

those which analyze the way an American industry was targeted to carry the weight of cold war cultural influences, equality in employment opportunities and a myopic national anti-inflation strategy. On the back of steelworkers would ride not only economic austerity but also the high ideals of liberal social justice.

In the first half of *Running Steel* the author describes how the civil rights movement found fertile soil within the country's basic steel mills. Principally through litigation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 the industry was forced to accept an affirmative action program largely crafted by institutional forces with little knowledge of the steel industry, labor or product markets or respect for union contracts. The end result was a social justice agenda endorsed by the steelworkers union but incapable of accomplishing the ends that erstwhile advocates of racial equality had sought. After ten years of court struggles the Justice Department produced a program that "offered black workers little that was concrete and embittered a good many white[s]."

Stein's book promises a lot and delivers a great deal. If there is any fault in this marvelous addition to post-cold war economic analysis it lies in the structure of the chapters. While the author claims (and has done so) to be writing an integrated history the work is actually tightly bounded by separate narratives. In effect Stein has written two different books. The reader will benefit greatly by reading either one but often he or she needs to be reminded what the thesis is. With that minor point aside, *Running Steel*, *Running America* makes a solid addition to the growing understanding students now have about the demise of working class-liberalism.

ROBERT A. BRUNO  
*University of Chicago*

***The Unions and the Democrats: An Enduring Alliance.*** By Taylor E. Dark.  
Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999. 233 pp. \$37.50 cloth.

It is with the same degree of certainty reserved for the calculations of the earth's rotations around the sun that organized labor will endorse and campaign for the Democratic party candidate for president of the United States. Since William Jennings Bryant's populist 1896 campaign (with the exception of the 1924 and 1972 election) the AFL-CIO and its politically active affiliates have faithfully worked—if not formally endorsed—the Democratic flag bearer. They did so for good reason. There is singularly no

presidential election where among the major party candidates the Republican represented a better choice.

For their efforts labor leaders were afforded, at least until the mid-1970s, access to national policy-makers and a voice in policy making. But after the economic carnage of the late-1970s, the Democratic party grew disenchanted with the labor-led liberal project and started acting towards unions more like disinterested or hostile Republicans. As a result, labor was politically nullified. So the conventional wisdom, according to Taylor Dark, would have us believe. Instead, it is the unconventional position of *Unions and the Democrats* that "unions have actually been remarkably successful in holding on to political power."

Dark admits that many of the contemporary accomplishments of labor's "enduring alliance" with the Democrats lack the "sex appeal of major legislative battles." He does however, make the important point that the Neal Deal-era "programs have remained largely intact." Despite attempts to decisively roll back the "interventionist state" labor has not been excluded from the policymaking process. While the author's defense of labor's political fealty to the Democrats does remind the reader of the myriad legislative, bureaucratic and judicial mechanisms that an even slightly more supportive party can use to reward a favored constituent group, it is ultimately the least significant part of his work.

What makes *Unions and the Democrats* a valuable resource for labor educators is its thesis of how and when organized labor successfully plays the "Washington Power Game." Dark postulates that labor's "bargaining capacity" is enhanced when both the Democratic party and the AFL-CIO function in a centralized fashion. Leadership in both institutions must be strong, unifying and capable of forging consensual arrangements before labor can expect to achieve meaningful goals in Washington. This leadership structure is referred to as "centralized pluralism."

Now Dark notes that the labor movement's decentralized structure has always presented a serious challenge to putting forth a national union position. But two other events in the last thirty years have aggravated the Democrat-labor "alliance." First, the ascendancy in 1980 to the AFL-CIO presidency of Lane Kirkland who was more willing than his predecessor (i.e., George Meany) to allow power to be diffused throughout the affiliated unions made it difficult for labor to speak in a convincing manner. In addition, the Democratic party's adoption of the 1968 McGovern Commission reforms which welcomed political "amateurs" into the presidential selection process, added new, unfamiliar and competitive constituents to the party's electoral base. By 1980 when the AFL-CIO faced resistance from corporate

America, the most anti-union president in the Twentieth Century, and a Democratic party led by its conservative forces, it could do little more than defend its right to exist.

Dark's "centralized pluralism" explanation is one that labor educators should wrestle with and present to their students. There is much here that needs debating. If the argument seems at times to be a defense of a top-down, less-democracy is better approach to union governance and political rule, it also rings true as a reflection of how the "Washington Power Game" is actually played and more importantly, won.

ROBERT BRUNO

*University of Chicago*

***Managing Tomorrow's High-Performance Unions.*** By Thomas A. Hannigan. Westport, CT: Quorum Books, 1998. 320 pp. \$59.95 cloth.

If and when the publisher is smart enough to bring out an affordable paperback edition, this book will belong in the hands, rather than on the desk or bookshelf, of every thinking unionist. Alone among the plethora of recent books of advice for labor, it dares to insist labor leaders should become expert users of MBA-like insights into management: a heresy among union purists who cannot imagine that labor has anything to learn from management theorists.

Written by a lifelong electrician, IBEW staffer, and highly-placed insider, the book warns that labor has "the option to leapfrog over Management or be dragged behind it." It attempts to bring the basic union functions and the basic management function together, the better to show union leaders how to become high-performance professional managers. The author wants them to master the management literature, and become effective team-builders, controllers, creators, assessors, and sources of inspiration. Better yet, he lays out a pragmatic plan for soon achieving this.

Generous in offering unconventional reform ideas, Thomas A. Hannigan understands leaders are only as strong as are their followers. He therefore makes a persuasive argument for more union democracy: for the "customizing" of benefits and contract terms, for lifelong membership, and for the pushing down of autonomy and power to the locals. Other innovations include a revamped AFL-CIO Executive Board, an AFL-CIO Institute for Managing Labor Organizations, new Social Research Departments, and several other fresh and promising reforms.

Copyright of Labor Studies Journal is the property of West Virginia University. The copyright in an individual article may be maintained by the author in certain cases. Content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.