



Cornell University  
ILR School

Labor Research Review

---

Volume 1 | Number 18  
*Let's Get Moving! Organizing for the '90's*

Article 7

---

1991

## Women's Ways of Organizing: A Conversation with AFSCME Organizers Kris Rondeau and Gladys McKenzie

Lisa Oppenheim

---

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@ILR. It has been accepted for inclusion in Labor Research Review by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@ILR. For more information, please contact [catherwood-dig@cornell.edu](mailto:catherwood-dig@cornell.edu).

© 1991 by Labor Research Review

---

## Women's Ways of Organizing: A Conversation with AFSCME Organizers Kris Rondeau and Gladys McKenzie

### Abstract

[Excerpt] Their signs declare: "We believe in ourselves." They speak about values: we cut our apples in half and share them; those who are strong carry those who are weaker until they can become stronger They talk about emotional connections; commitment from both the head and heart. They talk about constantly learning. They talk about telling stories; listening; forming relationships.

If you think those words have nothing to do with union organizing, think again. Over 6600 clerical and technical workers—at one of the nation's most prestigious private universities and one of the largest public universities in the country—have organized guided by this kind of talking union. Those 6600 workers are now members of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME).

### Keywords

union organizing, AFSCME, Harvard, gender



IT'S NOT  
ANTI-HARVARD  
TO BE  
PRO-UNION  
**HUCTW**

WE  
CAN'T EAT  
PRESTIGE  
**HUCTW**

WE  
CAN'T  
EAT  
PRESTIGE  
**HUCTW**

WE  
CAN'T  
EAT  
PRESTIGE  
**HUCTW**

# Women's Ways of Organizing

**A Conversation with AFSCME Organizers  
Kris Rondeau and Gladys McKenzie**

*Their signs declare: "We believe in ourselves." They speak about values: we cut our apples in half and share them; those who are strong carry those who are weaker until they can become stronger. They talk about emotional connections; commitment from both the head and heart. They talk about constantly learning. They talk about telling stories; listening; forming relationships.*

If you think those words have nothing to do with union organizing, think again. Over 6600 clerical and technical workers—at one of the nation's most prestigious private universities and one of the largest public universities in the country—have organized guided by this kind of talking union. Those 6600 workers are now members of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME).

The principal organizers of the two union drives are Kris Rondeau of the Harvard Union of Clerical and Technical Workers/AFSCME and Gladys McKenzie of University of Minnesota/AFSCME.

Rondeau was not a new face at Harvard. She had been working at Harvard in the '70s as a medical research assistant when she was approached by a volunteer organizer from UAW District 65. "I was the prototype of the hard-to-organize worker," she recalls. "I kept asking questions and he kept answering me or going back

and finding the answers. Finally I ran out of questions." Rondeau became a volunteer employee organizer for the drive which ended unsuccessfully in 1977. After another loss, Rondeau and seven other Harvard organizers left the UAW and formed the independent Harvard Union in 1985. Once they had gained enough credibility and legitimacy from Harvard workers, they decided to become part of AFSCME.

May 17, 1988 marked the culmination of their yearlong struggle to organize the 3400 c & t's at Harvard University. The workers, 80% of whom are women, were spread among 400 university buildings, in 2000 worksites. Gerald W. McEntee, president of AFSCME, told the *New York Times* that the union victory "gives a real breath of vitality and life to the entire labor movement." He added, "I'm certain that if you can do it at Harvard you can do it at an awful lot of places."

McKenzie, too, was first an employee at the university that she came to organize. After years of participating in an employee association and building interest in organizing, McKenzie and her associates moved to form a union. The Harvard employee victory was a great spark—especially the way Rondeau and others approached organizing. "I had finally found someone speaking the same language," McKenzie says. Harvard organizers provided vital assistance to the University of Minnesota drive where 93% of the clerical workers were women. After a year-and-a-half long drive, on February 20, 1991, 3200 UM employees, in over 400 buildings spanning six campuses, voted 51% for AFSCME affiliation. (The Teamsters, also attempting to organize UM, received 10% of the vote).

The model of organizing which Rondeau, McKenzie and their sister organizers use is a dynamic blend of feminism and rank-and-file union organizing. Both have been connected to the labor movement for over a decade. They rely heavily on one-on-one organizing, establishing member organizing committees and training employee organizers.

Unlike traditional union organizing, however, they don't focus on specific issues in their organizing drives. Instead, the AFSCME organizers focus on the need for workers to establish a voice for themselves through the union. As Rondeau explains, they organize for "power and participation." Moreover, they shun the use of literature, maintaining it organizes no one. Instead, they rely on building relationships among workers and holding cultural activities to generate movement.

At the same time, Rondeau and McKenzie are not simply organizers who happen to be female. Their way of organizing

reflects their feminism and understanding of women's lives. They understand the importance that most women place on maintaining relationships and building connections. They know that telling stories raises consciousness and that's needed to transform the workplace and to create a strong union. They also know that these women who "hold up half the sky" are trivialized and patronized at their place of work.

"She doesn't talk in a labor language," says one friend of *LRR* who heard Rondeau speak. I don't know how to describe it—it's a women's language."

Some have referred to Rondeau and McKenzie's way of organizing as a "feminine model" as opposed to a masculine, or traditional model of organizing. Both Rondeau and McKenzie are unsure of the label. But one thing that they are sure of: they are organizing predominately women workers into creative, strong unions. And they *are* winning.

*The following article is an abridgement of a conversation between Rondeau and McKenzie and Labor Research Review Editor Lisa Oppenheim. Additional assistance was provided by LRR Associate Editor Lynn Feekin and HUCTW/AFSCME staff-person Ellen DeGenova.*



**LRR:** Would you describe the model of one-on-one organizing that you've been involved in creating?

**Rondeau:** The first major point is that the union must have a relationship with every single person in the workplace. The union, through one or more of its representatives, whether that is staff or employee organizers—has to have a relationship with every person.

There's nothing in this kind of organizing that is anything like electoral politics. Organizing workers is not about advertising. It's based on the belief that people change in relationships, not in isolation. Each person needs time to decide, a real connection to the union, and lots of information. But not just information—we call it "head and heart." That means that workers have to have some kind of emotional connection to the union as well as knowledge of it. They have to care about it.

Joining a union is an act of personal courage on the part of every single person who does it. And to the extent that we don't realize and respect that and understand the emotional and psychological part of joining a union, then we don't really get votes. In an anti-union campaign, workers are going to be petrified and they're

going to vote no. They're going to doubt what you tell them. They need to see the organization, be exposed to it. They need to see the basic practical expressions of the union to see that those who are in it are just like themselves. They need to get used to the idea that it is possible for ordinary people to build strong organizations.

**McKenzie:** In our model, the goal is to build a community of workers, not merely win an election. We seek to build a strong, committed, organization where everybody counts; where people create a vision of the kind of union they want. We believe that unions should go to election with that kind of organization—not try to build it afterwards.

**LRR:** You both refer to your model as “one-on-one” organizing. It may be so in form, but in content you are talking about a new way of organizing. Relationships. “Head and Heart.” Why do you focus on these concerns in your model?

**Rondeau:** It's important to recognize that people change. Workers make up their minds over a long period of time. Basically, we have a model where we put the concept of unionism under close scrutiny. Most organizers don't really give workers enough time to figure out exactly what the union means. The primary component of this model is that each person in the workplace has to go through a learning process. And once the relationship has been built, it's ongoing. It's not a simple vote for or against the union.

We must have a regular relationship with every single person who works in a place and stick with them through the entire process—first they become pro-union; then they develop a sense of community, they know where to go if they have a problem; then they become active; they're able to organize co-workers, make strategic decisions, and help create strong organizations. There's all kinds of important changes that take place in individual members and these changes never stop.

**McKenzie:** Actually, I prefer to call the model “person-to-person organizing.” It speaks better to what we're trying to do here.

But, to your question: once we recognized that people constantly change, we realized that we had to build a strong community, one that would be there for people. We formed personal relationships, connected with other workers whom we had once known only through memos. We realized that we had to create a strong organization that provided a safe environment for people to change and grow.

**Rondeau:** I want to make it clear: Gladys and I both play to win! It can't be emphasized enough; you play to win and one of the best ways of ensuring victory is by building a solid organization from the very beginning. One of my co-workers says "time is the precious commodity" and he's right. If we try to move people too quickly, even if we succeed in getting them, we won't be able to keep them. We begin the basic work of transforming the culture of the workplace, building the community as Gladys talked about, in order to make the union able to survive through thick and thin.

**LRR:** So you really see organizing as more than a union drive. You are trying to transform the workplace in the process?

**Rondeau:** Right—and we transform ourselves too.

Another important aspect of our model of organizing is our focus on the isolation of workers. One of the things we found is that workers come in two broad categories: those who are isolated in their workplace, who have no support networks at work or home. Those are the people who can't take it anymore, who have given up, disintegrated. The other category is those workers who are able to deal with work because they are connected, they do have friends and co-workers to whom they can turn.

Workers who are isolated have an outrageous sense of revenge against the boss. They're for the union to get revenge—not justice. One of our rules in this organization is that any isolated person will end up voting no for the union. Anti-union campaigns are designed for people who feel isolated, who see no hope. So we constantly work with those people and help them develop relationships, stay connected to others.

**McKenzie:** The University of Minnesota is the largest public university in the country. There are nearly 500 buildings spread out over six campuses. We discovered the joy that people had in meeting each other. There were so many instances of workers sitting across the table from each other and realizing "Oh, so you're the person I've been talking with over the phone for 10 years!" Now when you walk on campus, you always run into a



Kris Rondeau



union member whom you know—no matter what time of day.

**LRR:** One feature of your organizing model that is mentioned most often is you don't use literature. Would you explain? After all, the workforce you're organizing is highly literate.

**Rondeau:** Doing newsletters is boring, tedious. It doesn't organize. Nobody really reads it. When we left the UAW—eight of us, all former employees of Harvard—we had no income. One of the local churches gave us a room. We had no paper. We had nothing. So we stopped putting out a newsletter all together. Those circumstances forced us to go out into the campus and start talking one-on-one with workers or telephoning them. Although it was scary at first we found that it made wonderful organizing.

Secondly, not depending on literature requires everybody to eventually talk to somebody about the union. A piece of literature would satisfy the simplest curiosity about the union drive. It was really weird—if you'd leave a newsletter, they'd just glance at it and throw it right in the trash. Then they would never even need to talk to anyone about the union because that had somehow satisfied their basic curiosity.

When you rely on one-on-one organizing, people don't have the safety valve of literature anymore. If they want to know what's going on, they have to approach somebody. Workers who were really nervous about talking to the union would eventually ask their co-workers: "What's going on with the union drive anyway?"—and then the door would be open to talking. When a union drive is in the workplace, it's a big thing. Everybody is thinking about it in one way or another. Everybody wants to know what it's about. Nobody wants to be left out.

The third reason we dumped literature is that we didn't want to say what kind of union would be created. One of the things that literature does is tell people "This is What Unions Do and This is How They Do It." We decided we didn't want to do that. We wanted to leave it as wide open as possible. We didn't want workers to be inhibited by what we wrote about unions. I think that worked out great for us. We see the union not only as a workplace democracy but also as a cultural, social, educational, and political organization.

**McKenzie:** I was very interested in what some of the most active people in the organization here would say to this question. They said, "Well, it's obvious. We know what the paper chase creates. We live in the midst of paper where nobody knows anybody and everybody is isolated from everyone else and memos come down

in droves and that's not what we want to build. We don't want to be pen pals. We want to connect with a face."

To have the organization grow and take on its own character and become something that connects to people is very important. You cut down on your ability to do that immeasurably when you start handing out paper. People would come to us all the time and say "What is AFSCME, what are you about?" as if we were some "planet AFSCME," outside of their experience. We wanted to challenge that notion of the union as third party. The only way to do that was to talk and not rely on literature.

As you know, we were in competition with one of the largest unions in the country. Some people wanted us to do a two-column flyer: this is AFSCME on one side and this is the Teamsters on the other. We absolutely refused to do that kind of thing. Frankly, we didn't know what AFSCME was here. We were *building something*. We could tell people why we chose to work with AFSCME, but a lot of that had to do with the fact that they would make room for us to do something special for ourselves here that was based on who we were and not who anybody else was.

**Rondeau:** We recoil at the idea of workers seeing the union as a third party. Lots of literature tends to promote that image. That is not to say that you should never use literature—say you have a workforce of 10,000. It's not possible to never use literature, but be careful to control that urge.



Gladys McKenzie

**LRR:** So instead of using literature you sent out staff and volunteer employee organizers to talk one-on-one with others about the union. How did that work—were volunteers reluctant to do that?

**McKenzie:** We got very serious about organizing every single worker. We were determined not to leave anyone out. Each person deserves our respect and to be treated as an individual—not as an amorphous blob to hit with one big sales pitch.

Many employee organizers

had never done organizing before and were scared. They thought that there was some special school for organizers, or some special quality you're born with. What they didn't realize is when they met with someone over coffee or at lunch, or dropped something off at a building, they were organizing.

We went out organizing in teams to every building. We tried to help each other stay focused by reviewing who we were going to see or at least what to expect. When we were done, we'd discuss our experience and analyze what happened. So often teams would return saying, "Oh, that was really scary, but it wasn't so hard. I want to go again!"

**Rondeau:** Once they've had the practice, it isn't scary anymore. The kind of analysis or reflection that Gladys talked about is part of the model.

We call it "constant adult learning." We realized that workers often feel an oppressive lack of learning in their work lives and one of the primary responsibilities of the union is to create a place where people can learn and grow and change all the time. That's really important.

**LRR: Is this not happening in traditional unions?**

**Rondeau:** Oh, I don't know that—certainly, I've learned a lot in all my experiences with unions. It's helped us to focus on constant adult learning in building the Harvard local.

For us, the union is a place for learning. We do training for our staff, our executive board, our leadership and our members. We try to do training all the time.

**LRR: How do you see education continuing once a union's in place?**

**McKenzie:** In my entire experience at the U, I always heard my co-workers say that they had a certain amount of knowledge that nobody was asking them for. When there were changes made in the workplace or where the university faced a particular problem that called for a real solution, nobody was coming to them saying, "Help us solve this problem. We think that you have good ideas. We think that you're a person who's learning all the time." So focusing on it, in a way, brings out something that's already there. The organization shouldn't go into sudden brain death after an election. Constant adult learning means having active people after you've become an official organization. Things are always happening in the union: new people come into the workforce, or new issues come up each day so we have to constantly educate

and learn. As Kris said, change is constant and you're either having things happen to you or you're making them happen.

**Rondeau:** One of the best things that workers know is that change starts by telling stories. In both organizations we spend a lot of time telling each other stories. Every organizer around the country knows that every person has a story and sooner or later, each person will tell you theirs. Everytime I hear one, I think to myself, "the world isn't big enough for all these stories."

It gets back to what Gladys said in the very beginning that *everybody counts*. The union has to be a place where everybody's story matters. Our lives are as complicated and important as any manager's. There's no reason that our stories should ever be trivialized. So a lot of the kind of work that Gladys is talking about—the kind of learning she's talking about—gets done through storytelling.

**LRR:** Once you tell your story, then that heart connection comes.

**Rondeau:** Also, storytelling becomes a good way for workers to figure out that they really are good at something. Telling stories is a much better way of talking about the world rather than talking in abstractions. If you can tell a story to make an important point, it's great.

**McKenzie:** It is. Our meetings are never really huge—except when we want them to be that way. Mostly we have a lot of building meetings and committee meetings that are the size that allow people to be comfortable. Small groups allow people to tell stories and form relationships so that everybody gets a chance to talk. In that sense, a meeting among three workers who get the chance to really talk about their lives and their dreams for the union, is far better than a meeting of 20 people where no one is really able to share.

Hearing stories is incredibly powerful. In the three organizing situations that I know best, Yale, Harvard, the U, at a certain point in each one of them somebody says—and it's an older woman in all three cases: "As I was growing up my father took care of me, when I got married my husband took care of me. When I went to work I had a boss to take care of me. But when I signed my union card I did it for myself."

That's what it's about: taking care of ourselves. We wanted to negotiate our own contract and represent ourselves even though the idea was scary. The idea of being self-representative, the idea

of being in charge of your life, the idea that you're not supposed to acquiesce in your work is at the core of our organizing model.

**LRR: One of the other hallmarks of your organizing model is that you don't organize around specific issues, and instead conduct "positive campaigns."**

**Rondeau:** There are two major points about this way of organizing. First of all, union organizing really doesn't have anything to do with the boss. It is true—very important—that the staff organizer spends time absorbing the culture of the workplace that he or she is trying to organize, so in that sense the boss is very relevant. But in general the idea of forming the union has nothing to do with the boss.

I've heard many people say, "Oppressed workers organize. People who are miserable, disaffected, who have a bad supervisor. . . ." In my experience that hasn't been true. In fact, we found the more truly oppressed the worker is, the more difficult she or he is to organize. Those who have the most to lose have the greatest hesitation. So our primary responsibility is to create a real atmosphere of safety for those workers. The union and union drive has to be something that even though it has tremendous risk in it, there's a belief that nobody is going to let one person fall through the cracks or pay the price—the political price of job loss.

People don't really respond to organizing against the boss and when you think about how long it takes to organize these days, with anti-union campaigns, you really can't sustain a negative campaign for very long before people get tired and bored and disgusted. You have to have other reasons for existing. What we said is "Harvard is irrelevant to this. Harvard is an employer like any other, not particularly terrible, not particularly good."

The most important thing for us to know is that this predominantly female workforce deserves recognition. Women are out there handling life and death issues. Most work at home when they get home from work. They deal with the most serious things on earth, but when they come to work they don't have any power. Anywhere they look—certainly at universities—they see that there's no such thing as a successful person who won't represent him or her self. So we said, "That applies to us too. We're as good, we're as important, we care as much, know as much, and we want to be in the room where decisions are made."

We also said, "It's not about issues." In fact, to the extent that we organized around issues in the past, Harvard was always able to match us. We put out a button once that said "Dignity, Democracy, and a Dental Plan." Thought it was very cute. You

know, the next day we had a dental plan. In most of the private sector organizing that the labor movement does, management is able to beat us if we make the campaign about individual issues.

We also realized that the issues that we faced at one workplace are pretty much the same anywhere. Certainly for working women everywhere. Gladys and I have seen a million times how much overlap there is in issues between Harvard and the University of Minnesota: flexibility, salary, health benefits, elder care, child care. So what we said is, "This is about power and self-representation and we're good enough that we can get in the room and represent ourselves."

We also had a slogan, "It's not anti-Harvard to be pro-union" and that was really important. Most everybody out there who is unorganized thinks that building a good organization of their own is an act against the employer. But there are thousands and thousands of service sector workers out there who don't want to do that.

**McKenzie:** We found that the parts of the university that were most open to the idea of organizing were places where people had a little bit of community already but weren't able to be involved in decision-making as much as they wanted. There were workers in other areas who were downright hostile to the idea of the union, who worked under incredibly poor conditions, but were afraid of losing what little they had.

There was one office where seven women sat at computers in a semi-circle virtually tied to their seats for hours. They were data entry operators who worked on incentive pay—at first, they were ambivalent towards the union. They had lost hope about what was possible. And then right across the street there was a group of employees who was used to sitting down with management, meeting as a group, and discussing issues like cultural diversity. They were open and active from almost the beginning. It was a strong center for our organizing. It's an example of what Kris is talking about: it's not the most downtrodden, it's often the people who still have hope about the possibility of change.

**LRR:** Still, some people insist that workers really do have specific issues in mind as an impetus for organizing.

**McKenzie:** In both of these areas there were issues and they were very similar, really, if you got down to it. But the critical difference was whether people felt they had the ability to make an impact in their workplace.

**Rondeau:** You know, she's exactly right. Workers experience a powerlessness that makes them very scared about being part of change. Most workers have to go through an emotional process even to get themselves to the point where they believe change is really possible and change is better than where they're presently at.

Often, the people who are the worst treated at work are the ones who are the most cynical about the possibility of ever changing anything. So we take it as our responsibility to see that the people who have the strength and freedom to do so are the people who take the first steps forward. Those workers create a safe environment so the people who are the most badly treated are able to join. A safe organization makes it easier for the people who are the most vulnerable to come into it and participate.

**McKenzie:** When you think about what sectors are growing in our economy it's not surprising that it's women who are involved in organizing. We are creating, hopefully, a safe environment for the labor movement to rebuild.

**Rondeau:** Both at the U and at Harvard we spoke openly about our values all the time. We said repeatedly: "Every strong person gets a chance in life at being weak and every weak person gets a chance at being strong." Life constantly shifts and changes and everybody takes care of everybody else and everybody gets taken care of. We don't see sympathy or solidarity with others as a sign of weakness or stupidity.

We had two rules at Harvard; we still go by them and now we treat management that way too. They are: we always treat each other with kindness and respect, and it's good to have a sense of humor. You don't have to be funny, but you do have to get the joke.

**McKenzie:** A focus on values was probably a primary feature of our organizing. All the literature we used (which were six pieces) always had an element of helping us define our values of who we were as an organization. I don't think that we ever put anything out that didn't have that as the heart of it.

**Rondeau:** It's very important for us to say these things: when we are children, elders are always reminding us of the values of life. But when you're grown up, people don't talk about values very much. Not enough I think. So we always gently and with a sense of humor build our organization on solid values.

Listening is also an important value of ours. One reason that women are good organizers is that we can listen. From the earliest age we've been taught to listen to people's needs and also to listen for what's not being said. But it is not a biological trait. Listening

is a skill that can be taught and learned. If you don't know how to listen, you won't really hear a person's story. And it's vital for our organization that people know how to do that.

**LRR:** It's a commonly held belief that female clericals are the hardest sector to organize. There are two assumptions: first, the gender, and secondly, the workplace. What are your responses?

**Rondeau:** It's baloney.

**McKenzie:** It is baloney. We've always said that nobody's born pro-union and everything we've been talking about speaks to this question. In any organizing situation you have to connect people, you have to create a vision. When you take a poll and you find if this is pro-union or anti-union you don't know much about what's really there.

Anybody is hard to organize if you're not really organizing. I hear talk all the time about "hot shops" and I don't buy that kind of stuff. If the labor movement has brought that attitude to clerical organizing then they're not going to get a good response.

We keep talking about traditional kinds of organizing. My work has given me contacts with some people who have been involved in organizing since the '30s and '40s. I've found that it's actually the best traditions of the labor movement that people respond to. What we do is very much like organizing of years ago: it's about people with community. People talking to each other and knowing each other intimately. If anything we somehow got away from that but maybe we're getting back to what really builds a strong organization.

**LRR:** Do you think this way of organizing is only for women workers? Do you have any sense if this would work in an all-male workforce?

**McKenzie:** I can tell you one thing: the men here don't think it's too corny. It's something that I think about a lot because we really want what we do to be applicable. I think it is, but I haven't had the experience of walking into a place that was mostly men and developing an organization in this way. People are people and they aspire to a lot of the same kinds of things.

**LRR:** Has feminism or the women's movement influenced your ways of organizing?

**Rondeau:** Yes, in lots of different ways. I'm grateful to the women's movement for my personal freedom. But beyond that,





Clerical workers at the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana voted on August 22, 1991 to affiliate with AFSCME. Harvard organizers were integral to the drive that organized 2200 workers—90% of whom are women, working in 180 worksites on campus. That brings the number of university clericals who've organized to nearly 9,000. (Photo by Steve Trossman, AFSCME District 31)

I think this is the most exciting time for women and the women's movement that I've ever seen. There's exciting and relevant work going on here in women's psychology by Jean Baker Miller, Carol Gilligan—there's too many to mention. (See references at end of this article.) Gilligan's major work is called *In a Different Voice*. I love that title: the sound of it, how it resonates. In the past, women's ways of talking or organizing might have been seen as inferior. Many of us here have come to realize: "It's ok to have my own voice. I do have a voice and I can speak it clearly and straightforwardly and not be ashamed or think that I'm intellectually inferior." It's very liberating.

**McKenzie:** What I've noticed, in addition to what Kris has talked about, is that we also seem to be able to do a really good job of thinking together, collectively, and coming up with solutions. We don't have to have fully worked out thoughts, but we can think out loud. It's helpful, especially when you're trying to do something new.

**Rondeau:** I want to point out that this way of organizing came out of learning how to beat an anti-union campaign. It all came out of the Harvard experience. We figured it out—Harvard taught us.

Now obviously, if there's not an anti-union campaign then you've built a wonderful strong organization that has real power and diversity. And that's great.

This model puts all its eggs in the training basket. It's about leadership; building confidence in individual workers; teaching people to organize, to deal with management, to negotiate, to problem-solve.

**LRR:** That brings up a related question. I'm troubled that anti-union lawyers and consultants will read this and subvert it as the New Right has subverted so much progressive action that happened out of the civil rights movement. Subvert it and use it for its own ends. Can you see this happening?

**Rondeau/McKenzie:** They can't, they can't do it.

**McKenzie:** Somebody in the organization said that the kind of one-on-one organizing that we do is something that management can duplicate. I don't believe that because it's so much about relationships between workers, changing power relations. It just can't be done by them.

**Rondeau:** Workers either have power or they don't and all the staged versions of it are figured out pretty quickly. So I'm not worried about it at all. Building unions is about sharing power and that's a very powerful idea. It is possible to build organizations that bring out the best in people. And we're doing it.

## RESOURCES

**In A Different Voice** by Carol Gilligan, Harvard University Press, 1982.

*"Organizing and Representing Clerical Workers: The HUCTW Model"* by Rick Hurd, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University. To be published in **Women and Unions: Forging a Partnership** edited by D. Sue Cobble, ILR Press, forthcoming. Interested individuals can call him for an advance copy at (607) 255-2765.

**Toward a New Psychology of Women** by Jean Baker Miller, Beacon Press, 1976.

**Women's Growth in Connection—Writings from the Stone Center** by Judith V. Jordan, Alexandra G. Kaplan, Jean Baker Miller, Irene P. Stiver, Janet L. Surrey, Wellesley College.

**Women's Ways of Knowing** by Mary Field Belenky, Blythe McVicker Clinchy, Nancy Rule Goldberger, Jill Mattuck Tarule, Basic Books, 1986.

**You Just Don't Understand** by Deborah Tannen, Ballantine Books, 1991.