

Fall, 2006

**The Nestedness of Class Politics in Urban Politics:
A Comparative Study of Two Industrial Cities**

Jae-Woo Kim

1. Introduction

There has been considerable debate as to whether labor participation in urban social movements during the period of economic restructuring in the 1970s and 1980s could overcome the long-standing separations between class and community that characterized US politics as well as spatial and class divisions among workers (Katznelson, 1981; Smith, 1988; Portz, 1990; Beauregard et.al., 1992; Nissen, 1995). This is why workers' struggles against plant closures have been one of the most typical topics in studies on labor-community coalitions (Nissen, 2004). In this study I examine what happened to industrial cities, Sheffield and Pittsburgh, around that period, how have those cities been reorganized toward a new economy, and how did labor movement and urban social movements respond to that process? This inquiry becomes particularly interesting given that the steel industry was one of key manufacturing industries led by large corporations during the twentieth-century capitalism, and workers employed in the industry were one of the most militant blocks within the labor movement in both the UK and the US.

2. Background

Against the devastation in a regional economy, the City Council in Sheffield dubbed 'the socialist republic of South Yorkshire' adopted radical strategies under the banner of 'city socialism,' i.e., 'restructuring for labor' as opposed to 'restructuring for capital,' during the first half of the 1980s. It was charged not only with promoting new industrial development but also creating jobs, assisting workers to make their cooperatives, and instigating new

municipal enterprises. Furthermore, the Employment Department tried to pursue industrial democracy, liberate resources of the local state, and put them at the service of working class movement, women's movement, and community-based movements¹. The Council in the second half of the 1980s changed its position to support public-private partnerships that had nothing to do with the pursuit of more influence of trade unions and community organizations over their local economy in the earlier years². The British Chambers of Commerce in 1988 applauded Sheffield as one of the most successful examples of public-private partnership. The Sheffield Economic Regeneration Committee made in 1987 has been composed of local authorities, local business, trade unions, and community organizations (especially, churches). Also, the Sheffield Development Corporation (1988-1997) as one of central-government-initiated organizations has pursued the regeneration of urban areas, with some of board members dispatched from the business community out of control by the City Council³ (Gyford, 1985; Goodwin and Duncan, 1986; Lawless, 1990;

¹ In terms of economic and social outcomes, the Employment Department created 1,000 new jobs during the first three years. Additionally, it indeed helped to create a product development unit that assisted local entrepreneurs to bring socially useful goods and services onto the market, and encouraged technology adoption through the construction of a science park and a technology center (Beauregard et al., 1992). Seyd(1993: 162) summarized three goals of social services during that period. First, the consumer should play a more direct part in determining the nature of the services received, and this was to be achieved by decentralizing service provision and ensuring that decisions were taken, in collaboration with the user, at a very local level. Secondly, services should be distributed more selectively so that those in need would benefit. Lastly, the council should recruit officers who shared the values of a radical, reforming local authority.

² Focusing only on the change in social services, the public-private partnerships have been financially disastrous for the city council. As the most typical example, the project of the World Student Games led directly to cuts in the basic provision of services to some of the most deprived people in the city. Old peoples' and children's homes were closed, home helps were reduced, and social workers were not replaced. The availability of recreation and leisure facilities declined and charges for the use of these facilities were increased (Seyd, 1993).

³ One of examples is the redevelopment of a derelict steelwork site as a major shopping complex with the establishment of a formal consultative body for the public-private partnership. Through the membership of the UDC and the support of World Student Games that left a huge amount of debt, the Labor Council authorized the new growth coalition in Sheffield. A Partnership Promotion Campaign for Sheffield reported in 1987 that both city

Seyd, 1993; Cochrane, 1993).

Pittsburgh is the oldest city in the US where the growth coalition, the Allegheny Conference on Community Development (ACCD hereafter), was established in 1943. The ACCD was directed by an executive committee composed of chief executive officers of major Pittsburgh financial institutions and corporations including the US Steel. Although it had tried to make a soft landing by implementing the gradual diversification of the regional industrial structure, its acceptance of the plant closings as something inevitable, unlike Sheffield, led to unceasing struggles throughout the 1980s and after⁴. Labor unions in Pittsburgh and its neighborhood communities in Ohio and West Virginia, against public-private partnership that tried to replace steel industry-based economy by service and high-tech industry-based economy, organized the Tri-state Conference on Steel (1979) and the Steel Valley Authority (1985, SVA hereafter) composed of rank-and-file workers,

council and Chamber of Commerce represented by the local business community have come to the conclusion that one of the ways of achieving the economic regeneration of the city will be through the fostering of confidence and pride by local business in their city (Seyd, 1993). Cochrane(1993) pointed out, the shifts in forms of political representation have highlighted a new position for business and this has been reinforced by the increased use of management-oriented language in local government. One reflection of this is the way in which trade unions have largely been absorbed into the new organizations as secondary partners – grateful to be involved, but left to argue for the ‘greater good’ expressed in corporate (business led or influenced) organizations such as Training and Enterprise Councils and other local partnerships. But they have also helped to legitimate a range of ‘respectable’ voluntary organizations and community groups, some of whom may also be involved in service delivery.

⁴ “One paragraph in that report unveiled at the annual Allegheny Conference on Community Development dinner listed a number of recent labor strikes and contended, “We have created a national image of a region with chronic labor problems and one of the highest net corporate-income taxes – a difficult place to do business...” (But...) USW’s Williams says that when management began closing down industrial facilities here in the 1980s, it was organized labor that worked hard with the affected communities to retain manufacturing... (Besides the efforts of the SVA...) Another overlooked factor is the role that unions can play financially through their pension funds. For example, the building-trade unions here, through a pension fund-financed institution called ERECT, have furnished money for 10 local projects...” ([Union problem? What union problem? Yes, Pittsburgh is a union town – and that’s a benefit to this region’s economic development, not an obstacle], January 5, 1994, Wednesday, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette)

community activists, and members of the small business community⁵, unlike most of authorities led by corporate executives and government bureaucrats. Although the SVA, an entity with no taxing power but empowered to exercise eminent domain and issue bonds, have promoted alternative strategies⁶ for industrial development and community revitalization which culminated in the Heartland Labor Capital Network Project(1995), the Pittsburgh public-private partnership, getting through the crisis of regional economy, has still had the initiative in regional restructuring until the present (Hudson and Sadler, 1986; Portz, 1990; Plotkin and Scheuerman, 1990; Fitzgerald and Simmons, 1991; Hathaway, 1993).

3. Research Questions

How can I explain little noticeable resistance of steel workers against plant closures and urban restructuring in spite of a long history of laborism in Sheffield called ‘red island’ in the UK, then⁷? Also, why was there little fighting from the community against the drastic regional change notwithstanding historical experiences of urban social movements

⁵ Eight municipalities, including the city of Pittsburgh, joined the SVA. Interestingly, however, few Mon Valley officials have been in a leadership role. For them, the SVA is worth a try but only if it did not jeopardize their limited power. Mill town officials were generally supportive but often were hesitant allies for the Tri-State (Portz, 1990: 114-5). This shows the contradictory position of local officials in steel towns.

⁶ Here are the four main goals the SVA proposed (Fitzgerald and Simmons, 1991): 1) To develop a plan to revitalize Mon Valley steelmaking, emphasizing eminent domain purchasing of US Steel’s Mon Valley Works by a regional authority (the SVA) representing the Mon Valley workers and communities. 2) To organize union, public, and local government support for the plan to secure assistance from Allegheny County, the state, and federal governments. 3) To promote the plan as a model for saving the steel industry throughout the tri-state area and the nation and, in so doing, to enlist broad political support for the plan, particularly in the US Congress. 4) To become directly involved in organizing and operating the authority through membership on its board, along with a worker/community representative majority.

⁷ By the similar token, Allender(2001: 82) asked: “Why, given the strength of the Sheffield labor movement, when faced by the imminent decline and possible destruction of its major industries, did its trade unions do so little?”

like the tenant's struggle from the mid-1960s to the mid 1980s⁸?

How can I explain the noticeable alliance between labor movement and urban social movements given that neither of them did ever dream of something like radical strategies based on socialist traditions in Sheffield, then? What roles has the Pittsburgh Partnership for Neighborhood Development (1983)⁹, one of the oldest networks of community

⁸ At the end of local growth era in Sheffield, there was a rapid increase of organizations formed by people affected by particular public services, including tenants' associations, parents' associations and neighborhood groups under the banner of 'decentralization.' These organizations entered the local political process from outside the structure of the mainstream political parties, but they had an important influence in policy debates (Hampton, 1993; Allender, 2001).

⁹ Suffice to say here that there have existed a lot of CDCs interested in regional redevelopment in Pittsburgh, while the emergence of CDCs is a new phenomenon in Sheffield. It is CDCs rather than large companies that have taken the lead in urban revitalization which is officially not one of business lines of the US Steel. However, given that the USX (a new name of the US Steel) has been one of the members in the Regional Industrial Development Corporation, it is hard to say that RIDC's activities are not influenced by corporate interests. What are the consequences of the proliferation of CDCs both the local government and the business community support for the alliance between labor and community, then? First, they have been concerned with similar tasks the SVA has tried to handle since its establishment, not to mention the fact that they have a lot of much more resources compared to the SVA. This is why Fitzgerald and Simmons(1991) regard the Mon Valley Initiative (1987), an umbrella organization of local CDCs by the ACCD, as an organization created by the corporate community in order to offer a competing agenda to that of Tri-State and other bottom-up community organizations in Pittsburgh. Second, they have been interested in boosting their own political influences on a variety of regional issues as well. "The Mon Valley Initiative, made up of 17 community development corporations (known as CDCs), is one such new approach borne of necessity. Interestingly, this grassroots effort stemmed from an unlikely source – Pittsburgh's so-called establishment. Foundation grants enabled Robert Pease and David Bergholz of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development to hire Machael Eichler, a young University of Pittsburgh graduate with valley experience, to work in the valley communities to get people together to form CDCs. Because good housing was seen as a key to valley revitalization, these CDCs largely have concentrated upon improving that situation, but with significant byproducts... Moreover, many CDC leaders have been running for elected office, bringing a new flavor to municipal councils that once were mostly white, male, and over 60." ([Not fade away: the fight is not over, but the Mon Valley shows signs of progress], January 3, 1996, Wednesday, *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*) For these reasons, I do not want to agree with the opinion that CDCs have potentials for the

development corporations (CDCs, hereafter) in the US, played in urban politics regarding another question of how to account for the unbroken consensus¹⁰ after the crisis over ‘never stop doing something for city growth’ with the decrease in the strength of labor-community alliance?

Put together, what I brought up so far comes down to the problem of labor-community alliance against growth coalition, which ranges from “how to better understand class politics in a broader context of urban politics?” through “whether class and community are competitive (or alternative) or cooperative (or complementary) bases of collective action in urban politics (Fitzgerald, 1991)?” to “under what conditions the alliance between labor movement and urban social movements can be made to search for alternatives based on common causes?”

4. Literature Review

Although students of ‘growth coalition theory’ (Logan and Molotch, 1987) or ‘urban regime theory’ (Stone, 1993) have argued how the change in big cities depends on how local authorities and local capitalists collaborate, some other studies have stressed that there

development of grassroots movements in what is called ‘place-based democracy’ (e.g. For this, see Williamson et.al., 2002).

¹⁰ The public-private partnership model in Pittsburgh had changed in the 1980s from its traditional style to the inclusion of nonprofit organizations such as universities, foundations, and community-based organizations, but Deitrick(1999) diagnosed that the Pittsburgh model has weakened over the recent years. One of the main reasons is that the growth coalition characterized by public paternalism has not been open-minded to different voices from community organizations, not to mention labor unions. For example, even neighborhood-based initiatives besides a remanufacturing strategy for the devastated Monongahela River Valley had received little attention – and even less funding – under ‘Strategy 21: Pittsburgh/Allegheny Economic Development Strategy to Begin the 21st Century,’ as the ACCD-local government partnership continued to set the region’s agenda (Deitrick, 1999). Also, the SVA had argued that workers’ interest was not represented in Strategy 21 proposals.

was little leeway for local actors to pursue their own plans under the conservative and pro-market atmosphere of national politics in both the UK and the US¹¹.

Even though my focus is more on the analysis at the local level rather than at the national level, it cannot be overemphasized that the local politics in both cities have unfolded to show different trajectories of urban revitalization in some aspects. This is why some scholars (Mossberger and Stoker, 2001; Davies, 2003) emphasize that there are undeniable dissimilarities in public-private partnership between UK cities and US cities in terms of the size of public sector, the strength of local capitalists¹² and landowners, and the relationship between local authorities and the central government. They pointed out the risk of applying growth coalition theory or urban regime theory to local politics in the UK without investigating its unique contexts. More importantly, existing studies did not pay due attention to what roles labor unions and community-based organizations have played in the history of urban politics. My study suggests to focus more on their relationships and its variation over time in the context of how they as stakeholders have responded to urban revitalization processes, and how urban governance as a mobilizing structure has promoted or restricted their interactions, and how much they have changed urban governance?

¹¹ From this perspective, Beauregard et. al. (1992) make a conclusion that the overall direction of invention by the local government in Sheffield has converged to the type of public-private partnership in Pittsburgh, which indicates that regional collaborative strategies are tightly constrained by the national political and economic trends in spite of the relative autonomy of local political and social coalitions. In the similar tone, Lawless and Ramsden(1990) argue, the collaboration around steel-based reindustrialization in both regions had to face the national financial market that was keeping an eye on the declining competitiveness of steel industry. In their opinions, local economic development strategies eventually reflected the national agenda articulated by conservative officials and corporate leaders. This is why Sheffield's strategy more and more resembled that of Pittsburgh over time. To compare two cities in terms of the trajectory of urban politics, it could be said that radical intervention under the banner of municipal socialism in Sheffield had moved to 'immature' public-private partnership, whereas public-private partnership in Pittsburgh has remained without significant changes since its establishment in 1943.

¹² The business community in Sheffield was not well organized politically so that it could not play any significant roles in city affairs during the period of city growth. Business leaders operated within their own distinct world of the company. Their network of contacts was through the Chamber of Commerce or the Culters' Company, but this was very distinct from the political world of councilors and chief officers (Seyd, 1993: 156).

Regarding the alliance between labor unions and urban social movements, Heckscher and Palmer(1993) asserted that labor unions can act as established ‘insider’ institutions, narrowly focused on collective bargaining and bilateral power relations with employers, or they can act in accordance with another variation on the business-union model, as dominant partners in coalitions with a narrow focus on ‘labor support’ rather than on broad civil rights or social justice issues. Not surprisingly, as they see it, labor unions are incapable of acting as equal partners with others in multilateral coalitions working for broad social goals. In other words, labor unions are only capable to form “vanguard” coalitions. However, as Nissen(2004) pointed out, they did not give a clear theoretical indication of why they believe common-cause coalitions around broader goals are impossible to make or vanguard coalitions can be created at best.

Katznelson(1981) from the different angles showed in one of his influential books that the separation between class and community marked political actions in the US. “American urban politics has been governed by boundaries and rules that stress ethnicity, race, and territoriality, rather than class, and that emphasize the distribution of goods and services, while excluding questions of production or workplace relations. The centerpiece of these rules has been the radical separation in people’s consciousness, speech, and activity of the politics of work from the politics of community (Ibid: 6).” Nonetheless, it is also hard to deny that the restructuring of advanced economies in the 1970s and 1980s provided the conditions under which urban movements in a lot of communities could make coalitions with the labor movement to fight plant closures or their relocation under the banner of supporting local economies and increasing democratic participation in local politics. In this course of actions, working-class consciousness and community consciousness enhanced each other in such communities (Hudson and Sadler, 1986; Tufts, 1998)¹³.

¹³ There might be called “the dilemma of activism” in the course of labor-community alliance, however. Plotkin and Scheuerman (1990), while examining the contested politics in Pittsburgh, argued that there were two distinctive types of political responses to plant closures in Pittsburgh. The “agitational” approach heavily influenced by community organizations emphasized the irresponsibility of Steel corporations (e.g. USX) and religious

Fitzgerald (1991) maintained that the experience of Pittsburgh showed the transition from a community-defined movement with low class consciousness to a community-based movement with high class consciousness. In the typology of political movements he proposed (Table 1), the key distinction between community-defined and community-based movement is that the first serves only to fragment the working class by promoting competition between places, while the second may contribute to a broader political movement advancing working-class interests¹⁴.

Similarly, Nissen(1995) who has dedicated to the study on labor-community alliance, although he acknowledged the critical limitations of the labor-community coalition at the local level¹⁵, raised the following question: “Do labor-community coalitions and struggles increase the ability of the US working class and its institutions (primarily unions) to wield

leaders urged workers to shame top-level officials into reversing their investment plans, while the “institutional” approach led by labor unions was characterized by the creation of worker-owned (or community-owned) and controlled companies and a community-based industrial authority, i.e., the SVA. “Tri-State leaders, although they well understood the nature of the capitalist system, made no effort to define the issues in explicitly class terms since they proposed the SVA as a mechanism to save the region’s industrial jobs and preserve the valley as a home for its traditional steelworkers families (Ibid: 211).” Also, “Tri-State’s ideology... is essentially a fusion of populist democratic and communitarian themes (Ibid: 211-2).” This is why they contended, “It is unclear, from a class perspective, what workers themselves might have learned from the battle for the SVA, and what they are learning in the process of its development. Because the stress thus far has been on a positive program of coalition building and legislative politics, the big issue of who runs the national political economy and for what ends remains unspoken (Ibid: 222).” I agree with them to some extent, but they assume that there is a ‘pure’ class consciousness that should not be contaminated. In other words, class consciousness exists prior to or separately from community consciousness in their view.

¹⁴ Tattersall(2005) suggested three types of the relationships of union-community: 1) simple instrumental union-community relationships; 2) union-community coalitions; 3) community unionism. According to Wills and Simms(2004), there have been three types of trade unionism in the history of labor movements such as community-based trade unionism, representational community unionism, and reciprocal community unionism.

¹⁵ First, it is indisputable that the globalization of the US economy has removed much corporate decision making from the local to national and international arenas. Therefore, the insecure economic environment facing industrial communities can only be altered through national and even international policies and institutions aimed to ensure greater economic security and job stability (Ibid: 170).

power?... Do ‘populist’ community struggles weaken and dilute class awareness and class power for workers, or can they aid working class capacities?” (Ibid: 168)

<Table 1> Typology of political movements (Fitzgerald, 1991: 120)

Class Consciousness	Community Consciousness	
	Low	High
Low	Competitive individualism	Community-defined movement
High	Class struggle	Community-based movement

5. Data and Method

I will analyze, besides the critical review of existing literatures, the secondary sources of information: local newspapers (e.g. Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Sheffield Telegraph via LexisNexis and Factiva), statistics, almanacs (e.g. Annual reports of Pittsburgh Partnership for Neighborhood Development), and state and local government reports. Also, I will do interviews with informants who were engaged in organizations one way or another (e.g. local labor unions, local corporation boards, community organizations, local government officials, and partnership committees). Librarians at University of Sheffield and University of Pittsburgh could help me find some other archives to understand economic, political, and social contexts of both cities in more nuanced way.

This research is closer to the macro-causal analysis than the parallel demonstration of theory or the contrast of contexts. The former prefers to make causal inferences about macro-level structures and processes on the condition that there are many variables but limited cases, while the parallel demonstration of theory is aimed at verifying a given, explicitly delineated hypothesis or theory, and the contrast of contexts place historical limits on overly generalized theories focusing on contextual particularities respectively (Skocpol and Somers, 1980).

6. Comparison of Urban Politics in Sheffield and Pittsburgh

How to explain the emergence and decline of labor-community alliance in the context of urban politics, and what are its relations with urban governance as a political opportunity structure? There is no such thing like a list of key factors conducive to that alliance, but I suggest to the correlation between social networks and belief systems as the first factor, following Obach(2004)'s application of organizational study together with social network perspective to the analysis of the field of social movement organizations¹⁶. Besides him, not a few scholars have been interested in how to incorporate organizational ecology into social movement theories from the perspective of social network, especially focusing on the evolution of organizational fields with multiple relations: "The existence of specific belief systems helps to broadly define the potential boundaries of the 'conflict system' and the 'alliance system' of a given movement. This is the case inasmuch as social actors who share the movement's beliefs will probably be part of the latter, while actors holding opposite views will tend to be part of the former (Diani, 1992; 111)."

On the one hand (i.e., system of meanings), the success of labor-community solidarity against growth coalition depends on the degree of the overlap in organizational ranges although it alone does not guarantee the formation of coalition (Obach, 2004). On the other hand (i.e., system of social relations), the chance that the labor-community alliance can be formed becomes higher with the increase in the number of 'bridge builders' - with different resources and backgrounds who cut across fragmented social movement groups - which is equivalent to 'coalition brokers (Obach, 2004).' In the context of urban politics, put together, the chance of labor-community alliance will go up when labor movement with the

¹⁶ Obach(2004) suggested two sorts of organizational learning: 'experiential learning' and 'learning through interaction with others.' Besides, I would like to suggest another issue related to organizational learning from the case study of the Calumen Project (Nissen, 1995): "Alliance develops better if there is a length period of time for them to be cemented in struggle or if previous struggles have paved the way." (Ibid: 167) There were not a few previous struggles in Pittsburgh at the local level albeit no strikes at the national level interestingly. Above all, the struggle named "Save our valley, and save Dorothy (the name of one Duquesne facility)" must pave the way to organizational learning for the future alliance, I think.

help of bridge builders is able to suggest a new icon of development based on ‘use-values’ as a common cause against ‘exchange values’ which can attract community organizations¹⁷.

Let me take a closer look at this issue. First, both Nissen and Fitzgerald also proposed the presence of ‘bridge builders’ as one of the key factors to make successful coalition between labor movement and urban social movements: “All coalitions have depended heavily on ‘bridge builders’ who share both labor and community viewpoints, and who actively work to bring labor together with potential non-labor partners (Nissen, 2004).” “The presence of key actors to offer alternative interpretations of events is thus conducive to the development of community-based movement (Fitzgerald, 1991).”

¹⁷ The growth machine thesis in the US since Logan and Molotch(1987) has emphasized the contradiction between ‘use-values’ and ‘exchange-values’ in cities mentioned above (e.g. community ownership of land as opposed to capitalistic private property, egalitarian public services for need as opposed to discriminating social services for profit). Similarly, in the UK context, “The notion of local socialism [that is, restructuring for labor as opposed to servicing capital; I added] is essentially about defending an ‘urban meaning’ based on use-value – on the defense and extension of public services for need (Lowe, 1986: 117).” The following debate clearly reveals the conflict between these two values. One is more based on exchange values, while the other on use values. “Q: So you are making it easier for the private market to take over?” “Birru (Executive director of the Urban Redevelopment Authority): We created the value. The market rate is going up; rents will be going up. The value of the properties will be going up. The city will get its money back probably in four or five years, if [Fifth and Forbes] happens. All of the taxing bodies will get their money back in a much shorter period of time.” “Croft(Executive director of the SVA): In terms of the purpose of public financing, I think a lot of it historically has come down to where there are market failures, there is sometimes a need for the public sector to invest and to try to re-create growth... It seems that what has happened in the Pittsburgh region in terms of the last 15 years, since the decline of the industrialization period in the 1980s, when we lost so many major industrial jobs, is that there have been a number of huge projects that were funded through various universities and institutions to try to decide what [our local] vision is. One of the mistakes the region made was declaring some of the hard industries dead. One year we were going to be the medical city, the next year the high-tech city, the next year the biotech city... I guess this is the fun city year, right?... It seems as though many of those initial goals were reduced to, basically, investing in real estate projects Downtown to toward the urban core. I want to see some thought given to stretching back to where there are more true market failures. So that we begin to look at the broader region in terms of areas which have been harder hit, for instance Braddock, a Mon valley town...” ([When to spend public money on private projects], October 22, 2000, Sunday, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette)

Especially, Fitzgerald's conclusion is based on his study of Pittsburgh although he did not analyze the number of bridge builders and its structural pattern through social network analysis. However, the problem I found out is that there does not seem to be the significant difference in the number of bridge builders between Sheffield and Pittsburgh. Rather, the network of activists in Sheffield is overlapped more than that in Pittsburgh. Furthermore, it seems to me that the SVA is not that efficient in terms of bridge builders. As Portz (1991) pointed out, in sharp contrast to business corporations, and to a greater degree than labor unions, mobilization has been the central issue for the SVA and Tri-State because they are not bound by a bureaucratic tradition. In other words, they have had had hard time to organize activists who are not committed to the existing paternalistic structure of labor movement.

Turning to another related factor, this comes down to the transformation of competing frames into a global frame. 'Collective action frame' (Snow et.al, 1986; Portz, 1990: 23-5) is a set of interpretative schemas that provides people with the standard by which they identify a problem, helps them explain the problem, and suggests alternatives to it (e.g. workers' protest is social problems while plant closing is economic one? Restructuring for whom and what?). Especially, it seems to be more insightful to make a distinction between 'domain-specific interpretive frame' (i.e., fairly self-contained, rigid, and exclusive frame in a particular domain) and 'global interpretive frame' (i.e., flexible and inclusive frame so that it can more easily function as a master frame which interprets experiences in a new way).

Looking at workers' response to corporate restructuring in Sheffield, traditional practices such as 'short-time working' instead of mass struggles were pursued. One interviewee said (Allender, 2001: 79), "the actual struggles and battles for the right to work and the opposition against job losses never really took off... Historically we'd always had a good track record of sharing short-term problems, in engineering and in steel, whereby we frequently had periods of short-time working and it was a feature of that period – 1975 up to 1984." In this way, labor unions in Sheffield seemed to search for the solution to corporate restructuring within the limit of organizational routine so that it prevented them

from adopting different strategies. To put it another way, this practice seemed to impede labor unions' growing out of their domestic-specific interpretative frame. Although there was a big strike by steel workers at the national level at 1980, they were more interested in redundancy payments as the individualistic solution than deindustrialization, economic democracy, and the overproduction of steel.

By contrast, unlike labor unions in Sheffield preferred individualistic solution (e.g. the acceptance of payments) or pursued 'class struggles' in Fitzgerald's classification (Table 1), the SVA organizers realized that future successes would require convincing community leaders and local workers that they had the right to question corporate decisions that affect their livelihood (Fitzgerald and Simmons, 1991: 517)¹⁸. Above all, Portz(1991: 105-6) noticed how the Tri-State tried to redefine plant closings. First, causal responsibility for plant closings must be understood within the context of corporate decision making. Second, the temporal and geographical context of a plant closing should be noted. In other words, rather than view plant closings as single and isolated events at one point in time, the Tri-State presented plant closings in the Mon Valley as common victims of corporate disinvestment with consequences for the entire region. Lastly, this definition pointed to a collective response and community mobilization. That is to way, the Tri-State tried to promote the public debate in terms of workers and communities controlling their own economic futures.

I think, in this regard, the frame that mills in the valley is worker and community's property was more outward than any other frame that narrowly focused on labor issues such as employment security, training, or pension. One of good examples is the principle suggested by the Tri-State that funding for the purchase of plants should come from a

¹⁸ At the beginning, with little precedent for working-class participation in production decisions, the SVA's strategic focus on saving plants through an eminent-domain takeover (rather than protectionist legislation supported by the majority) were not welcomed by many workers. What is worse, worker's responses were divided, as it was in Sheffield (See Westergaard et al., 1989), because many workers at the Duquesne mill accepted contract closing benefits as the best-case alternative to a long and questionable fight to reopen the mill. The contract between the steel-workers' union and US Steel contained an array of provisions covering pensions, supplemental unemployment pay, health insurance, and severance pay (Portz, 1990: 115).

combination of private, public, and employee funds. Additionally, the SVA owns the land and equipment, and leases it to the potential operators of the Southside Steel who ensure a clean environment, a fair tax rate beneficial to all and a voice for the community in decisions that affect workers and community alike. Also, a nonprofit Southbank Industry Association was created to provide South Pittsburgh community organizations with an equity share and a direct voice in the project (Fitzgerald, 1991).

The SVA also claimed a primacy for community interests over those of the corporations. In other words, private property was to serve interests of the broader community rather than perpetuate a system of inequality and privilege (Portz, 1990: 119-20). In this aspect, worker and community ownership against the notion of private property is none other than an alternative frame that is conducive to the labor-community coalition. Furthermore, it should be noted that community ownership rather than worker ownership alone helped residents to overcome the deep-rooted paternalism in industrial towns and raise community consciousness as well. Residents in the Mon Valley would have to change some long-held beliefs, including the unquestioned reliance on company decisions as good ones as well as the ‘pervasive sense of helplessness’ that hit the Mon Valley communities. (Portz, 1990: 117) Finally, the enhancement of community consciousness did make it for labor unions to turn their attention to community-defined movement from community-based movement. Indeed, the Tri-State led efforts to create a statewide industrial capital fund to finance industrial development projects beyond a particular community¹⁹.

However, one of disadvantages in Obach’s study is that he is preoccupied with the relationship among social movement organizations (i.e., micro-reduction) while leaving out a larger context, that is, how organizational field is embedded in the political opportunity structure. To reincorporate it into the analysis, first, I would like to suggest focusing on the

¹⁹ It was debated by the Pennsylvania House of Representatives Business and Commerce Committee as the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Finance Corporation Bill. Besides, the Tri-State in the early 1990s was involved in organizing the national-level Federation for Industrial Retention and Renewal whose goals are to strengthen local organizations in campaigns to prevent plant closings and to promote national plant closing legislation as part of a national industrial policy (Fitzgerald and Simmons, 1991).

interaction between the type of corporate restructuring and the type of regional development. This is the kernel of urban governance as a mobilizing structure, which boils down to the following questions: “Labor-inclusive or labor-exclusive?” and “resident-inclusive or resident-exclusive?”

It is actually impossible for labor unions to participate in corporate decision-making in both cities where there are no institutionalized settings like codetermination in Germany although they can raise some issues companies exclusively deal with on the table of collective bargaining to some extent (e.g. so-called ‘invest bargaining’ by using ESOP prevalent in the steel industry in the US). In this regard, labor-exclusive restructuring is likely to bring about more resistance than labor-inclusive one.

Paternalism as another aspect in labor-management relations, is intertwined with the issue mentioned above. Given that paternalism, especially combined with the structure of company-based unionism, filters class relations and class struggles so that workers can be more supportive of corporate interests in industrial cities and less supportive of confrontation²⁰, it still seems to me that its failure could be a source of resistance that comes from a feeling of the loss of family or community.

Turning the attention to the type of regional development, resident-exclusive development during the crisis might engender a feeling of alienation from decision-making processes so that it could lead grassroots to the opposition to the bureaucratic authorities. In the similar way as above, paternalism in the relationships between community organizations and local governments has been reported as one of key features in industrial cities, which implies that its failure, albeit the negative correlation between paternalism and community consciousness, might provide the conditions for the enhancement of community consciousness.

²⁰ For instance, “it had a long record free of significant disputes, management had a reputation for paternal interest in their employees, and the workforce had no experience of tough action against them... Echoes of a ‘paternalist’ atmosphere were certainly strong when we asked people to describe how they had felt about their working lives there” (Westergaard et al., 1989: 36-7).

What I addressed so far is helpful, albeit not satisfactorily, to better understand why the public-private partnership in Pittsburgh has been challenged since the 1980s to this day. The public-private partnership model in Pittsburgh had changed in the 1980s from its traditional style to the inclusion of nonprofit organizations such as universities, foundations, and community-based organizations, but Deitrick(1999) diagnosed that the Pittsburgh model has weakened over the recent years. One of the main reasons is that the growth coalition characterized by public paternalism has not been open-minded to different voices from community organizations, not to mention labor unions. For example, even neighborhood-based initiatives besides a remanufacturing strategy for the devastated Monongahela River Valley had received little attention – and even less funding – under ‘Strategy 21: Pittsburgh/Allegheny Economic Development Strategy to Begin the 21st Century,’ as the ACCD-local government partnership continued to set the region’s agenda (Deitrick, 1999). Also, the SVA had argued that workers’ interest was not represented in Strategy 21 proposals. Rather, upper-level managers of local corporations and banks who are investing in foreign steel operations – the capital flight towards especially Mexico – serve as representatives on regional public-private partnerships that formulate local economic development policy to meet their own interests.

The next factor I would like to bring up is the interaction between spatial segregation and class structure division²¹. Deindustrialization and urban revitalization provided newly

²¹ Regarding this issue, it might be that strong working-class community is not that favorable to the alliance between labor movement and urban social movements in terms of a ‘cultural divide (Obach, 2004)’. “The deepest but least noted social cost of the current global restructuring of industrial production has been the undermining of the urban working-class cultures for which factory work provided a material and social base for enduring social relationships in residential communities (Smith, 1988: 193-4).” It has been reported that industrial towns in both cities, Mon Valley (Pittsburgh) and Don Valley (Sheffield), has been characterized by workers’ cooperation coupled with their cultural homogeneity and their attachment to place. Relatively autonomous local working-class cultures have persisted despite rapid social and economic changes in the society as a whole because of the high degree of class segregation of everyday life in the US urban system generally (Smith, 1988). This is the case with the UK. For instance, one very positive aspect was the widespread prevalence of cooperation within communities. Traditional

emerging working and middle classes with the chance of getting jobs in a growing service economy. Community organizations (esp. community development corporations) also benefited from that by participating in various projects supported by public-private partnership. However, working-class communities in the two river valleys had to have different experiences at the same time such as plant closings, layoffs, and the demolition of their communities.

Generally, it could be suggested that steel-based reindustrialization has a strong base of support in the towns and their neighborhoods where such factories were located, whereas service industry-based reindustrialization gets more support from the central city and expanding non-industrial suburbs (Beauregard et. al., 1992). The Don Valley (Sheffield) and the Mon Valley (Pittsburgh) was the hardest hit area, but the consequences of industrial restructuring and the loss of working class community seem to linger on²².

working-class communities in Sheffield displayed genuine caring and cooperation (Allender, 2001: 106).

²² The industrial towns that line Southwestern Pennsylvania's rivers have become the region's Third World, increasingly disadvantaged and increasingly unable to take care of themselves. While towns and cities in much of the nine-county area have recovered from the industrial disasters of the 1980s, the river towns have not. They are poorer; they have more old people; they have lost more families and more jobs; they have lost more income and more real wealth. Homes are worth less, and so are whole communities. ([Valley towns' fortunes decline steadily], November 28, 1993, Sunday, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette) Giarratani and Houston(1989) interestingly pinpointed that there is little evidence of a new basis for economic prosperity resulting from a structural transformation of the regional economy in Pittsburgh. They did not deny that economic adjustments had been occurring, but argued that the evidence is slight that Pittsburgh should be regarded as a showcase of economic adjustment and renewed prosperity. Additionally, although it should be acknowledged that some significant benefits can be associated with the decline of congestion, crime rates, pollution, and so on, these outcomes were achieved at the cost of tremendous hardship and something else. Deitrick (1999) also argued that despite the accolades Pittsburgh received, the region was forming a bifurcated economic structure, as many people were not participating in the region's post-industrial transition. Hardcore poverty stretched from Pittsburgh's inner-city neighborhoods to the Monongahela River Valley towns where the still mills once stood. In some of these areas, over one-fourth of all families lived in poverty in 1989. Many Mon Valley communities never recovered from the fall of steel and eventually fell under the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's plan for fiscally distressed communities.

This spatial segregation interacts with the composition of labor force and its change over time. As Seyd(1993) aptly addressed, one of factors that could explain enduring support to the local politics led by the Labor Party in Sheffield is the predominance of manual workers among the city’s population and the spatial distribution of the population (e.g. non-manual workers were tightly concentrated in a few wards in the southwest of the city). More than one third of the total workforce in 1970 was composed of skilled, male manual workers in steel and engineering (Goodwin and Duncan, 1986). After a series of corporate restructuring including plant closings, it turned out that those workers are less central in the local labor market.

<Table 2> Manufacturing employment change based on Standard Industrial Classification, 1978-1984 (Watts, 1991: 43)

Industry Classification	1978	1984	Change	%
Metal manufacturing Metal goods	59,200	22,300	-36,900	-62
Mechanical engineering	13,200	7,700	-5,500	-42
Engineers small tools	10,000	5,100	-4,900	-49
Food & drink	9,000	6,500	-2,500	-28
Hand tools & implements	6,800	4,300	-2,500	-37
Non-metallic mineral products	6,100	4,100	-2,000	-33
All other manufacturing	17,200	13,000	-4,200	-24
Total (Manufacturing)	121,500	63,000	-59,100	-48

In the city of Pittsburgh where manufacturing workers were once the largest industry group, by 1980, 46.4 percent of workers was ‘already’ in professional and related services, and 19.4 percent were in wholesale and retail trade, leaving the manufacturing sector with only 13.3 percent. This new economy was based on educational services and corporate headquarters (Portz, 1990: 100).

<Table 3> Employment in the Pittsburgh Metropolitan Region (Giarratani and Houston, 1989: 550, I modified and calculated the percentage of job loss)

Industry Classification	1980	1988	Change	%
Manufacturing	214,000	125,000	-89,000	-41.6
Non manufacturing	695,000	747,000	+52,000	+7.5
Mining/ Construction	56,000	44,000	-12,000	-21.4
Trans./ Pub. utilities	54,000	48,000	-6,000	-11.1
Whole./ Retail trade	207,000	223,000	+16,000	+7.7
Fin./ Ins./ Real estate	45,000	52,000	+7,000	+15.6
Service	211,000	274,000	+63,000	+29.9
Government	121,000	106,000	-15,000	-12.4
Total	910,000	872,000	-38,000	-4.2

It seems to me that both cities had the similar level of the spatial segregation, but working classes in Sheffield were more homogenous than working classes in Pittsburgh even after corporate restructuring including plant closings. What implications does this have for the possibility of labor-community coalition, then? As Beauregard et al. (1992) brought up (See also Portz (1990: 100-2)), cutting across but also reinforcing the spatial dimension is a class dimension in which labor unions along with mill town and city residents of working class background take up a steel-based reindustrialization strategy against the middle-class professionals who support new-industry reindustrialization. The working class, like manufacturing, was marginalized politically within the collaboration as well as being spatially marginalized by the shrinkage of the dominant industry, not to mention that they are less central economically and culturally²³.

Similarly, the consequences of the drastic change in labor forces were more that this in Sheffield, which means that local politics is no longer dominated by those erstwhile central workforces in steel and engineering. White-collar and public sector jobs are the most numerous, and labor unions in those sectors have become increasingly dominant in

²³ In the similar tone, Smith(1988: 199) contended that the successful public-private partnerships have displaced the economic foundations of old working class cultural communities and created new elite engendered uses of urban space. Where the process of central city conversion from industrial to corporate-professional urban space has been successful, a major result in some cities (FYI: his examples are St Paul and San Francisco) has been ‘private’ gentrification of nearby residential neighborhoods and geographic displacement of the lower classes from the urban core to more periphery urban districts. Where this has occurred, race and class inequality have not decreased.

the local labor movement. However, unlike Pittsburgh, Sheffield did not experience the right-left/ manual-white collar divisions in the same way as some other local Labor Parties although working-class political cultures are not reproduced by white-collar and public sector workers (Goodwin and Duncan, 1986).

Lastly, I would like to contend that the degree of bureaucratization of labor unions and city council should be considered. My hypothetical argument is that the high degree of bureaucratization of labor unions and the city council seemed to impede organizational learning (as a more institutionalized form) or coopt mass struggles (as a less institutionalized form). It seemed that labor movements in both cities had the similar experiences, but it should be noted that there were no such cases in Pittsburgh as long as the relationship between labor unions and urban social movements is concerned.

The red island with the long history of Labor-led local politics does mean that labor movement is the most prevalent form of social movement in Sheffield, but it also indicates that the local government and the local Labor has tried to solve community issues actively. For example, with the economy slow down at the end of the 1950s and racism more overt, the Sheffield committee for community relations were organized by the city council in 1966. Representatives of voluntary organizations within the settler communities were important members of the committee and played a key role in creating welfare and other facilities in the city. Other committee members came from the churches, local businesses, trade unions, and the university (Hampton, 1993). However, Allender(2001: 102-3) gave an example of paternalism, that is, the betrayal by labor movement leaders inherent in the logic of laborism. In his opinion, the strict hierarchy of the factory was replicated with the labor unions in Sheffield. The new left on the city council in Sheffield was another active group to mediate the alliance between labor and community, but the way the city council handled issues was not that far from paternalism although the urban new left tried to pursue a bottom-up and anti-paternalist approach. One interviewee said, "In the early 1980s the council was incredibly paternalistic... David Blunkett was incredibly paternalistic as well..." (Allender, 2001: 64-5). For one instance, taking the struggle against plant closures

and redundancies was rejected by the new left under the leadership of David Blunkett (Seyd, 1993). What is worse, the government's Manpower Services Commission threatened to withdraw its proposals to fund the retraining of redundant workers if the Labor Council endorsed the class for campaigns and strikes against further redundancies that came from the Unemployment Centers. More importantly, tenants' movement is a good example for discussion. Housing service had been one of the most contested arenas in Sheffield local politics. The decision by the Labor-controlled council to introduce a rent rebate scheme with the national recommendations caused much anger among Labor voters, which led to tenants' movement. Professional community workers helped to initiate the early city-wide liaison and establish a number of new tenant's associations, but the involvement of these workers in the authority seemed to accelerate the institutionalization of tenant's movement. In other words, although the Left tried to 'raise the political level' of the tenants' movement, they found urban protest an unfamiliar and difficult terrain that did not easily conform to their workplace and trade union-centered experiences (Lowe, 1986: 113-4). Taken together, the problem was that the Left groups and the labor unions failed to understand the essentially 'spontaneous' nature of the tenants' movement.

This chronic problem in the history of labor movements was the case with labor unions in Pittsburgh. For instance, Hathaway(1993: 22) did not include the International USWA as one of main actors during the period of contested politics in Pittsburgh. He acknowledged that the USWA participated in efforts to delay the demolition of the Duquesne mill, but he doubted it would have taken such step without the efforts of the smaller insurgent groups. Indeed, when it did join in that project it worked to minimize the power of the insurgent groups. Later it worked to oppose the reelection of union local presidents active in those groups. Here is another example that shows the conflict between local unions and the International union. The International at first accepted the steel companies' arguments for labor concessions and supported calls for government trade assistance. In contrast, many locals in the USWA were exploring different strategies to keep their mills open. This split between locals and the International, he argued, was perpetuated by a top-down organizational structure within the USWA that gave local union

members few opportunities for participation (Portz, 1990: 103). Similarly, by 1984 the International USWA was under new leadership that encouraged rank-and-file participation and provided more support to local efforts to stop plant closings. However, while the International provided financial support for feasibility studies of the Duquesne mill, the union leadership was less supportive of public rallies and demonstrations sponsored by the Tri-State. (Ibid: 115).

7. Implications

Community is the place where the double movement (Polanyi, 1944, 1968) – the spiral of the expansion of market principles that attempts to make social relations embedded in the economic system and the self-protection of society as local responses that tries to make such market re-embedded into the society – proceeds. This is why my study will attach more importance to community than civil society that is the contested but elusive concept. In this aspect, it is arguably one of promising tasks to construct the middle-range theory of how class politics is nested in urban politics. Additionally, this research will contribute to the debate on ‘community unionism’ as one form of ‘social movement unionism’ (Brecher and Costello, 1990; Turfs, 1998; Nissen, 2004) that has received increasing scholarly concern in labor studies recently.

There is also another implication of this study for policies. As the consensus decrease of both public-private partnerships indicates (Seyd, 1993; Ferman, 1996; Deitrick, 1999), it is time to evaluate economic, political, and social outcomes both public-private partnerships produced. Based on the same criteria, I will assess consequences of labor’s strategies: What was wrong with the city socialism experiment in Sheffield? What are problems with labor-affiliated community development projects in Pittsburgh? In this way, my study will be able to rekindle the attention to how labor unions and community-based organizations can build alliances to yield better policy outcomes and furthermore to make a place for community in pursuit of economic democracy at the local level.

<Appendix 1> Collaboration in Sheffield and Pittsburgh (Beauregard et.al., 1992: 426)

	Sheffield (1979-1985)	Sheffield (post-1985)	Pittsburgh (1980s)
Strategy			
Dominant	Steel-based reindustrialization Job creation	New-industry Reindustrialization Image	New-industry reindustrialization Image
Subordinate	None	Manufacturing Worker welfare	Steel-based reindustrialization Worker welfare
Sectoral targets			
Dominant	Manufacturing including steel	Business services Tourism Retail Recreation	Business services Health Education High-tech infrastructure
Subordinate	None	Manufacturing	Manufacturing
Key actors	Labor party Local Authority Employment department	Public-private partnerships	Public-private partnerships Local & state government
Local politics	Labor, anticentral government	Increasingly pragmatic Moderate labor	Reform liberal, Corporatist
National politics	Conservative Promarket	Conservative Promarket	Conservative Promarket
Funding sources	Local authority	Central government Private	Government Private sector Foundations

<Appendix 2> Major public-private partnerships in Pittsburgh (Deitrick, 1999: 6)

Name	Leadership	Years	Major Projects
Renaissance 1	Allegheny Conference City of Pittsburgh	1945- 1970	Environment improvement Urban renewal & rebuilding of the Golden Triangle
Renaissance 2	Allegheny Conference City of Pittsburgh State government Foundations & Nonprofits	1977- 1987	High-rise office complexes Convention center Cultural institutions Historic preservation Transportation improvements Community development
Strategy 21	Allegheny Conference City & County government State government Universities	1985	Infrastructure development: new airport & highways Advanced technology research Riverfront development & cultural institutions
Working Together Consortium	Allegheny Conference Universities Economic Development Nonprofit Organizations	1994- present	Highlight of plan to create 100,000 new jobs by 2000 through workforce development, tourism, high technology
Regional Renaissance Partnership	Allegheny Conference Sports teams owners	1997	Lost ballot initiative to raise sales tax in region

<References>

- Allender, Paul. 2001. *What's Wrong with Labour?: A Critical History of the Labour Party in the Twentieth Century*. Merlin Press.
- Beauregard, Robert A., Paul Lawless, and Sabina Deitrick. 1992. "Collaborative Strategies for Reindustrialization: Sheffield and Pittsburgh." *Economic Development Quarterly*. Vol.6. No.4. November.
- Blunkett, David and Geoff Green. 1983. *Building from the Bottom: The Sheffield Experience*. Fabian Society. No.491
- Clark, Gordon L. 1989. "Pittsburgh in Transition: Consolidation of Prosperity in an Era of Economic Restructuring," in *Economic Restructuring and Political Responses*, edited by Robert A. Beauregard. Sage Publications.
- Clavel, Pierre. 1986. *The Progressive City: Planning and Participation, 1969-1984*. Rutgers University Press.
- Cochrane, Allan. 1993. *Whatever happened to local government?*. Open University Press.
- Davies, Jonathan S. 2003. "Partnerships versus Regimes: Why Regime Theory Cannot Explain Urban Coalitions in the UK?" *Journal of Urban Affairs*. Vol.25, No.3.
- Deitrick, Sabina. 1999. "The Post Industrial Revitalization of Pittsburgh: Myths and Evidences," *Community Development Journal*. 34(1).
- Ferman, Barbara. 1996. *Challenging the Growth Machine: Neighborhood Politics in Chicago and Pittsburgh*. University Press of Kansas.
- Fitzgerald, J. 1991. "Class as Community: The New Dynamics of Social Change." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. Vol.9.
- Fitzgerald, Joan and Louise Simmons. 1991. "From Consumption to Production: Labor Participation in Grass-Roots Movements in Pittsburgh and Hartford." *Urban Affairs Quarterly*. Vol.26. No.4. June.
- Gordon L. Clark. 1989. "Pittsburgh in Transition: Consolidation of Prosperity in an Era of Economic Restructuring." *Economic Restructuring and Political Response*. Edited by Beauregard, Robert A. Sage publications.
- Giarratani, Frank and David B. Houston. 1989. "Structural Change and Economic Policy in a Declining Metropolitan Region: Implications of the Pittsburgh Experience," *Urban Studies* (26).
- Gyford, John. 1985. *The Politics of Local Socialism*. George Allen and Unwin.
- Hampton, William. 1993. "Optimism and Growth: 1951-1973," in *The History of the City of Sheffield: 1843-1993 (Vol.1: Politics)*, edited by Clyde Binfield et.al. Sheffield Academic Press.
- Hathaway, Dale. 1993. *Can Workers have a Voice?: The Politics of De-industrialization in Pittsburgh*. Pennsylvania Univ. Press.
- Hudson, R. and D. Sadler. 1983. "Region, Class, and the Politics of Steel Closures in the European Community." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. Vol.1
- Katznelson, Ira. 1981. *City Trenches: Urban Politics and the Patterning of Class in the United States*. Chicago.

- Lawless, Paul. 1990. "Regeneration in Sheffield: From Radical Intervention to Partnership." in *Leadership and Urban Regeneration: Cities in North America and Europe*. edited by Judd, Dennis and Michael Parkinson. Sage publications.
- Logan, John R. and Harvey L. Molotch. 1987. *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place*. University of California Press.
- Lowe, Stuart. 1986. *Urban Social Movements: The City after Castells*. St. Martin's.
- McCollester, Charles and Mike Stout. 1990. in *Building Bridges: The Emerging Grassroots Coalition of Labor and Community*, edited by Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello. Monthly Review Press.
- Mossberger, Karen and Gerry Stoker. 2001. "The Evolution of Urban Regime Theory: The Challenge of Conceptualization," *Urban Affairs Review*. Vol.36, No.6.
- Nissen, Bruce. 1995. *Fighting for Jobs: Case Studies of Labor-Community Coalitions Confronting Plant Closings*. State University of New York Press.
- Nissen, Bruce. 2004. "The Effectiveness and Limits of Labor-Community Coalitions: Evidence from South Florida." *Labor Studies Journal* 2.1.
- Obach, Brian K. 2004. *Labor and the Environmental Movement: The Quest for Common Ground*. The MIT Press.
- Plotkin, Sidney and Scheuerman, William. E. 1990. "Two Roads Left: Strategies of Resistance to Plant Closings in the Monongahela Valley," in *Dilemmas of Activism: Class, Community, and the Politics of Local Mobilization*. edited by Kling, Joseph M. and Prudence S. Posner. Temple University Press.
- Polanyi, Karl. 1944. *The Great Transformation*. Beacon Press.
- Polanyi, Karl. 1968. *Primitive, archaic, and modern economies; essays of Karl Polanyi*. edited by George Dalton. Anchor Books.
- Portz, John. 1990. *The Politics of Plant Closings*. The University Press of Kansas.
- Sbragia, Alberta M. 1990. "Pittsburgh's Third Way: The Nonprofit Sector as a Key to Urban Regeneration." *Leadership and Urban Regeneration: Cities in North America and Europe*. Edited by Judd, Dennis and Michael Parkinson. Sage publications.
- Seyd, Patrick. 1993. "The Political Management of Decline: 1973-1993," in *The History of the City of Sheffield: 1843-1993 (Vol.1: Politics)*, edited by Clyde Binfield et.al. Sheffield Academic Press.
- Skocpol, Theda and Margaret Somers. 1980. "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. Vol.22, No.2.
- Smelser, Neil J. 1976. *Comparative Methods in the Social Sciences*. Prentice-Hall.
- Smith, Michael Peter. 1988. *City, State, and Market: The Political Economy of Urban Society*. Basil Blackwell.
- Stone, C. N. 1993. "Urban Regimes and the Capacity to Govern: A Political Economy Approach." *Journal of Urban Affairs*. Vol.15.
- Tattersall, Amanda. 2005, "Understanding What Makes Union-Community Coalitions Effective: A Framework for Analyzing Union-Community Relationships," AIRAANZ.
- Turfs, Steven. 1998. "Community Unionism in Canada and Labor's (Re)organization of Space." *Antipode* 30:3.
- Wills, Jane and Melanie Simms. 2004. "Building Reciprocal Community Unionism in the UK," *Capital and Class*. Issue 82. Spring.