Feminism: Nike Style" (1995) for an interesting analysis of how Nike's advertising to appeal to young women in the 1980s and early 1990s was shaped by political, economic, and cultural forces of that era, contrary to progressive images of Nike ads. Likewise, see Pintado-Vertner (2002) for an essay about how some apparel companies like Gap and Levi Strauss & Company are now targeting youths of color through the theme of hip-hop in their advertisements.

[62] This press release is available from the researcher.

they are usually with the help from indigenous, ethnic-based "workers' centers"[63] in their communities and with support from other groups (see Louie 2001:223-31; Tait 2000:209-46 for some U.S. examples).

As in the Nicaraguan Chentex case in 2000, anti-sweatshop campaigns in the Global North often begin in response to the requests of workers in apparel producing regions for consumers and citizens in the Global North to put pressure on companies or governments. Sk Nazma, president of the Bangladesh Workers Solidarity Center, for example, appealed to an American audience in November 2001 to pressure U.S. apparel companies that do business in Bangladesh to help respect workers' rights in Bangladesh:

> For us in Bangladesh, these jobs are critical because we don't have alternative employment…. Since our product is consumed by U.S. citizens, the U.S. people can have a great influence on the companies to help us gain our rights. Because of the global recession and after the attack on September 11, 700 to 1,000 garment factories have been shut down. Tens of thousands of workers are on the street and facing starvation. I again make an appeal to the student and labor and religious communities in the United States to please help us keep jobs in Bangladesh and support our struggle to gain respect for workers rights so that these workers can live as human beings.[64]

Sociologists Edna Bonacich and Richard Appelbaum (2000) observe the significance of the anti-sweatshop movement in tackling neoliberal globalization:

> [The anti-sweatshop movement] represents nothing less than an attack on the entire system of global, flexible production and the social inequality and suffering that it is creating. The movement asserts that this way of doing business, including contracting out and denying responsibility, moving production to around the world where workers

[63] The workers' centers refer to "independent groups where workers gather and organize themselves to carry out their fights and meet their needs" (Louie 2001:14).

[64] This testimony of Sk Nazma is available from the researcher. Unfortunately, I am unaware of any visible campaign for the Bangladesh workers. For more information on 1.8 million Bangladesh garment workers, visit the National Labor Committee website at www.nlcnet.org.

> are most oppressed and least able to defend themselves, pitting workers around the world one another in an effort to lower labor costs, and in general, the attack on the power of labor while businesses and their managers and professionals enrich themselves, is unacceptable (P. 297).

This way, the movement tries to "shift the venue" of controversy from the factory floor to consumers in public to transfer the ultimate responsibility of working conditions from direct employers or contractors to retailers and manufacturers (Keck and Sikkink 1998). This is a way to open up the mostly secretive operations of the corporate production process to public scrutiny and to make corporations accountable.

As indicated, mobilizations are often cross-border and transnational due to the nature of transnational process to produce and sell garments. By forging ties with worker and human rights groups in the apparel producing regions, this "transnational advocacy network"[65] (Keck and Sikkink 1998:10) mobilizes both sides of national borders to put pressures on wherever they are needed to bring about desired changes.[66]

Many labor unions in the Global North also pursue their self-interest by networking with workers and organizations in apparel producing regions to mitigate the effects of the "race to the bottom" and the erosion of their working conditions in the Global North.[67] Particularly under the leadership of John Sweeney, the president of the

---

[65] "Transnational advocacy network" refers to networking of actors across state borders for common goals and interests to change policies and norms of the state and international organizations, which are "bound together by shared values, a common discourse, and dense exchanges of information and services" (Keck and Sikkink 1998:2). They note that although this network is not new (e.g., international women's movement in the late 19th century and the early 20th century and the abolitionist movement in the 19th century), its extensiveness is qualitatively different in the last three decades in terms of numbers, size, speed, density, and complex network (Keck and Sikkink 1998:10).

[66] See Sage (1999) for the Nike transnational advocacy network.

[67] In the Cold War era, however, the U.S. organized labor contributed to the repression of leftist worker organizing in many parts of the world as a part of an anti-communist agenda. Some critics call this "trade union imperialism" (Armbruster-Sandoval 1999:110; see also Smithsimon 1999:72-74).

American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) since 1995, the American labor movement has emphasized organizing,[68] including corporate campaigns, rather than business unionism to "serve" its members just by getting good contracts without soliciting their inputs and participation. They often use more militant tactics and build coalitions with community groups, such as religious, neighborhood, student, immigrant, racial and ethnic, and women's groups, which are vital to the anti-sweatshop movement (Clawson and Clawson 1999; Manheim 2001:64; Turner, Katz, and Hurd 2001; Voos 2000; Voss and Sherman 2000).

Moreover, the anti-sweatshop movement has contributed to and been helped by the emerging "anti-globalization" or global justice movement, especially since the anti-World Trade Organization demonstration in Seattle in late 1999.[69] The sheer visibility of major demonstrations has raised awareness about the negative sides of the global economy among many ordinary people in the Global North.[70]

Some Effects of the Anti-Sweatshop Movement

Thanks partly to the movement and partly to the media, a large segment of consumers in many countries are now aware of the sweatshop issue. They even suggest a change in their buying habits. In the United States, for example, three-fourths of survey

[68] See Arnold (2001) for an AFL-CIO's effort to organize Cambodian workers.
[69] Needless to say, many protests in the Global South well predate Seattle. See, for example, Anderson, Cavanagh, and Lee (2000:111-13). Even in the Global North, protests began in the early 1980s (O'Brien et al. 2000).
[70] Results of these protests against neoliberal institutions and policies have been, however, limited at best. But neoliberal global institutions have increasingly recognized the demands of these movements over the last couple of decades. Many such proposals have been incorporated, such as "gender equity," micro-credit

respondents in a national survey of 1,000 American adults by Marymount University in 1999 said they would avoid retailers that sell sweatshop-made clothing. More than 86 percent of them responded that they would be willing to pay an additional dollar for a $20 item of clothing if guaranteed that it was not made in sweatshops (Fung, O'Rourke, and Sabel 2001), similar to the results in 1995 and 1996 (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:298). Moreover, in a 1999 survey of 25,000 individuals in 23 countries by Environics International, large minorities in all the countries felt that major corporations are responsible as social and ethical leaders in their businesses. In North America and Western Europe, larger percentages of those who were surveyed responded similarly (Fung et al. 2001).

Feeling the heat from the movement, a number of leading apparel companies in the United States have gradually shifted their rhetoric from "we are just a buyer of the clothing from our independent contractors" to "we take responsibility of working conditions and work with our contractors to make necessary improvements" by the mid-1990s.[71] Many of them have adopted voluntary codes of conduct or a set of standards about working conditions and human rights for their contractors' employees worldwide,

---

programs for poor women, and rhetoric of participation and sustainability (Kothari and Minogue 2002:6-7; O'Brien et al. 2000:64, 220-25). The underling framework is still based on neoclassical economic thinking.

[71] Of course, many others in the apparel industry have not shifted their rhetoric. Especially, the movement seems to have a limitation to influence on companies who do not really depend on their name-recognition or who just sell products or services to other companies, not to consumers in public. Also, leading companies in most other industries have not taken this shift. An example is Taco Bell. It purchases tomatoes from a company (via a broker) which employs mostly immigrant workers who earn less than the minimum wage in southwest Florida. Taco Bell says it is just a buyer of tomatoes from a broker who deals with tomatoes from the direct employers of the tomato pickers. Thus, Taco Bell says it does not get involved in a labor dispute between the employer and its employees. See, for example, Bacon (2002) or visit the website of the Coalition of Immokalee Workers (CIW) at www.ciw-online.org.

such as wages and hours, and health and safety.[72] Some critics, however, call this kind of response "the Starbucks solution" (Rothstein 1996) because codes such as those undertaken by Starbucks lack an independent enforcement mechanism, and seem designed to deflect public criticism of corporate indifference to the working conditions of their contractors.

The California State Department of Labor, for example, biannually surveys apparel firms in Los Angeles county as to compliance with federal and state labor laws. In 2000, only 44 percent of those who say they monitor their factories were in compliance, while 11 percent of those who say they do not monitor were in fact in compliance. The overall compliance percentage of 33 percent in 2000 was a decline from 39 percent in 1998 (Cleeland 2000).

Companies which self-monitor their own and/or contractors' factories most likely do so by their own employees or by hiring an auditing firm, such as PricewaterhouseCoopers, and often misleadingly call it "independent" monitoring. Critics charge that monitoring by employees is not reliable because they have an interest in not criticizing their employer who provides them with pay, promotion, and other benefits. They also criticize the fact that such monitoring is secretive in that monitors do not publicize detailed monitoring procedures and results. The locations of contractors are hidden. If companies claim there is no problem with their contractors, it is very difficult

[72] See Liubicic (1998:128-31) for samples of a variety of codes of conduct. Codes of conduct by private groups began much earlier than the 1990s. In 1977, for example, the Sullivan Principles were created for American corporations conducting business in South Africa in the 1970s and 1980s, as a part of the worldwide anti-Apartheid movement (Everett 1998:1133-34; Liubicic 1998:122-24). In the mid-1980s, the MacBride Principles were formulated for U.S. corporations that operate in Northern Ireland in order to

for anyone to locate where contractors are in many countries and find out how workers are actually treated.

PricewaterhouseCoopers, the largest auditing company and one hired by companies like Nike, performed more than 6,000 factory inspections a year. Dara O'Rourke, a professor at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a specialist of workplace law compliance, accompanied inspectors of PricewaterhouseCoopers at several factories in 2000 as an independent observer. In his report,[73] he criticized the inspections as spotty and missing many health, safety, and wage violations as well as violations of freedom of association and collective bargaining (Greenhouse 2000c; see also National Labor Committee 2000b; O'Rourke 1997; Roberts and Bernstein 2000 for other criticisms).[74]

One major effort to deal with sweatshops in the United States was called for by President Bill Clinton in 1996. It happened right after a major media exposé of a sweatshop in Honduras and its relationship with a celebrity, Kathie Lee Gifford, in the context of the growing anti-sweatshop movement in the United States. This taskforce, the Apparel Industry Partnership (AIP), was made up of some twenty organizations – about ten companies, some human rights organizations, and a few U.S. unions (Bonacich and Appelbaum 2000:242-44; Liubicic 1998:125-26).[75]

---

minimize discrimination against Catholic workers in this Protestant-dominant country (Everett 1998:1134-35; Liubicic 1998:124).

[73] It can be read or downloaded from http://www.mit.edu/dorourke/www/.

[74] Because of a series of intense criticisms and resulting diminished credibility, I heard that PricewaterhouseCoopers decided to cease inspection work.

[75] The companies were Liz Claiborne, Reebok, L.L. Bean, Nike, Patagonia, Phillips-Van Heusen, Nicole Miller, and Kathie Lee Gifford. The human rights groups included the National Consumer League, Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, International Labor Rights Fund, Lawyers Committee for

Their job was to come up with a program to deal with sweatshops. When the AIP published its Workplace Code of Conduct and the Principles of Monitoring in April 1997, critics charged its approval of low wages (no "living wage"), inhumane hours (60 hours a week, in contrast to the official norm of 40 hours in the United States), child labor (as young as 14 years old), no overtime pay, an inadequate top-down monitoring mechanism, inadequate enforceability of the code, and the use of misleading "No Sweat" labels on products (Sweatshop Watch 1997). Elaine Bernard, Director of Harvard's Trade Union Studies Program, called this seal a "good housekeeping seal of approval to a 'kinder, gentler sweatshop'" (quoted in Ross 1997b:294).

After a year and a half of further negotiations and disputes (Greenhouse 1998), the AIP grew into the Fair Labor Association (FLA) in November 1998 to enforce the code. Two unions (UNITE and the Retail Wholesale and Department Store Union) and the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility withdrew from the coalition because they felt the code and the enforcement mechanism were too weak and would serve as a public relations tool of participating corporations (see Howard 1998).

Several companies also dropped out from the organization because "the code of conduct and monitoring procedures were too strict and compliance would be too expensive" (Greenhouse 1999c). Michael Shellenberger, spokesperson for Global Exchange, a prominent human rights organization based in San Francisco, commented on the FLA: "This is a step backwards. These companies will be able to market their

---

Human Rights, and Business for Social Responsibility. The unions were Union of Needletrades, Industrial, and Textile Employees (UNITE) and the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union.

products as sweatshop-free – without actually making changes to sweatshop practices abroad" (quoted in Mandle 2000:96-97).

These developments notwithstanding, the anti-sweatshop movement has made some positive modest effects to concretely improve working conditions (Greenhouse 2000a; Thompson 2001b). An interesting development is that a company was recently set up in Los Angeles, in March 2002, to demonstrate that a for-profit company can treat its workers well while making a profit (Hightower 2002). The company, *team*X (www.sweatx.net), is a worker-owned co-op, and the workers are represented by UNITE. It claims to pay a living wage, starting at $8.50 an hour with good health care, a pension, and a share of profits through co-op ownership. No company executives will be paid more than eight times what the lowest-paid worker gets. Demand for this company's products seem to be high, but the effects on the apparel industry remain to be seen.

Nonetheless, the movement has made fairly limited impacts so far. Sweatshops continue to persist (e.g., Connor 2001). Even just changing the tide will take enormous organizing efforts and more political power while negotiating internal divisions and power dynamics (La Botz 2002; Smithsimon 1999; Williams 1999; see Smith 2001 about the Global Justice movement).

Chapter 2 – Students Organizing for Economic Justice in the 1990s and Beyond

"The most important thing that we need to remember is that our #1 ally is THE WORKERS. NO ONE COMES BEFORE THE WORKERS! …. Don't let anyone, no matter who they are or how powerful they might be (or think they are), mislead you from understanding that! Our #2 ally is OURSELVES, THE STUDENTS! If we can't rely on each other then who can we rely on?"[76]

- Alice (pseudonym), former Georgia State University USAS student

Growing U.S. Campus Activism for Economic Justice in the 1990s

[76] This quote is from "Students: Get Fired Up!" in the forward of *Sweat~Free Campus Campaign: Organizer's Manual* (United Students Against Sweatshops 1999).

Shifting the focus to college and university campuses in the United States, there has been a resurgence of interest in economic justice among college and university students in the latter half of the 1990s (Cooper 1999; Greenhouse 1999b).[77] John Sweeney, the AFL-CIO president, observed that "[s]tudents have always shown an ability to hold a mirror up to society and force it to face the truth about its flaws…. What is new is that today's students are organizing and mobilizing for *workers'* rights and on issues of economic justice" (quoted in Cooper 1999:11, emphasis original).

By 1997, for example, graduate students at several universities were attempting to organize a union (Featherstone 2001a:109).[78] The campaign to provide a "living wage" to low wage campus workers like janitors and custodians at several schools began to develop during this period.[79] Anti-corporate campaigns, anti-corporatization of

[77] For U.S. student activism in the 1980s and early 1990s, which one observer characterizes as a "small, localized (campus-based) grouping that emphasized issues of autonomy, identity, and the attendant concerns with direct democracy" (Kelly 2001:151), see Kelly (2001:127-53) and Rhoads (1997). In the early 1990s, for example, mostly African American students at Georgia State University protested for the creation of an African American Studies program. For a historical study of student activism around the world, see Boren (2001).

[78] Graduate student organizing began much earlier. Graduate students at the University of Wisconsin won the first union contract for teaching and research assistants in 1969. Since then, graduate students at 27 public universities have won bargaining rights. See Greenhouse (2001b) and Lafer (2001) for recent graduate students and adjunct professor organizing for unions. See also Krupat and Tanenbaum (2002) and Willis (2001) for labor organizing in the academy with a focus on New York University, whose graduate students just recently won the first union contract at a private university.

[79] To get an idea about the campus living wage campaign, see "Campus Living Wage Manual" (Garza and Reville 1999) and Neumann (2001). Students at Valdosta State University recently helped campus workers win a modest wage increase in June 2002 after a year of campaigning. Ultimately, however, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia determines the wages for its public employees. Moreover, this campus living wage campaign is part of the larger living wage campaign around the country. Its basic aim is to provide a "living wage" to government workers, workers of government contractors and of companies receiving substantial government subsidies. The campaign occurs at the municipal level where local citizens have the most power. Since the first living wage ordinance was passed in Baltimore in 1994, more than 60 municipalities around the country have done the same (see Merrifield 2000; Murray 2001; Pollin 1998). Many others, including Atlanta, are organizing campaigns by building a strong coalition of local groups and concerned citizens.

universities ("academic-industrial complex") campaigns,[80] and campus democracy campaigns began to be organized by such student groups as Student Alliance to Reform Corporations (STARC),[81] Students United for a Responsible Global Environment (SURGE), and 180/ Movement for Democracy and Education (180/MDE) in the late 1990s.[82] Students at individual campuses helping human rights groups soon found out about their universities' big contracts with companies like Nike and Reebok to supply school athletic gear (Benjamin 2000:241). In general, student activism seems to have reached a high level in recent years. For example, a record 46 percent of college freshmen participated in a public protest in the 1999-2000 school year, according to the UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute, which has been conducting the annual survey since 1966 (Meatto 2000).[83]

United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS)[84]

---

[80] Corporatization of universities involves privatization, corporate sponsorship of university activities, having exclusive contracts with corporations to provide products and services, using more graduate students and adjunct instructors to teach more classes while under-compensating them and degrading the quality of education, the "industrialization" of the academy (Kleinman and Vallas 2001), and their consequences in the lives of university community members. See also Poovey (2001) and White and Hauck (2000).

[81] They later renamed to Students Transforming and Resisting Corporations, still the same acronym, STARC.

[82] Their web-site addresses are www.starcalliance.org (STARC), www.corporations.org/democracy (180/MDE), and www.unc.edu/surge (SURGE). See also www.campusactivism.org for other progressive student organizations in the United States.

[83] See Meatto (2000) for an interesting "top 10" activist campus list of the year. As the list indicates, many other students are engaged in other progressive activism, such as anti-racism, feminism, queer, and environment (e.g., Student Environmental Action Coalition at www.seac.org). See also Featherstone (2000c) for the successful year-long "Not With Our Money" campaign at a number of college campuses beginning in April 2000. The campaign concerned the relation between a major school cafeteria company, Sodexho-Marriott, and a major private prison company, the Corrections Corporation of America.

[84] A good number of publications about USAS are now available (also see www.usasnet.org). For some sympathetic accounts, see Appelbaum and Dreier (1999), Benjamin (2000), Cooper (1999), Featherstone (2000a), Featherstone (2000b), Featherstone and Henwood (2001), Featherstone and United Students

In this section, I would like to briefly describe the trajectory of the United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS), the college student anti-sweatshop movement in the United States. I will discuss its origin, rationales, objectives, major actions, and related organizations (the Worker Rights Consortium and the Fair Labor Association) in the movement.

In 1996, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), began its annual Union Summer program for young people, particularly college students, to train them in labor organizing for several weeks during summer.[85] During the 1997 Union Summer, interns at UNITE created an organizing manual for a Sweat-Free Campus Campaign (UNITE interns 1997). The manual was distributed to a number of college students around the country by the end of the summer break to encourage them to launch campaigns on their campuses. The rationale was that our universities should not be associated with, let alone profit from, sweatshops by way of apparel with college logos sold at bookstores and worn by athletes.

College-logo apparel is the largest segment of collegiate licensing (typically about 80 percent of total sales) which collectively generates about $2.5 billion per year, according to the 1994 estimate by the Collegiate Licensing Company (CLC)(UNITE interns 1997:53). Most colleges and universities contract with a number of companies (usually hundreds), such as Nike, Gear for Sports, and Sara Lee Corporation (e.g.,

---

Against Sweatshops (2002), Greenhouse (1999b), Krupat (2002), and Woomer (2001). For a critique from a moderate progressive, see Issac (2001) and a response by Featherstone (2001a). For some critiques from neoliberal views, see Mandle (2000) and Sneider (2000). For an ultra-left critique, see Grant-Friedman and Tanniru (2000). For a very intriguing account on Nike's response to USAS's protests, see Emerson (2001).

Champion), which in turn subcontract their work around the world to manufacture licensed products like a T-shirt or a cap with school trademarks (e.g., names, logos, and images). In return, colleges and universities receive typically seven to eight percent of retail sales of such licensed products as royalties. The University of Michigan and Duke University, for example, earned $5.7 million and $500,000 in 1998, respectively (Greenhouse 1999b).

Recognizing colleges and universities as cultural and economic entities, students believed that they had an opportunity to change the situation:

> [T]hese companies rely on large buyers like colleges and universities not only for their value as customers but for the prestige and publicity gained by associating with them. Colleges and universities possess a cultural and moral force as institutions of higher learning. The Sweat-Free Campus Campaign aims to use this force as well as the economic influence of universities as leverage in the fight to end sweatshop abuse. If we make college and university administrations demand their apparel contractors run clean, sweatshop-free operations, we will have a considerable effect on those companies and the industry as a whole (UNITE interns 1997:1).

Student activists appealed to the school pride of the student body that their supposedly highly moral colleges and universities were tied to exploitation, and that their clothing with their school logos may have been made by young women toiling for long hours for starvation wages and abused by management. From a slightly different perspective, school pride can be interpreted in terms of "consumption." As a USAS student commented, "we can think of the university itself as a brand, a logo, that students consume" (Featherstone and United Students Against Sweatshops 2002:30). This may

---

[85] John Sweeney, President of AFL-CIO, set aside $3 million for this paid internship to recruit a new and younger generation of labor organizers. Thousands of young people have been through the program since

have especially been the case for more reputable schools where students more likely strongly identified with their institutions.

The sweat-free campus campaign started on about 20 campuses across the country in the fall of 1997 (see Appendix II for the basic timeline of the college student anti-sweatshop movement in the United States). The initial goals were to have school administrations adopt a code of conduct for their licensees, including provisions for full public disclosure of locations of licensees' contractors and for effective enforcement of the code (UNITE interns 1997). A full public disclosure of factory locations was critical in the industry where retailers and manufacturers outsource orders to tens of thousands of factories around the world because it is very hard to trace where a particular garment was made and to check on working conditions. It was a way to shed a bright light on a secretive global apparel production process.

In February 1998, a watershed event occurred when Duke University became the first university to adopt a code of conduct.[86] The standards included the right to organize and collective bargaining, public disclosure of cities where factories locate (not addresses of factories), no child labor, minimum wage or industrial prevailing wage, overtime, no forced labor, and periodic announced and unannounced visits for monitoring. At most other schools, despite months of negotiations and widespread campus support, administrations rejected several code provisions that were deemed crucial, such as a

---

then.

[86] Alexis Herman, then U.S. Secretary of Labor, applauded Duke University right after it adopted this code in a press release: "[n]o matter what the outcome on the college basketball courts during March madness, one thing is for sure…in my book, Duke University is the national slam-dunk champ in the fight against sweatshop labor" (U.S. Department of Labor 1998). This press release is available from the researcher.

living wage, public disclosure of factory locations, explicit language about women's rights, and a serious monitoring plan.[87]

A "living wage" has been considered especially important in the anti-sweatshop movement, despite the lack of clear, agreed-upon definition (see Connor et al. 1999 for the case of El Salvador). This is because legal minimum wages are most likely not enough to meet even the basic needs of the family. A "living wage" can be defined as "the take-home pay one adult person must earn during a legal work week to allow an average-sized family to meet its basic needs with dignity and save a certain portion for long-term planning and emergencies. Basic needs include food, housing, education, childcare, health care, clothing, energy, water, and transportation" (Connor et al. 1999). Proponents argue that its benefits far outweigh its potential negative impact. For example, it would reduce turnover rates, absenteeism, and training costs because workers would be more committed to their jobs and enjoy higher morale. It would also reduce child labor because children would not need to earn extra money to support their family any longer. It would benefit the local economy because workers would have money to spend for their necessities. Firms would enhance their reputation for the good practice of paying a living wage. Moreover, a wage increase would have a relatively small impact on consumers even if retailers relegate all the increased labor costs to consumers because the original wages are so small in proportion (i.e., less than one to six percent of retail prices). The effects of U.S. living wage ordinances suggest that job losses may not be substantial (Featherstone and Henwood 2001), particularly if backed up with an effective

[87] Duke's code did not have any of these provisions. Perhaps that was partly why it was so well accepted by

enforcement mechanism of codes. That is in part because labor costs are just one among several factors that shape investment decisions.

Meanwhile, the Collegiate Licensing Company (CLC), which carries out day-to-day job of licensing on behalf of some 170 contracting colleges and universities, adopted a uniform code of conduct in January 1999 for all the licensees of the CLC schools without student input and without language about important provisions, such as a living wage, public disclosure, and women's rights.[88] In the early spring of 1999, the Fair Labor Association (FLA), which the USAS students criticized, began to court colleges and universities to join.[89] By March, dozens of schools had joined the FLA without students' knowledge.[90]

Student activists also felt that there was little campus democracy because, irrespective of the degree of campus support they had, administrators controlled the process of policy making, including adoption of anti-sweatshop codes. In this context, activists at a number of campuses felt it was high time to engage in more aggressive actions to show student power. As a result, a series of sit-ins took place at six schools in

---

many quarters.

[88] Provisions in the code include legal compliance in countries of manufacture, minimum or local industry prevailing wage, the right of freedom of association and collective bargaining, and prohibition of child labor, forced labor, harassment and abuses, and discrimination based on gender, race, religion, sexual orientation, political opinion, disability, etc. The overtime compensation is at least equal to workers' regular hourly wages, in contrast to the norm of 1.5 times more in the United States. The regular working hour is set at 48 hours, plus 12 hours overtime (at least one day off every week), "except in extraordinary business circumstances." The code is available at www.clc.com.

[89] As of March 6, 2002, 170 colleges and universities were part of the FLA.

[90] USAS and many other critics of the FLA believe that the FLA began to invite colleges and universities to join them because they felt they lost legitimacy as a credible anti-sweatshop organization when a few human rights groups on board withdrew in late 1998. Thus, the FLA tried to regain its legitimacy by including colleges and universities which have a high prestige in society. Many colleges and universities might have felt that they could deflect students' demands to do something about sweatshops by joining the FLA, which had backing from the White House.

the spring of 1999.[91] They all won partial or full victories around their demands for a living wage, full public disclosure, women's rights, and/or a promise not to join the FLA.

Many other campus anti-sweatshop groups participated in solidarity actions with the sit-ins while demanding similar provisions at their own campuses. They called and e-mailed administrators where sit-ins were taking place to show that they supported the students occupying administrative offices, and that they were closely watching the situation. The sit-ins were covered by some major media (e.g., Appea 1999; Greenhouse 1999a; Greenhouse 1999b), and some groups at other schools won code provisions without resorting to confrontational actions. As a USAS activist recalled, "[a]s a result of the snowball effect, some campuses got significant concessions from their universities without even having a sit-in" (Benjamin 2000:248). Thus, it appeared that the fear of a sit-in at their own schools induced administrators at a number of colleges and universities to choose "to avert bad publicity through graceful capitulation" (Featherstone 2000a:14). To put it differently, accepting the demands of USAS groups became the self-interest of these administrators because not doing so would be more costly.

Another wave of sit-ins came one year later. This time, the goal was to compel colleges and universities to join an organization, the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC). It was created in October 1999 by USAS with substantial input from other human rights organizations, experts, and labor representatives in the apparel producing regions.[92] It

[91] They were Duke University (started on 1/29), Georgetown University (2/5), University of Wisconsin at Madison (2/8), University of Michigan at Ann Arbor (3/17), University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (4/21), and University of Arizona (4/22), where the sit-in lasted over 10 days. No arrests were made at any of these schools.

[92] Especially since the Executive Director was hired in the late 2000, however, the WRC has tried to establish itself as a credible, fair, and objective organization, by distinguishing itself from USAS and not

was set up to enforce codes of conduct that were adopted by participating colleges and universities. This was the USAS students' answer to the question, "then what?" posed by administrators with whom they were in negotiation. Now, USAS had an alternative when its members criticized the FLA.

The WRC is based on three key principles. First, it forces out information to public scrutiny. The assumption was that sweatshops proliferate when they operate secretively. All licensees of the WRC participating colleges and universities are required to publicly disclose locations of their contractors making collegiate apparel. This enables worker-allied groups in apparel producing regions to find out factory locations and check on working conditions when necessary. This transparency gives the licensees an incentive to comply with codes even if they know worker-allied groups or the WRC cannot regularly check on working conditions at all factories. Yet the full public disclosure creates a potential for an investigation and intervention at any moment in historically secretive apparel production process. WRC reports on code violation allegations are also posted on the WRC website for the public interest.

Second, the WRC verifies code violation allegations as they are filed. It is nearly impossible to investigate tens of thousands of factories around the world even every year. Factory locations may change in the course of the year according to work orders from licensees and manufacturers. The WRC does not approve "good" companies or "good" factories because it cannot guarantee compliance with codes of conduct under this flexible contracting system. All investigations are done unannounced in close

---

publicly criticizing the FLA. For more information on the WRC, visit their website at

coordination with credible local non-governmental organizations that know local conditions best and are likely to have the trust of workers. All interviews are conducted off-site and away from managers and supervisors to create a safe environment for workers to tell their stories honestly.

Third, the WRC pro-actively investigates countries and regions that likely suppress workers' rights, and factories of licensees that have a history of violations. This is a check to the verification of code violation allegations because it may be that many violations are simply not filed with the WRC due to intimidation and threats against workers. Once violations are confirmed, moreover, licensees are expected to take responsibility by using their power to improve working conditions, not to "cut and run."

The WRC believes that the implementation of these principles will create a space for workers to organize for improved working conditions and more fundamentally for self-determination. The key to this mechanism are USAS activists at colleges and universities participating in the WRC program, because they can put pressure on their administrations to insure licensees' compliance with the WRC.

The WRC's Governing Board, the decision-making body, gives five seats to the WRC Advisory Board (experts and NGOs), five seats to participating colleges and universities, five seats to USAS, and the WRC Executive Director. Unlike the FLA, it does not include corporations on its board because the WRC believes it is wiser to exclude entities that have strong interests against the ultimate objectives of the WRC. The WRC, however, tries to maintain a dialogue with corporations to gain their cooperation.

---

www.workersrights.org.

Progressive NGO critics and USAS activists believe that despite gradual improvement over the last few years,[93] the FLA is still controlled by corporations, and that it may cover up sweatshops (see Appendix III for the comparison between the WRC and the FLA; see also Appelbaum and Bonacich 2000 to support the WRC; Athreya 2000 to defend the FLA; Gourevitch 2001; Greenhouse 1999c).[94] The FLA permitted companies to conceal the locations of their contracting factories,[95] and its own monitoring reports are kept secret, only to be made available to the public in summary form once a year after a review of companies.[96] Companies were able to submit a list of factories to be monitored,[97] and they can have other business ties with their FLA-accredited monitors,[98] which used to include private accounting firms like PricewaterhouseCooper. This "independent" monitoring used to allow announced visits.[99] It monitors only 5 to 15 percent per year of applicable contracting factories, but companies can get a "FLA" seal on their products if they pass the monitoring test. In addition, interviews with workers can be done inside factories where the presence of managers and supervisors can influence testimony.

---

[93] The FLA has gradually improved significantly over the last three years, primarily due to the power of vocal critics like USAS. For more information on the FLA, visit www.fairlabor.org.

[94] Other monitoring organizations were also created in the late 1990s, such as Worldwide Responsible Apparel Production by the American Apparel Manufacturers Association, and Social Accountability 8000 by the Council on Economic Priorities Accreditation Agency. Both have been criticized as inadequate, but they have been much less visible, compared to the FLA and the WRC, in the sweatshop debate.

[95] Later, locations of factories that make only college and university apparel became disclosed. Locations of factories making other apparel have not yet been required to be public.

[96] In April 2002, among some major changes, the FLA decided that a monitoring report of each factory will be posted on the FLA web, though without listing specific factory locations.

[97] Now, the FLA Executive Director decides which factories to be monitored

[98] Companies can still have some business with monitors up to $100,000 excluding financial auditing or less than 25 percent of annual revenues of monitors.

[99] Only unannounced visits are now permitted.

A student activist at the University of Arizona criticized the FLA this way in a press release in November 2000 posted on the USAS national general listserv:

> The FLA is not only flawed – it is contrary to the campaign against sweatshops…. It keeps information secret, allows apparel companies to choose their own monitors, and bolsters corporate power. It does nothing to empower sweatshop workers.[100]

Another University of Arizona student added in the same press release that it "allows corporations to police themselves…. It is a corporate fig-leaf, a smokescreen."

In the FLA, moreover, some 150 participating colleges and universities were given only one out of fourteen seats on the FLA Executive Board where major decisions are made.[101] USAS also believe that corporations effectively control the decision-making process of the FLA because of the "super-majority votes." "Super majority votes" require two-thirds of corporations (and NGOs) on the FLA Executive Board to vote "yes" to change some important policies like the FLA code and its monitoring principles. USAS students concluded that the voices of their schools, and thus themselves, would not be heard, and that improvement within the FLA would not be forthcoming. For these reasons, USAS groups at many FLA-affiliated schools pressured their schools to withdraw from the association.[102] Otherwise, they felt that their universities would be lending legitimacy to this flawed organization, as they sometimes wrote "FLAw" in their e-mail exchanges. Hence, USAS students at a number of schools decided to have sit-ins.

---

[100] This November 9, 2000 e-mail is available from the researcher.
[101] The number of seats for the participating colleges and universities was later increased to three.
[102] This issue of withdrawal from the FLA has been much less discussed soon afterwards perhaps because of the amount of energy of students it took to realize it at a few schools, or/and perhaps because the FLA was making some improvement.

Starting at University of Pennsylvania, students at about ten schools[103] occupied their administration buildings for days in the spring of 2000, demanding that their schools join the WRC and/or withdraw from the FLA.[104] Many other schools simultaneously held solidarity actions, including hunger strikes at Purdue University (eleven days) and Loyola University at Chicago (five days), and a tent city at Yale University. By late April, 47 schools had joined the WRC.

With schools continuing to join the WRC (about 100 by May 2002), USAS groups needed to figure out how to sustain the movement once they had attained their major goal of affiliating their schools with the WRC and adopting codes of conduct. In the meantime, many USAS activists began to realize that sweatshops can be more broadly interpreted to include other workplace exploitation, such as violations of workers' rights in agriculture, in prisons, and even on campuses. Such workplace exploitation not just occurs in the Global South, but also in the Global North and towns and cities where these students attend schools. As a response, they strategically created Principles of Unity[105] in the summer of 2000 that attempt to unite all the campus anti-sweatshop groups and move forward as United Students Against Sweatshops.[106] I will quote them in length since they are now the basic visions of USAS:

---

[103] They included University of Pennsylvania, University of Michigan, University of Wisconsin at Madison, University of Oregon, University of Kentucky, University of Iowa, State University of New York at Albany, Tulane University, University of Toronto, and MaCalester College.

[104] This time, however, many students were arrested at several schools. At Madison, for example, over 50 people were arrested (Evangelauf 2000).

[105] The Principles of Unity can be found at the USAS website at www.usasnet.org.

[106] Each campus decides whether they formally affiliate with USAS. As of summer 2002, there were 111 college and university affiliates and 8 high school affiliates. The GSU group affiliated with USAS soon after this call for a formal affiliation.

...[W]e consider all struggles against the systematic problems of the global economy to be directly or by analogy a struggle against sweatshops. Whether a campus group focuses its energies on the apparel industry or on another form of sweatshop[,] agreement with the principles below will be used as the sole requisite for working under the name of United Students Against Sweatshops.

1. We work in solidarity with working people's struggles. In order to best accomplish this and in recognition of the interconnection between local and global struggles, we strive to build relationships with other progressive movements and cooperate in coalition with other groups struggling for justice within all communities [–] campus, local, regional, and international.

2. We struggle against racism, sexism, homophobia, classism, and other forms of oppression within our society, within our organizations, and within ourselves. Not only are we collectively confronting these prejudices as inherent defects of the global economy which creates sweatshops, but we also recognize the need for individuals to confront the prejudices they have internalized as the result of living and learning in a flawed and oppressive society.

3. We are working in coalition to build a grassroots student movement that challenges corporate power and that fights for economic justice. This coalition is loosely defined, thus we strive to act in coordination with one another to mobilize resources and build a national network while also reserving the autonomy of individuals and campuses. We do not impose a single ideological position, practice, or approach; rather, we aim to support one another in a spirit of respect for difference, shared purpose, and hope.

4. We strive to act democratically. With the understanding that we live and learn in a state of imperfect government, we attempt to achieve truer democracy in making decisions which affect our collective work. Furthermore, we strive to empower one another as individuals and as a collective through trust, patience, and an open spirit.

The power of these principles to unify as United Students Against Sweatshops ultimately rests with the individual. Self-evaluation and personal responsibility are critical to the effectiveness of our work we all must continue to struggle as individuals in order to struggle in concert, thus we strive for compassion and support for one another as we continue this endeavor together.

Many USAS affiliates often work with local unions and community groups to organize events and campaigns for economic justice, such as campaigns for a living wage or organizing drive for campus workers. This does not mean, however, that they no longer engage in "traditional" transnational anti-sweatshop work. Active student pressure is necessary to make sure the codes of conduct are enforced at each school through the WRC, whether violations occur in New York or Nicaragua. The International Solidarity Committee in USAS coordinates some transnational solidarity actions for USAS. Some students go overseas to make contact with workers and worker-allied groups and to research working conditions. Today, we have student anti-sweatshop campaigns in a number of countries, including Canada, Australia, Britain, Germany, and Spain.

Chapter 3 – The Anti-Sweatshop Campaign at Georgia State University

The Emergence of the Campaign

In order to provide a context for the emergence of the GSU campaign, it is necessary to briefly discuss one group in Atlanta, the Atlanta Labor Solidarity Network (LSN), and the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia Institute of Technology (Tech, hereafter). I will then briefly chronicle some early efforts of Georgia State anti-sweatshop activism.

The Atlanta Labor Solidarity Network (LSN) was formed in late 1996 by a number of progressive community labor activists – students, academics, unionists, and other citizens, to create a space for an autonomous grassroots labor activism. The LSN organized forums, participated in rallies and protests, regularly published newsletters,[107] and tried to create chapters at local college campuses. They also worked closely with the Atlanta Labor Council, AFL-CIO, which paid for the publishing cost of the newsletters, and some affiliated unions like the southern regional office of UNITE. The main figures in the LSN group were two graduate students at Tech, who tried to launch an anti-sweatshop campaign there in February 1998,[108] among a few other projects. They maintained an e-mail listserv and monthly meetings to exchange ideas about the campaign with other LSN students and members.

Soon, Labor Education and Action Project (LEAP) was formed at Georgia State University as a chapter. It has been registered as the only explicitly labor- and economic justice-themed student chartered organization at Georgia State University (besides the International Socialist Organization at GSU which perhaps began its activities either in late 1999 or early 2000). Two students, Alice and Peter (pseudonyms), led the GSU

[107] At the peak period (2000-2001), the LSN had about 340 subscribers.

[108] As early as October 1997, one of these Tech students exchanged information about the anti-sweatshop campaign with the main figure of the Duke campaign. In October and December of 1997, the LSN participated in the protest at Lord & Taylor organized by the local UNITE. At Tech, they formed a student coalition with Women's Student Union, Young Democrats, Gay and Lesbian Alliance, Empty the Shelters, and Amnesty International, and sent a letter to President, mass-emailed to the President, talked to the Tech licensing officials, and attempted to pass a resolution in support of their campaign in the Tech Student Government Association. According to one of the two main Tech LSN activists, they "found it very difficult to attract a critical mass of undergraduates to get a code-of-conduct campaign going at Georgia Tech, and we were getting frustrated about doing so much work ourselves [most were graduate students]. The culture of the place was such that when we set up an info table[,] most people would walk by without even looking at us." So, they soon shifted their focus and did other activities in the hope that they could

group. Alice had completed the AFL-CIO's 1997 Union Summer program. She also had attended the first national gathering of college student anti-sweatshop activists in New York in the summer of 1998 to form United Students Against Sweatshops, and then visited three Central American countries in that summer as a part of a student anti-sweatshop delegation[109] which was organized by the National Labor Committee. By the fall of 1998, they decided to start an anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University (see Appendix II for the basic timeline of the GSU campaign).[110]

However, Peter soon dropped out of school, and Alice seemed to not have enough time to build a campaign on campus. That was because she was a full-time undergraduate student who was working part-time for a union and was catching up with and involved in the development of the growing national anti-sweatshop campaign at that time.[111] For the GSU campaign, she did preliminary research on who our licensees are, and she made a phone call to the GSU athletic department.

---

build the group and supporters, and they could eventually launch a successful anti-sweatshop campaign at Tech.

[109] The delegation consisted of eight students from across the country. They produced a 32-page report, "Behind Closed Doors: The Workers Who Make Our Clothes," that described their experience of visiting sweatshops and meeting with workers. Alice wrote one segment which was titled, "Tour of Garbage Dump." This was her observation of a big garbage landfill in Nicaragua where she found not only discarded clothing labels like Arizona for J.C. Penny, but also some families, including children scavenging for valuables like clothing and food for themselves. Moreover, Alice felt that the face-to-face meeting with the student activists in New York in the summer of 1998 to form United Students Against Sweatshops right before this delegation "kind of sealed the deal that this was the campaign I needed to be on."

[110] They helped the local Guess? campaign by the local UNITE and helped organize a forum on globalization at Tech with the Tech LSN in October 1998.

[111] But, she helped form a USAS chapter at University of Georgia in the fall of 1999. On behalf of USAS, she spoke about the student anti-sweatshop campaign at the American Radical Gathering conference in Athens, Georgia in September 1999. This hooked in one University of Georgia (UGA) activist who was leading an environmental group on campus. Alice then set up an e-mail listserv for Georgia students interested in the anti-sweatshop campaign. The UGA campaign started strong in the fall of 1999, but the administration decided to join the Fair Labor Association in the spring of 2000 without consulting the students. They had some other actions afterwards, but the campaign seemed to be over after key activists graduated in spring 2000.

I became aware of the issue of sweatshops at the globalization forum organized by the LSN in October 1998. There, I met Alice and Peter for the first time and heard about their plan for the anti-sweatshop campaign at GSU. I soon began to subscribe to the national e-mail listserv of United Students Against Sweatshops where I received as many as 30 or even 50 messages per day discussing strategies and tactics and sharing other information about the campaign and sweatshops.

While recognizing the importance of the sweatshop issue, I took over the main tasks of the LSN (e-mail listserv maintenance, newsletters, and organizing some events) and participated in some other events[112] rather than taking a direct part in the early anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University.

In the fall semester of 1999, I began to set up a table to promote labor and economic justice in general under the name of LEAP in the Library Plaza, one of the few places on the GSU campus where chartered student organizations can reserve a table to exhibit their materials. At this table, I gradually came to know a number of socially conscious, progressive students, although few of them formerly joined the LSN or LEAP.

In November 1999, the first southern USAS regional conference was held at University of Georgia to which about 30 students from eight campuses showed up (Alice and I went from Georgia State University).[113] After the conference, we set up a southern

---

[112] The main campaign I actively participated from the spring of 1999 to the spring of 2000 was about the health care crisis at Grady Memorial Hospital in downtown Atlanta.

[113] Those eight campuses were University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Duke University, University of Tennessee at Knoxville, University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa, University of South Carolina at Columbia, New School in Florida, University of Georgia, and Georgia State University. Alice, right after organizing this successful first conference in the South, wrote to the conference participants and to the national USAS e-mail listserv that "…. I've said it before, and I'll say it again. It's this type of work that sets the fires. We [USAS], as an organization, started as a few small fires that were easy to be ignored. The wildfires that

regional e-mail listserv for discussions and communication. We also organized several other off-campus activities.[114]

Into the Campaign[115]

After Alice took her full-time organizing job at the Association of Flight Attendants (AFA), AFL-CIO while still taking some classes at GSU, it became apparent that she did not have time for the USAS activism other than following it on e-mail listservs she subscribed to. In this vacuum, already deep into the cause of economic justice and the student anti-sweatshop movement, I decided to take over her position and put more energy into carrying out an anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University (GSU).

In the following section, I will present a more analytical and thematic treatment of this still on-going GSU campaign from early 2000 to May 2002. After a description of the relationship between Georgia State University and apparel sweatshops, I will highlight some dimensions of the campaign as a social movement. These dimensions are goals, rationales, strategies, tactics, mobilizing structures, ideology and framing,

---

have been sparked over the past year and a half cannot be ignored now. It's easy to ignore a dozen but hard to ignore a couple of hundred. Keep up the hard work and level of commitment. All of you set me on fire!!"

[114] In December 1999, Alice and I leafleted at the Rage Against the Machine concert inside the Philips Arena in downtown Atlanta with three University of Georgia activists to spread the word about the campaign in the hope that some would get involved. About ten students from University of Georgia, University of Tennessee at Knoxville, Duke University, and Georgia State University carried GAP anti-sweat posters and marched in the Martin Luther King, Jr. march in January 2000. A few weeks later in February, Alice spoke about her delegation experience to three Central American countries in 1998 at a global economy public forum, and later, seven or eight of us leafleted about the GAP's use of sweatshop labor in Saipan (a U.S. territory in the Pacific Ocean) in front of the Five Points MARTA station after we were ousted from the Underground Atlanta nearby where a GAP store was located.

[115] The term, "campaign," seems more appropriate than "movement" for the anti-sweatshop activities at Georgia State University because the activities have so far been limited in size and intensity.

collective identities, and political opportunity structures. Although they are analytically distinct, they interacted to produce the campaign. I will then identify and assess some outcomes of the campaign, and explore some possible reasons why the campaign at GSU has not so far been successful in attaining its goals. Exploring reasons for weakness and failure is as important as understanding reasons for strength and success in the study of social movements.

Georgia State University and Sweatshops

As at many other colleges and universities around the country, Georgia State University licenses its trademarks (i.e., the logo, the name, and images, such as Panther) to over 100 companies, such as Nike, Gear for Sports, and MV Sport.[116] These licensees produce merchandise with the GSU trademarks, such as caps, T-shirts, cups, notebooks, and accessories. These are sold in three bookstores in and around the university,[117] and other apparel with the GSU trademarks are worn by some GSU staff like custodians, and by GSU athletes.[118]

The GSU Trademark Licensing Committee, made up of 11 people from different branches of Georgia State University, meets from time to time to, among other tasks,

[116] As of January 2002.
[117] They are the Georgia Bookstore at the corner of Courtland St. and Edgewood Ave., the Georgia State University bookstore operated by Follett in the University Center on campus, and the Park Place bookstore at the corner of Park Place Ave. and Decatur St. My understanding is that they are owned individually and operated independently.
[118] Technically, custodians' and janitors' clothing as well as athletic gear seem to go through different channels to produce them. According to the GSU Legal Advisors, a company called Aramark manufacturers uniforms for GSU janitors and groundkeepers, and the athletic department deals with athletic uniform contracts separate from the GSU Trademark Licensing Committee that deals with licensed merchandise sold in the bookstores. But I think it is possible that they can be included under the WRC (or for that matter, the FLA) jurisdiction.

oversee designs of GSU licensed products.[119] The day-to-day operation of licensing work, however, is coordinated by the Collegiate Licensing Company (CLC), which performs this work for more than 170 colleges and universities in the United States.[120] The licensees usually contract out their work to manufacturers in a number of countries. On the labels of garments sold in the bookstores, we can find country names like Mexico, Bangladesh, and China, in addition to the United States.

Each year, Georgia State University receives 7.5 percent[121] of the retail sales of the licensed merchandise as royalties. This means that GSU earned just over $12,000 in Fiscal Year 1998, nearly $14,000 in FY 1999, and almost $16,000 in FY 2000.[122]

The anti-sweatshop campaign, however, only deals with apparel among the many kinds of GSU licensed merchandise and services procured or contracted to by the university. This limitation stems from the fact that the capacity of the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC) is limited, and the apparel industry is responsible to some of the worst abuse of workers' rights worldwide. In other words, the WRC decided to concentrate on the notorious U.S. apparel industry which contracts with tens of thousands of factories around the world because it is still a fledging organization with a small number of staff and a relatively small number of contacts with worker-allied groups around the world. It would be virtually meaningless or even dangerous if GSU were to adopt a code of conduct for all companies that deal with GSU, without adequate means of

[119] According to one of the GSU Legal Advisors who is on this committee.
[120] A similar go-between entity is The Licensing Resource Group. They contract with a smaller number of schools than the CLC. Many other colleges and universities, moreover, handle this licensing task by themselves.
[121] The figure comes from the Collegiate Licensing Company website at www.clc.com.
[122] The figures were obtained from one of the GSU Legal Advisors.

enforcement. It can be dangerous because those companies can publicly claim they adhere to such a socially conscious code without actually doing anything.

How do we know then if garments with the GSU logo are made in sweatshops? No direct, clear evidence is currently available. So we put a question mark in our flyer – "Is GSU Clothing Made in Sweatshops?" But the following examples suggest a close connection between GSU and sweatshops.

On one occasion, I found that the Georgia Bookstore was selling some Jones & Mitchell parkas with the GSU logo made in Burma (or Myanmar). Burma, located in southeastern Asia, has been under a military dictatorship since 1988. The country is known for its brutal violations of human rights and suppression of democracy, such as forced labor, torture, rapes, and prohibitions of free speech and the right to organize. Burmese garment workers are reported to earn as low as four cents per hour (National Labor Committee 2000a). U.S. President Bill Clinton prohibited new investments in, though not all trade with, Burma in 1997,[123] and the International Labor Organization (a UN agency) suspended Burma's voting rights as a form of sanction in 2000. As the National Labor Committee (2000a, 2001) reported, however, most foreign garment manufacturers operating in Burma are in joint venture with the government, and thus a part of the profits directly supports the dictatorship. This means, for one thing, that there is a good probability that the parkas with the GSU logo were made in sweatshops.

[123] Despite this, the apparel imports from Burma has been increasing significantly. Between 1995 and 1999, it went up 272 percent (National Labor Committee 2000a). The U.S. government apparently set either no quotas or high quotas of apparel import such that U.S. companies can import from Burma in increasing numbers (National Labor Committee 2001).

I also found several baseball caps with the GSU logo by New Era Cap Co. in the Georgia Bookstore. New Era has contracts with over 100 colleges and universities across the country and has an exclusive contract with Major League Baseball (MLB) to produce caps by paying $80 million to MLB (Greenhouse 2001c). The company, however, has been charged with numerous health, safety, and labor law violations by the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the National Labor Relations Board. Referring to the WRC report on New Era at its Derby plant in New York,[124] *the New York Times* reported:

> In surveying 140 New Era workers, the consortium found that physicians had diagnosed work-related musculoskeletal disorders in 46 percent of the workers, and that 21 percent had either had surgery for such disorders or been told it was necessary. The investigators said the injuries resulted largely from tasks repeated thousands of times a day, like sewing seams, attaching visors and embroidering team logos – all of which places strains on the workers' wrists, thumbs, elbows, and necks (Greenhouse 2001c).

One worker wore "cumbersome 12-inch splints on both arms and [said] her tendinitis is so bad that she cannot open a pop-top can or lift her 18-month-old granddaughter" (Greenhouse 2001c). Workers reported that for many years, when they complained about the pains, they were given aspirin and anti-inflammatories and often told to go back to the machine and work through the pain. But the safety committees set up by the factory in 1999 significantly reduced the number of reported injuries (Greenhouse 2001c).

But a few hundred workers at this only unionized factory in Derby, New York went on strike in July 2001 after the company proposed to cut workers' wages by $4 per hour, on average, unless the workers significantly speed up production, and to shift more

[124] The WRC reports on the New Era Derby factory can be accessed at www.workersrights.org.

work to non-unionized factories in Alabama and Bangladesh. For about a year, the factory attracted a considerable attention from USAS for its violations of the codes of the WRC participating schools which had contracts with New Era.[125]

In sum, there is a good probability that Georgia State University sells trademarked apparel made in sweatshops. It seemed reasonable to assume that a considerable amount of the GSU apparel is produced under inhumane working conditions, given the structure of the apparel industry. It follows that the school receives a significant amount of royalty money from the sales of the clothing. This sounded a problem for us.

Campaign Goals

Organizers and participants usually set goals to be attained in a particular campaign in order to give strategic direction and shape to the movement. Goals may change, however, in the face of changing circumstances or through negotiations among participants.

The GSU campaign has been strongly influenced by the larger USAS anti-sweatshop campaign, despite the USAS norm and practice of autonomy of each campus group. Our goals have been just one such area. One way to account for this influence is to see the process of diffusion between transmitters and adopters within movements (Soule 1997, 1999).

Slogans, songs, tactics, and ideas about organizational forms are examples of practices that can be diffused. This is done in two ways. One is through "direct or

[125] The situation was finally, but tentatively resolved in the late June 2002 when the workers approved the

relational ties" between people, and the other is "indirect or cultural linkages" (Soule 1997:860-61). In "indirect or cultural linkages," adopters imitate tactics and ideas from a transmitter without any direct and personal contact, such as phone conversations and meetings. "Indirect or cultural linkages" include learning an idea through watching TV, listening to radio, or reading a magazine article. This is particularly likely if an adopter is highly identified with a transmitter.

From her case study of the diffusion of the tactic of shantytown building on college campuses during the anti-Apartheid movement in the United States, sociologist Sarah Soule (1999) also argues that the tactic, despite its apparent ineffectiveness,[126] was adopted at many campuses because it was *perceived* as effective by the student activists whose worldview about South Africa resonated with the representations of the shantytowns and whose existing tactical repertoire permitted them to construct shantytowns.

Our GSU campaign has been connected with the larger USAS movement through a number of ways. "Direct relational ties" in our campaign include going to national and regional conferences, making some phone conversations, e-mailing personally each other, and meeting directly with other activists.[127] "Indirect or cultural ties" might include reading media coverage of USAS activities and e-mails posted on a number of USAS e-mail listservs (both national and regional levels), and taking ideas from the 140-page "Sweat-Free Campus Campaign Organizing Manual" by United Students Against

---

new union contract (Glynn 2002).

[126] Soule (1999:121) found that those campuses with shantytowns actually divested more slowly than those without shantytowns.

Sweatshops (1999), which includes information and ideas about how to organize a sweat-free campaign on campus.

As the main organizer at the GSU campaign, I regularly consulted the manual and read most e-mails posted on a number of listservs, even if this activity consumed a lot of time to go through 30-50 messages every day.[128] E-mail has been particularly important for the campaign because of the ease of transmitting information about critical news and tactics, sharing ideas and strategies, and exchanging political views among several hundred activists around the country instantaneously and at virtually no cost. As a University of Michigan USAS activist commented:

> E-mail has been essential to the movement. It gives us a low-cost way to communicate with each other every hour of every day, all over the country. It allows different campuses to plan their strategies by drawing on the experiences and achievements of every other campus. I don't know how we would have organized without it! (quoted in Benjamin 2000:244)

Initially, the GSU campaign had three goals: (1) to encourage the university join the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC); (2) to extract a pledge from the administration that GSU will not join the Fair Labor Association (FLA); and (3) to assure that GSU adopts a strong code of conduct for all the licensees who manufacture apparel with the GSU trademarks.

According to our preliminary research, Georgia State University is a member, along with other 170 colleges and universities, of the Collegiate Licensing Company (CLC). They have the CLC Labor Code Standards for all licensees which contract with

---

[127] From early 2000 to date, I was the sole LEAP participant in any USAS conferences and conference calls.

the CLC member schools. The code shares many provisions with those of the WRC and the FLA codes. The CLC code includes legal compliance in countries of manufacture, minimum or local industry prevailing wage, the right of freedom of association and collective bargaining, and prohibition of child labor, forced labor, harassment and abuses, and discrimination based on gender, race, religion, sexual orientation, nationality, political opinion, age, disability, or social or ethnic origin. The overtime compensation is at least equal to workers' regular hourly wages, in contrast to the norm of 1.5 times more in the United States. Workers can get at least one day off every seven days. The code does not require a living wage and allows a compulsory 60-hour work week, and more hours under "extraordinary business circumstances" (regular 48 hours, plus 12 overtime hours, thus the overtime is not voluntary). It permits the provisions of full public disclosure and women's rights as options, not mandatory.

The CLC does not have any mechanism to enforce its own code with their contractors. This essentially means that all GSU licensees, while required to agree to the principles, can continue to use sweatshop labor because no one but licensees themselves is responsible for investigating compliance. By the year 2000, the evidence against "self-monitoring" by companies themselves or hired accounting firms like PricewaterhouseCoopers was so strong (Cleeland 2000; Greenhouse 2000c) that we felt we did not need to worry about the CLC becoming a rival organization of the WRC or even the FLA.

---

[128] I became the main organizer because I was only registering for my MA non-thesis paper and because I did not have to earn money.

By early 2000, the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC), a non-profit organization to verify code violations by participant colleges' and universities' licensees, had been officially launched, and USAS anti-sweatshop activists around the country were pressuring their administrations to join the WRC. Most of them were struggling to convince administrations of the credibility of the WRC. Recognizing ourselves as a part of the United Students Against Sweatshop's anti-sweatshop movement, we made participation in the WRC the highest priority of our campaign at GSU.

Initially, we campaigned to get a commitment from GSU not to join the Fair Labor Association (FLA), which has been criticized as a corporate-controlled sham by USAS and other critics. The dominant opinion in the USAS in early 2000 was that schools joining the FLA had to be opposed lest the FLA gain legitimacy. In this context, we thought it was wise for us at GSU to get a commitment from administrators that GSU would not join the FLA. However, as time passed, this legitimacy argument received less emphasis in the USAS, and USAS activists at institutions already in the FLA made little effort to force a withdrawal from the association.

Another campaign goal has been to persuade GSU to adopt a strong code of conduct for our over 100 licensees (as of January 2002). After consulting the WRC model code and some other documents, I drafted a code for GSU and submitted it with other documents in September 2000 to the assistant director of Auxiliary Services, who is a part of the GSU Trademark Licensing Committee. The code included such provisions as no child labor, a living wage, women's rights, and full public disclosure, in addition to

other basic provisions.[129] Although joining the WRC (or the FLA) would require GSU to adopt a strong code,[130] I thought even the WRC code could be strengthened and improved.[131]

Campaign Rationales

Any campaign has rationales. Rationales are essentially claims about why and how a certain phenomenon is not a "misfortune," but an "unjust problem," and who needs to care about it. "Frames" might be defined as "a cognitive ordering that relates events into one other: It is a way of talking and thinking about things that links idea elements into packages" (Ferree and Merrill 2000:456). The frame package or ideology can identify an "unjust problem" (including identifications of a "villain," a "victim," and a condition), lend legitimacy to one's position (and often discredit others'), provide a solution, and call for support and participation (Benford and Snow 2000:615-18; Steinberg 1998:857). In collective actions, the frame package is "intended to mobilize potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystander support, and to demobilize antagonists" (Benford and Snow 2000:614).

[129] The drafted code is available from the researcher.
[130] By early 2001, however, the WRC decided not to make a "living wage" a requirement for colleges and universities to join the WRC. According to Maria Roeper, a former interim director of the WRC and a recent college graduate, there is no strong consensus among the experts as to what consists of a "living wage." With resistance to it even as a commitment to the concept by many administrators, the WRC decided that it would be wiser to make a "living wage" an option in order to increase the number of WRC participant schools. See Witte (2000) for the report on the Living Wage Symposium that discussed this concept of "living wage" in the anti-sweatshop movement.
[131] The strengthened parts include language prohibiting management interference with freedom of association and collective bargaining, environmental protection in and around the workplace, adequate worker education about the code, and the governance of the GSU code at GSU.

Frames and frame packages do not appear in a vacuum. They are embedded in cultural, historical, organizational, political, ideological, and situational contexts. Frames include discursive repertoires already known by actors to make sense of a particular situation and to articulate demands and justifications (Steinberg 1998:857). Emotions are an important aspect of frames; they are expressed simultaneously with cognitions in norms, expectations, obligations, and rights (Ferree and Merrill 2000:457). As sociologists Jeff Goodwin, James Jasper, and Francesca Polletta (2001) argue, "emotions are 'stuff' through which humans are connected with one another and the world around them, coloring thoughts, actions, and judgments" (p. 81).

How has the GSU anti-sweatshop campaign framed its campaign? We very much followed the basic framing of other USAS campaigns. In the first place, we assumed that licensees have a responsibility to improve their independent contractors' working conditions worldwide. This had become the norm among anti-sweatshop activists. We took advantage of the relative visibility of the anti-sweatshop issue to lend legitimacy to our claim that GSU licensees do have such a responsibility. We appealed to students' moral source of responsibility, in contrast to licensees' lack of legal responsibility for their contractors' working conditions.

We described the widespread nature of the anti-sweatshop campaign on campuses around the country to legitimize our campaign. As I wrote to the GSU weekly student newspaper, *the Signal*:

> Responding to this immoral situation [of the relationship between sweatshops and higher education institutions], a college student group, United Students Against Sweatshops…has been urging administrations around the country to do the right thing… (Ono 2000d:11).

We then problematized the gap between the school's status in society and the awful working conditions under which GSU apparel is probably made, as in other campuses: "USAS believes that under no circumstances should workers be subject to such inhumane treatment [in sweatshops],… GSU is a highly respected institution in the community – simply put, it shouldn't be associated with sweatshops in any way" (Ono 2000d:11). We also argued that GSU should use its market power as the holder of the coveted trademark right to force licensees to accept our demands: "USAS believes that … universities have the power to insist that merchandise with their logos must be made under decent and fair conditions" (Ono 2000d:11). We also emphasized from time to time in *Signal* op-eds, one-to-one conversations, and public presentations that these victimized workers are typically young collage-age women and that GSU is perhaps benefiting from their labor by receiving royalties. This approach built on students' likely general cultural image of young women as innocent, vulnerable, and worthy of support. We hoped that this framing would garner sympathy and solidarity from the GSU community. At the same time, we tried to undercut opposition by appealing to the morality of the audience.

We suggested that adopting a code and joining the WRC would concretely fulfill GSU's mission of social responsibility:

> The USAS chapter at Georgia State University calls upon our administration to adopt an exemplary code of conduct and join the WRC as soon as possible. The WRC is the only viable and effective monitoring organization to find out what's really going on in workplaces suspected of abusing "sweatshop labor" (Ono 2000d:11).

Since we did not know the extent to which GSU apparel is actually made in sweatshops, we argued that, fundamentally, joining the WRC was a way to minimize the possibility in the future that GSU garments might be produced in sweatshops.

Campaign Strategy

How have we tried to achieve our goals? We will need to discuss our strategy and tactics. A strategy is an overall plan concerning who does what to build the power to attain goals. This plan also involves identifying who the targets (who can give us what we want) are, who the constituents (or supporters) are, who might organize against our campaign, and what kinds of resources we have. Tactics are specific vehicles or tools used in a campaign, such as petitions, rallies, and sit-ins (United Students Against Sweatshops 1999:74-77). We will look at the overall campaign strategy in this section.

Let me begin with a discussion of institutional and cultural dimensions of the campaign that have affected the development of strategy and choice of tactics. For example, Georgia State University runs on a semester system, divided by fairly long breaks, especially during summer when most students do not take classes. We have found that the campaign needs to build up its forces, sometimes from scratch, at the beginning of each semester. Within a semester period, participation often lags during mid-term and final exam periods. Also, more students and other university community members tend to be around on campus during the mid-day, compared to in the morning or evening. Combined with the availability of the participants, I checked out the concentration of class starting and ending time periods in the course schedules. We planned to have events

during those busy time periods – particularly around the lunch time. Of course, students eventually graduate. Even if a given student becomes actively involved in a campaign or a group in his or her first year, he or she is usually gone within several years. This means that a group and its campaign needs to be conscious about reproducing its participants and nurturing leadership just to survive, particularly if it takes a long time to advance its goals.

Various school regulations have exercised a background influence over our campaign. While freedom of speech and assembly on campus is permitted in principle, places and times students can set up a table and leaflet, post flyers, hold demonstrations and other events are regulated. The only three places where student chartered organizations like our group, Labor Education and Action Project (LEAP), are allowed to table and have some outdoor events are in the Library Plaza in front of the Library North; in the less populated Unity Plaza in front of the Student Center; and in the much less populated open area surrounded by the Urban Life Building, the Law School, the University Center, and the bridges to the Sports Arena. Chartered student organizations can have indoor events in the Student Center and several rooms in the University Center and the Urban Life Building. Student chartered organizations must make reservations to use these spaces for a given time period.

In principle, moreover, school-related groups can post only one flyer with their organization's name on it at each designated posting area on campus for one week (when custodians remove them, usually during the weekend). In practice, however, many people, including non-GSU persons, routinely post multiple flyers even at undesignated

areas, although custodians often take them down during the week. We posted our flyers wherever we could, especially when big events were coming up, and we sometimes posted them a few times a week because flyers often "disappear" (i.e., taken down by opponents, interested persons, or custodians).

With regard to some cultural dimensions of the campaign, it is important to underscore the point made by sociologist Francesca Polletta (1997) that any strategy, tactic, or action is embedded in culture. Actors' perceptions, understanding, and assumptions shape their plans and activities in a given context. This is to say what is considered "strategic," what is "legitimate" and "appropriate," and what is "rational" and "instrumental" vary in situations and are influenced by norms, values, emotions, and other meaning-making mechanisms. Such meanings are also influenced by challengers' perception of how other actors, like decision-makers and opponents, would see and react to a particular strategy, tactic, or action.

Looking at the anti-sweatshop campaigns on other campuses around the country, it seemed reasonable to predict that the GSU administration would similarly resist our demands. USAS groups at a number of campuses felt compelled to take over administration buildings to force their demands after a long negotiating period by early 2000. While the GSU athletic department person with whom Alice had spoken on the phone back in 1999 regarding the sweatshop issue had sounded courteous and cooperative, she expressed a general distrust of the GSU administration and skepticism regarding the likelihood of any progressive social change.

I also sensed that decision makers in the GSU administration would reject our efforts and cling to the status quo. Specifically, it is highly unlikely that President Carl Patton would allow GSU to join the WRC, given his political philosophy evidenced by his close relations with the Atlanta business community. I knew, for example, that he had served as the chairman of Central Atlanta Progress (CAP), the major business group in downtown Atlanta. I remembered that CAP, struggling to attract businesses and customers to downtown, had pushed hard in Atlanta city politics to sweep off homeless people from public places and public views.

I knew many USAS campaigns garnered strong support from local community groups, such as labor unions and faith groups. These community groups provided some money to student groups and showed up at rallies and sit-ins on campus. We thought it would be a good idea to get their support so that we would be able to create a more effective campaign to pressure our school administration. In fact, I had some good relationships with some local unions and community groups through my community activism. But I knew that they were operating on a shoe-string budget, and that they were already busy with their own projects in part because, compared to other regions, Atlanta has a fairly small presence of progressive groups and unions. Fundamentally, they were technically not a part of the GSU community. My perception was that their strong presence in the anti-sweatshop campaign would give an impression to the GSU community that it is controlled by "outsiders." I was aware of a characterization of the national anti-sweatshop campaign in the early phase that the USAS students were

controlled and deceived by unions. Hence, our decision was to solicit their support when absolutely necessary – such as a major rally and unconventional non-violent tactics.

The only logical way to achieve our goals, it seemed to us, was to build support and power on campus to force the administration to accept our demands. As the USAS organizer's manual (United Students Against Sweatshops 1999) explained:

> Decisionmakers always act in their self-interest. By organizing, we can change what that self-interest is, by making the costs of making a decision against the will of the campus community greater than they usually are. By challenging this, we begin to change the balance of power on campus. In order to do this, however, we've got to organize where we hold power. The private sphere is where administrators hold their greatest power. The public sphere is where we do… (P. 66).

The basic strategy then was first to raise awareness and build wide support on campus rather than to go directly to decision-makers. The constituents included individual students, faculty and staff members, and campus organizations. Through our outreach and events, we hoped that some groups would become allies, and others would become at least supportive of our campaign. We sought to act early in the semester so that we would be in a better position to build momentum and accomplish our goals before finals and papers reclaimed students' attention.

We did not prepare for counter-organizing by conservative groups and individuals because we did not expect organized opposition; it was my understanding that almost no USAS campaigns had faced any determined opponents. Our group had just a few more or less active participants, and we did not have any funding from the university until the spring of 2002. As the main organizer, therefore, I spent my own money to purchase

necessary campaign materials, such as making copies, poster boards, tapes, thumbnails, and markers.

In our meetings with the GSU Legal Advisors in the fall of 2000, we learned that the GSU Trademark Licensing Committee does not have the power to change GSU policy. A group of GSU Vice Presidents (the University Administrative Council) will makes such ultimate decisions. The lawyers said they would eventually make a recommendation to this administrator group as to what GSU should do regarding the sweatshop issue. In the meantime, we decided to focus our energy on grassroots organizing on campus.

Mobilizing Structures and Tactics

How have we tried to put the overall strategy into practice? First, we had to mobilize constituents, mostly GSU students, to get things done. "Mobilizing structures," do this work. The term generally refers to "*those collective vehicles, informal as well as formal, through which people mobilize and engage in collective action*" (McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1996:3, emphasis original). The "vehicles" are typically made up of organizations, informal networks of friends and supporters, and leadership. Those movement participants and supporters are coordinated to make things happen more or less smoothly and to sustain a movement over time and with flexibility, according to changing circumstances (Tarrow 1994:136).

Preexisting formal and informal ties or structures often help mobilize a movement (Taylor 1999:16). The LSN and Alice had helped create a space for the GSU campaign,

but there were few preexisting connections on the GSU campus that we could use for our mobilization; we had to find potential supporters and participants. While taking advantage of ideas and the momentum created by other USAS campuses, we needed to figure out how to concretely mobilize ourselves and conduct our campaigns.

Because of our perception that the GSU administration would resist our demands, I felt we would eventually have to resort to more unconventional, yet still culturally legitimate non-violent, tactics, such as sit-ins (Tarrow 1994:95). But, I felt it was imperative to exhaust all legitimate means of negotiations before doing so. Then we would be able to say, "we did all we could to bring attention to this issue and give our school ample opportunity to do the right thing. But, they have not done so. Thus, we were *compelled* to resort to a sit-in so that our school can finally listen to what the GSU campus community really wants." This presumes, of course, that wide campus support, based on appeals to the cultural ideal of democracy, can be achieved at GSU. In such a scenario, negotiating with us would likely be in the administration's self-interest, and making a decision against us would incur a high cost by angering and alienating a significant part of the campus.

Thus, the campaign started with a moderate "repertoire of contention" or "a stock of familiar forms of action that are known by both potential challengers and their opponents – and which become habitual aspects of their interaction" (Tarrow 1994:19). In the spring of 2000, I began regularly setting up and staffing a table in the Library Plaza to provide some information about the global economy, sweatshops, and Georgia State University. I talked to interested passers-by, providing them with leaflets about

sweatshops and the campaign,[132] asking students, staff, and faculty members to sign our petition to the administration,[133] and signing some of them up to our e-mail listserv. On the e-mail listserv, I posted messages about upcoming events, updates of the campaign, action alerts about anti-sweatshop struggles around the world, and newspaper and magazine articles and reports about sweatshops and anti-sweatshop movement.[134]

We made it clear that the campaign does not encourage a boycott of any product. We essentially followed what the larger USAS and anti-sweatshop campaigns have done and explained to our audience that a boycott would not work well in our case.[135] That is because most apparel is likely made in sweatshops and it is very difficult to distinguish which clothing is "sweat-free." A boycott could reduce the demand for apparel and could cost precious jobs that these workers depend on. Hurting these workers is the last thing we want to do. At the bottom of our main flyer, it says that:

> Please note that *we do not encourage a boycott of any product*. If you start to boycott "sweatshop-suspect" apparel, you might end up wearing only your birthday suit!! And, a boycott could jeopardize the jobs these workers depend on. Rather, we need to change the whole way the industry operates so that the workers make products with dignity and justice (emphasis and underline original).

---

[132] See Appendix IV for the titles of some campaign materials. On the table, I also put out the Atlanta Labor Solidarity Network newsletters which had some articles on the USAS anti-sweatshop movement.

[133] As of early 2002, we had collected 272 signatures.

[134] The formal e-mail listserv on the GSU campaign was set up in August 2000. From September 2000 to November 2001, 18.6 messages per month on average had been posted on the list. But, most posted messages contained more than one message. I compiled several messages because I thought flooding people's e-mail accounts would be one factor to turn them away. Again, it took a good amount of time to do this task. With other e-mail work, I routinely spent three to four hours on e-mails practically every day.

[135] Particularly, an unorganized individual boycott would be least effective, even if it may make boycotters feel good. This is because its sporadic nature does not clearly convey the message to the targeted company, and even if the company notices a sales decline, they may attribute the cause to factors other than a boycott. It sometimes makes sense to engage in an organized boycott. It is when workers ask us to do it, or/and when companies continue to do business with brutal regimes like Burma where there is very little hope for improvement. Aun San Suu Kyi, a leader of the Burmese democracy movement, in effect encourages people around the world to boycott companies doing businesses with Burma, by saying that without democracy and the rule of law, investments in Burma will only enrich elite (Anderson et al. 2000:93).

It is interesting to note, however, that many people initially seem to react to our anti-sweatshop campaign as if we are calling for a boycott. This may be because a boycott is what Sidney Tarrow (1994) calls "the modular repertoire" in the United States, or a popular form of collective action used "across wide territories, broad social sectors and for different kinds of issues" (p. 19). In particular, since our campaign is partly to mobilize consumer identity and power, this link may have been natural to many.

With help from a few people, I created a display case in the corridor of the third floor of the University Center, just across from the university bookstore. The display lasted for one week, and it contained a GSU sweatshirt with a sentence, "Is GSU Clothing Made in Sweatshops?," sewed onto the shirt, covered with a cross of yellow "caution" tapes. We also put up information and graphics on sweatshops and our campaign. We mounted the display several times between 2000 and 2002.

As in many other campuses, we held teach-ins on sweatshops and the campaign on March 29, 2000 and September 27, 2000. We showed videos about sweatshops by the National Labor Committee – *Zoned for Slavery: The Child Behind the Label* (1995, 23 minutes) and *Something to Hide* (1999, approximately 25 minutes) about a USAS delegation to Salvadoran sweatshops. Each teach-in was attended by about 10-15 people.

The GSU campus newspaper, *the Signal*, carried four favorable sweatshop-related articles from other campus newspapers (Fish 2000; Hammond 2000; Kudo 2000; Tietgen 2000) and one article about campus activism nationwide, including USAS, in *Steamtunnels*, a short-lived insert in *Signal* (Aguilar 2000) in 2000. My responses to a

couple of these articles were published (Ono 2000a; Ono 2000b). My independent article about the GSU campaign was also published in the same year (Ono 2000d).[136]

Despite regular tabling, display cases, and several *Signal* articles, the campaign was not really able to take advantage of the series of sit-ins around the country in the spring of 2000 and the momentum it generated in the summer and fall. Our group was still very small, despite the 20-30 people who signed onto the e-mail list getting updates and messages to help out with the campaign. This was about the time, I thought, to actively reach out to other progressive student groups to build a coalition on campus, as I knew many other USAS groups had already successfully done in their campaigns.

I began to talk to several progressive groups on campus in early January 2001 about the possibility of whether forming a campus coalition. The idea was that while we were small groups individually, we could have a mutually beneficial relationship with each other and achieve more if we strategically worked together.[137] Fortunately, they liked the idea. Elizabeth (pseudonym) from Power of Women (POW - GSU student feminist group) and I identified a number of groups whose names looked "liberal" or "progressive" from the list of GSU student chartered organizations, and invited them to our first couple of meetings. The groups that showed up in the monthly meetings included Power of Women, the Greens, International Socialist Organization, Campaign to End the Death Penalty, Young Democrats, Empowered Hermanas, NAACP, and Labor

[136] Also, other essays on sweatshop-related farmworker issue (Ono 2001b) and the IMF and the World Bank protest (Ono 2000c) were published in *Signal* during the campaign period. In the 2002 fall semester, two articles were published about the campaign; one criticism (Wall 2002) and our response (Labor Education and Action Project 2002).

Education and Action Project.[138] We created an e-mail listserv where people could post, for example, their groups' updates and help requests.

The GSU Progressive Coalition contributed to our anti-sweatshop campaign when we tried to organize an anti-sweatshop fashion show in March and April 2001. In the anti-sweatshop fashion show, just like any other fashion show, we planned to have a number of models wearing brand-name clothing, such as Disney, Nike, and the GSU logo, and walk on a stage to some dance music. Two emcees were to narrate how each brand of clothing looks good on each model, and then go on to describe how the clothing might have been made in factories around the world by illustrating with actual examples of sweatshops making those brands. The purpose was to raise awareness of this issue in a fun and very visible way. We also hoped to recruit new participants.

Elizabeth of POW, who was in the leadership position in her group, was very helpful in gathering together clothing of particular brands and styles through her personal connections. She also proofread the 10-page script I drafted. Through the Progressive Coalition, we were also able to recruit models. With help from a couple of other groups in the coalition, we created a huge banner (approximately 5 yards-wide, 5 feet-tall), declaring "GSU Anti-Sweatshop Fashion Show, NO SWEAT!, Presented by GSU United Students Against Sweatshops." We also made a number of posters and flyers with more

---

[137] In the first meeting, I laid out purposes of the coalition. They included to learn from each other's activities and perspectives, help out each other's activities, create a feeling of solidarity and trust to one another, accomplish more tasks, and recruit more students.

[138] I developed some loose connections with at least one representative of a number of campus groups over the last few years, including Sankofa Society (African American Studies student group), the Alliance of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Students, Black Law Students Association at GSU, National Lawyer's Guild at GSU, Environmental Law Society at GSU, Graduate Student Association, and to a lesser

information on the issue. This show was to become the most major event of our campaign. We knew many USAS groups had successfully staged similar shows, and we felt we could do the same. And we were excited, as a few participants including Daniel (pseudonym), our LEAP faculty advisor, and I feel these events were the most memorable moments in the campaign so far.

However, the March show was cancelled, and the April show was again almost cancelled (but we did it for about 10 minutes). The March disaster was caused by the late arrival of the sound equipment by the campus Spotlight Program to the Library Plaza stage, as a few hundred people were hanging around in the area during that noon time period. The same thing happened in April at the Unity Plaza in front of the Student Center.[139] Everyone was greatly disappointed, and many were even angry about the Spotlight's irresponsible attitude. This may be an example of how contingent events can shape the direction of a campaign. As I wrote to a *Signal* writer as to how I felt about the outcome of the April show:

> We…felt that this [April] event was a strategic part of our anti-sweatshop campaign, and that this event may have raised some support from student, faculty, and staff members so that we could have attained our goals better this semester.

---

degree, Latin Forum. The Coalition unfortunately became inactive after the spring semester of 2001 when a few core individuals could not organize regular meetings any longer.

[139] A group with a reservation of the Library Plaza stage is allowed to make big noises or play loud music only between 12:15pm and 1pm on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Because this place is perhaps the most populated area on campus, the spot is usually reserved in advance. Although there is no such restriction in the Unity Plaza, the place has much less walking traffic. In the case of the April show, many models and emcee persons had to leave by 1pm, which was the scheduled ending time of the show. By the time the equipment was set up by the school's Spotlight program at around 12:45 or 12:50pm, we had no choice but to cut down the show length very substantially.

Still, I felt that we made our presence known to many on campus. As I posted a message on the campaign e-mail listserv right after the March event, "I think we were able to get our information out to hundreds of people in the Plaza, and got many people talk[ing] about sweatshops (visually, we had a great big banner… standing behind the stage – anyone passed the stage area must have noticed it….)…." And we were more or less favorably covered by the *Signal* (Montcalm 2001a and see Ono 2001a for my response; Montcalm 2001b) and local TV Channel 46 in March, and by *Rampway* (GSU campus web magazine)(Miller 2001) and local TV Channel 11 in April.

It is important to note here how the fashion shows were gendered and racialized. As many feminist and anti-racist social movement scholars (Buechler 2000:112-21; Einwohner Hollander, and Olson 2000; Kuumba 2001; Omi and Winant 1994; Taylor 1999) have pointed out, social movements are embedded in gender and racial relations. Not only are participants' assumptions, perceptions, and identities gendered and racialized, but also their actions are embedded in larger gender and racial relations and in turn help recreate such relations.

First, I thought it was important to turn this show into a feminist fashion show because in a typical fashion show, women's bodies in nice clothing are used to define as a rather oppressive beauty standard. So, I e-mailed a GSU feminist professor who teaches theater to ask whether she had some suggestions for us. She made the interesting recommendation that models might cross-dress, the idea which I was obliged to reject after consulting with Elizabeth because we felt it would likely have diverted the audience's attention from the main issue of sweatshops.

Other ideas for the show included having equal numbers of men and women as models and emcees, which we pretty much attained (three female and four male models as well as one female and one male emcee). We also inserted a few sentences about the sexual objectification of women's bodies in the script right after one emcee describes the fact of sexual harassment and other abuses against women in sweatshops:

> These women's situations are not accidental. In fact, these things are happening basically everywhere, including the United States. One of the major problems is that women in many cultures, including ours, have been perceived, especially by men, as sexual objects, sexually accessible, or "the property of men," so to speak. Is it any wonder a rape is reported every six minutes in this country, and close to 100% of the victims are women?

This passage was intended to remind the audience of pervasive sexism in both "developing" countries and the United States. It was also designed to discourage spectators from viewing female models as sexual objects by negatively narrating such an action.

Elizabeth wondered why only a few POW members (women) were willing to serve as models in the show. It may be that most were not willing because, as conscious feminists, they might have imagined that their bodies would have become sexual objects or at least been closely "evaluated" by the audience, besides the possible factor of simple shyness.

The shows were also raced. On one occasion, the Greens decided to spend one of their meeting periods preparing for the upcoming fashion show in March. A few of us[140] were creating large logos of well-known companies, such as Nike, Gap, and Tommy

[140] I have been active in the Greens since the early 2000.

Hilfiger, out of poster boards. When two white members were selecting logos, an African American female member of the Greens suggested we not target logos like FUBU. She explained that they are owned by and popular among African Americans. Had we used those logos at the fashion show, we may have provoked unnecessarily negative reactions from African American students, who compose about 30 percent of the student body. As a subordinate group, many African Americans nurture their own culture and institutions, including businesses, and they feel a collective ownership over them. Thanks to the student's insight, which white students and I lacked,[141] a potential blunder was avoided.

On another occasion, models and emcees were practicing for the fashion show next day. I had already assigned models to wear certain brands. But, for some reason, the Nike model needed to be replaced. In the script, following the stereotypical image of Nike as very athletic, the Nike model was to actively and energetically move around the stage – pretending to "shoot hoops," jog, and do push-ups and jumping jacks. An African American male student in this group, without knowing the exact role of the Nike model, offered to take the spot. Yet soon after I described to him what this model would do, he paused for a while, and said something like this: "As a person who is committed to anti-racism, I can't do it because I would be reproducing the stereotypes of African Americans." I had not realized until then that the script was in fact racialized if played and seen by racial subjects. Fortunately, we were able to assign a white male student to serve as the Nike model.

[141] The lack of certain racialized knowledge is also racialized knowledge because the absence indicates a racial boundary. They have a different set of racialized knowledge because they tend to be part of different activities and networks based on race.

Beside the fashion shows, another tactic has been to secure a resolution from the GSU Student Government Association (SGA) in support of our campaign. A representative from the Greens and I met with the SGA president in the early fall of 2000. The Greens were starting a campaign to get more school subsidies for the monthly MARTA cards sold to GSU students, staff and faculty, and he wanted to meet with the president.[142] The task of negotiation was then relegated to the SGA Vice President of Student Services, who turned out to be unsupportive of the Greens' effort. For this reason, I saw him as not supportive of our effort, either. After a few meetings, I stopped following up with him, and decided to wait for a better time.

In concert with other Progressive Coalition groups, we submitted a short list of questions about our concerns to SGA candidates, right before two elections in the spring and fall of 2001. One of the questions was whether the candidates supported our campaign to "insure that clothing sold with the GSU logo is not made in conditions that exploit the workers." The purpose was to let them know of our presence on campus, educate them on our issues, and create a familiarity with future officers so that we will be able to approach them more easily.[143] We forwarded their answers to our e-mail networks during the elections. Yet we did not approach the SGA for the resolution after the spring 2001 elections because the results were nullified. When the officers were finally elected in the fall of 2001, we were busy with anti-war/peaceful justice organizing on campus

[142] MARTA (Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority) is the major public transportation system in the metro-Atlanta area.
[143] Most candidates basically supported our campaign. One presidential candidate had this issue on his platform. But he lost both elections.

and elsewhere to do so in the fall of 2001 after the September 11 event.[144] The September 11 incident, which significantly changed the atmosphere in the United States and elsewhere, was another contingent event that affected the anti-sweatshop campaign.

I made a few presentations about sweatshops in women's studies classes in 2001, and, during my outreach activities, I got to know several sympathetic professors. Our actions have sometimes coincided with national days of action, such as the annual April 4 Student Labor Day of Action to commemorate the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. who was in Memphis to support striking sanitation workers on April 4, 1968. This Day of Action started in 1999, and the number of participating campuses has grown each year to over 100 in 2002. Days of action have been a good way to mobilize people because this automatically sets the dates of action and creates a feeling that we are a part of a larger effort.

Personally, I coordinated a few projects about economic justice at Georgia State University to raise awareness and recruit new supporters for our campaign.[145] I also encouraged people on the campaign e-mail listserv to participate in events that happened

---

[144] The organizing for peace was a part of the larger student response against the U.S. military retaliation against Afghanistan and other undemocratic repercussions in the aftermath of the September 11 incident. See Featherstone (2001b) for one account of this mobilization. See also Featherstone (2002) for a glimpse of the progressive student activism in response to the heightened Israeli-Palestinian conflict since early 2002.

[145] In October 2000, I coordinated with a local Amnesty International group to host Enrique Villeda, a Guatemalan banana union leader in Atlanta to talk about gross worker rights violations at his workplace of a banana plantation, which was a subsidiary of Del Monte Fresh Produce (a separate entity from Del Monte Foods). It was a part of the southern regional speaking tour organized by the Network in Solidarity with the People of Guatemala (NISGUA, www.nisgua.org), a human rights organization based in Washington, D.C. He spoke in five classes at GSU. In September 2001, I coordinated with Empty the Shelters people in Atlanta to host a visit of 70 tomato pickers of the Coalition of Immokalee Workers (www.ciw-online.org) and their supporter from Florida at Georgia State University as a part of their "Taco Bell Truth Tour." Unfortunately, the tour in September was cancelled just a couple of days before the event due to September 11. About 20 of them, however, came to Atlanta in October 2001 and a big, successful national tour with

off campus, including three USAS southern regional conferences between early 2000 and late 2001. These events could have equipped them with new information, organizing skills, networks, inspirations, and a sense of solidarity, but in the end, I was the only one who participated in such conferences.

As to the internal dynamics of our group, we shall consider communication methods and decision-making process here. We have primarily communicated through e-mails partly because it has been the cheapest and easiest way to communicate. It was also because I thought it would contribute to more group democracy by increasing transparency and participation. Mainly I posted updates to let everybody know what was going on and provided a chance to be a part of the decision-making body, especially for those who could not make it to meetings. While I was doing most of the organizing work in part because only a few have usually volunteered to take on some tasks, I have tried to let everyone else on the e-mail listserv know and to ask for their suggestions when I or a just a few of us had to make major decisions, such as organizing events and even the content and phrases of my op-ed to *Signal* before submission.

Moreover, in the meetings where just a few people usually attended, we have tried to go with consensus. I have tried to follow USAS's and the GSU Greens' democratic and non-hierarchical model because I agreed with them that the model is the best way to embody culturally-valued, yet often poorly practiced "democracy" in our small group. As a USAS student activist at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill said about the consensus element of USAS:

---

about 90 people finally visited Atlanta on March 1, 2002. I was the main coordinator of these events. I gave

> When people join our actions, they often say that what they like most is [the] fact that we operate by consensus. And that's what I'd say that I like most about USAS, too – almost all proposals get circulated to everyone and you have a chance to participate on any of the issues you want (quoted in Benjamin 2000:245).

"Democracy" seems more than just making decisions by majority votes; in our version of more substantive democracy, the decision-making process needs to be transparent, inclusive, participatory, dialogic, non-violent, and sensitive to power dynamics among participants or stakeholders. Participants strive for a consensus. Those who take on tasks need to be accountable to all stakeholders. This version of democracy is often thought in contrast to the more conventional notion of democracy, whose only criterion is voting rights and periodical "fair" elections (see also Eschle 2001; Smith 1998; Trend 1996). That is, as poststructuralism's notion of "difference" suggests (Scott [1988] 1994:285), the meaning of this substantive democracy is made in contrast with that of more conventional, "weak" democracy. I would think that "progressives" activists who are disillusioned with conventional democracy, are often encouraged to practice this substantive democracy. In any case, Daniel sums up the situation at Georgia State:

> There's not a lot of active people so there can't have been to[o] much hierarchy. Dialogue between you [the researcher], me, and [Thadeus - pseudonym] has been good and I think consensus between the three of us was usually reached….

To summarize this "Mobilizing Structures and Tactics" section, we have used a number of tactics to garner grassroots campus support. They have included flyers, a petition, op-eds to *Signal*, display cases, teach-ins, fashion shows, lobbying the SGA, and

---

out hundreds of flyers to students at GSU for the March farmworker event.

presentations to classes. We followed the norm and began with moderate tactical means to build our campaign in the expectation that we may eventually have to resort to more dramatic tactics. Even if we end up using such unconventional tactics, we thought we would be able to provide a reasonable justification that we explored all necessary means of negotiation. We tried to mobilize interested people mainly through e-mail notices, the Progressive Coalition, and informal connections on campus. Activities were often raced and gendered. And, we attempted to reach a consensus to make major decisions because that was considered "democratic" and morally right as "progressive" activists.

Framing and Ideology

We will examine frames and ideology of the campaign in more detail. While frames are more about how facts and information are ordered to make sense of events, ideologies are packages of frames that explain why things happen the way they do and why they matter (Ferree and Merrill 2000). Ideologies can be defined as "any system of meaning that couples assertions and theories about the nature of social life with values and norms relevant to promoting or resisting change" (quoted in Ferree and Merrill 2000:7). "Framing" is an activity that combines and represents both frames and ideologies. We will take a look in this section at how the campaign has discursively framed some issues into packages of descriptions and explanations, and what norms, values, understandings, and assumptions those representations reveal.

Fundamentally, frames and ideologies are a more or less coherent meaning-constituting system (Scott [1998] 1994:283-84). Through this system, as Joan Scott

([1988] 1994) argues, “meaning is constructed and cultural practices organized and by which, accordingly, people represent and understand their world, including who they are and how they relate to others” (p. 283). They are deployed and constantly negotiated among actors, including movement proponents, opponents, and observers (Benford and Snow 2000:625-27; Einwohner et al. 2000; Steinberg 1998:857).

In what follows, we will specifically discuss some representations of workers, corporations and global economy, the FLA and the WRC, our own campaign, and related issues. We will also examine the representation of “victims,” “victimizers,” and “solutions” around the issue of sweatshops.

Representations of Workers

Some observers of the anti-sweatshop movement, including USAS students, point out that the movement frequently depicts workers as if they are just victims of oppression and corporate greed without any agency or power to resist the hardship (Featherstone and United Students Against Sweatshops 2002:70-74). The dominant image is victimized poor young women of color in, or from, the Global South. Such raced, gendered, class- and nation-based (see also Brooks 2002) hierarchies of categories tend to be reproduced and “presented as part of spectacle, image-making, and marketing” (Brooks 2002:107) in the anti-sweatshop movement. As journalist Liza Featherstone comments in her book with United Students Against Sweatshops (2002), “such representation ignores these women’s own struggles for self-determination, and reinforces degrading stereotypes about the passivity of Third World, especially Asian, women” (p. 71).

At the other end, some activists represent workers as fierce fighters against oppression without showing their vulnerability. In other words, there has been a tendency in the movement to represent the "worker" in simple, stereotypical ways without showing a wide range of workers and their ambiguous and contradictory elements as "mere human beings." In his e-mail to the general national USAS listserv in the summer of 2001, one student USAS activist at Indiana University, who had recently visited a sweatshop factory, Kukdong, in Mexico, critiqued the romanticized portrayal of workers:

> … as helpless or revolutionary figures, not real people. Maquila workers experience the entire spectrum of human emotions, thoughts, and actions. Sometimes they are courageous and other times they are not…. The Kukdong workers are not exploited and helpless beings. They are also not all-valiant and courageous union leaders. Some have taken active support of SITEKIM [the new independent union at the factory] and made sacrifices for the independent union. Other workers have not participated in the campaign and some others do not know the name of the independent union….. The Kukdong workers do not all live in abject poverty. Economically, some workers have maquila jobs to have spending on the weekends, while others need the maquila jobs to support their family. Many enjoy working in maquilas, especially because it is a place to meet other young people, and they take pride in their work. Still for others, it is "a job that seems the devil's will."[146]

This tendency to bifurcate representation can also be observed in the GSU campaign. I made sure to present the case to potential supporters that real people are victimized, and these people are more than likely young women who are often forced to take pregnancy tests and suffer from sexual harassment. In one of my essays to the school weekly newspaper, *Signal*, I described the treatment of workers in Saipan, a U.S. territory in the Pacific Ocean:

[146] The whole text is available from the researcher.

> [T]hey [workers] are often forced to sign "shadow contracts" – not to speak up, not to quit or marry, etc. – and then they are forced to work up to 12 hours a day, seven days a week for a mere $3 per hour…. The workers are forced to sleep in unsanitary, overcrowded housing surrounded by barbed wire. Guards often control the workers with lockdowns and curfews. Deductions for food and housing from their meager wages further prevent them from enjoying the human life we take for granted…. (Ono 2000a:11).

This rhetoric of victimization has usually not been accompanied with representations of resistance, let alone more complex characterizations. In the first place, GSU activists do not personally know anyone who has worked in sweatshops, and there is little information in the media and movement literature to convey the complexity of workers' lives. We have had to count on the dominant representations by the larger anti-sweatshop movement, including USAS, and to a lesser degree, academic texts on this topic. Even if we had access to such information, we have not had enough space or time to elaborate the wide range of workers' life and perceptions. Strategically, it makes sense to present a case that will likely garner the most sympathy – helpless, innocent young women or even children being abused or denied basic rights that much of the GSU audience takes for granted – so that we can get support and attain our goals more effectively. If we characterize that many workers in fact enjoy their work in sweatshops, I would even fear that some who disagree with our campaign may take advantage of such a representation to undermine our cause.

Other participants in the campaign seem to agree that "victims" of sweatshops are poor workers. Asked about this question, Daniel answers that victims are "the workers in developing countries. They have no legal or governmental backing. They are powerless." Alice responds that the victims are "the poor, [and] there is no denying that. Sweatshops

consume those who have no other choice but to accept whatever they can get, which is always the poorest of the poor. When you have nothing[,] it is hard to refuse even $.45/hour." And, while agreeing that workers are primary victims, another participant, Thadeus and I take a slightly different view by saying that we are all "victims."[147]

However, as a former USAS activist said, "[s]uch language [of victimhood] helps hook people in…, but is not the stuff of which solidarity is made" (Featherstone and United Students Against Sweatshops 2002:71). That is because people would just see workers to "be helped" or "be salvaged" by well-intentioned people in the Global North, not as equal partners for justice. The attitude is that of paternalism, and it lets the whole power dynamics that create sweatshops in the first place off the hook. Aware of this problem, I sometimes emphasized worker resistance, as courageous people fighting back to their exploitation. For example, I created a poster board at the fashion shows that was titled "Fighting Back! Cz Sweatshops are Not Inevitable & Against Humanity!!" It had four pictures – three of them were about workers protesting sweatshop conditions.[148]

Another example is when I posted on the GSU campaign e-mail listserv news of the death of Rose Freedman (at the age of 107), who survived the famous Triangle Shirtwaist factory fire in New York City in 1911 (Martin 2001). On the one hand, I noted that nearly 150 workers died in this fire as tragic victims unable to escape from factory exits blocked by uncaring owners. On the other hand, I linked the victims with the

[147] Thadeus says that "in a sense, we are all victims, because we get drawn into the addiction of (a) trying to find happiness and (b) trying to find it through buying. The immorality of our quest (the fact that to optimize it we must encourage the suffering of others) undermines our own integrity as human beings; … it makes it difficult for us to slow down and actually appreciate the things we have…." I answered this question that we are all victims in a sense that we all participate in this neoliberal global economy in one way or another that encourages oppression in order to survive in it.

struggle in which many of them had participated in just two years before to improve working conditions. I also cited a poem about the struggle from Ronald Takaki's book, *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America* (1993):

> Many of them [fire casualties] actually went on strike in 1909-1910's famous "uprising of 20,000" when eventually 20,000 workers went on strike, protesting and demanding better working conditions in New York City despite intimidations and sometimes bloody beatings by the police and hired thugs.
>
> "In the black winter of 1909
> When we froze and bled on the picket line
> We showed the world that women could fight
> And we rose and we won with women's might
>
> Hail the waist makers of 1909
> Making their stand on the picket line
> Breaking the power of those who reign
> Pointing the way and smashing the chain" (Takaki 1993:296).

I also wanted to convey in the same e-mail that grassroots organizing by marginalized groups is imperative for more democracy and justice. Indeed, protesting workers in 1909-10 succeeded in improving some working conditions:

> It would be reasonable to assume that there have been countless sad and (courageous) stories like this [the Triangle Shirtwaist fire]. Yet, alas, such sad tales wouldn't guarantee the interests of workers; it's fundamentally a political issue – someone with political power changes the situation in their favor. Grassroots organizing, like the one in 1909-10, would be the first sure step for marginalized groups like these young women workers to gain political power for more democracy and justice.

---

[148] The other picture was about a protest by mostly white American youth supporters in New York.

In fact, the campaign participants generally seem to view workers as equal with us and as deserving dignity, while acknowledging that they are "victims." Alice says that "[t]hese workers want to change the way that they are viewed in our society. To me they just want to be treated as equals, not as less of workers than those in another country." Daniel feels that "they are workers just the same [as the ones in industrialized countries] and so deserve these [basic worker] protections." I say that workers "may not share with the concept of 'human rights,' but I believe they hate how it feels to be treated like slaves because that humiliates their dignity and clearly disadvantages them and their family." Thadeus, on the other hand, seems to feel that they are generally hardworking, but a diverse range of people:

> … I imagine a diversity of people, some who are hardworking and unwilling or unable to raise a voice of complaint; other's [*sic*] who carry a sort of relaxed wisdom of the world…; and some who are astute to the intricacies of the modern political landscape.

It seems that Alice's view of workers as equals and her fairly intense involvement in labor organizing in the last several years enabled her to write an inspiring message to other USAS activists around the country. It was about the relationship between activists and workers in the anti-sweatshop solidarity work:

> The most important thing that we need to remember is that our #1 ally is THE WORKERS. NO ONE COMES BEFORE THE WORKERS! This is true in any labor/human rights organizing campaign. Don't let anyone, no matter who they are or how powerful they might be (or think they are), mislead you from understanding that! (capital letters in original)

Implicit in this view may be that these workers' struggles are essentially *their* struggles, and we as *supporters* add pressure where we have power to aid their struggles. I also posted a message on the GSU campaign e-mail listserv in August 2001 about our role as "allies" of workers:

> What do "allies" do in international solidarity work? It might be said that being "allies" or in solidarity with workers and oppressed groups requires recognition of your own roles and power and understanding of how best you can support the struggles of workers and oppressed groups for concrete gains. Sometimes, USAS have failed to do it properly, including by exoticizing workers – depicting workers as total victims of sweatshops or "women warriors who are thoroughly aware of their place in the proletariat."

Daniel echoes this sentiment:

> I see my relationship to workers as one of support and to some extent obligation. As a consumer of the products they manufacture, I believe I have a responsibility to use any power and leverage I may have to ensure the workers who made what I buy are treated fairly, that is paid a living wage, not harassed, not in unsafe conditions, etc. As a supporter I believe I, and the international labor movement, exist to represent workers to those in power in my country. That is, to be an agent of sweatshop workers to present their plight to those who have created it.

Yet, this relationship is not that of paternalism, but as "equals" who understand their power differences and ultimate common interests of the struggle. As Lilla Watson, an "aboriginal activist sister," who was quoted and printed on the back of the USAS T-shirt I bought at the national USAS gathering in 2001, says:

> If you have come to help me, you are wasting your time[.] But if you have come because your liberation is bound up with mine, then let us work together.

In sum, the GSU campaign has tended to depict workers as "victims" to solicit support on campus, but participants seem to be aware of the militancy and resilience of

workers. They appear to strive to work *for* and *with* workers in sweatshop solidarity work rather than to unilaterally decide what they do because they know what is best for workers. I personally do not think, however, the representation of workers as victims *per se* is problematic as long as other representations of workers as three-dimensional beings are included strategically. It means that representations do not need to lose an overall picture of unequal and unjust neoliberal global economy whose primary victims are these workers, and that we, as "allies," need to do solidarity support in the eventual interest of all of us.

Representations of Corporations and the Global Economy

How has the campaign represented corporations and the global economy? Corporations are the primary target of the larger anti-sweatshop movement and our GSU campaign. The campaign participants hold strong opinions about corporations and the global economy that these companies are embedded in.

The campaign depicts corporations and the neoliberal global economy as the institutions ultimately responsible for sweatshops. Corporations are represented as benefiting the most from this global economy, at the expense of workers and ordinary people around the world. For example, we had a poster board titled "The Global 'Sweatshop' Economy Cycle: 'Race to the Bottom,'" that described a very simplified cycle of how global poverty and sweatshops exemplify this global economy. The cycle begins with "free trade/market" policies that lead to oligopolies through mergers and acquisitions. These policies also lead to increasing relocation and outsourcing of

productions worldwide, which often means the loss of (union) jobs in the Global North. Governments try to lure foreign investment by creating a "good business/investment environment." In this context, ordinary people's livelihood degrades, and this condition often generates social instabilities. Nevertheless, policy makers continue to support "free trade/market" policies because they have faith in them. The circle then comes back to the beginning. We created other poster boards providing evidence against some popular beliefs about the global economy, including beliefs that free trade contributes to more equality and democracy and that more foreign investment automatically upgrades the living standards of ordinary people.

In the *Signal* coverage of the March 2001 fashion show (Montcalm 2001), a couple of College Republicans who were at the show made a couple of claims against our campaign. One of them was that free trade/market benefits everyone, and the other was that our campaign would take away jobs from workers who are entitled to them "no matter how little they are making" (Montcalm 2001:4). In response, I tried to offer my "counterframing," or an attempt "to rebut, undermine, or neutralize a person's or group's myths, versions of reality, or interpretive framework" (Benford and Snow 2000:626), so that the campaign could not only defend itself from criticisms, but also possibly convince others and/or solicit support. I argued that "free" trade/market is a social construction and can be reconstructed according to our beliefs. The global economy, constructed as "free" unjustly benefits corporations, in part, by often taking jobs away from workers both in the Global South and the Global North. It was published in the next issue, and I quote it at length:

> There ain't such a thing as a "free" market. These conditions are largely made possible by a series of political decisions like policies and trade agreements by powerful groups in society, such as politicians financed and supported by financial interests and multinational corporations. They are created and maintained by humans. Thus, when we examine the issue of sweatshops, we must take into account what we cherish in our hearts, such as fairness, justice, equity, democracy, and human dignity. The multinationals like Nike are taking advantage of this environment for their own benefit, namely private profits. This is in grave conflict with our beliefs.
>
> It is often multinational corporations that take away jobs from hard working people. For example, the Phillips Van-Heusen Corporation abruptly shut down its 10-year-old factory in Guatemala in 1998 when the workers finally attained a collective bargaining agreement to defend their basic rights, and shifted production to other sweatshops.
>
> This may sound familiar to Americans, because tens of thousands of jobs are being lost every year to the "third world" countries. Here corporations take advantage of reduced or no taxes or tariffs, looser enforcement of basic human rights, lower rates of unionization, cheaper labor, public subsidies, and protection of their property rights. They promote a "race to the bottom," pitting workers and even countries against each other to extract the most benefits for the corporations (Ono 2001a:9).

Interestingly, College Republicans offered no response to my article in *the Signal*. But part of my purpose was to present an alternative view to the dominant "free market/trade" perspective on this global economy issue to other students who might not yet have formulated their opinions on this issue.

This image of corporations and global economy is shared by a couple of other campaign participants. Alice feels that corporations are to be blamed because they "perpetuate the situation" [of sweatshops] and "cut and run to find the cheapest labor prices." She also feels that they engage in "behind the scenes deals with heads of state to ensure that these practices continue." Daniel blames free trade policies because "[t]hey allow corporations to do whatever they wish with no governmental regulations." He also

believes that corporations' response to the anti-sweatshop movement has been just "lip-service" in order to enhance their public image. Thadeus, from a different perspective, nonetheless echoes the sentiment by implying that corporations and consumerism are to be blamed for ultimately causing sweatshops. He thinks that "[a] pervasive attitude [that] the money and goods are the primary thing of importance in life is to blame."

Representations of the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC) and the Fair Labor Association (FLA)

How and why has the campaign depicted the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC) and the Fair Labor Association (FLA)? The basic situation again is that we want Georgia State University to join the WRC rather than the FLA. For that reason, the campaign has represented the WRC favorably, and the FLA unfavorably in relation to each other. It would be wise to make a clear distinction between the two so that the audience can understand the differences and support our cause. How has this been done?

Our campaign essentially replicated the rhetoric of the larger USAS campaign: the FLA is corporate-controlled, would be ineffective, and, worse yet, might cover up sweatshops. The WRC is the only organization committed to improving working conditions significantly through worker empowerment (see Appendix III for the basic representations). The three participants share this view. On the FLA, Daniel says it "is corporate and government backed therefore weak," while Alice claims "the FLA is a crock. Anyone who lets the fox guard the hen house is in for trouble."

I commented on the FLA's third party system during the Kukdong campaign in mid-February 2001. The third party system is supposed to fill in the blank of the external monitoring system, which monitors only 5-15 percent of applicable factories every year. Workers and their allies are supposed to be able to file complaints of code violations to the FLA at any time of the year, and the FLA lets companies and their monitors investigate the complaints.

Workers at the Mexican Kukdong factory, making clothing for a number of colleges and universities through Nike and Reebok, went on a wild-cat strike in January 2001. After physical violence by the local police to forcibly end the strike, a tense situation continued until it was finally resolved in the fall. USAS was directly pressuring Nike and Reebok to intervene in the situation while the WRC and the FLA were investigating it.[149]

> … I would hope that this [case] would support the inadequacy of FLA's third party claim system where companies/their monitors have 45 days to report what happened (after an unspecified period when FLA's Executive Director determines the credibility of allegations). Think about it. The incident came out just over one month ago. Under FLA, no one but companies/their monitors [who would be directly paid for by such companies] would know the situation in this time frame. [And, they could cover whole thing up as if nothing happened.]

And, I compare the FLA with the WRC this way:

> [T]he FLA is a very moderate effort to deal with sweatshops, to say the least. Worse yet, they could cover up sweatshops, but put the misleading "FLA" seals – a virtual "no sweat" seals – on the products of participating companies. The FLA model is a "top-down" monitoring whereas the WRC is more of "bottom-up" verifications of alleged violations of codes…. This is a clever, if not perfect mechanism

[149] Many fired workers were eventually rehired, and the workers now have an independent union who won a wage increase in the early 2002. See Thompson (2001b).

> taking advantage of who's got [the] power [i.e., consumers] in the current phase of globalization.

Daniel adds that "USAS and WRC are labor[-]based organizations fighting for true labor rights…. [They want] to empower workers to make their lives and working conditions better."

Thus, our GSU campaign very much replicated the rhetoric of the larger USAS campaign: The FLA is corporate-controlled and bad while the WRC is the only organization that can adequately fulfill the mission of safeguarding workers' rights.

Representations of Ourselves as a Campaign

In terms of our main target constituents, we have appealed to "mainstream" GSU students to build campus-wide support. We have tried to create a clear message aimed at to their minds and hearts so that they recognize sweatshops as "unfair" and "unjust." There are many ways to attain this, but one consideration has been to avoid presenting ourselves in ways that might be perceived as too "radical" (Goffman 1959).

Early in the campaign, I posted a message on the campaign e-mail list that we should not be perceived as "a bunch of radicals" or as "kids who don't know nothing about the real world." The sweatshop issue was, for me, to be presented as something in which everyone has a stake – as consumers, GSU community members, and believers in basic human rights. But being perceived as "radical" might reduce the possibility that "mainstream" students would sense their stake in this issue.

I was aware of the fact that USAS had attracted students with a wide range of beliefs. As a University of Michigan USAS activist once said:

> One reason we've been so successful is that opposition to sweatshops isn't that radical. Although I'm sure lots of us are all for overthrowing the corporate power structure, the human rights issues are what make a lot of people get involved and put their energy into rallies, sit-ins, etc. We have support not just from students on the far Left, but from students in the middle who don't consider themselves radical. Without those people, we would never have gotten as far as we have (quoted in Benjamin 2000:244).

Thus, while I thought it would be very important not to be sectarian, it seemed also important to present ourselves as a group in a way not to alienate "mainstream" students. Two terms have been relevant: "anti-capitalism" and "socialism" (or "communism"). Those who advocate such positions could be attached with radical and negative meanings in a culture that celebrates "free enterprise" system and capitalism. Our campaign goal is a reform within capitalism; I thought there was no need to represent our campaign as anti-capitalist and socialist or communist, irrespective of individual members' ideological positions.

On one occasion in 2000, Daniel and I were tabling in the Library Plaza. The GSU International Socialist Organization happened to have their table right next to us. When one student came up to our table and asked "are you socialists?," I replied "no, we are not socialists." This was in part because of my identity as non-socialist and my ambivalent attitude toward socialism or communism, but I was certainly aware of a possible negative effect my answer might have had on that student.

Liza Featherstone (2002:35 with United Students Against Sweatshops) points out in her book about United Students Against Sweatshops that USAS generally goes with an

anti-corporate rather than an anti-capitalist stance, in part because of the larger American culture. She raises an interesting point that whereas progressive activists in Europe often call themselves and are called by the European mainstream media "anti-capitalists," most progressive activists as well as the mainstream media in the United States do not use this term. In the United States, big corporations often arouse loathing, but small businesses are considered favorably, despite the fact that they too are based on capitalism.

Interestingly, although I have not consciously tried to control participants' language, to the best of my memory, the participants have never used such terms (i.e., anti-capitalist, socialist, communist) to characterize our group. The primary reason why no active participant in our group has characterized the campaign as "anti-capitalist" or "socialist" may have been participants' own ideologies and identities. No one seems to identify themselves as such, and when asked about the solution to the sweatshop problem, their answers do not suggest the need to abolish capitalism or to create a socialist society. Alice argues that the solution is "to have more labor laws and enforce the ones that are already in place." Daniel believes in "fair trade" that respects labor rights, especially the right to organize, across the world. I say while there is no panacea, the WRC model of empowering workers and resulting possible improvement of human rights standards is a key to "build a real democracy." Thadeus, however, does not suggest how we can change the "pervasive attitude [that] the money and goods are the primary thing of importance [in life]" (which is his explanation of the root cause of sweatshops). The president of GSU Young Democrats, a close student observer of this campaign, seems to have been convinced that the group is not "radical":

> I have a better sense now that anti-sweatshop activists are not extremist[s] or conspiracy theorist[s], but that the abuses they are attacking are so dramatic that most reasonable, good-willed people will be upset and want to change the situation.

Representations of Related Issues

I have personally encouraged others to look beyond the narrow, stereotypical apparel "sweatshop" issue, however important it is, and see interrelations with other issues. This was in part because the issue of apparel sweatshops and anti-sweatshop organizing are internally complex and intertwined with many other issues. It was in part because I felt that supporting other progressive struggles led by oppressed people would be beneficial to ourselves as activists and would positively change the dynamics of those social movements and contribute to the expansion of grassroots democracy.

Internally, we have presented the issue of sweatshop as issues of immigrant rights (because many sweatshop workers are immigrants), the environment (because of weak environmental regulations and lax enforcement in apparel producing regions), women's rights (because most sweatshop workers are women), and future generations (because many children and young people work and are exploited in sweatshops). Diverse representations were also intended to attract people who were interested in any of these issues in general.

I have also encouraged participants and supporters to get involved or get interested in various labor-themed struggles. These include living wage campaigns and labor struggles at other campuses, as well as other social justice and human rights struggles, from global justice demonstrations to reproductive rights, and from the School

of the Americas protests to anti-war/peace demonstrations after September 11. While it may not have been practical to set up caucuses to deal with racism and other forms of oppression within our group, I also encouraged people to study anti-racist/anti-sexist readings forwarded from the national USAS e-mail listserv. It seemed especially important because there has been a series of critiques primarily from activists of color (Featherstone and United Students Against Sweatshops 2002:62-66; Klonsky and Larimore-Hall 2000; Martinez 2000) that the global justice and anti-sweatshop movements are dominated by white, middle-class activists.

Collective and Individual Identities

How did the participants identify themselves through the experience of the GSU anti-sweatshop campaign? We will take a look at a few collective and individual identities among the participants, other than some already indicated identities (e.g., "progressives," small "d" democrats, allies of workers, anti-corporate/neoliberalism, anti-FLA/pro-WRC, and non-socialists, non-anti-capitalists, and non-communists). In fact, as sociologists Robert Benford and David Snow (2000:631-32) argue, framing shapes collective identities by carving out shared understanding and purposes, which give particular meanings to actions and interactions in a social movement. In turn, collective identities usually reinforce frames and ideologies of participants. Collective identity might be defined as group members' collective sense of "who we are" and "who we are not" based on their common interests and solidarity.

Feminist sociologists Verta Taylor and Nancy E. Whittier (1992:111-21) suggest three overlapping and interacting analytical dimensions of collective identity in social movements. One dimension is "boundaries" (pp. 111-14), or "the social, psychological, and physical structures that establish differences between a challenging group and dominant groups" (p. 111), including alternative institutions, projects, or other symbols that create symbolic boundaries of "us" vs. "them." A second dimension is "consciousness" (pp. 114-17), or "the interpretive frameworks that emerge out of a challenging group's struggle to define and realize its interests" (p. 111). A third dimension is "negotiation" (pp. 117-21), or "the symbols and everyday actions subordinate groups use to resist and restructure existing system of domination" (p. 111). These include clothing, behaviors, attitudes, and actions that often valorize group's "essential" differences from others.

Here, we will briefly examine four identities: (1) organizational identities as Labor Education and Action Project (LEAP); (2) as United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS); (3) consumer identities as being uncomfortable wearing brand-name clothing; and (4) a political identity as affiliated with the "Left." However, the salience of these identities among the participants may not be strong largely because of their fairly low campaign involvement.

First, I can recall a couple of instances at Greens' meetings where we introduced ourselves to each other. Daniel and I had been involved in the Greens for a while, but at that time at least I felt I was still a "visitor" rather than a "member" of the Greens. I think this led me to say, "I regularly attend the Greens' meetings," when I mentioned my

relationship to the Greens. If I felt I was fully identified with the Greens, I could have said that "I'm a member of the Greens." In fact, I was hesitant to identify myself as Greens when I met other campus progressive activists. My first identification has been LEAP, and I might have said, "I help out the Greens," to relate myself to the Greens. Daniel used the exactly the same phrase ("I regularly attend the Greens' meetings") when he introduced himself in this Greens' meeting, perhaps because he felt the same way. Since we were only active in LEAP and the Greens, this sentence seems to imply a fairly strong identification with, even loyalty to, LEAP by negotiating a delicate boundary between LEAP and the Greens.

Second, the participants seem to feel some degree of identification with USAS. This is despite a sense that they are not close to national or even regional USAS, as revealed in their answers to my question of their sense of identification with USAS.[150] Two participants (Daniel and Thadeus) bought $1 USAS pins, which I bought at the USAS national gathering in the summer of 2001.[151] I have seen them wearing it on Daniel's bag and on Thadeus's clothing when our big events happened. I bought a USAS pin, T-shirt, and cap (all union-made) for myself. We routinely identified ourselves (particularly Daniel and I) as a part of United Students Against Sweatshops when I made presentations, in posters we created, and in the Fashion Show banner we created. In this

[150] My question was "do you feel connected with or separated from other USAS chapters in the South as well as around the country? Why?" Daniel wrote that "I don't feel very connected but I don't see how I could since I really haven't made an effort to be very involved in regional or national activities." Thadeus replied that "[s]eparated. I'm just not involved enough."

[151] LEAP faculty advisor bought one pin, but no one else on the GSU campaign e-mail listserv showed an interest when the message about the sale of pins was posted. At that time, Alice was working full-time, while taking a class at GSU.

sense, we may have found some common interests working toward common goals as a part of USAS.

Third, I asked a few participants as to whether they would be reluctant or uncomfortable to wear brand-name clothes associated with sweatshops. While acknowledging that they should be able to wear such clothing with no problem because they are not advocating a boycott of sweatshop-made clothing, they showed some discomfort doing so. Thadeus feels that "I'm embarrassed to let people see me wear them [Nike running shoes]" even though he nonetheless wore them because there is "little point in throwing them out." Likewise, Daniel says "I am a little uncomfortable wearing clothing such as Nike, Gap, Old Navy, etc. since they have received the brunt of the media attention." I feel the same way when I say that "I would be a bit reluctant to wear or buy products by Nike or Gap just because they are so closely associated with sweatshops now."

Daniel points to a reason of uneasiness, particularly as an anti-sweatshop activist, when he says that "[o]ften times people discredit you and your cause if they notice you wearing these brands." In other words, it might be that they are reluctant to wear them, at least in part, because popular perceptions of wearing the symbol of sweatshop-identified brand clothing would blur the line between "legitimate" and "illegitimate" anti-sweatshop activists. Those who wear them would be "illegitimate" or hypocrites – at least in the eyes of others. These apparel and shoes are symbols that the activists must successfully negotiate with others and within themselves to present themselves as "credible" anti-sweatshop activists.

This uneasiness fundamentally seems to be based on an identity negotiation as "socially responsible" consumers. In this culture, people are often encouraged to make an informed choice when they purchase something or invest in stocks and bonds of companies. By spending the dollar, consumers either reproduce inequalities and immorality by purchasing unethically produced products, or contribute to the ideals of equality and fairness by choosing ethically made commodities. To knowingly possess or wear products that were likely made unethically often make "socially responsible" consumers feel that they may be helping maintain inequalities and oppression. The public is likely to perceive as such if they can recognize those products as unethically made. Likewise, to wear brand-name apparel strongly associated with sweatshops would make "socially responsible" consumers, particularly anti-sweatshop activists, uncomfortable.

Fourth, at the March 2001 fashion show, the GSU men's basketball team and their supporters held a press conference and celebration beside the Library Plaza stage because they unexpectedly won a tournament. The supporters were called "Lefty's Loonies" because the popular coach's nickname is "Lefty." They were wearing a T-shirt with the word, "Loony Lefty," on it. Watching this, Grundy (pseudonym) of the Greens, who was helping with the fashion show, later said to me jokingly that "we may wear them very well because some of us can be called 'Lefty' (politically speaking) and some of us may be 'Loony'!"[152] Perhaps, what he meant by "we" were participants of the fashion show, which included LEAP and other students – many of whom belonged to groups in the Progressive Coalition. If this was the case, he was aware of the boundary of political

[152] From a message I posted on the campaign e-mail listserv.

ideology shared by us in relation to the rest of the GSU community and the public in general. My guess is that part of his joking that "some of us may be 'Loony'" comes from his feeling of marginalization in society as a left-wing person (i.e., "loony" as a bit exaggerated popular view about leftists) and also from his artfulness in using this term and laughing it off as a joke to symbolically resist the devaluation.

Hence, the participants carved out their identities as LEAP and USAS members, anti-sweatshop activists, "socially responsible" consumers, and leftist people through creating boundaries in relation to the Greens, irresponsible consumers and anti-sweatshop activists, and the mainstream public. They also did it through formulating some consciousness by identifying with as LEAP and USAS members and leftists, and through negotiating to be conscientious anti-sweatshop activists and proud left-wing activists.

Political Opportunity Structures

In this section, we will examine the decision making structure of the GSU sweatshop issue, namely the GSU administration. As noted earlier, the GSU Trademark Licensing Committee deals with licensing matters, but does not have any final decision making power to decide whether GSU joins the WRC. I submitted a packet of information in September 2000 to an Auxiliary Service staff person who is one of the committee members. After several weeks and a reminder, the task of handling this issue was relegated to two GSU Legal Advisors who are also on this committee. I then requested a meeting with them on this matter, which was granted. Daniel and I were to meet with them for the first time in October 2000.

At this point, let me discuss the notion of "political opportunity structures," which is relevant in this section. According to social movement scholar Sidney Tarrow (1994), they refer to "consistent – but not necessarily formal, permanent or national – dimensions of the political environment which either encourage or discourage people from using collective action" (p. 18). Such structures are external to a challenger group, and they can ultimately concede to a challenger group what it wants. In modern society, the state has been the main target of social movements because it has instituted "legitimate" avenues for grievances (Tarrow 1994:72). In our case, the political opportunity structures have been the school administration, which can decide whether GSU joins the WRC and adopts a strong code of conduct. Yet the school administration, similar to the state, is not structured in a simple way.

Following Michael Omi and Howard Winant's (1994) analysis of state structures, I can identify several elements of university administrative structures in general. First, the school administration is made up of offices in a hierarchical arrangement and networked to each other. The administration formulates, administers, and enforces policies and regulations governing school affairs – activities of administrators, faculty, staff, students, outsiders. These policies and regulations include, as discussed earlier, rules about the activities of chartered student organizations. They also have informal rules that set limits on what they can do and on ways to carry out their daily routine business. Human relations among administrators, such as their status and patterns of networking, affect their day-to-day administrative operations. In response to pressures, the administration may decide to "absorb" or incorporate demands in a watered-down way because the

normal core operation of administration would otherwise be significantly threatened. They may also "insulate" or contain demands in some marginal parts of the administration (Omi and Winant 1994:86-87).

Our demands do not fundamentally challenge administrative structures or rules. To join the WRC would just require the school to pay an annual fee of 1 percent of the annual royalties but no less than $1,000 and to set up a procedure or a committee at GSU to deal with GSU code violations and violating licensees. Representatives from WRC member colleges and universities are also strongly encouraged to get involved in the WRC University Caucus to discuss ways in which to improve the WRC. This way, an "insulation," or a minor administrative structure change, would be the best outcome of our campaign. Yet so far, the GSU administration has resisted such an easy outcome.

Hence, one campaign task has been to figure out specific avenues through which we can approach administrators and pressure them to accept our demands. In our first meeting with the GSU Legal Advisors, we found out that a group of Vice Presidents (the University Administrative Council) was empowered to make the final decision about our demands, and the Legal Advisors would just make a recommendation to them as to what GSU should do on this sweatshop issue. Thus, our first task was to convince the Legal Advisors to recommend acceptance of our demands. That is, GSU joins the Worker Rights Consortium and adopts a strong code of conduct. However, things have not turned out well.

In our first meeting, the two Legal Advisors sounded unexpectedly sympathetic. They seemed to know about this issue in a general way, and they did not question the

validity of the suggestion that GSU clothing may have been made in sweatshops. They only said many licensees are not really sweatshops because they are small and located around the metro-Atlanta area. It can be argued that, by the time we met, the debate about sweatshops had already shifted in our favor. In other words, the relationship between universities and sweatshops had been so legitimated by the growing anti-sweatshop movement around the country that the Legal Advisors took for granted that there was a good possibility that the GSU apparel was made in sweatshops. They did not ask "what is a sweatshop?" or "why do we need to do anything?" Rather, the question was "what is to be done about this issue?" I remember in our first meeting that one of them said to us that "we'll do something."

Their attitude was influenced by the high likelihood that they had heard about or even researched the vocal and visible USAS campaigns around the country. They may have heard about USAS through our campaign; I saw our campaign flyers in their own informational folder in the meetings with them. They were also on the same Trademark Licensing Committee with a campus bookstore employee who asked me in September 2000 if I had permission to set up a display case in the University Center that, in effect, criticized the bookstore located just across the corridor. This employee also told me that the people on the committee were talking about our campaign.

For our part, successes by "early risers"[153] (Tarrow 1994:155) at other campuses around the country encouraged us at GSU to think that attaining our goals was indeed

[153] "Early risers" are groups mobilizing in the early stage of a social movement that show the vulnerabilities of the state or decision makers to potential challengers. As a result, they encourage other groups to mobilize for/against the same or similar goals.

possible. I wrote to the group e-mail listserv to express my confidence just before the first meeting with the lawyers:

> I feel that this is apparently the first hurdle we need to jump over successfully, and I want to do it with our best. I have no reason to suspect that we cannot do it.

The basic analysis of the WRC and the FLA (and a variety of other information) provided by USAS was critical at this stage of our campaign. We had no way to come up with such information and analysis by ourselves to present to the administration and the campus community.

In this first meeting,[154] however, the lawyers said they wanted to examine the issue "objectively" with more relevant information. They said they could meet with us one month later. We actually wanted to meet sooner in part because we were ready and we were encouraged by the overall tone of the Legal Advisors. It was also in part because we were aware that a common tactic by administrations is to delay the procedure in the hope that activist students will go away or graduate. But they said they were very busy, and we made the appointment accordingly.

In the second meeting in November, however, things turned unfavorably for us. Daniel and I met with the same lawyers, who were now openly in favor of the FLA. I had submitted a comparison of the WRC and the FLA before this meeting for their review, but I was accused of not being "objective" in the representations of both organizations. I

[154] We presented some information to the lawyers in this meeting, including our analyses about Follett's code of conduct and monitoring mechanism. When I met with the Follett bookstore employee in front of the display case in September 2000, I learned that the company has a code and monitors. She said Follett did not use sweatshop labor. Thus, I created a couple of documents explaining why and how the code is weak and the monitoring, which used accounting firms like PricewaterhouseCooper, is flawed. These documents are available from the researcher.

admit that I included evaluations that explicitly favored the WRC over the FLA. This may have been my tactical mistake, beyond the issue of anyone's capability of being fully "objective," particularly those lawyers who, I suspect, took various GSU's interests into account to evaluate those two organizations.

For the Legal Advisors, only minor differences separated the two organizations, and they liked some aspects of the FLA.[155] They argued that the FLA was about to launch its monitoring program while the WRC had no substantial, concrete program set in place yet. They pointed out that the FLA is "engaging" with companies by having them on the Executive Board, while the WRC excludes companies by not having any company representatives on the Governing Board.[156] They also said that they could not recommend adoption of a living wage clause (or even a clause about GSU's commitment to the *notion* of a living wage) because there was no concrete definition of what constituted such a wage.

They also repeated their concern that the WRC and even the FLA might hurt the workers they intend to help by taking away jobs through improvement of working conditions. They cited a letter by the Academic Consortium on International Trade (ACIT), which was given to us in the previous meeting. The letter[157] was initiated by some well-known pro-free trade/market economists, such as Jagdish Bhagwati of

---

[155] In this second meeting, they said they had contacted the Collegiate Licensing Company (CLC) to get some information. GSU is a part of the CLC, which is located in northern Atlanta, and the CLC has been involved in the formation of the FLA. In short, the CLC favors the FLA, and the lawyers took their side of story into account to formulate their view, perhaps without similarly contacting the WRC office.

[156] To this point, I argued that the WRC was planning to hold a series of dialogues with companies, and that it is wiser not to have companies in question on the decision-making board because of their interests and probable influence against genuinely improving working conditions.

Columbia University. It was signed by nearly two hundred academics, mostly economists at more than 90 colleges and universities around the country and overseas (see also Basinger 2000; Featherstone and Henwood 2001; see Schiffrin 2001 for some progressive economists' efforts in response). Their basic claim was:

> [t]o call for a more effective process of dealing with these issues [sweatshops and universities getting on the WRC and/or the FLA] that would involve more careful research and better communication with economists who have researched and written extensively on these issues (quoted in Basinger 2000).

Daniel and I came out of the meeting feeling baffled, having been unable to persuade them of anything. Although we agreed to have our next meeting in January 2001, we did not follow up (and they did not, either) because at that time, I lost confidence in our ability to change their position. Because I was the main negotiator and organizer of the campaign, no one else in the group followed up, either.

In March 2001, however, we decided to call for a meeting with the lawyers right before the fashion show in the hope that the show would gain momentum and that it might help us push the lawyers in our favor. One week before the show, I e-mailed the request to the chief Legal Advisor with whom we had met. She did not e-mail me back until the day of the fashion show. In fact, her response came right after the show. Although the show was cancelled, we had a huge anti-sweatshop banner at the Library Plaza, and I happened to notice her walking by it.

---

[157] The letter, apparently sent out to many campuses around the country on September 25, 2000, was addressed to GSU President Carl Patton, and the Office of the President officially received it on September 28. The letter is available from the researcher.

In the e-mail, she said that she and her colleague would make no recommendation because GSU already belongs to a system, the Collegiate Licensing Company (CLC), which insures that GSU licensees do not use sweatshops:

> [T]here is a Labor Code of Standards required of all Licensees by CLC, the company which represents Georgia State in all of its merchandise licensing. Both CLC and Georgia State University are committed to conducting their business affairs in a socially responsible and ethical manner consistent with their respective educational, research and service missions. We believe that the CLC Labor Code effectively fulfills this commitment. In fact, the CLC Labor Code mirrors much of what is required by both the WRC and the FLA. Therefore, after much consideration, we have decided not to recommend membership in either the FLA or the WRC. We will, however, continue our efforts to protect and preserve the global environment through application of the CLC Labor Code Standards.

I appreciated her reply, but I soon confirmed that the CLC code lacks some important provisions (i.e., a living wage, full public disclosure, women's rights, and overtime as voluntary, not mandatory) and crucially, any enforcement mechanism. Yet, I failed to follow up with her during the 2001 spring semester.

Yet we had an indirect contact with this chief lawyer one month later. Moments before the April 2001 fashion show, a high GSU administrator came over to the show stage and told me that the chief lawyer we have been in negotiation with was "upset" because we apparently violated a clause in the GSU student code of conduct. Specifically, he pointed to our usage of "GSU" right before our event or group names in the fashion show flyer and the fashion show banner, and said the code bans student organizations like us from using "GSU" as a prefix before any name or title of an event. He declared that "GSU USAS" and "GSU Anti-Sweatshop Fashion Show," for example,

were violations of the code. According to him, however, only titles like "USAS of GSU" and "Anti-Sweatshop Fashion Show at GSU" were in compliance. This time, he said, he was giving us just a warning.

I immediately pointed out to him that other groups were doing the same thing as well as possibly violating other codes like the campus posting policy, and that what he was doing amounted to selective enforcement of the code just because the lawyer did not like us. He claimed that the school was trying to be consistent in its enforcement. Realizing that we had no chance to override his position, I grudgingly accepted his warning.[158]

The next round of exchanges between the main school lawyer and myself came one year later, in the spring semester of 2002. She still believed in the adequacy of the CLC, and she wrote that GSU is virtually a member of the FLA because most CLC licensees, including GSU licensees, were in the process of joining the FLA. After all, she added, there is no perfect monitoring system in existence, which sounded like an excuse for not joining any organization.

I argued in response that agreeing on the CLC code without an enforcement mechanism does not work, and that GSU licensees joining the FLA does not guarantee that GSU merchandise, in particular, will be monitored since licensees make orders at multiple places around the world.[159] Of course, I included a lengthy critique of the FLA

[158] Later, I looked up the GSU Student Code of Conduct to find a relevant clause. The relevant section I could find was in "16.16.1 Additional Policies" in which it says, "[a]ll student organizations are asked not to use Georgia State University as a prefix to their names. The preferred identification is the 'ABC Club of Georgia State University.'"

[159] Later, I found out that most joining licensees are required to comply with the FLA code only for the school merchandise of the schools on the FLA. This means that GSU, not being on the FLA, will not

and encouraged her to get GSU more actively involved in this issue. She felt, however, that she and her colleague had spent a considerable time on this issue, and she wrote in response that they were not going to discuss it any longer.

The campaign participants were frustrated about the attitude of the lawyers. Thadeus said "it seems the university lawyers are ridiculously, staunchly against this [joining the WRC]." Daniel felt this way:

> They seemed unwavering in their support of [the] FLA and the CLC. I do believe their intentions were good[.] [H]owever[,] I don't believe they understood the problems of giving corporations as much power as the FLA does.

I felt that they were not really interested in this issue and did not want to spend any money on issues like ours:

> [M]y sense is that they want to do as little as they can and as late as they get to do it. For one thing, over 100 universities and colleges have joined the FLA upon invitation since 1999. Assuming that GSU also got the invitation, no action, to me, indicates their basic position: They don't really care, or they don't want to even pay a dime for that purpose.

Feeling that we had hit a wall, we decided to approach our President, Dr. Carl V. Patton. As noted, we heard from the lawyers that the University Administrative Council would make the decision on this topic. We felt, nonetheless, that the president would be the ultimate decision maker on any major issues, as indicated by the experience of USAS campaigns at many other campuses. We also believed that he could at least exert his power on this issue even if he is not the actual ultimate decision maker.

---

benefit from the FLA even if all the GSU licensees join the FLA. And, not all GSU licensees were joining

Four of us visited the Office of the President in late April 2002.[160] Thadeus generously purchased $50 worth of flowers for President Patton because we thought the flowers would enhance our image and encourage him to read our letter quickly. We did not expect to meet with him because we made no appointment, but the President was there, and he kindly invited us into his office for a few minutes to talk about this issue. We handed him a packet of information, including our letter signed by representatives of a number of GSU student chartered organizations.[161] He agreed to read the materials and get back to us soon. In his letter a few weeks later, however, he basically repeated what the lawyers have been saying. In his case, he just said that GSU has adequately dealt with this issue because the school is a part of the CLC. We are planning to respond soon.

At this point, it seems useful to consider four factors in turn that create political opportunities for social movements, according to social movement scholars Doug McAdam, John McCarthy, and Mayer Zald (1996:10), and apply them to the GSU campaign. The first factor is "[t]he relative openness or closure of the institutionalized political system" (p. 10). As seen above, it appeared that while the lawyers have met with us and acknowledged the importance of the issue, they were not willing to accept our demands. The main figure even said they are not going to discuss the issue because, she said, they had already put enough time and thought into it. We shall see how the position

---

the FLA at this time.

[160] Those four people were Alice, Daniel, Thadeus, and myself.

[161] Upon a short notice, the signed organizations include International Socialist Organization, the Greens, Young Democrats, the Campaign to End the Death Penalty, Black Law Students Association, and Graduate Student Association. Copies of the letter were sent to the out-going president of the GSU Student Government Association, the in-coming president of the GSU Student Government Association, and *Signal* (Avent et al. 2002)(albeit in a substantially shortened version due to *the Signal*'s word restriction). The new

of President Patton may change in the future, although I personally have a pessimistic view of the prospects for a significant change because of my perception that he is politically conservative. From a different part of the GSU administration, however, our group, LEAP, finally started to receive some funding from the university since the spring of 2002.[162] This increase in resources will help expand our activities.

The second element is "[t]he stability of that broad set of elite alignments that typically undergird a polity" (p. 10). We have been able to observe no evidence that the GSU administration is divided to the degree that our campaign can penetrate it. Similarly, we have not had any allies in the administration, particularly in the higher-up ranks (the third factor). At our LEAP faculty advisor's suggestion, we have thought about approaching the Faculty Senate, but so far, we can barely identify a few key sympathetic faculty members who seem to be active in university politics. The last factor is the administration's "capacity and propensity for repression" (p. 10). The only evidence for this was the incident at the April fashion show when, I felt, the high administrator (and the main school lawyer) selectively pointed out our violation of the student code of conduct and, in effect, we were intimidated, if in a minor way.

In sum, the political opportunity structures of Georgia State University appear to be fairly closed. The structures seem to have affected the campaign in the general sense that our group has not been able to exploit any openings to more expeditiously attain its goals of making the school join the WRC and adopt a strong code of conduct. However, I

SGA president later contacted Daniel to say she is interested in learning more about this issue. We hope to meet with her in the future.

am not sure about the extent to which the structures have affected the campaign because our encounters with the administration have been fairly minimal.

Some Campaign Outcomes

After two years of campaigning, we have not yet attained the stated goals of convincing GSU to join the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC) or adopt a strong code of conduct. In the process, we lost ground on our goal of getting a commitment from the school not to join the Fair Labor Association (FLA). In part, this was because the importance of this goal receded in the national USAS campaign, and it did not make a lot of sense to emphasize it in our campaign. The GSU lawyers countered our insistence on the merits of participating in the WRC program by employing the CLC and the FLA.

In this section, we will look at some other outcomes of this still on-going campaign as of the end of the 2002 spring semester. We will first examine the overall number of more or less active regular participants for a certain period of time (more than a few months), and their race, class, and gender characteristics. I will also discuss some less visible outcomes of the campaign, such as a higher awareness of the issue, some network creation, and possible worldview changes among the participants. In the next section, I will then attempt to account for some of these outcomes, particularly the outcomes around our stated goals.

---

[162] For the 2002 spring semester, we were awarded $410. For the school year 2002-2003, LEAP was provided with $750. The money comes from the student activities fee that every enrolled student must pay each semester. Of course, myriads of regulations restrict for what purposes the money can be used.

The number of active members has been consistently very small. Even though the e-mail listserv had, at the peak, 50 GSU community members, almost all of whom were students, the actual active participants were no more than several students who have not necessarily been consistent in their participation over the last couple of years. As a result, I carried almost all the load. The participants have been overwhelmingly white, except myself (Asian/Japanese), and mostly from middle-class background.[163] More men than women have been in our group.

We can also observe more subtle and invisible outcomes. Some scholars of social movements point out that the effects of social movements cannot be measured just on the accomplishment of stated goals, which are often policy changes. Effects should be seen as both external and internal to movements. Externally, they include educating the public, creating changes in the larger culture (politics and/or everyday life of the larger population), and weakening or splitting opponents (Brecher et al. 2000:108-109; Fitzgerald and Rogers 2000:586-88; Meyer and Whittier 1994). Internally, they might include bringing new participants into movements, unifying different groups, increasing the capacity for action, strengthening movements relative to their opponents, building a larger vision, creating new cultures like new identities, behaviors, and norms, nurturing hopes, providing empowerment and inspiration, and developing various skills that can be useful even after movements die down and could be a basis for future social movements (Brecher et al. 2000:108-109, 118; Fitzgerald and Rogers 2000:586-88; Meyer and

[163] I asked Alice, Daniel, and Thadeus about their parents' annual household incomes as of 1999. Specifically, I asked them to choose their incomes from these three options: (a) more than $100,000 a year; (b) between $99,999 and $40,001 a year; and (c) less than $40,000 a year. Including myself, one chose (a)

Whittier 1994). It can be argued that these internal effects are often more important than the attainment of stated goals, given their potential widespread and enduring influence.

How has the GSU anti-sweatshop campaign fared on these aspects? We may have produced some very modest but mixed effects. Externally, we were able to reach out to hundreds of people in the GSU community through a variety of means, such as flyers and presentations, to educate people about sweatshops, the global economy, and the larger movement against sweatshops. A few hundred, mostly students either signed our petition or wrote a letter to President Patton, though few actually participated in our campaign beyond these one-time actions. I think it has been important to at least project a progressive perspective in a society where "free market/trade" is the dominant paradigm. I do not claim, however, that we convinced most people we came in contact with about the merits of the campaign.

Fortunately, we had no organized opponents, much like most other campuses where USAS has been active. There have been only occasional critiques from conservative individuals. We have had some conversations with these people, and if nothing else, we presented an alternative perspective to them. Thadeus cites this occasion as his most memorable moment in this campaign:

> I think I had a moment at an informational tabling where we were confronted fairly aggressively by a man who was pretty skeptical about our goals. I think I (uncharacteristically) handled his questions and arguments fairly deftly and, though I doubt he was convinced, he may have left the table in a thoughtful and not totally antagonized way.

---

although he has mostly supported himself financially at GSU. Two chose (b), even though one of whom added she has not been receiving any financial support from her parents by 1999. One selected (c).

Internally, the campaign has been an occasional site for some coalition work among campus groups and individuals. At the fashion shows, for example, the campaign was a temporary site for some groups and individuals from the GSU Progressive Coalition and elsewhere to interact. A loose network of people and groups I mainly built over the last few years at Georgia State still exist and can be activated when an occasion comes up in the future. For example, I used this network to help organize two successful anti-war/peaceful justice rallies at the Library Plaza Stage in September and October 2001. As a result, I personally have felt a sense of being in a progressive network on campus.

A few participants may have developed some organizing skills that can be useful in other areas of our lives. This has been particularly relevant to me. As the main organizer, I created almost all materials (e.g., flyers, educational literature, poster boards, and the fashion show banner), made connections with individuals on campus, made presentations, and got involved in some negotiations. Combined with my involvement in other activism outside the GSU anti-sweatshop campaign, especially the larger USAS, I have acquired a good experience of social activism and learned many important practical lessons of organizing.

Has involvement in this campaign influenced the perspectives and feeling of the participants? Here, the results seem mixed. First, my perspective has been expanded, and I feel a modest satisfaction as the main organizer:

> I certainly feel that my participation enlarged my perspective – about the global economy/globalization, labor and economic justice, social movements and organizing work, politics, oppressions and divisions within progressive communities, etc. I really feel that I'm a part of

> larger movements for more justice, democracy, and liberation. This sense is something that you may never get by just reading books; you have to actually get your hands dirty, feel it, and keep faith in it. And, I reinforced my perspective that progressive social changes can indeed happen, even if after enormous strategic organizing and even if we won't ever get to the "promised land," so to speak, where everyone is satisfied with oneself and each other, and where there are little conflicts…..
>
> I just hope we let just some of the people associated with the GSU campaign learn that if we can get together with a good strategy, something can be done, even if a modest one. Just seeing and feeling other USAS chapters' activities and accomplishments would tell you that. I really hope that they will take new perspectives and experiences to whatever they will do in their life.

Elizabeth, of GSU Power of Women, whose help was so valuable in preparing the fashion shows, seems to have gotten some inspiration from the national USAS movement via our e-mail listserv:

> [T]his campaign did give me hope that diverse groups of students across the country are mobilizing collectively on crucial human rights issues. In a strange way, knowing that we all recognize how problematically our society is currently structured gives me hope that we will be able to work together to create a better vision for the future.

Daniel, on the other hand, senses that he just confirmed his perspective already formed by the time of his involvement in the campaign:

> I came to the [GSU anti-sweatshop] campaign with a certain view of society and my participation has confirmed it. I felt the masses were apathetic and ignorant of the situation around them and that those in power benefited from existing arrangements thus were reluctant to change anything without demand.

Thadeus feels that while he is impressed by some activists, the GSU campaign has not been inspiring for him:

> I'm impressed by the resourcefulness and guts of some activists…. [But,] I am uninspired by the [GSU] movement. I often fail to see the big picture, find myself lacking the kind of factual background which would make me comfortable in my beliefs, and am unclear in what kind of vision I should have. That said, I do believe in the quasi-[A]merican mantra that where there is a will, there is a way. So I just try to keep my will focused on a world where possessions matter less, and personal relationships matter more. And I hope the rest shall follow.

To sum up, the campaign has been unable to attract a large number of participants or produce the desired results. In this sense, the campaign has not been successful. And, given the time we have spent on this campaign (two years) without much accomplishment, it might be said that the campaign has not even been effective. However, it has contributed to some very modest human and community development through creating an informal network of individuals and groups, raising awareness of a human rights issue, and expanding or at least confirming participants' views of politics and social change.

Accounting for the Outcomes

"The movement at GSU is lagging." Thadeus thus characterizes the state of the GSU anti-sweatshop campaign in comparison to other USAS groups around the country. The question now is why such outcomes? Despite its modest goals, despite the existence of a virtual full-time organizer (myself), despite the existence of a few "very dedicated," "quiet and dependable" activists with "sincerity and enthusiasm" who are striving

"diligently to accomplish its goals,"[164] despite favorable campus media coverage of the issue, despite the visibility of many USAS groups around the country, despite our similar framings to those at other successful campuses, and despite increasing awareness of the issue of sweatshops through sympathetic coverage by major national media and a number of courses on the topic available on the GSU campus, why such results? Specifically, we might ask: why has the GSU anti-sweatshop campaign not been able to accomplish the stated goals of having the school join the WRC and adopt a strong code of conduct? Why has the campaign not been able to catch on with many people on the GSU campus and to have them participate in the campaign?

I would argue that the campaign has lacked strong mobilizing structures to pressure the administration in the first place, and this has been the result of a number of factors. These factors include the demography of the student body (class, age, and race), a lack of a strong student identification with the school, a weak progressive political culture at GSU, the setting of GSU as a commuter school, the lack of direct evidence that GSU apparel is actually made in sweatshops, the lack of economic resources to invite outside speakers, and the lack of adequate organizing skills of the core organizers.

Many scholars (e.g., McAdam et al. 1996; Morris 2000; Tarrow 1994) argue that strong mobilizing structures are a key for success in social movements. Even under the circumstance of closed political opportunity structures, movements can have an independent influence on these structures and attain their goals (Kurzman 1996; McAdam et al. 1996:13; Morris 2000:447). Liza Featherstone (2001a:110) contends that

[164] These phrases come from three close student observers of the campaign, namely Dan (pseudonym), S.

levels of aggressiveness in a campaign and degrees of goal attainment are correlated in progressive campus activism; the more aggressive movements are, the more successful they can be. For Featherstone, that is because universities are essentially corporations whose interests are in direct conflict with interests of such movements and who would never implement progressive changes without aggressive demands.

It seems that our campaign has so far lacked strong mobilizing structures to challenge the decision-makers. We met with the Legal Advisors only two times (and exchanged several e-mails), and the President just once. We have not really demonstrated to them and other potential decision makers that we have wide campus support and that they should take us very seriously. I think we lacked a number of elements to build strong mobilizing structures, irrespective of the relatively closed political opportunities at Georgia State in comparison to progressive institutions like Earlham College or Oberlin College.[165]

We have not been able to create momentum, after we missed the chance to take advantage of the nation-wide surge created by other USAS groups in the spring of 2000. Momentum has positive emotional and behavioral consequences. Emotionally, participants feel excited and see a positive future of a movement. This inspires them to prioritize movement activities and get more involved in activities. It draws more people into a movement who sense the momentum and excitement. The target in turn is likely to sense the rising pressure and take an action to deflect or/and co-opt the movement. I remember that one GSU student activist, who has been on our campaign e-mail listserv,

---

Grundy, and Elizabeth.

wrote to me in the spring of 2000 after the series of USAS sit-ins that "let me know when you're occupying the president's office!" It may be that many on the e-mail listserv were excited about the actions happening around the country and wanted to do something. But, we were not able to take advantage of that feeling. Why?

And why have we not been able to build strong mobilizing structures? Some activists say the student body at Georgia State is apathetic. Perhaps. It may be that most students believe there are few serious problems in the world because the media, politicians, and businesses tend to create such a complacent sense of reality for students. Even if they recognize the existence of serious problems, they may think they are not responsible or they cannot do anything to change these problems.

Some might argue that attracting an interest for a rather technical issue of the merits of specific organizations (i.e., the WRC and the FLA) is more difficult than garnering support for a noble-sounding, more abstract cause of anti-sweatshops. I agree. Many USAS activists have been aware of this. A former Harvard USAS activist discusses the importance of having a right balance between the two to accomplish goals:

> If our focus is too narrow, we'll lose momentum, since it's hard to mobilize students around the technical issues of monitoring. We have to follow through on enforcing our codes, but we also have to join fights against particular companies with name recognition to be part of the larger antisweatshop movement and to keep students mobilized. Our challenge is to find the right balance (quoted in Benjamin 2000:250).

At Georgia State, while educating the people about the code of conduct and the WRC and the FLA, I forwarded a number of e-mails from the national USAS general e-mail listserv

---

[165] For any indication, these colleges are on the WRC.

about new campaigns (e.g., Kukdong and New Era campaigns) and media exposures of sweatshops to keep people's attentions. We showed videos about sweatshops as a part of the WRC campaign. I helped organize a few events on a farmworker issue – the tomato pickers for Taco Bell[166] – to sustain interests and recruit new people in our group. In the process, we tried to build trust from the GSU people for our cause by presenting ourselves as knowledgeable and credible people who can be trusted for the selection of a specific organization for GSU to join (i.e., the WRC). We also emphasized that this is a national campaign, and many schools have already joined the WRC.

Admittedly, it would be harder to build trust and get support from administrators. Due to our relatively minimal interactions at Georgia State, the GSU administrators may not have had enough time to closely examine the work of the WRC while building trust in the organization. Individual administrators can be good allies to nudge decision-makers to join the WRC from inside. But, beside this specific situation at GSU, have they not also been the case for other active and successful USAS groups?

We might also point out the rather disappointing outcomes of the fashion shows, due to the unexpected late sound equipment delivery. It may be that we could have gotten more signatures on the petition, signed many more up on the e-mail listserv, and recruited a few active participants. Maybe. But I would guess that the effects would have been relatively small because interested people could have talked to or signed up with us since we were visible at the fashion shows with a large banner and other displays. The September 11 significantly changed the atmosphere of the country, the world, and

[166] As mentioned, the workers belong to the Coalition of Immokalee Workers (www.ciw-online.org).

progressive activism. At Georgia State, we were compelled to focus on the organizing against the "war on terrorism," as manifested in the two successful campus rallies and the planning for a failed southeastern student anti-war/peace conference on campus. Was this a factor for not having been able to mobilize the GSU community for our anti-sweatshop campaign? Maybe. But it is telling that for a year and a half prior to the fall of 2001, we had not been able to build wide campus support.

Probably the above factors were at work in our campaign. But it seems most of these factors existed in other more active and successful campaigns around the country. In order to explain the different outcomes, I believe there seem more fundamental structural and cultural reasons more specifically at GSU that must be taken into account. I believe that these factors interacted with each other to help formulate the view that most students look apathetic and hindered us from building the campaign and creating a momentum on campus.

First, one factor is the demography of the GSU student body. This includes factors of class, age, and race. At GSU, there were a total of 25,506 students, including non-degree and laws students, in the 2001 fall semester (18,192 undergraduates).[167] In this semester, 48 percent of them took 11-15 hours of classes, 31 percent took 6-10 hours, 12 percent took 1-5 hours, and only 9 percent took more than 15 hours of classes. The average age of the undergraduate students was 25 years old, while 27 years old was the average for the graduate students. As to the racial breakdown, 52 percent of the total student body were white (46 percent of undergraduates), 27 percent were black (32

percent of undergraduates), 3 percent were Hispanic or Latino (3 percent of undergraduates), 11 percent were Asian (11 percent of undergraduates), 0.3 percent were American Indians (0.3 percent of undergraduates), and 8 percent were mixed race (8 percent of undergraduates). Furthermore, it seems reasonable to say, based on my casual observation, that a good percentage of GSU students work full-time, and an even larger percentage of them take at least one part-time job, most likely those 43 percent of the students who register for only 1-10 hours of classes. Though unable to get the data on students' average annual household income, it seems that they mainly come from lower middle class or working class families.

What do they tell, assuming that these percentages of the fall semester of 2001 above also apply in general to the whole campaign period between the early 2000 and May 2002? First, it seems that compared to more "traditional" colleges and universities where students are straight out of high school and do not generally work, a higher portion of GSU students, because they have children or need to earn money for their daily necessities, seems to carry some responsibilities for their families and jobs that take them away from extra-curricula activities, including activism. Daniel, one of the GSU campaign participants, for example, cites his job and family responsibilities in addition to his full-time student status as the reason he cannot spend more time for the campaign.

Second, unlike students from upper-middle and upper class backgrounds who may have a sense of more security for their future, those from lower-middle and working classes, who seem disproportionately to comprise the GSU student body, would be more

[167] All these numbers about Georgia State University are of the 2001 fall semester and came from the

likely to come to a university for the purpose of acquiring a better job or career.[168] This would mean that activities which do not contribute to their future jobs, including activism, would be low among their priorities. And, even if they decide to participate in activism, they may be more interested in issues closer to their economic situations, such as tuition and fee hikes rather than the seemingly distant issue of sweatshops.

It has been said that the most active USAS chapters are more likely to be those at elite schools, and their memberships more likely come from upper-middle or middle-middle class backgrounds. In an interesting 1999 survey (though I doubt that the sample was representative), over one-third of USAS students came from families with an annual income of over $100,000 while only 8 percent came from households earning less than $40,000 a year (Featherstone and United Students Against Sweatshops 2002:92).

Likewise, a sociology graduate USAS activist student at the University of Notre Dame recently calculated that USAS affiliated groups are more likely to be found in those schools of high-ranked status, as measured by *US News and World Report*. According to his results, a surprising 50.5 percent of the formerly USAS affiliate schools (49 schools) belong to the highest bracket of schools in the ranking. Thirty-one percent (30 schools) rank second, and 12.4 percent (12 schools) come next in the ranking. Only 6.1 percent or six schools among the USAS affiliates belong to the fourth rank. Similarly,

---

University Public Relations office.

[168] Many would argue that colleges and universities are increasingly becoming the places to train people to successfully get a good job or career rather than to acquire critical thinking about society. Thus, it can be argued that this job-bound attitude is a part of the larger ideology and practice.

he found that the higher-status schools (as measured by *US News and World Report*) were more likely to have experienced sit-ins in the springs of 1999 and 2000.[169]

These results are confirmed by research on activism at US colleges and universities in the 1960s, as measured by the presence of Students for a Democratic Society chapter or the existence of 1964 Freedom Summer participants.[170] Van Dyke (1998a, 1998b) reports that more protests occurred at more selective institutions, even after controlling for economic resources of schools, as measured by tuition and fees. Van Dyke (1998a, 1998b) reasons that more selective institutions were more likely to have a receptive political culture for activism, and that the personal and familial backgrounds of their students were more likely to be politically active, thus increasing the likelihood that students got involved in activism once in college.

Van Dyke (1998a, 1998b) also reports that the larger an institution, the more it witnessed student activism, even after controlling "student isolation" (i.e., the student-faculty ratio and the number of students in dormitory). A possible explanation is that a larger school more likely had a greater number of student activists, who facilitated a formation of a community of activists and activism on campus. Another finding is that schools with a history of campus activism (as measured by the presence of American Student Union or Student League for Industrial Democracy on campus in the 1930s) were more likely to have activism in the 1960s, suggesting that political culture of campus was a factor to encourage student activism.

---

[169] These results are available from the researcher.

[170] The Freedom Summer was organized by the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), one of the major U.S. youth organizations in the 1960s.

Georgia State University ranked in the fourth tier in 2002, as measured by *US News and World Report*. On this account, it is rather an exception to the pattern of the active USAS affiliate schools (assuming that the ranking has not changed significantly over the last few years). In addition to being a commuter school, which probably reduces student interactions, the lower ranking of GSU's likely decreases the likelihood that GSU students would strongly identify with the university. I do not see, for example, many students wearing GSU clothing on campus. GSU Student Government Association candidates often declare in their platforms that they are determined to create a school spirit. The evidence suggests that GSU students generally have a fairly low identification with Georgia State University and a fairly low sense of school pride as GSU students. If this is the case, the lack of strong identification would discourage GSU students from sympathizing with the anti-sweatshop campaign, which in good part appeals to a sense of school pride.

It can be arguably said that the median annual household income of GSU students does not exceed $40,000, assuming that they are mainly from the lower middle and working classes (the Georgia's median annual household income in 1999 was $42,433).[171] As noted, however, the annual incomes of main campaign activists' parents in 1999 were more varied. One activist guesses that his parents earned over $100,000 although he says he mostly supports himself financially (much less than $40,000). Two activists' parents, the activists believe, acquired less than $99,999, but more than $40,001

[171] The median income figure is from 2000 U.S. Census at http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?_+s=55292491915 (QT-P32 Income Distribution in 1999 of Households and Families: 2000).

(one of them notes she has not receiving any financial support from her parents – her own annual income has been less than $20,000), and one activist falls in the category of less than $40,000.

It is interesting as to how to interpret these numbers in comparison to the 1999 survey of the annual household incomes of USAS activists above. It is not clear what percentages of USAS activists in the survey worked either part-time or full-time or were financially supported by parents partially or fully. One way to interpret is to solely base its evidence on the parents' incomes and say that GSU activists are, on average, in the middle of the income layers (i.e., between $40,001 and $99,999) and they are more or less the average of USAS groups in terms of their family incomes. An alternative interpretation is that given the estimated average household incomes of the GSU students and actual incomes they and the campaign activists depended on (less than $40,000) in comparison to the average household incomes of the students where USAS chapters were active, GSU could be categorized as an exceptional school among the USAS affiliated schools.

While GSU has a large student population, which can be a factor encouraging protests, as reported in Van Dyke (1998a, 1998b), GSU does not seem to have a history of activism. About 150 African American students' successful sit-in in 1992 in protest of the racially exclusionary school environment appears a noticeable exception, and other factors seem to have been at work, as discussed below. In any case, much evidence above seems to suggest that GSU does not have a good social environment for generating activism or protests.

Third, the GSU anti-sweatshop activists tend to be white in a school where about 30 percent of students are African American and about the half of the student body (48 percent in total or 54 percent of undergraduates) are people of color. The racial composition of our group tends to mirror the larger USAS, which has been overwhelmingly white (though there may have been some changes lately). As the racial demography of global justice movement participants seems to suggest, people of color tend not to be involved in this movement in part because they feel this is not really "their issue" (Featherstone and United Students Against Sweatshops 2002; Klonsky and Larimore-Hall 2000; Martinez 2000). People of color tend to identify with issues that more deeply and visibly affect their communities – myriads forms of racism in their communities. In terms of economic justice, as our LEAP faculty advisor suggests, issues like a living wage for campus workers who are disproportionately African Americans may resonate more with the GSU student body than distant-sounding sweatshops. On the other hand, the rhetoric of the anti-sweatshop campaign could have been tailored in ways that appealed to people of color. For example, we could have argued that as the capital gets more flexible to move production to lower-waged regions and bust unions, actual domestic labor standards upon which those students and their family members depend become worse. Particularly people of color who disproportionately work low-wage jobs have a stake in the anti-sweatshop movement to reduce the effects of neoliberalism. But we have failed to make this connection. Thus this race factor may have been one reason why the anti-sweatshop campaign at GSU has not attracted many students.

In contrast, the race factor seems to have been central in the sit-in at Georgia State University in November 1992, which was eventually participated by about 150 African American students. This sit-in occurred on the following Monday of a week when a racial epithet ("NIGERS [*sic*] ENTER" stenciled out of the original words, "UNIVERSITY CENTER") on the lid of a trashcan was found on campus. My un-systemic observation of the incident from the coverage of the student newspaper (*Signal*) suggests that a number of factors were important at least for the mobilization of the students (Hafer 1992a; Hafer 1992b; *Signal* 1992; Spence 2002a; Spence 2002b).

First, the issue heightened a sense of racial injustice among the Black students who already had a high racial awareness. There had been a number of racist events on campus prior to the dustbin discovery, but the university seems to have poorly dealt with them. In 1992, there were fewer African Americans were enrolled at Georgia State University, and many Black students apparently felt the school racially exclusionary. There was a widely publicized racial upsurge in Los Angeles in 1992, just several months prior to this sit-in. It can be argued that Black students in general felt higher level of racial injustice at the time of the trashcan incident. It happened on campus; many more students may have felt the issue closer to their heart, compared to the issue of sweatshops.

Second, the university created a space where the students could gather and air their concerns and help formulate their strategy right after the trashcan incident. On the next day of the discovery of the dustbin, the weekly multicultural forum discussed the event. Heated debates in the forum prompted a number of students to go upstairs to the

president's office to present the trashcan and discuss the issue with the president who agreed to facilitate an open forum on race relations on campus next morning. Next day, the group of Black students, made up of some indigenous student organizations, such as the Black Student Alliance, went to the forum with a list of 11 demands to President Carl Patton. Due to his "lackluster response" as perceived by the group, they went up to the president's suite and remained there for eight hours. Then, in the following Monday morning, the sit-in began to block the offices of financial aid, registrar, and admission and lasted for 12 hours until President Patton accepted seven of eleven demands that included the formation of the African American Studies department by the following fall of 1993. Hence this issue had a sense of urgency for many students and a space to formulate collective positions. It can be argued that the anti-sweatshop campaign lacked at least the first factor of a sense of urgency felt among the students.

Fourth, the fact of GSU being a commuter school without any sizable on-campus housing for its students seems to create fewer opportunities for students to interact with each other and develop a sense of community. My impression has been that most students come to the university just for their classes; they leave almost immediately after their classes, perhaps for their family responsibilities or jobs. If this is the case, strong support for the campaign would be less likely to develop because it would be harder to reach out to the constituents, and because they would feel more separation from each other and would develop a weaker identification as a part of the GSU community. Especially for those who commute many miles to campus, they would need to take into account that time and spend even less time on campus as a consequence.

Fifth, the GSU campaign lacked direct overwhelming evidence that GSU apparel is actually made in sweatshops. In a larger anti-sweatshop campaign, reports on sweatshops often list the names of schools to which workers in specific sweatshops make clothes in order to enlist students at those colleges and universities for a particular campaign. For example, the New Era campaign, since the fall of 2001, generated a list of over 100 schools so that students at those schools could pressure their administrations to send a letter to New Era or suspend contract with the company. Although we later found New Era in the GSU licensee list obtained from one of the Legal Advisors, we initially – when it mattered – did not know Georgia State University had dealings with New Era. This has been the case in other campaigns, too. In other words, we have lacked the direct, concrete evidence to show to GSU students and administration that GSU apparel is in fact made in a sweatshop. Existence of clear and compelling evidence almost certainly would have helped the campaign to make a strong link between GSU and sweatshops, and may have resonated with more students.

We did not have much economic resources to carry out major events, particularly inviting well-known speakers on the issue. I knew some organizations, such as Global Exchange, has a number of speakers for a fairly expensive fee. For example, Living Wage Project (www.nikewages.org) was conducting a well-received national campus speaking tour about their experience of living with Nike factory workers in Indonesia from the fall of 2000 to the spring of 2001. Some campuses attracted a few hundred people as the audience. When they were booking their southern tour, I found out that the speaking fee was $1,000 in addition to costs for travel and accommodations. We wanted

them to come to GSU, but it was impossible for us to pay such amount of money either from our pockets or group budget allocation from the school. It may have been that there were people I could talk to at GSU to pay such a fee, such as the Spotlight Program, but it seems that it requires months of advance notice for planning and budgeting. Fortunately, Living Wage Project came to Emory University in the spring of 2001, but I felt the difference between relatively poor schools like GSU and more affluent schools like Emory. Had they come to GSU, we may have made some differences in our campaign.

The last factor is an inadequacy of organizing skills of the organizers, particularly the main organizer (myself). While structures and cultures matter immensely to affect decisions that individual activists and constituents make and feeling they conjure up, creativity and idiosyncrasies of activists also shape trajectories and outcomes of social movements (Jasper 1997:54-58, 66). Particularly, I wonder if I have been able to present myself as a capable and attractive activist with whom potential participants felt they want to associate and put their time and energy into the campaign. Unfortunately, it is not really the question that I can respond with a confident “yes.” Thus, the campaign might have been a little different if I had been an activist who could honestly answer to that question with a strong “yes.”

In this section, I have tried to give some explanations for some of the outcomes of the GSU anti-sweatshop campaign. I asked two specific questions at the beginning. (1) Why has the GSU anti-sweatshop campaign not been able to accomplish the stated goals of having the school join the WRC and adopt a strong code of conduct? (2) Why has the campaign not been able to draw in many people on the GSU campus? As noted earlier, it

is often as significant to study and explain a movement that has apparently failed to attain its mission as to examine successful movements. This is because social scientists reason that combinations of social forces constrain as well as enable movements to take given shapes and trajectories. It seems that movements that "fail" have been understudied in part because of the political unattractiveness of the problem, and in part because such movements are harder to find unless the researcher knows a given activist community well.

To answer the first question, I argued that the campaign lacked a crucial factor in all social movements, namely strong mobilizing structures to pressure the GSU administration to give us what we want. Though the number of participants is one element in mobilizing structures, I think it is the base to build strong mobilizing structures. This is because more people can pool a larger amount of money, share ideas and skills better, reach out to more people, and increase the general capacity of a given campaign. Hence, I tried to account for why there have been just a small number of students in the campaign.

I pointed out a number of possible factors more specific to Georgia State University. First, a disproportionate number of students seem to have family responsibilities and jobs, and many simply do not have time for activism. Second, the class background of most students at GSU may have discouraged them from participating in the campaign because they are in school more likely for their future jobs or careers rather than their present ethical or social concerns like sweatshops. The available data indicates that most active USAS chapters have been at elite schools, unlike GSU, and that

students at the elite schools seem to have much higher household incomes than GSU students.

Third, the fairly low status ranking of Georgia State University as an academic institution, combined with the fact of being a commuter school, may also reduce the possibility that students strongly identify with the school. This may have been a factor in the campaign, which appealed to school pride. Fourth, GSU lacks progressive political culture and a history of activism, which seem likely to discourage the participation in the anti-sweatshop campaign.

Fifth, the multi-racial composition of the GSU student body suggests that the high number of students, who are people of color, may not perceive the sweatshop issue as important to them as issues of racism in their communities. Sixth, the GSU campaign did not have direct and clear evidence of the link between GSU and sweatshops. The existence of such evidence could have appealed to the students more and made a difference in the campaign. Seventh, the inability to pay large amount of fees for speakers on the issue may have made a difference because they typically attract many people and motivate many to do something in the anti-sweatshop movement. Eighth, my limitations as the skilled main organizer may have had an effect of not having been able to build strong mobilizing structures. Of course, more studies, particularly comparative ones similar to the GSU condition, are necessary to confirm or revise my explanations for the outcomes of the GSU campaign.

Conclusions

Summary

I discussed the "artful" student campaign against sweatshop labor at Georgia State University in the context of globalization and "counter-hegemonic" globalization. Neoliberal globalization increases the flexibility of corporations like GSU licensees to manufacture clothing with the GSU logo in many factories around the world. This flexibility for corporations and financial interests, however, puts a downward pressure on licensees' contractors who must compete for orders with similarly situated low-capital factory owners on the other side of the globe. With the increasing impoverishment of ordinary citizens around the world, many of them have to put up with what we call "sweatshop conditions" to sew apparel at their workplaces.

Responding to this situation, many workers and their supporters have raised their voices against such treatment. In those factories, however, many voices have been suppressed, often brutally. At the same time, many in the consumer market began to raise their voices. They felt that the treatment was inhumane and immoral, and that companies have a responsibility to ensure that worker abuses do not occur in their contractors' factories around the world. So emerged the anti-sweatshop movement. It gradually spread

to many sectors of the population in the Global North, including college and university students in the United States. Since the fall of 1997, the students in the United States have demanded that their schools make sure their licensees do not use sweatshop labor to make apparel merchandise with their college logos. They have demanded that their schools join the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC) and adopt a strong code of conduct for all the licensees to accomplish this task. This new movement soon reached some students at Georgia State University.

The campaign at Georgia State University has been helped by the resurgence of organized labor in the United States and by growing student interests in economic justice and labor. In particular, the visible larger anti-sweatshop movement, including United Students Against Sweatshops, was critical. Locally, the formation of the Atlanta Labor Solidarity Network was also important because it gave a few key participants information, organizing skills, networks, and a sense of solidarity to launch the campaign in the first place.

The GSU campaign really took shape in early 2000 when I began to set up a table in the Library Plaza to spread the word about the issue. We argued that Georgia State University's high moral and social responsibilities demanded an adequate and prompt response to this sweatshop issue. GSU should not profit from abused young women's labor by receiving royalties, which amounted to nearly $16,000 in the fiscal year 2000. The only adequate solution for the school was, we maintained, to join the WRC and adopt a strong code of conduct.

Because we were skeptical of the willingness of the GSU administration to willingly accept our demands, we decided to focus on building grassroots campus support. We have tried to raise awareness of the issue through flyering, display cases, teach-ins, class presentations, publishing articles in the campus newspaper, and fashion shows. We collected petitions and letters to President Carl Patton. We created an e-mail listserv, and we helped form a student Progressive Coalition on campus to strategically work together. The campaign benefited most from the coalition when we tried to hold anti-sweatshop fashion shows, which were racialized and gendered. We also attempted to pass a GSU Student Government Association resolution in support of our campaign. These tactics were drawn from other USAS campus campaigns. In addition, we also tried to be "democratic" in our group dynamics. Important messages were posted on the e-mail listserv for everyone's review, and we tried to make decisions through consensus.

We projected our rhetoric to garner campus support, to demobilize critics, and to make sense of the whole situation about who we are, who the "villains" are, who the "victims" are, and what is to be done. For example, the campaign tended to portray workers as victims of sweatshops created by corporations and free trade policies in order to get more sympathy and support from the GSU campus community. To a lesser degree, the campaign also showed some resilient aspects of workers, such as pictures and descriptions of their protests. At the same time, the campaign saw workers as "equal allies" in the struggles for economic justice.

Corporations were usually depicted as "villains" who are benefiting from neoliberal globalization. To solve the issue of sweatshops, a few participants believed,

corporate behaviors need to be constrained to give workers more power to protect their own rights. We believed that the Fair Labor Association (FLA) is corporate-controlled and ineffective. In contrast, we believed the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC) empowers sweatshop workers and thus improves working conditions from bottom-up.

We also looked at collective and individual identities as leftists, as members of the Labor Education and Action Project and United Students Against Sweatshops, and as ethical individual consumers and anti-sweatshop activists opposing sweatshop labor. Participants created these bounded forms of consciousnesses and negotiated them to carve out their senses of who they are (or are not).

We felt that the political opportunity structures of Georgia State University were relatively closed. We have been in touch with the Legal Advisors, who eventually announced an end to negotiations, and also with President Carl Patton, whom we contacted at the end of the research period. President Patton responded to our letter in which we asked that GSU join the WRC, but he shifted the debate and said GSU is adequately handling the sweatshop issue. We shall see how his position might change in our future exchanges with him.

What the campaign has accomplished so far is not remarkable. We have not attained our stated goals of having GSU participate in the WRC and adopt a strong code of conduct. However, the outcomes do not end there. We can point to more subtle effects that the campaign has produced, both externally and internally. We raised awareness of the issue on campus. The campaign contributed to the modest development of participants' organizing skills and confirmation of their worldviews. In a couple of

instances, it gave hope for future activism. The campaign helped develop an informal network of progressive groups and individuals on campus.

Last, to explain why we have not attained our goals or attracted many participants, I maintain that the mobilizing structures of the campaign have not been strong enough to push our agenda forward. In essence, this is my thesis. Stronger mobilizing structures may have even created political opportunities for the campaign and may have helped us better attain our goals. There are a number of potential factors why the campaign's mobilizing structures have been fragile. They include the demographics of the GSU student body (i.e., class, race, and age), GSU as a commuter school, GSU's political culture, the relatively weak extent of school pride, the lack of direct evidence of sweatshop labor making GSU apparel, the lack of economic resources for outside speakers, and an inadequate ability of the main organizer.

Prospects and Concluding Remarks

The GSU anti-sweatshop campaign has been struggling. It has had difficulty in moving forward, although I know any struggle has such an element. It has constantly been on the verge to fading out altogether. And, to be honest, I have been frustrated about the course of development.

Is there any hope? Is it impossible for the campaign to accomplish our goals in the future? Perhaps. Certainly, the odds are against us, beside the factors that discourage participation in the campaign mentioned earlier. It will be more difficult to make a clear distinction between the WRC and the FLA because the FLA recently made some major

changes in how they go about their work. I will have little time for the campaign from the fall of 2002 because I will take a full-load of classes again with some 20 hours-per-week of work. Most of the main participants graduated by the fall semester 2002. Most other active USAS affiliates are already on the WRC, so they will be busy with other campaigns. This means that most likely there will not be an occasion to benefit from a big momentum on this issue created by the larger USAS, as happened in the springs of 1999 and 2000. And, even if Daniel could continue to carry the torch of the campaign, I would have to agree with the general view of other participants that it will be hard. Especially, he would need to take on the arduous task of building the campaign from his very limited time for activism. Wide campus support can only be generated by getting a SGA resolution, by attaining support from campus organizations and students, and by winning endorsements from many faculty members. If that happens, we could perhaps take a chance to, as one GSU activist observed, “hell raise” on the GSU campus to demand what we want. One positive factor is that the WRC seems to be gaining credibility among many administrators. Majority of the over 100 WRC participating colleges and universities have done so without resorting to unconventional tactics like sit-ins. Many administrators seem to have changed their view of the WRC’s capability, unlike the earlier days of the WRC campaign when they appeared to have little trust in the WRC’s work. The WRC’s job performance at the Kukdong and New Era may have contributed to this changed attitude. In this sense, USAS chapters still conducting the WRC campaign could strategically mobilize those sympathetic, if perhaps still cautious,

administrators around the country to pressure their decision-makers to join the WRC. But I just cannot be optimistic about GSU.

Yet the bottom line is that the anti-sweatshop campaign has been one project, not the raison d'être of Labor Education and Action Project (LEAP).[172] LEAP can contribute to counter-hegemonic globalization in other ways than the campaign to put GSU on the WRC. The campaign in a sense has been a part of the larger, if on-going, "counter-hegemonic" process. If we could contribute to this process in other ways, such projects would be justified. As David Moberg (1999) argued:

> The technical solutions are less important than building a movement that can grow and sustain itself for the long haul, expanding its demands and alliances…. None of the sweatshop solutions even global guarantees of workers' rights, will be effective without a citizen and consumer movement giving support to workers [both in the Global North and South] and their unions and keeping pressure on corporations and politicians here and abroad (P. 19).

This movement and alliance building between and within the Global North and the Global South happens at the "local" level of human connections – whether it is face-to-face or through e-mails. They reach out to each other strategically or by necessity. They try to figure out commonalities and visions, acknowledge differences, recognize our own liberating and oppressive powers and roles, learn from each other and self-critiques, create trust, formulate strategies, reach out to the public, change the term of public debates, develop political courage to be persistent and resolute in the face of risk, uncertainty, or fear (Sparks 1997), challenge the unjust status quo, and build movements

for justice, dignity, and democracy for workers and all others. There is no end point where everyone is satisfied with everything. But, in the process, we collectively create and recreate alliances, institutions, human relations, and senses of self that attempt to realize and embody the norms of justice, dignity, and democracy.

As in the USAS Principles of Unity, "sweatshops" can mean many forms of workplace exploitation – the low wages of campus workers, intimidation of union organizers and supporters, a busting of already established unions, or the abuse of worker rights by U.S. corporations at Guatemalan plantations. It can be argued that these conditions have been generated at least in part by the global economy. While trying to be accountable to people with whom we claim to be in solidarity, we can strategically choose issues from which our group, as a part of United Students Against Sweatshops, can benefit most – energizing people to get involved, learning new things and developing new skills, creating new alliances, and attaining goals.[173] Over the course of this development, we will need to interact and strategically work together with other progressive groups on campus, in Atlanta, and elsewhere. We create concrete struggles through a process, not *a priori*. We shall see what shape it might take.

Political theorist Catherine Eschle (2001) quotes black feminist theorist Sheila Radford-Hill to indicate the challenge of social movement theorization and the perpetual nature of struggles for social change:

---

[172] For your reference, the mission of Labor Education and Action Project is "to foster prospects for working people and organized labor in the United States and around the world," as stated in its student organization charter form of Georgia State University.

[173] But, getting to choose issues is an evidence of privilege because the marginalized groups would have little choice but to face their oppressions. At least, such a campaign needs to be accountable to the people it

> All social change is based in struggle; this struggle is both from within the movement itself…and outside the movement, based on resistance to change. Mobilization tactics must be fashioned to the strength of the people whose struggle it is…. [W]e [feminist theorists and activists] must dig in for the long haul and accept the challenges of our history. The struggle continues, begins anew (Pp. 235-36).

References

Aguilar, Michelle. 2000. "Sweating It Out: University Protests Focus on Sweatshop Labor." *Steamtunnels*, September 15, p. 7.

Anderson, Cynthia D., Michael D. Schulman, and Phillip J. Wood. 2001. "Globalization and Uncertainty: The Restructuring of Southern Textiles." *Social Problems* 48:478-98.

Anderson, Sarah, John Cavanagh, and Thea Lee. 2000. *Field Guide to the Global Economy*. New York: The New Press.

Antonio, Robert J. and Alessandro Bonanno. 1996. "Post-Fordism in the United States: The Poverty of Market-Centered Democracy." *Current Perspectives in Social Theory* 16:3-32.

------. 2000. "A New Global Capitalism?: From 'Americanism and Fordism' to 'Americanization-Globalization.'" *American Studies* 41(2/3):33-77.

---

claims to be in solidarity with and responsible for its actions. Otherwise, a given hierarchy of power within

Appea, Pamela J. 1999. “Sweatshop Debate: Students Seek Changes in Clothes-Licensing Deals.” *Chicago Tribune*, March 27.

Appelbaum, Richard P. 1996. “Multiculturalism and Flexibility: Some New Directions in Global Capitalism.” Pp. 297-316 in *Mapping Multiculturalism*, edited by A. F. Gordon and C. Newfield. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Appelbaum, Richard P. and Edna Bonacich. 2000. “The Key is Enhancing the Power of Workers.” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 7, pp. B4-B5.

Appelbaum, Richard P. and Peter Dreier. 1999. “The Campus Anti-Sweatshop Movement.” *American Prospect* 46:71-78.

Applbaum, Kalman. 2000. “Corssing Borders: Globalization as Myth and Charter in American Transnational Consumer Marketing.” *American Ethnologist* 27:257-82.

Araghi, Farshad A. 1995. “Global Depeasantization, 1945-1990.” *Sociological Quarterly* 36:337-68.

Armbruster-Sandoval, Ralph. 1999. “Globalization and Cross-Border Labor Organizing: The Guatelaman Maquiladora Industry and the Phillips Van Heusen Workers’ Movement.” *Latin American Perspectives* 26:108-28.

Arnold, Wayne. 2001. “The A.F.L.-C.I.O. Organizes in Cambodia.” *New York Times*, July 12. Retrieved July 12, 2001 (wysiwyg://47/http://www.nytimes.com/200…ldbusiness/12UNIO.html?pagewanted=print).

Athreya, Bama. 2000. “We Need Immediate, Practical Solutions.” *Chronicle of*

---

a movement and in society is likely to be reproduced rather than challenged.

Higher Education, April 7, pp. B5-B6.

Avent, Dustin, David Courtenay-Quirk, Michael Norman, Brian Sernulka, Cari Courtenay-Quirk, and Steven Carden. 2002. "Letter to the President." *Signal*, April 30, p. 9.

Ayoub, Lena. 1999. "NIKE Just Does It – And Why the United States Shouldn't: The United States' International Obligation to Hold MNCs Accountable for Their Labor Rights Violations Abroad." *DePaul Business Law Journal* 11:395-442.

Babbie, Earl. 1995. *The Practice of Social Research*. 7th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Bacon, David. 2000. "The Story of a Maquiladora Worker: Interview with Omar Gil by David Bacon" (Campaign for Labor Rights e-mail alert, September 5, 2000). Washington, D.C.: Campaign for Labor Rights.

------. 2002. "¡No Quiero Taco Bell!: David Bacon Interviews Lucas Benitez of the Coalition of Immokalee Workers." *In These Times*, April 12 (http://www.inthesetimes.com/issue/26/12/feature3.shtml).

Bales, Kevin. 1999. *Disposable People: New Slavery in the Global Economy*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Baltazar, Liza G. 1998. "Government Sanctions and Private Initiatives: Striking a New Balance for U.S. Enforcement of Internationally-Recognized Workers' Rights." *Columbia Human Rights Law Review* 29:687-722.

Bao, Xiaolan. 2002. "Sweatshops in Sunset Park: A Variation of the late 20th Century Chinese Garment Shops in New York City." *International Labor and Working-*

Class History 61:69-90.

Barlow, Maude and Tony Clarke. 2002. "Who Owns Water?" *The Nation*, September 2. Retrieved August 16, 2002 (http://www.thenation.com/docPrint.mhtml?I=20020902&s=barlo).

Basinger, Julianne. 2000. "Economists Take College Presidents to Task for Joining Anti-Sweatshop Groups." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 29, p. A39.

Bayat, Asef. 1997. *Street Politics: Poor People's Movements in Iran*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bearak, Barry. 2001. "Lives Held Cheap in Bangladesh Sweatshops." *New York Times*, April 15. Retrieved April 16, 2001 (http://www.nytimes.com/2001/04/15/world…726079d87&ex=988273226&pagewanted=print).

Belzer, Michael H. 2000. *Sweatshops on Wheels: Winners and Losers in Trucking Deregulation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bender, Daniel. 2002. "Sweatshop Subjectivity and the Politics of Definition and Exhibition." *International Labor and Working-Class History* 61:13-23.

Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:611-39.

Benjamin, Media. 2000. "Toil and Trouble: Student Activism in the Fight Against Sweatshops." Pp. 237-52 in *Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*, edited by G. D. White with F. C. Hauck. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Bhattacharyya, Gargi, John Gabriel, and Stephen Small. 2002. *Race and Power: Global Racism in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Routledge.

Boal, Mark. 1999. "An American Sweatshop." *Mother Jones*, May/June, pp. 46-51, 78-79.

Bonacich, Edna. 1996. "The Class Question in Global Capitalism: The Case of the Los Angeles Garment Industry." Pp. 317-29 in *Mapping Multiculturalism*, edited by A. F. Gordon and C. Newfield. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

------. 1998. "Latino Immigrant Workers in the Los Angeles Apparel Industry." *New Political Science* 20:459-73.

Bonacich, Edna and Richard P. Appelbaum. 2000. *Behind the Label: Inequality in the Los Angeles Apparel Industry*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bond, Patti. 2001. "Textile Industry in the South: Worn Threadbare." *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, August 12. Retrieved August 14, 2001 (http://www.accessatlanta.com/ajc/epaper…nday/business_b367b11b74d0b04c0093.html).

Booker, Salih and William Minter. 2001. "Global Apartheid." *The Nation*, July 9. Retrieved June 22, 2001 (http://www.thenation.com/docPrint.mhtml?i=20010709&s=booker).

Boren, Mark Edelman. 2001. *Student Resistance: A History of the Unruly Subject*. New York: Routledge.

Bragg, Rick. 2001. "A Way of Life Comes to an End as Alabama Mill Closes." *New York Times*, May 16. Retrieved May 16, 2001

(http://www.nytimes.com/2001/05/16/natio…2db689bda&ex=991035303&page wanted=print).

Brecher, Jeremy, Tim Costello, and Brendan Smith. 2000. *Globalization from Below: Power of Solidarity*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Broad, Robin and John Cavanagh. 1999. "The Corporate Accountability Movement: Lessons & Opportunities." *Fletcher Forum of World Affairs* 23:151-67.

Brohman, John. 1995. "Economism and Critical Silences in Development Studies: A Theoretical Critique of Neoliberalism." *Third World Quarterly* 16:297-318.

Bronfenbrenner, Kate. 2000. "Uneasy Terrain: The Impact of Capital Mobility on Workers, Wages, and Union Organizing." (http://www.ustdrc.gov/research/bronfenbrenner.pdf).

Brooks, Ethel. 2002. "The Ideal Sweatshop? Gender and Transnational Protest." *International Labor and Working-Class History* 61:91-111.

Brown, Richard Harvey. 1993. "Modern Science: Institutionalization of Knowledge and Rationalization of Power." *Sociological Quarterly* 34:153-68.

Buechler, Steven M. 2000. *Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism: The Political Economy and Cultural Construction of Social Activism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bullard, Robert D. 1993. *Confronting Environmental Racism: Voices from the Grassroots*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Burawoy, Michael. 2000. "Grounding Globalization." Pp. 337-50 in *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World*, by

M. Burawoy, J. A. Blum, S. George, Z. Gille, T. Gowan, L. Haney, M. Klawiter, S. H. Lopez, S. Ó Riain, and M. Thayer. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Caffentzis, George and Silvia Federici. 2001. "A Brief History of Resistance to Structural Adjustment." Pp. 139-44 in *Democratizing the Global Economy: The Battle Against the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund*, edited by K. Danaher. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.

Calhoun, Craig. 1997. *Nationalism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Campbell, Greg. 2001. "The Killing Fields." *In These Times*, June 25. Retrieved May 31. 2001 (http://www.inthesetimes.com/web2515/campbell2515.html).

Cavanagh, John. 1997. "The Global Resistance to Sweatshops." Pp. 39-50 in *No Sweat: Fashion, Free Trade, and the Rights of Garment Workers*, edited by A. Ross. New York: Verso.

Cavanagh, John, Sarah Anderson, and Jill Pike. 1996. "Behind the Cloak of Benevolence: World Bank and IMF Policies Hurt Workers At Home and Abroad." Pp. 97-104 in *Corporations Are Gonna Get Your Mama: Globalization and the Downsizing of the American Dream*, edited by K Danaher. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.

Carruthers, Bruce G. and Sarah L. Babb. 2000. *Economy/Society: Markets, Meanings, and Social Structures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Center for Economic and Social Rights. 1999. "'Treated Like Slaves': Donna Karan, Inc. Violates Women Workers' Human Rights." December (http://www.cesr.org).

Chang, Grace. 2000. *Disposable Domestics: Immigrant Women Workers in the Global Economy*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Cheng, Lucie. 1999. "Globalization and Women's Paid Labour in Asia." *International Social Science Journal* 51:217-28.

Chossudovsky, Michel. 1997. *The Globalization of Poverty: Impacts of IMF and World Bank Reforms*. London: Zed Books.

Clawson, Dan and Mary Ann Clawson. 1999. "What Has Happened to the US Labor Movement? Union Decline and Renewal." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:95-119.

Cleeland, Nancy. 1999. "Garment Jobs: Hard, Bleak and Vanishing." *Los Angeles Times*, March 11, pp. A1, A14, A16.

------. 2000. "Garment Makers' Compliance with Labor Laws Slips in L.A." *Los Angeles Times*, September 21.

Cohen, Robin and Paul Kennedy. 2000. *Global Sociology*. New York: New York University Press.

Cohen, Robin and Shirin M. Rai, eds. 2001. *Global Social Movements*. London: The Athlone Press.

Cole, Cheryl L. and Amy Hribar. 1995. "Celebrity Feminism: *Nike Style*: Post-Fordism, Transcendence, and Consumer Power." *Sociology of Sport Journal* 12:347-69.

Collins, Jane L. 2002. "Mapping A Global Labor Market: Gender and Skill in the Globalizing Garment Industry." *Gender & Society* 16:921-40.

Connell, Tula. 2001. "Maquila Melée: Death Threats and Plant Closings Threaten

Workers Rights in Guatemala." *In These Times*, December 7 Retrieved December 13, 2001 (http://www.inthesetimes.com/issue/26/03/news2.shtml).

Connor, Melissa, Tara Gruzen, Larry Sacks, Jude Sunderland, and Darcy Tromanhauser. 1999. "The Case for Corporate Responsibility: Paying a Living Wage to Maquila Workers in El Salvador." May 14. Retrieved October 25, 1999 (http://www.nlcnet.org/elsalvador/sipareport.htm).

Connor, Tim. 2001. "Still Waiting For Nike to Do It." May. Retrieved May 16, 2001 (http://www.globalexchange.org/economy/corporations/nike/stillwaiting.html).

Cooper, Marc. 1999. "No Sweat: Uniting Workers and Students, A New Movement Is Born." *The Nation*, June 7, pp. 11-12, 14-15.

Corn, David. 2002. "Corporate Human Rights." *The Nation*, July 15 (http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20020715&s=corn).

Crouse, Charity. 2001. "Slaves of Chicago: International Sex Trafficking Is Becoming Big Business." *In These Times*, January 8 (http://www.inthesetimes.com/web2503/crouse2503.html).

Daley, Suzanne. 2001. "African Migrants Risk All on Passage to Spain." *New York Times*, July 10, pp. A1, A6.

Daly, Kerry. 1997. "Re-Placing Theory in Ethnography: A Postmodern View." *Qualitative Inquiry* 3:343-65.

Danaher, Kevin, ed. 1994. *50 Years Is Enough: The Case Against the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

------, ed. 1996. *Corporations Are Gonna Get Your Mama: Globalization and the*

Downsizing of the American Dream. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.

------, ed. 2001. *Democratizing the Global Economy: The Battle Against the World Bank and the IMF*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.

Danaher, Kevin and Roger Burbach, ed. 2000. *Globalize This!: The Battle Against the World Trade Organization and Corporate Rule*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.

Dickerson, Marla and Nancy Cleeland. 2000. "Employment in L.A. Garment Trade Continues to Shrink." *Los Angeles Times*, August 18.

Dreier, Peter. 2000. "Cultural Studies Program 6: Sweatshops." Spring. Retrieved March 10, 2000 (wysiwyg://main.124/http://www.uepi.oxy.edu/sweatshops/).

Eckholm, Erik. 2000. "For Want of Safer Glue, Chinese Shoemakers Get Sick." *New York Times*, June 6. Retrieved June 6, 2000 (http://www.nytimes.com/library/world/asia/060600china-work-conditions.html).

------. 2001. "Workers' Rights Suffering as China Goes Capitalist." *New York Times*, August 22. Retrieved August 22, 2001 (wysiwyg://8/http://www,nytimes.com/2001…ional/asia/22CHIN.html?pagewanted=print).

Einwohner Rachel L., Jocelyn A. Hollander, and Toska Olson. 2000. "Engendering Social Movements: Cultural Images and Movement Dynamics." *Gender & Society* 14:679-99.

Emerson, Tony. 2001. "Swoosh Wars: In an Operation Modeled on the Clinton Campaign Machine, Nike Takes on Its Enemies." *Newsweek International*, March

12.

Enloe, Cynthia. 1990. *Bananas, Beaches & Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

------. 1995. "The Globetrotting Sneaker." *Ms.* V(5):10-15.

Eschle, Catherine. 2001. *Global Democracy, Social Movements, and Feminism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Esteva, Gustavo and Madhu Suri Prakash. 1998. *Grassroots Post-Modernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures*. New York: Zed Books.

Evangelauf, Jean. 2000. "3 Universities Join Anti-Sweatshop Group; Police Arrest 54 Protestors at U of Wisconsin." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 21.

Evans, Peter. 2000. "Fighting Marginalization with Transnational Networks: Counter Hegemonic Globalization." *Contemporary Sociology* 29:230-41.

------, ed. 2002. *Livable Cities? Urban Struggles for Livelihood and Sustainability*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Everett, Danielle. 1998. "New Concern for Transnational Corporations: Potential Liability for Tortious Acts Committed By Foreign Partners." *San Diego Law Review* 35:1123-61.

Featherstone, Liza. 2000a. "The New Student Movement." *The Nation*, May 15, pp. 11-18.

------. 2000b. "The Student Movement Comes of Age." *The Nation*, October 16, pp. 23-26.

------. 2000c. "A Common Enemy: Students Fight Private Prisons." *Dissent*, Fall, pp. 78-

82.

------. 2001a. “Liza Featherstone Responds.” *Dissent*, Fall, pp. 109-11.

------. 2001b. “Students Wrestle With War.” *The Nation*, December 17, pp. 18-20.

------. 2002. “The Mideast War Breaks Out on Campus.” *The Nation*, June 17. Retrieved May 31, 2002 (http://www.thenation.com/docPrint.mhtml?i=20020617&s=featherstone).

Featherstone, Liza and Doug Henwood. 2001. “Clothes Encounters: Activists and Economists Clash Over Sweatshops.” *Lingua Franca*, March, 11(2).

Featherstone, Liza and United Students Against Sweatshops. 2002. *Students Against Sweatshops*. New York: Verso.

Ferree, Myra Marx and David A. Merrill. 2000. “Hot Movements, Cold Cognitions: Thinking about Social Movements in Gendered Frames.” *Contemporary Sociology* 29:454-62.

Ferriss, Susan, 2002. “Murder in Colombia Lands Coca-Cola in Court Battle.” *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, June 6, pp. A1, A16.

50 Years Is Enough. N.d. “The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF).” Washington, D.C. Retrieved February 28, 2000 (http://www.50years.org/update/questions.html).

Fish, Jen. 2000. “Workers’ Rights Groups Supported by Students.” *Signal*, April 4, p. 8.

Fitzgerald, Kathleen J. and Diane M. Rodgers. 2000. “Radical Social Movement Organizations: A Theoretical Model.” *Sociological Quarterly* 41:573-92.

Forero, Juan. 2002a. “In Ecuador’s Banana Fields, Child Labor Is Key to Profits.” *New*

York Times, July 13. Retrieved July 19, 2002 (wysiwyg://37/http://www.nytimes.com/2002…3ECUA.html?pagewanted=print&position=top).

------. 2002b. "Still Poor, Latin Americans Protest Push for Open Markets." *New York Times*, July 19. Retrieved July 19, 2002 (wysiwyg://13/http://www.nytimes.com/2002…9PERU.html?/pagewanted=print&position=top).

Franklin, Stephen. 2002. "'Massive Scale' of Child Labor Cited." *Chicago Tribune*, May 7. Retrieved May 8, 2002 (wysiwyg://104/http://www.commondreams.org/headlines02/0507-05.htm).

Frantz, Douglas. 1999. "For Cruise Ships' Workers, Much Toil, Little Protection." *New York Times*, December 24, pp. A1, A16.

Fraser, Jill Andresky. 2001. *White-Collar Sweatshop: The Deterioration of Work and Its Renewals in Corporate America*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Freeman, Carla. 2000. *High Tech and High Heels in the Global Economy: Women, Work and Pink-Collar Identities in the Caribbean*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Fuller, Steve. 1997. *Science*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Fung, Archon, Dara O'Rourke, and Charles Sabel. 2001. "Realizing Labor Standards: How Transparency, Competition, and Sanctions Could Improve Working Conditions Worldwide." *Boston Review*, February/March. Retrieved July 25, 2001 (http://bostonreview.mit.edu/BR26.1/fung,html).

Garza, Martí and Nicholas Reville. 1999. "Campus Living Wage Manual." Boston, MA:

United for a Fair Economy (http://www.ufenet.org/activist/tools/campus_manual/index.html).

George, Susan. 1994. "The Debt Boomerang." Pp. 29-34 in *50 Years Is Enough: The Case Against the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund*, edited by K. Danaher. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Glynn, Matt. 2002. "New Era Begins Anew." *Buffalo News*, July 1. Retrieved July 3, 2002 (wysiwyg://160/http://www.buffalonews.com/editorial/20020701/1025603.asp).

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Gonzalez, David. 2000. "Nicaragua's Trade Zone: Battleground for Unions." *New York Times*, December 16, p. A3.

Goodman, Amy and Jeremy Scahill. 1998. "Drilling and Killing." *The Nation*, November 16. Retrieved May 18, 2000 (http://www.thenation.com/1998/issue/981116/1116GOOD.HTM).

Goodwin, Jeff, James M. Jasper, and Francesca Polletta. 2001. *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Gourevitch, Alexander. 2001. "No Justice, No Contract: The Worker Rights Consortium Leads the Fight Against Sweatshops." *American Prospect*, June 29. Retrieved July 5, 2001 (http://www.prospect.org/print-friendly/webfeatures/2001/06/gourevitch-a-06-29.html).

Grant-Friedman, Andrea and Joseph Tanniru. 2000. "United Students Against Sweatshops: Reformist Illusions in the Service of the American Trade

Bureaucracy." *World Socialist Web Site*, August 1. Retrieved August 23, 2000 (http://www.wsws.org/articles/2000/aug2000/usas-a01-prn.shtml).

Green, Cecilia. 1998. "The Asian Connection: The U.S.-Caribbean Apparel Circuit and a New Model of Industrial Relations." *Latin American Research Review* 33(3):7-47.

Greenhouse, Steven. 1998. "Anti-Sweatshop Coalition Finds Itself at Odds on Garment Factory Code." *New York Times*, July 3, p. A16.

------. 1999a. "Two Protests by Students Over Wages For Workers." *New York Times*, January 31.

------. 1999b. "Activism Surges at Campuses Nationwide, and Labor Is at Issue." *New York Times*, March 29.

------. 1999c. "Student Critics Push Attacks on an Association Meant to Prevent Sweatshops." *New York Times*, April 25.

------. 1999d. "Labor, Revitalized with New Recruiting, Has Regained Power and Prestige." *New York Times*, October 9, p. A10.

------. 2000a. "Anti-Sweatshop Movement Is Achieving Gains Overseas." *New York Times*, January 26.

------. 2000b. "Farm Work by Children Tests Labor Laws." *New York Times*, August 6, p. A10.

------. 2000c. "Report Says Global Accounting Firm Overlooks Factory Abuses." *New York Times*, September 28. Retrieved September 28, 2000 (http://www.nytimes.com/2000/09/28/business/28SWEA.html).

------. 2000d. “Critics Calling U.S. Supplier in Nicaragua a ‘Sweatshop.’” *New York Times*, December 3. Retrieved December 3, 2000 (http://www.nytimes.com/2000/12/03/world/03/LABO.html).

------. 2001a. “Beatings and Other Abuses Cited at Samoan Apparel Plant That Supplied U.S. Retailers.” *New York Times*, February 6, p. A14.

------. 2001b. “Graduate Students Push for Union Membership.” *New York Times*, May 15.

------. 2001c. “Big-League Caps and Labor Flaps.” *New York Times*, August 21. Retrieved August 21, 2001 (wyslwyg://11/http://www.nytimes.com/2…c4ef7da&ex=999428306&pagewanted=print).

Greider, William. 2001. “A New Giant Sucking Sound.” *The Nation*, December 31. Retrieved December 13, 2001 (http://www.thenation.com/docPrint.mhtml?I=20011231&s=greider).

Guidry, John A., Michael D. Kennedy, and Mayer N. Zald. 2000. “Globalizations and Social Movements.” Pp. 1-32 in *Globalizations and Social Movements: Culture, Power, and Transnational Public Sphere*, edited by J. A. Guidry, M. D. Kennedy, and M. N. Zald. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Guillén, Mauro F. 2001. “Is Globalization Civilizing, Destructive Or Feeble? A Critique of Five Key Debates in the Social Science Literature.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:235-60.

Hafer, Jennifer. 1992a. “Student Protests Rock Georgia State.” *Signal*, November 10, pp.

1A, 3A.

------. 1992b. “Trash can Only Symptom of Problems.” *Signal*, November 10, pp. 1A, 3A.

Hammond, Alicia. 2000. “Sit-in Leads to Arrests and Chaos at Wisconsin.” *Signal*, February 29.

Harden, Blaine. 2000. “Africa’s Gems: Warfare’s Best Friend.” *New York Times*, April 6, pp. A1, A10, A11.

Harding, Sandra. 1998. *Is Science Multicultural? Postcolonialisms, Feminisms, and Epistemologies*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Harvey, David. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origin of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hays, Sharon. 1994. “Structure and Agency and the Sticky Problem of Culture.” *Sociological Theory* 12:57-72.

Held, David and Anthony McGrew. 2000. “The Great Globalization Debate: An Introduction.” Pp. 1-48 in *The Global Transformation Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*, edited by D. Held and A. McGrew. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heron, Tony. 2002. “The US – Caribbean Apparel Connection and the Politics of ‘NAFTA Parity.’” *Third World Quarterly* 23:753-67.

Hertz, Rosanna. 1997. “Introduction: Reflexivity and Voice.” Pp. vii-xviii in *Reflexivity & Voice*, edited by R. Hertz. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Hightower, Jim. 2002. “Going Down the Road.” *The Nation*, June 24. Retrieved July 10,

2002 (http://www.thenation.com/docPrint.mhtml?i=20020624&s=hightower).

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette and Cynthia Cranford. 1999. "Gender and Migration." Pp. 105-26 in *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*, edited by J. S. Chafetz. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Horn, Patricia. 1996. "Paying to Lose Our Jobs: The U.S. Job Export Strategy." Pp. 105-13 in *Corporations Are Gonna Get Your Mama: Globalization and the Downsizing of the American Dream*, edited by K. Danaher. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.

Howard, Alan. 1998. "Partners in Sweat." *The Nation*, December 28, p. 24.

Human Rights Watch. 1999. *The Price of Oil: Corporate Responsibility and Human Rights Violations in Nigeria's Oil Producing Communities*. New York: Human Rights Watch.

------. 2000. "Unfair Advantage: Workers' Freedom of Association in the United States Under International Human Rights Standards." August. Retrieved August 31, 2000 (http://www.htw.org/press/2000/08/laborights0831.htm).

Idemudia, Patience and Kole Shettina. 1994. "World Bank Takes Control of UNCED's Environmental Fund." Pp. 107-11 in *50 Years Is Enough: The Case Against the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund*, edited by K. Danaher. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Issac, Jeffrey C. 2001. "Thinking About the Antisweatshop Movement: A Proposal for Modesty." *Dissent*, Fall, pp. 100-108.

Jasper, James M. 1997. *The Art of Moral Protest: Culture, Biography, and Creativity in*

Social Movements. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Jordan, Mary. 2002. "Mexican Workers Pay for Success: With Labor Costs Rising, Factories Depart for Asia." *Washington Post*, June 20, p. A1.

Kaufman, Leslie. 2002. "For Clothing Makers, It's Cut or Be Cut." *New York Times*, January 6. Retrieved January 23, 2002 (wysiwyg://partner.136/http://www.nytimes…06APPA.html?ex=10114370&pagewanted=print).

Keck, Margaret E. and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kellner, Douglas. 2002. "Theorizing Globalization." *Sociological Theory* 20:285-305.

Kelly, Christine A. 2001. *Tangled Up in Red, White, and Blue: New Social Movements in America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kempadoo, Kamala and Jo Doezema, eds. 1998. *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance, and Redefinition*. New York: Routledge.

Kernaghan, Charles. [1992] 1997. "Paying to Lose Our Jobs." Pp. 79-93 in *No Sweat: Fashion, Free Trade, and the Rights of Garment Workers*, edited by A. Ross. New York: Verso.

Kiely, Ray. 1999. "The Last Refuge of the Noble Savage?: A Critical Assessment of Post-Development Theory." *The European Journal of Development Research* 11:30-55.

Kilborn, Peter T. 1999. "Prosperity Builds Mounds of Cast-Off Clothes." *New York Times*, July 19, pp. A1, A11.

Klein, Naomi. 2000. *No Logo: Taking Aim at the Brand Bullies*. New York: Picador USA.

Kleinman, Daniel Lee and Steven P. Vallas. 2001. "Science, Capitalism, and the Rise of the 'Knowledge Worker': The Changing Structure of Knowledge Production in the United States." *Theory and Society* 30:451-92.

Klonsky, Amanda and Daraka Larimore-Hall. 2000. "Ain't Gonna Let Segregation Turn Us 'Round: Thoughts on Building an Interracial and Anti-Racist Student Movement." *The Activist*, November 3. Retrieved November 27, 2000 (http://www.alternet.org/print.html?StoryID=10040&wiretap=yes).

Kothari, Uma, and Martin Minogue. 2002. "Critical Perspectives on Development: An Introduction." Pp. 1-15 in *Development Theory and Practice: Critical Perspectives*, edited by U. Kothari and M. Minogue. New York: PALGRAVE.

Krupat, Kitty. 2002. "Rethinking the Sweatshop: A Conversation About United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) with Charles Eaton, Marion-Traub-Werner, and Evelyn Zepeda." *International Labor and Working-Class History* 61:412-27.

Krupat, Kitty and Laura Tanenbaum. 2002. "A Network for Campus Democracy: Reflections on NYU and the Academic Labor Movement." *Social Text* 20(1):27-50.

Kudo, Timothy. 2000. "Group Strips in Protest of Gap's Alleged Sweatshop Practices." *Signal*, February 15, p. 7.

Kurzman, Charles. 1996. "Structural Opportunity and Perceived Opportunity in Social-Movement Theory: The Iranian Revolution of 1979." *American Sociological*

Review 61:153-70.

Kuumba, M. Bahati. 2001. *Gender and Social Movements*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Labor Education and Action Project. 2002. "Campus Group LEAP-ing for a More Just and Sustainable World." *Signal*, October 15, p. 22.

La Botz, Dan. 2002. "Loose Threads." June. Minneapolis, MN: Resource Center of the Americas. Retrieved June 4, 2002 (http://www.americas.org).

Ladipo, David. 2001. "The Rise of America's Prison-Industrial Complex." *New Left Review* 7:109-23.

Lafer, Gordon. 1999. "Captive Labor: America's Prisoners as Corporate Workforce." *American Prospect* 46:66-70.

------. 2001. "Graduate Student Unions Fight the Corporate University." *Dissent*, Fall, pp. 63-70.

Landau, Saul. 2002. "The End of the Maquila Era." *The Progressive*, September, pp. 24-26.

Landler, Mark. 2000. "Making Nike Shoes in Vietnam." *New York Times*, April 28. Retrieved April 28, 2000 (http://www.nytimes.com/library/world/asia/042800vietnam-nike.html).

Leonard, Andrew. 1992. "Taiwan Goes Its Own Third Way." *The Nation*, April 13, pp. 482-84.

Levinson, Mark. 2000. "The Cracking Washington Consensus." *Dissent*, Fall, pp. 11-14.

Light, Julie. 2000. "Look for That Prison Label." *The Progressive*, June, pp. 22-23.

Liubicic, Robert J. 1998. “Corporate Codes of Conduct and Product Labeling Schemes: The Limits and Possibilities of Promoting International Labor Rights Through Private Initiatives.” *Law & Policy in International Business* 30:111-58.

Lobe, Jim. 2002a. “North American Fair Trade Movement Reports Big Advances.” *OneWorld.net*, May 2. Retrieved May 2, 2002 (wysiwyg://63/http://www.commondreams.org/headlines02/0502-01.htm).

------. 2002b. “Colombia Leads World in Trade Union Killings.” *Inter Press Service*, June 19. Retrieved June 21, 2002 (wysiwyg://partner.130/http://www.commondreams.org/headlines02/0619-06.html).

Louie, Miriam Ching Yoon. 2001. *Sweatshop Warriors: Immigrant Women Workers Take On the Global Factory*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Luh, Shu Shin. 2001. “Nike Report Cites Violations in Indonesian Plants.” *Asian Wall Street Journal*, February 21.

Mandle, Jay R. 2000. “The Student Anti-Sweatshop Movement: Limits and Potential.” *American Academy of Political and Social Science* 570:92-103.

Manheim, Jarol B. 2001. *The Death of A Thousands Cuts: Corporate Campaigns and the Attack on the Corporation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Manning, Robert D. and Anita Christina Butera. 2000. “Global Restructuring and U.S.-Mexican Economic Integration: Rhetoric and Reality of Mexican Immigration Five Years After NAFTA.” *American Studies* 41(2/3):183-209.

Martin, Douglas. 2001. “Rose Freedman, Last Survivor of Triangle Fire, Dies at 107.” *New York Times*, February 17. Retrieved February 20, 2001 (http://www.nytimes.com/2001/02/17/national/17FREE.html?printpage=yes).

Martinez, Elizabeth. 2000. “Where Was the Color in Seattle? Looking for Reasons Why the Great Battle Was So White.” Pp. 74-81 in *Globalize This! The Battle Against the World Trade Organization and Corporate Rule*, edited by K. Danaher and R. Burback. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.

McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald. 1996. “Introduction: Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Framing Process – Toward a Synthetic, Comparative Perspective on Social Movements.” Pp. 1-20 in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, edited by D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, and M. N. Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McChesney, Robert W. 2001. “Global Media, Neoliberalism, and Imperialism.” *Monthly Review* 52(10):1-19.

McMichael, Philip. 2000. *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*. 2d ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Meatto, Keith. 2000. “Real Reformers, Real Results: Our Seventh Annual Roundup of Student Protest.” *Mother Jones*, September/October. Retrieved September 8, 2000 (http://www.motherjones.com/mother_jones/So00/activist_campuses.html).

Merrifield, Andy. 2000. “The Urbanization of Labor: Living Wage Activism in the American City.” *Social Text* 18(1):31-54.

Meyer, David S. and Nancy Whittier. 1994. “Social Movement Spillover.” *Social Problems* 41:277-98.

Miller, Liz. 2001. “GSU Anti-Sweatshop Fashion Show: Groups Unite to Raise Awareness.” *Rampway*, April (http://www.rampway.org).

Mittelman, James H. 2000. *The Globalization Syndrome: Transformation and Resistance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Moberg, David. 1999. “Bringing Down Niketown.” *The Nation*, June 7, pp. 15-19.

------. 2001. “Labor’s Critical Condition.” *In These Times*. Retrieved February 14, 2001 (http://www.inthesetimes.com/web2507/moberg2507.html).

Moghadam, Valentine M. 1999. “Gender and the Global Economy.” Pp. 128-60 in *Revisioning Gender*, edited by M. M. Ferree, J. Lorber, and B. B. Hess. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Montcalm, Tony. 2001a. “Loonies Preempt GSUUSAS Anti-Sweatshop Fashion Show.” *Signal*, March 20, pp. 1, 4.

------. 2001b. “Anti-Sweatshop Fashion Show Delay Blamed on Spotlight Programs Board.” *Signal*, April 17, pp. 4, 6.

Morris, Aldon. 2000. “Reflections on Social Movement Theory: Criticisms and Proposals.” *Contemporary Sociology* 29:445-54.

Murray, Alison. 1998. “Debt-Bondage and Trafficking: Don’t Believe the Hype.” Pp. 51-64 in *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance, and Redefinition*, edited by K. Kempadoo and J. Doezema. New York: Routledge.

Murray, Bobbi. 2001. “Living Wage Comes of Age.” *The Nation*, July 23/30, pp. 24, 26-

28.

Nagel, Joane. 2000. “States of Arousal/Fantasy Islands: Race, Sex, and Romance in the Global Economy of Desire.” *American Studies* 41(2/3):159-81.

Naples, Nancy A. and Manisha Desai. 2002. *Women’s Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics*. New York: Routledge.

Nash, Kate. 2000. *Contemporary Political Sociology: Globalization, Politics, and Power*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

National Labor Committee. 1999a. “Fired for Crying to the Gringos: The Women in El Salvador Who Sew Liz Claiborne Garments Speak Out Asking for Justice.” July (http://www.nlcnet.org/LIZ/FIRED/index.html).

------. 1999b. “Help End the Race to the Bottom” (pamphlet).

------. 2000a. “U.S. Retailers Increase Use of Sweatshops in Burma.” Retrieved July 13, 2000 (http://www.nlcnet.org/burma/burmapress.htm).

------. 2000b. “PriceWaterhouse/Kohl’s Sweatshop Cover-Up in Nicaragua.” October 11. Retrieved October 26, 2000 (http://www.nlcnet.org/sweatingforkohls/pricewaterhouse.htm).

------. 2001. “Propping Up the Dictators in Burma.” March 1. Retrieved March 5, 2001 (http://www.nlcnet.org/Burma/report_02_01.html).

Nederveen Pieterse, Jan. 2000. “After Post-Development.” *Third World Quarterly* 21:175-91.

------. 2001. “Globalization and Collective Action.” Pp. 21-40 in *Globalization and Social* Movements, edited by P. Hamel, H. Lustiger-Thaler, J. Nederveen

Pieterse, and S. Rosencil. New York: PALGRAVE.

Neubauer, Deane. 2000. "Assaying the Frontiers of Globalization: Explorations in the New Economy." *American Studies*. 41(2/3):13-32.

Neumann, Rachel. 2001. "Living Wage 101." *Dissent*, Fall, pp. 59-62.

Nicholls, Martin. 2001. "Banishing the 'Sweatshop' Label." *Financial Times*, April 4. Retrieved April 4, 2001 (wysiwyg://partner.11/http://news.ft.com…plate=IXL8L4VRRBC&tagid=Variables.tagid).

Nieves, Evelyn. 2001. "Calls for Change in Ancient Job of Sheepherding [*sic*]." *New York Times*, July 11.

O'Brien, Robert, Ann Marie Goetz, Jan Aart Scholte, and Marc Williams. 2000. *Contesting Global Governance: Multinational Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. 2d ed. New York: Routledge.

Ong, Paul, Edna Bonacich, and Lucie Cheng. 1994. "The Political Economy of Capitalist Restructuring and the New Asian Immigration." Pp. 3-35 in *The New Asian Immigration in Los Angeles and Global Restructuring*, edited by P. Ong, E. Bonacich, and L. Cheng. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Ono, Taka. 2000a. "Gap's Sweatshop Abuse Protested in Atlanta." *Signal*, February 22, p. 11.

------. 2000b. "Is GSU Supporting Sweatshops?" *Signal*, March 14, p. 11.

------. 2000c. “Join IMF/World Bank Protests – Because They Destroy Democracy!” *Signal*, April 11, p. 13.

------. 2000d. “Is Georgia State University Apparel Made In Sweatshops?” *Signal*, October 3, p. 11.

------. 2001a. “Anti-Sweatshop Campaign Raises the Standards of All People.” *Signal*, March 27, p. 9.

------. 2001b. “Taco Bell Truths.” *Signal*, September 11, p. 8.

Ó Riain, Seán. 2000. “States and Markets in an Era of Globalization.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:187-213.

O’Rourke, Dara. 1997. “Smoke from A Hired Gun: A Critique of Nike’s Labor and Environmental Auditing in Vietnam as Performed by Ernest & Young.” November 10. San Francisco, CA: Transnational Resource and Action Center. Retrieved August 1, 2000 (http://www.corpwatch.org/trac/nike/ernst/trac.html).

Pan, Philip P. 2002. “Worked Till They Drop: Few Protections for China’s New Laborers.” *Washington Post*, May 13, p. A1.

Pellow, David N. 2001. “Environmental Justice and the Political Process: Movements, Corporations, and the State.” *Sociological Quarterly* 42:47-67.

Pintado-Vertner, Ryan. 2002. “From Sweatshops to Hip-Hop.” *ColorLines*, Summer 5(2), pp. 35-37, 41.

Polletta, Francesca. 1997. “Culture and Its Discontents: Recent Theorizing on the Cultural Dimensions of Protest.” *Sociological Inquiry* 67:431-50.

Pollin, Robert. 1998. “Living Wage, Live Action.” *The Nation*, November 28, pp. 15, 17-

20.

Poovey, Mary. 2001. “The Twenty-First-Century University and the Market: What Price Economic Viability?” *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 12:1-16.

Press, Eyal. 1996. “Barbie’s Betrayal: The Toy Industry’s Broken Workers.” *The Nation*, December 31. Retrieved March 5, 2001 (http://past.thenation.com/issue/961230/1230pres.htm).

Pyle, Jean L. 1999. “Third World Women and Global Restructuring.” Pp. 81-104 in *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*, edited by J. S. Chafetz. New York: Kluwer Academical Plenum Publishers.

Rashbaum, William K. 2001. “Clip Manufacturer in China Convicted of Forced Labor.” *New York Times*, March 1, p. A1.

Raynolds, Laura T. 2001. “New Plantations, New Workers: Gender and Production Politics in the Dominican Republic.” *Gender & Society* 15:7-28.

Redclift, Michael and Colin Sage. 1999. “Resources, Environmental Degradation, and Inequality.” Pp. 122-49 in *Inequality, Globalization, and World Politics*, edited by A. Hurrell and N. Woods. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rhoads, Robert A. 1997. “Interpreting Identity Politics: The Educational Challenge of Contemporary Student Activism.” *Journal of College Student Development* 38:508-19.

Ritzer, George. 1996. *The McDonaldization of Society: An Investigation into the Changing Character of Contemporary Social Life*. Rev. ed. Thousand Oaks, CA:

Pine Forge Press.

------. 2002. *McDonaldization: The Reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Roberts, Dexter and Aaron Bernstein. 2000. "Inside a Chinese Sweatshop:'A Life of Fines and Beating.'" *Business Week*, October 2. Retrieved September 28, 2000 (http://www.businessweek.com/2000/oo_40/b3701119.htm).

Robertson, Jennifer. 1997. "Empire of Nostalgia: Rethinking 'Internationalization' in Japan Today." *Theory, Culture & Society* 14 (4):97-122.

Robertson, Roland. 1995. "Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity." Pp. 25-44 in *Global Modernities*, edited by M. Featherstone, S. Lash, and R. Robertson. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

------. 2001. "Globalization Theory 2000+: Major Problematics." Pp. 458-71 in *Handbook in Social Theory*, edited by G. Ritzer and B. Smart. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Rosenblatt, Elihu, ed. 1996. *Criminal Injustice: Confronting the Prison Crisis*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Ross, Andrew. 1997a. "Introduction." Pp. 9-37 in *No Sweat: Fashion, Free Trade, and the Rights of Garment Workers*, edited by A. Ross. New York: Verso.

------. 1997b. "Postscript." Pp. 291-96 in *No Sweat: Fashion, Free Trade, and the Rights of Garment Workers*, edited by A. Ross. New York: Verso.

Ross, Robert J. S. and Charles Kernaghan. 2000. "Countdown at Managua." *The Nation*, September 4/11. Retrieved August 25, 2000 (http://www.thenation.com/issue/000904/0904ross.shtml).

Roston, Aram. 2001. “It’s the Real Thing: Murder.” *The Nation*, September 3/10, pp. 34-38.

Rothstein, Richard. 1996. “The Starbuck Solution.” *American Prospect*. 27, July-August. Retrieved November 12, 1999 (http://www.prospect.org/archives/27/27roth.html).

Sage, George H. 1999. “Justice Do It! The Nike Transnational Advocacy Network: Organization, Collective Actions, and Outcome.” *Sociology of Sport Journal* 16:206-35.

Salazar Parreñas, Rhacel. 2000. “Migrant Filipina Domestic Workers and the International Division of Reproductive Labor.” *Gender & Society* 14:560-81.

Salzinger, Leslie. 1997. “From High Heels to Swathed Bodies: Gendered Meanings Under Production in Mexico’s Export-Processing Industry.” *Feminist Studies* 23:549-74.

Sassen, Saskia. 1994. *Cities in a World Economy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

------. 1998. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: The New Press.

------. 2000. “The Global City: Strategic Site/New Frontier.” *American Studies* 41(2/3):79-95.

------. 2001. “The Excesses of Globalisation and the Feminisation of Survival.” *Parallax* 7:100-10.

Schlosser, Eric. 2001. “The Chain Never Stops.” *Mother Jones*, July/August. Retrieved June 16, 2002 (http://www.motherjones.com/magazine/JA01/meatpacking.pdf).

Schmit, Julie. 1999. “Nike’s Image Problem.” *USA Today*, October 3.

Scholte, Jan Aart. 2000. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. New York: St. Martin’s

Press.

Schaeffer, Robert K. 1997. *Understanding Globalization: The Social Consequences of Political, Economic, and Environmental Change*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Schiffrin, Anya. 2001. "Economists Spar Over Sweatshop Protests." *The Standard*, March 23. Retrieved March 27, 2001 (http://www.thestandard.com/article/article_print/0,1153,23074,00.html).

Scott, Allen J. 2002. "Competitive Dynamics of Southern California's Clothing Industry: The Widening Global Connection and Its Local Ramifications." *Urban Studies* 39:1287-1306.

Scott, Joan W. [1988] 1994. "Deconstructing Equality-versus-Difference: Or, the Uses of Poststructuralist Theory for Feminism." Pp. 282-98 in *The Postmodern Turn: New Perspectives on Social Theory*, edited by Steven Seidman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seidman, Steven. 1996. "The Political Unconscious of the Human Sciences." *Sociological Quarterly* 37:699-719.

Shao-hua, Liu. 2000. "Activists Allege Labor Violations." *Taipei Times*, December 2. Retrieved December 4, 2000 (http://www.taipeitimes.com/news/2000/12/02/print/0000063823).

Signal. 1992. "Time Line." November 17, p. 3A.

Sites, William. 2000. "Primitive Globalization? State and Locale in Neoliberal Global Engagement." *Sociological Theory* 18:121-44.

Sklair, Leslie. 2001. *The Transnational Capitalist Class*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Smith, Anna Marie. 1998. *Laclau and Mouffe: The Radical Democratic Imaginary*. New York: Routledge.

Smith, Jackie. 2001. "Globalizing Resistance: The Battle of Seattle and the Future of Social Movements." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 6:1-19.

Smith, Michael Peter. 1999. "Transnationalism and the City." Pp. 119-39 in *The Urban Moment: Cosmopolitan Essays on the Late-20th-Century City*, edited by R. A. Beauregard and S. Body-Gendrot. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Smith-Nonini, Sandy. 1999. "Uprooting Injustice." *Southern Exposure: A Journal of Politics and Culture* 27(2):40-52.

Smithsimon, Greg. 1999. "Transnational Labor Organizing: Opportunities and Obstacles for Unions Challenging Multinational Corporations." *Socialist Review* 27 (3/4):65-93.

Sneider, Jaime. 2000. "Good Propaganda, Bad Economics." *New York Times*, May 16. Retrieved May 16, 2000 (http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/16snei.html).

Soule, Sarah A. 1997. "The Student Divestment Movement in the United States and Tactical Diffusion: The Shantytown Protest." *Social Forces* 75:855-83.

------. 1999. "The Diffusion of an Unsuccessful Innovation." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 566:120-33.

Sparks, Holloway. 1997. "Dissident Citizenship: Democratic Theory, Political Courage, and Activist Women." *Hypatia* 12(4):74-110.

Spence, Jermaine. 2002a. "Students Reflect Back Ten Years Later on 1992 Sit-In."

Signal, October 29, pp. 1, 7, 8.

------. 2002b. “Panel Discusses Sit-In.” *Signal*, November 5, pp. 1, 5.

Sprague, Joey, and Diane Kobrynowicz. 1999. “A Feminist Epistemology.” Pp. 25-43 in *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*, edited by J. S. Chafetz. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Staples, Steven. 2000. “The Relationship Between Globalization and Militarism.” *Social Justice* 27(4):18-22.

Starr, Amory. 2000. *Naming the Enemy: Anti-Corporate Movements Confront Globalization*. New York: Zed Books.

Steinberg, Marc W. 1998. “Tilting the Frame: Considerations on Collective Action Framing from A Discursive Turn.” *Theory and Society* 27:845-72.

Su, Julie. 1997. “El Monte Thai Garment Workers: Slave Sweatshops.” Pp. 143-49 in *No Sweat: Fashion, Free Trade, and Rights of Garment Workers*, edited by A. Ross. New York: Verso.

Sweatshop Watch. 1997. “Response to the White House Apparel Industry Partnership Agreement.” May 21. Retrieved March 5, 2001 (http://www.sweatshopwatch.org/swatch/what/sw_response.html).

Tait, Vanessa Maura. 2000. “Poor Workers’ Unions: Rebuilding the Labor Movement from Below.” Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Takaki, Ronald. 1993. *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Company.

Taplin, Ian M. 1996. “Rethinking Flexibility: The Case of the Apparel Industry.” *Review of Social Economy* 54:191-220.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1994. *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, Verta. 1999. “Gender and Social Movements: Gender Processes in Women’s Self-Help Movements.” *Gender & Society* 13:8-33.

Taylor, Verta and Nancy E. Whittier. 1992. “Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization.” Pp. 104-29 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by A. D. Morris and C. M. Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Thompson, Ginger. 2001a. “Chasing Mexico’s Dream Into Squalor.” *New York Times*, February 11, pp. A1, A6.

------. 2001b. “Mexican Labor Protest Gets Results.” *New York Times*, October 8.

Tietgen, Gwen. 2000. “Nebraska Apparel Linked to Sweatshops.” *Signal*, September 19, p. 10.

Tomlinson, John. 1999. *Globalization and Culture*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Tonkiss, Fran. 2001. “Markets against States: Neo-liberalism.” Pp. 250-60 in *The Blackwell Companion to Political Sociology*, edited by K. Nash and A. Scott. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Trend, David, ed. 1996. *Radical Democracy: Identity, Citizenship, and the State*. New York: Routledge.

Turner, Lowell, Harry C. Katz, and Richard W. Hurd. 2001. *Rekindling the Movement: Labor's Quest for Relevance in the 21st Century*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Turning Point Project. 1999. "Global Monoculture." Washington, D.C.: Turning Point Project (http://www.turnpoint.org).

------. 2000. "Monocultures of the Mind." Washington, D.C.: Turning Point Project (http://www.turnpoint.org).

United Nations Development Program. [1999] 2000. "Globalization with a Human Face: UNDP Report 1999." Pp. 341-47 in *The Global Transformation Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*, edited by D. Held and A. McGrew. Cambridge: Polity Press.

United Students Against Sweatshops. 1999. *Sweat~Free Campus Campaign: Organizer's Manual*.

UNITE interns. 1997. *Sweat-Free Campus Campaign: Student Activist Materials.*

U.S. Department of Labor. 1998. "Statement of U.S. Labor Secretary Alexis M. Herman Regarding Duke University's Code of Conduct for Apparel Licensees." News Release, March 9. Washington, D.C.

U.S./Labor Education in the Americas Project, People of Faith Network, and United Students Against Sweatshops. 1999. "Phillips-Van Heusen: An Industry 'Leader' Unveiled." June 15 (http://www.americas.org/labor).

Van Dyke, Nella. 1998a. "The Location of Student Protest: Patterns of Activism at American Universities in the 1960s." Pp. 27-36 in *Student Protest: The Sixties*

and After, edited by G. J. DeGroot. London: Longman.

------. 1998b. "Hotbeds of Activism: Locations of Student Protest." *Social Problems* 45:205-20.

Van Maanen, John. 1988. *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Voos, Paula B. 2000. "Progressive Perspectives on Union Renewal." *Work and Occupations* 27:244-53.

Voss, Kim and Rachel Sherman. 2000. "Breaking the Iron Law of Oligarchy: Union Revitalization in the American Labor Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 106:303-49.

Wall, Jay. 2002. "LEAP-ing to Conclusion in Sweatshop Debate at GSU." *Signal*, October 1, p. 18, 22.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. [1983] 1995. *Historical Capitalism with Capitalist Civilization*. New York: Verso.

Ward, Kathryn B. and Jean Larson Pyle. 1995. "Gender, Industrialization, Transnational Corporations, and Development: An Overview of Trends and Patterns." Pp. 37-64 in *Women in Latin American Development Process*, edited by C. E. Bose and E. Acosta-Belén. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Weiss, Linda. 1999. "Managed Openness: Beyond Neoliberal Globalism." *New Left Review* 238:126-40.

Welsh-Huggins, Andrew. 2001. "Part-Time Profs Protest 'Intellectual Sweatshops.'" *Community College Week* 14 (8):10.

Whalen, Carmen Teresa. 2002. "Sweatshops Here and There: The Garment Industry, Latinas, and Labor Migrations." *International Labor and Working-Class History* 61:45-68.

White, Geoffry D. and Flannery C. Hauck., eds. 2000. *Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Williams, Heather L. 1999. "Mobile Capital and Transborder Labor Rights Mobilization." *Politics & Society* 27:139-66.

Willis, Ellen. 2001. "Why Professors Turn on Organized Labor." *New York Times*, May 28, p. A15.

Witte, John F. 2000. "Report on the Living Wage Symposium." February 8. Robert M. La Follette Institute of Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin at Madison (http://www.lafollette.wisc.edu/livingwage/Final_Report/report.htm).

Wong, Edward. 2001. "Management: Behind Bars and on the Clock." *New York Times*, June 6. Retrieved June 11, 2001 (http://www.nytimes.com/2001/06/06/business/06PRIS.html?pagewanted=print).

Woomer, Nicholas. 2001. "The Student-Labor Union." *The Nation*. Retrieved August 10, 2001 (http://www.thenation.com/docPrint.mhtml?I=special&s=woomer20010809).

Working Group on the WTO/MAI. 1999. "A Citizen's Guide to the World Trade Organization: Everything You Need to Know to Fight for Fair Trade." July (http://www.tradewatch.org).

Yetman, David. 2000. "*Ejidos*, Land Sales, and Free Trade in Northwest Mexico: Will

Globalization Affect the Commons?" *American Studies* 41(2/3):211-34.

Appendix I: E-mail Interview Questions

[To two Atlanta Labor Solidarity Network student activists at Georgia Institute of Technology] (Answers received in June and July 2001)

-How did you come to know about the sweatshop issue? Was it from [Alice]?

-How do you remember did your group at Georgia Tech help the anti-sweatshop campaign at GSU and vice versa? I'd appreciate if you can point out some concrete examples.

-If you had been able to do the anti-sweatshop campaign in the Atlanta universities all over again, how would you do in terms of the coordination with other schools, particularly Georgia State? Do you think you would take any different procedures, tactics, and strategies? Please describe.

-Is there anything else you want to add?

[To a local UNITE manager who have been organizing anti-sweatshop actions in Atlanta] (Answers received in July 2001)

-Would you describe how you helped the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University or more in general in the Atlanta area?

-It's commonly said that since the beginning of the John Sweeney administration of AFL-CIO in 1995, the labor movement in the United States has reinvigorated largely because the AFL-CIO has allocated more budgets on organizing. Do you say that the similar shift occurred in UNITE in the mid-1990s? And, if so, would you say that's partly how UNITE introduced the idea of the college anti-sweatshop campaign in Union Summer of 1997?

-Is there anything else you want to add?

[To the faculty advisor of LEAP] (Answers received in June 2002)

-How do you believe did the anti-sweatshop campaign in Atlanta and particularly at Georgia State University get started? Approximately when was it, and who were involved in it?

-In your memory, why do you believe they wanted to do it?

-Do you remember from when to when [name of a former LEAP activist] was active? Is it your understanding that [name of another former LEAP activist] got involved about when [name of the first activist] became inactive?

-Would you describe your basic role in the campaign at Georgia State University?

-In your view, how do you think the anti-sweatshop campaign has been run – in terms of internal hierarchy and decision-making process?

-Are there some aspects that you have liked in the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State? What are (were) they and why?

-Are there some aspects that you have felt some needs for improvements in the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State? What are (were) they and why?

-Is there anything else you want to add?

[To four close GSU student observers of the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University, including S. Grundy, Elizabeth, and Dan] (Answers received in June and July 2001)

-How did you get to know about the sweatshop issue and the anti-sweatshop campaign at college campuses around the country? Was it through the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State? When was it approximately?

-How did you feel about sweatshops and their possible relation to Georgia State University when you first learned about them?

-Why did you decide to help the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University?

-Do you have any particular image of the anti-sweatshop campaign or the group doing the campaign at Georgia State? If so, please describe and explain why that may be.

-Has the participation in this campaign changed how you look at society? If so, please describe how.

-Is there anything else you want to add?

[To Alice – these are the questions she was able to answer; I asked her many more questions, but she did not answer them primarily because of the lack of time.] (Answers received July 2001)

-Were you involved in some "activist-type" activities prior to your involvement in the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University? What was it (were they), and why do you think did you get involved in it (them)?

-Were you engaged in other "activist-type" activities beside the anti-sweatshop campaign at GSU? What was it (were they), and why do you think did you do it (them)?

-How did you come to know about the sweatshop issue? Is it correct that it was at the Union Summer of 1997? And, how did you feel about sweatshops and their possible relation to Georgia State University when you first learned about them?

-Is it also correct that most of the people in that program decided to embark on the sweat-free campus campaign at respective schools, including Georgia State University? How did you communicate with all others, especially with the graduates from other Union Summer locations to coordinate activities?

-Had there been no anti-sweatshop campaign at other campuses, do you believe you would have started one at Georgia State? Why (not)?

-Did you think it's possible to make a difference when you started to get involved in the anti-sweatshop campaign? Why (not)?

-In your image, please describe the employees who produce college-logoed apparel in sweatshops. What do you think do they want to change and why?

-In your view, who or what is to be blamed in the issue of sweatshops? Who is the victim? What is the solution? Why?

-How do you characterize United Students Against Sweatshops, the Worker Rights Consortium, and the Fair Labor Association? Why?

[To Thadeus and Daniel] (Answers received in July 2001 [Daniel] and in November 2001 [Thadeus], otherwise indicated)

-Were you involved in some "activist-type" activities prior to your involvement in the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University? What was it (were they), and why do you think did you get involved in it (them)?

-Are you engaged in other "activist-type" activities beside the anti-sweatshop campaign at GSU? What is it (are they), and why do you think do you do it (them)?

-How did you come to know about the sweatshop issue? When was it approximately? And, how did you feel about sweatshops and their possible relation to Georgia State University when you first learned about them?

-Why did you decide to get involved in this anti-sweatshop campaign at GSU?

-Did you think it's possible to make a difference when you started to get involved in the campaign? Why (not)?

-In your image, please describe the employees who produce college-logoed apparel in sweatshops. What do you think do they want to change (or not to change) and why?

-In your view, who or what is to be blamed in the issue of sweatshops? Who is the victim? What is the solution? Why?

-How do you think about the responses from companies apparently using sweatshops to the demands by USAS and other anti-sweatshop human rights groups? Why?

-How do you characterize United Students Against Sweatshops, the Worker Rights Consortium, and the Fair Labor Association? Why?

-How do you respond to a comment like "let's boycott these sweatshop-made clothes"? Why?

-Do you feel reluctant or uncomfortable to wear brand clothes associated with sweatshops? Why (not)?

-What do you think about how this anti-sweatshop group at Georgia State has been run in terms of group hierarchy and decision making process? How has it been different from your ideal situation? Please describe.

-What are your most memorable event and rewarding moment in the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State? Why might that be?

-Do you feel connected with or separated from other USAS chapters in the South as well as around the country? Why?

-How do you want to make changes in society through this anti-sweatshop campaign? How likely do you believe are they? Why (not)?

-Do you feel you have made a difference in the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University? Why (not)?

-Do you feel the college student anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State and nationally have made a difference? If so, in what ways?

-Has the participation in this campaign changed how you look at society? If so, please describe how.

-Do you believe the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State will be successful? Please describe your definition of "success" and how you foresee to attain it. If you do not believe it cannot be successful, please explain why it might be so.

-How do you envisage what the anti-sweatshop campaign at US colleges may be doing in 2 years, 5 years, and 10 years? Why?

-What do you feel what you may be doing in the future? In other words, do you feel you'd like to be involved in some type of activism for social change in the future? What do you feel might that be? Why may that be so?

-(Daniel only) After a couple of meetings with the GSU lawyers, how did they impress you in terms of their willingness to help eliminate sweatshops? Why?

-(Daniel only) If you had been able to do the campaign at GSU all over again, how would you do what you would do? Do you think you would take any different procedures, tactics, and strategies? Please describe.

-(Daniel only, June 2002) How do you describe your relationship with workers in sweatshops in the anti-sweatshop movement? That is, how do you describe your role in the (international) labor solidarity work? Why?

-(Daniel only, June 2002) As a person involved in the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University, do you feel you are a part of the larger anti-sweatshop movement (e.g., USAS, anti-sweatshop movement in the US or/and around the world), and/or other movements (e.g., global justice, workers' rights, human rights, species rights, feminist/womanist, queer/gay, liberation, anti-racist, anti-neocolonialist, environmentalist, democracy, anti-capitalist, anarchist, socialist, communist, anti-poverty)? If so, how and why do you see yourself doing the anti-sweatshop campaign at GSU in such a larger movement(s)? Would you name the movements you feel you are fairly strongly a part of? Why not other movements? What are their ultimate goals in your view? If not, can you describe why you feel the GSU campaign is separate from the larger movement(s)?

-Is there anything else you want to add?

[To the main organizer, or the researcher] (Answered in August 2001, otherwise indicated)

-Were you involved in some "activist-type" activities prior to your involvement in the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University? What was it (were they), and why do you think did you get involved in it (them)?

-Are you engaged in other "activist-type" activities beside the anti-sweatshop campaign at GSU? What is it (are they), and why do you think do you do it (them)?

-How did you come to know about the sweatshop issue? When was it approximately? And, how did you feel about sweatshops and their possible relation to Georgia State University when you first learned about them?

-Why did you decide to get involved in this anti-sweatshop campaign at GSU?

-Had there been no anti-sweatshop campaign at other campuses, do you believe you would have started one at Georgia State? Why (not)?

-Did you think it's possible to make a difference when you started to get involved in the campaign? Why (not)?

-In your image, please describe the employees who produce college-logoed apparel in sweatshops. What do you think do they want to change (or not to change) and why?

-In your view, who or what is to be blamed in the issue of sweatshops? Who is the victim? What is the solution? Why?

-How do you think about the responses from companies apparently using sweatshops to the demands by USAS and other anti-sweatshop human rights groups? Why?

-How do you characterize United Students Against Sweatshops, the Worker Rights Consortium, and the Fair Labor Association? Why?

-How do you respond to a comment like “let’s boycott these sweatshop-made clothes”? Why?

-Do you feel reluctant or uncomfortable to wear brand clothes associated with sweatshops? Why (not)?

-Please describe what you (and others at Georgia State) have primarily done in the anti-sweatshop campaign as your best memory permits (including local anti-sweatshop actions and e-mail/call-in actions). It would be great if you could create a basic timeline with the names of supporters and how they helped the campaign.

-What are your goals of the Georgia State campaign? And, what is your basic strategy? Has there been any interaction with the GSU administration? If there has been, when/how was it and why do you believe they responded in that particular way?

-What do you think about how this anti-sweatshop group at Georgia State has been run in terms of group hierarchy and decision making process? How has it been different from your ideal situation? Please describe.

-How did you communicate with each other at the GSU campaign?

-Have there been any divisions of labor on what you have done among the active people in the GSU campaign? If there have been, how and why do you think have they been so?

-How have you tries to recruit new people? How many active people have there been?

-Have you basically financed the campaign from your pocket? If not, who have supported your campaign at Georgia State financially?

-Has there been any media coverage of the GSU campaign?

-What are your most memorable event and rewarding moment in the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State? Why might that be?

-Do you feel connected with or separated from other USAS chapters in the South as well as around the country? Why?

-Why do you think did the anti-sweatshop campaign catch on quickly at many college campuses in a relatively short period?

-How do you want to make changes in society through this anti-sweatshop campaign? How likely do you believe are they? Why (not)?

-Do you feel you have made a difference in the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University? Why (not)?

-Do you feel the college student anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State and nationally have made a difference? If so, in what ways?

-Do you feel this national and international anti-sweatshop campaign is just a "campaign" or rather a "movement"? Why?

-Has the participation in this campaign changed how you look at society? If so, please describe how.

-Do you believe the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State will be successful? Please describe your definition of "success" and how you foresee to attain it. If you do not believe it cannot be successful, please explain why it might be so.

-How do you envisage what the anti-sweatshop campaign at US colleges may be doing in 2 years, 5 years, and 10 years? Why?

-What do you feel what you may be doing in the future? In other words, do you feel you'd like to be involved in some type of activism for social change in the future? What do you feel might that be? Why may that be so?

-If you had been able to do the campaign at GSU all over again, how would you do what you would do? Do you think you would take any different procedures, tactics, and strategies? Please describe.

- (June 2002) How do you describe your relationship with workers in sweatshops in the anti-sweatshop movement? That is, how do you describe your role in the (international) labor solidarity work? Why?

- (June 2002) As a person involved in the anti-sweatshop campaign at Georgia State University, do you feel you are a part of the larger anti-sweatshop movement (e.g., USAS, anti-sweatshop movement in the US or/and around the world), and/or other movements (e.g., global justice, workers' rights, human rights, species rights, feminist/womanist, queer/gay, liberation, anti-racist, anti-neocolonialist, environmentalist, democracy, anti-capitalist, anarchist, socialist, communist, anti-poverty)? If so, how and why do you see yourself doing the anti-sweatshop campaign at

GSU in such a larger movement(s)? Would you name the movements you feel you are fairly strongly a part of? Why not other movements? What are their ultimate goals in your view? If not, can you describe why you feel the GSU campaign is separate from the larger movement(s)?

-Is there anything else you want to add?

Appendix II: Basic Timelines of the Anti-Sweatshop Movement, United Students Against Sweatshops, and the Anti-Sweatshop Campaign at Georgia State University

Larger Anti-Sweatshop Movement	**United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS)**	**Anti-Sweatshop Campaign at Georgia State University**
1990 - The Clean Clothes Campaign begins in the Netherlands (Featherstone and United Students Against Sweatshops 2002). 1991 - Levi Strauss adopts "Global Sourcing and Operating Guidelines," one of the first codes of conduct by apparel companies. 1992 - Union of Needletrades, Industrial, and Textile Employees (UNITE), AFL-CIO and other human rights groups mobilize to support workers at a Phillips–Van		

Heusen factory in Guatemala, where they organized a union, but management refused to negotiate a contract. It was finally closed down in 1998 (Armbruster-Sandoval 1999). 1995 - The Child Labor Coalition wins agreement with the Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers, UNICEF, and ILO (Cavanagh 1997:41). 1995 – Department of Labor launches "No Sweat" campaign that creates a public "white list" of companies who are believed to be making an honest effort to get rid of sweatshops (Ross 1997a:29). 1995 - Starbucks adopts a code of conduct for its coffee growers. 1996 – National Labor Committee exposes the tie between Kathie Lee Gifford's apparel sold in Wal-Mart and teenage girls making it in Honduras. The major media catches on. 1996 – President Clinton sets up a taskforce, the		

Apparel Industry Partnership (AIP), to tackle sweatshops. Consists of about 10 companies, 5 human rights groups, and a few unions. 1997 – AIP agrees on and publicizes their code of conduct. 1997 - Congressman Bernie Sanders and Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur send a letter with 51 co-signers to Nike to address the sweatshop problem (Manheim 2001:321). 1998 (Nov.) – Fair Labor Association (FLA) operates out of AIP to enforce the AIP code. 1999 (spring) – FLA encourages colleges and universities to join them.	1997 – Union Summer UNITE interns create a "No Sweat" campaign manual, and the campaign begins at about 20 campuses in the fall. 1998 (Feb.) – Duke adopts a code. 1998 (July) – Official formation of United Students Against Sweatshop (USAS). 1998 (fall) – USAS demands high standards in the code being developed by the Collegiate Licensing Company (CLC). 1999 (winter-spring) – a series of sit-ins at six universities to win stronger codes. Many other actions at many other campuses.	1998 (fall) – Two GSU activists try to start a campaign on campus.

	1999 (July) – USAS national conference – about 200 students from about 70 schools. First staff hired.	
1999 (Sep.) – Second exposé of Kathie Lee Gifford, getting much media attention. USAS criticizes her and vice versa.	1999 (Oct.) – Worker Rights Consortium (WRC) officially launched.	1999 (Nov.) – First USAS Southern Regional Conference at University of Georgia. Two participants from GSU.
1999 (Nov.-Dec.) – Demonstration against the World Trade Organization in Seattle. Many anti-sweatshop activists protest.		
	2000 (spring) – Starting at Penn, another series of sit-ins at about 10 schools and other actions to join WRC and/or withdraw from FLA. Arrests at several schools.	2000 (March) – Second Southern Regional Conference at University of Tennessee at Knoxville. About 30 students attend. Only one participant from GSU.
		2000 (March) – First teach-in on sweatshops at GSU (10-15 attendants).
2000 (April) – Demonstration against the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank	2000 (April) – WRC founding conference, attended by 30 colleges and universities.	

in Washington, D.C. 2000 (Aug.) – Protests at the Democratic National Convention in LA that include a tour of the (in)famous LA garment district. 2000 (summer) – Two anti-sweatshop activists live with Nike sweatshop workers in Indonesia for one month. Their Living Wage Project (www.nikewages.org) presents their experience at many places, including many US college campuses around the country. They visit Emory University in April 2001.	2000 (Aug.) – "Nike Truth Tour" crosses the continent, protesting Niketowns on its way to Democratic National Convention in LA. Harassed by Niketown security guards, which was directed by the Nike headquarters. 2000 (Aug.) – Third USAS national conference at University of Oregon. 2001 (spring) – Kukdong campaign begins to support organizing for an independent union in Mexico.	2000 (Sept.) – Mails a packet of information to an Auxiliary Service person who sits on The school licensing committee. 2000 (Oct.) – First meeting with two GSU Legal Advisors. 2000 (Nov.) – Second meeting with the GSU Legal Advisors. 2001 (spring) – Formation of GSU Student Progressive Coalition. 2001 (Feb.) – Participates in the third USAS southeastern

		regional conference at University of South Carolina at Columbus. About 30 participants. Only one from GSU.
	2001 (April-May) – 21 day Harvard sit-in for a living wage and WRC.	2001 (March and April) – Two anti-sweatshop fashion shows.
2001 (summer) – UNITE's Global Justice for Garment Workers campaign begins.	2001 (Aug.) – Fourth USAS national gathering at Loyola University in Chicago, attended by about 400 people.	
	2001 (fall) – New Era campaign for striking cap makers near Buffalo, NY begins. Many campuses also focus on peace work.	2001 (Sept. and Oct.) – Helps organize two peace rallies in the Library Plaza.
		2001 (winter) – Participates in the fourth USAS southeastern regional conference at Duke University.
		2002 (April) – April 4 National Day of Action urges the GSU community to write

	2002 (June) – New Era campaign ends with worker approval of a new contract (Glynn 2002). 2002 (Aug.) – Fifth USAS national gathering at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Boston, MA.	a letter to President Patton that GSU join the WRC. Presents a letter to President Carl Patton to urge him to help GSU join the WRC.

Appendix III: A Comparison of the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC) and the Fair Labor Association (FLA)*

The Worker Rights Consortium www.workersrights.org	**The Fair Labor Association** www.fairlabor.org
• Scope is contractors of participating college/university licensees. • Factory locations and verification reports are publicly available.	• Scope is contractors of participating companies and of college/university licensees. • Factory locations are not publicly available. Reports from internal and external monitoring are available to public once a year in a summarized form after a review of companies.
• Living Wage.	• Minimum or industry prevailing wage, whichever the higher.
• Overtime rate is to be at least 1.5 times more than the regular hour rate.	• Overtime rate is as the same as the regular hour rate.
• Verifications of code violation allegations and pro-active monitoring are to include local NGOs and to be unannounced.	• FLA-accredited monitors paid for by companies carry out “independent” monitoring on 5-15 percent of applicable contractors every year. The monitors can have businesses with their client

	companies up to $100,000, excluding financial auditing or less than 25 percent of annual revenues of monitors.
• All interviews are off-site to maximize confidentiality.	• On-site interviews are allowed. • Monitors must regularly consult with local NGOs. • Companies can submit a list of factories to be monitored. • They perform "internal monitoring" by themselves on all applicable factories every year. • Monitoring can be announced in advance. • Third party complaint system allows 45 days for companies and their monitors to investigate allegations of code violations.
• No certification of brands, companies, or factories.	• Companies with a good record can attach the "FLA seals" on applicable brands.
• Governing Board is made up of sixteen seats – five from Advisory Board, five from participating colleges and universities, five from United Students Against Sweatshops, and one Executive Director. No involvement of corporations in the decision making process.	• Executive Board consists of fourteen seats – six from participating companies, six from participating NGOs, one from participating colleges and universities, and one Executive Director.
• Simple majority votes are required for most decisions.	• "Super-majority votes" are required to change the FLA code of conduct, monitoring principles, bylaws, etc. Two-thirds of company and NGO board members are required for "super-majority."
• Participating colleges and universities pay 1 percent of previous year's licensing revenues but no less than $1,000, no more than $50,000 every year.	• Participating colleges and universities pay 1 percent of previous year's licensing revenues but no less than $100, no more than $50,000 every year.

* The position of the FLA represented here is close to the one when it started in late 1998. Since then, it has significantly improved its standards.
-170 colleges and universities are part of the FLA, as of March 6, 2002.
-Just over 100 colleges and universities joined the WRC by late May, 2002.

Appendix IV: Basic Descriptions of Some Flyers and Campaign Materials[174]

-"Is GSU Apparel Made in Sweatshops?" – The main flyer describing what a sweatshop is, how it is related to colleges and universities, what needs to be done at GSU, and what people can do, including learning more about the issue and getting involved in the campaign.

-"What's a Code of Conduct?" – A flyer about the definition and major elements, why it is necessary, and how and why it works.

-"Resources for 'No Sweat' Activists" – A flyer with information on books, articles, web-sites, and reports about sweatshops, the global economy, the anti-sweatshop campaign, and USAS.

-"Glossary of Terms" – A flyer briefly defining a number of key terms in the anti-sweatshop campaign.

-"GSU Anti-Sweatshop Fashion Show" – A flyer describing the content, purposes, and sponsors of the show, and what people can do to help our campaign against sweatshops. Created for the two fashion shows in March and April, 2001.

[174] These materials are available from the researcher.

-“What’s the Worker Rights Consortium?” – A flyer describing the key elements of the Worker Rights Consortium and the role of participating universities.

-“Where Can I Find ‘Sweat-Free’ Clothing?” – A half-page flyer responding to this common question.

-United Students Against Sweatshops newsletters

-Real-sized “checks” (two kinds) – Developed by Indiana University USAS, each check contains information about one actual worker and how she is treated at her workplace, how much she is paid, how she spends her wages in her life, with a big stamp, “Non Negotiable.”