
Lee Saunders

President

**American Federation of State, County
& Municipal Employees**

**“The Value of Labor:
Transforming Unions to
Meet the Challenge of
Our Time”**

**The 2016 Jerry Wurf
Memorial Lecture**



**The Labor and Worklife Program
Harvard Law School**

Jerry Wurf Memorial Lecture

January 28, 2016

Lee Saunders

“The Value of Labor: Transforming Unions to Meet the Challenge of Our Time”

Table of Contents

Welcome	
Elaine Bernard	4
Executive Director, Labor and Worklife Program, Harvard Law School	
Introduction	
Martin J. Walsh	5
Mayor of Boston	
Keynote Address	
Lee Saunders	14
President, AFSCME	
“The Value of Labor: Transforming Unions to Meet the Challenge of Our Time”	
Questions and Answers	34

Photos on pages 10, 34, 36, 41, 42, 45, 47, 48 ©Martha Stewart, 2016

JERRY WURF MEMORIAL FUND (1982)
Harvard Trade Union Program, Harvard Law School

The Jerry Wurf Memorial Fund was established in memory of Jerry Wurf, the late President of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME). Its income is used to initiate programs and activities that “reflect Jerry Wurf’s belief in the dignity of work, and his commitment to improving the quality of lives of working people, to free open thought and debate about public policy issues, to informed political action...and to reflect his interests in the quality of management in public service, especially as it assures the ability of workers to do their jobs with maximum effect and efficiency in environments sensitive to their needs and activities.”

**Welcome
Elaine Bernard**



Elaine Bernard

My name is Elaine Bernard I am Executive Director of the Labor and Worklife Program and the Harvard Trade Union Program, which is in session here for six weeks. It is my great pleasure to welcome you to the Jerry Wurf Memorial Forum, which is the first forum of the Harvard Trade Union Program. I will allow our guest speakers to talk about Jerry Wurf.

Let me start by introducing Mayor Martin Walsh. Mayor Walsh is, of course, a life-long advocate for working people and a proud product of the city of Boston. I want to welcome Mayor Walsh to our fair city of Cambridge. He is the 54th Mayor of Boston and became Mayor in January of 2014. Before taking office, Mayor Walsh served in the Massachusetts House of Representatives. He represented Boston's diverse 13th Suffolk District. He was a leader on job creation and workers protection, substance abuse, mental health, homelessness, K-12 education, and civil rights. While working full time as a legislator, he returned to school to earn a degree in Political Science at Boston College. He is a real model to us all. Mayor Walsh also made his mark as a labor leader in this area, beginning with the Laborers Local 223 here in Boston. He rose to head the Building and Construction Trade Council of the Metropolitan District from 2011 to 2013. There he worked with business and community leaders to promote high quality development and career opportunities for all of us, for women, and for people of color. So please welcome Mayor Marty Walsh.

**Introduction
Martin J. Walsh**



Martin J. Walsh

Thank you very much. Elaine, I would like to thank you for that introduction. I want to thank everyone at the Labor and Worklife Program. Greeting to all of the labor leaders here at the Harvard Trade Union Program this week. Thank you for being here today. It's great to be in a friendly room. I want also to congratulate members of the Harvard Union of Clerical and Technical Workers represented by AFSCME who are here with us today. Thank you very much as well.

I certainly know and I want to thank all the workers who make this great institution run. And who made today's event possible. I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the great local leaders we have here also who work for AFSCME Council 93.

It's a privilege for me to be here today to speak in honor of a great labor leader of the past like Jerry Wurf. His wife is here today and his daughter. I want to thank you very much for being here with us. And great labor leaders present like Lee Saunders.

The labor movement played a very important role in my life. I wouldn't be standing here today without it. There is no question about it. I am very proud of that. I talk about it all the time. There are certain numbers that mean an awful lot to people in life. Particularly in sports, past sports heroes like #4 Bobby Orr. Or current sports heroes,

#12 Tom Brady. And because the president of AFSCME is from Cleveland, #23 LeBron James.

Some of the earliest memories for me of numbers is 223. That had a special ring to it. It had a special ring to it because it was the local union that my father belonged to when he came out to this country, the Laborers Union. Before I knew what the labor movement was, I knew that being part of the union was part of a bigger calling, something bigger that you joined.

As I grew older it meant a lot more to me. I followed my father into the Laborers Union. I got my first job. One of the summers when I was in high school I worked on the Commonwealth Pier, which is now the World Trade Center. That was when they were doing it over in the beginning. I worked on that job. And then to this day, after being a state representative, I led the building trades as was mentioned earlier. Brian Doherty, the person who followed me in the building trades, is here today.

In two years as mayor, I still belong to Laborers Local 223. I carry my union book in my pocket. I am proud of it. I am proud of who I am. When I ran for mayor of the city, a lot of people tried to say that because of my affiliation with labor and what I had done I can't be an effective leader. And I'm not going to talk about what we have done there in the city of Boston. We have done a lot in our city.

My experience with labor helped me build consensus among different constituencies. It has made

me a strong manager in a positive way. I took the Office of Labor Relations in the city of Boston that was adversarial for many years with different people and turned it into something that really can negotiate and has established trust with workers and with leaders and talk about how we move the agendas forward. It has had a dramatic effect. We not only settle contracts but we also achieved the City's first ever perfect bond rating with both Standard & Poor and Moody's over the last two years.

We showed how we could have strong fiscal positions, and we can also stand to make sure that workers have security and get paid a fair wage. Furthermore, public employees, for me, have made it possible for ground breaking public innovations in City Hall as well. Our police officers, firefighters, EMTs all got trained and are carrying NARCAN in their vehicles to protect people who are overdosing. We are able to do that by having a conversation. It wasn't a knock down drag out fight. It was a conversation. Everyone said it will make sense, so let's do it. We were able to do it.

With our teachers, we are able to sit down and talk with our teachers and work on a plan to extend the learning time in the Boston Public School by 11 percent. Often times Boston was criticized for having the shortest school day. We don't have the shortest school day anymore. We are working on ways of implementing that by sitting down.

With our parks employees, we are adding new public spaces and inclusive playground equipment. We are making sure that our parks are not

only parks for kids but they are also inclusive so that any kid can go into those parks and play.

All of this is possible because of our relationship with our public employees. And that is something I am very proud of. So when I see public employees under attack around the country, I shake my head. I have an opportunity, because I sit at a lot of tables with mayors. They ask, "How do you have such a relationship with your fire department? How do you have such a relationship with AFSCME? How do you have these relationships?" Well it's because it's a fair conversation. It doesn't mean we are not going to have disagreements. It doesn't mean we are not going to have arguments. It doesn't mean we are not going to fight about things. It doesn't mean that's not going to happen. Because that is going to happen in life.

What I see happening around the country is that they are trying to drive wages down. Not here in Boston, we are trying to lift people up.

We know the decline of the middle class in America, we see the increase in inequality. We also see a decline in union membership. So you can see the combination there. As you see the decline in membership, you see the growing inequality numbers are happening. And they are happening every single day.

I think it's important how we restore the middle class and make the American economy work for everyone. We need to continue to work together. And that is why I want to be here to listen and learn more from Lee Saunders.

President Saunders is one of the most effective advocates for public sector workers today. If you look at his experience, you can certainly see why. Since joining AFSCME in 1978, he has been a labor economist and research director. So he understands our economy and the needs of the workforce. He directed Community Action and was deputy director of Organizing and Field Services, so he knows what individual workers needs are and how to bring them together.

I had the opportunity to hear the president speak at a rally for then candidate Elizabeth Warren at the Painters Union Hall. What he was talking about that day was workers' rights and fundamental rights that are being lost in the country. And he talked about protections that workers needed and how people need advocates to fight for working class people. And it's something that is important.

Even in this presidential election, we are hearing a lot about the economy, and that's important. But we are not hearing a lot about workers' rights. We are not hearing a lot about what the middle class is all about. We are talking about creating middle class jobs, but that is a little different from what workers' rights are all about.

So he has certainly done so much working with administrators of AFSCME locals and councils across the country. He knows the importance of sound management. When you talk about labor leaders as someone who can go into a board room and can talk to the board members about the

economy but also talk about workers' rights, that is what we need in this country.

It has been an honor for me to meet with and sit with Lee and watch him. And see him on the campaign trail and fighting hard for workers. He understands that having the right arguments isn't enough. Behind this advocacy there has to be a body of work that workers are organized and employed. That is what the *Friedrichs* case in the Supreme Court case is all about. It's an effort to splinter their power and undercut the voice. That is why I signed my name on the Amicus brief opposing it.



It doesn't take a complicated legal argument to understand why workers' voice should be heard. We shouldn't be doing that. And today it's sad what is happening. I know it in my bones, and I know it in my earliest memories. I see the proof every day in the employees of the City of Boston. I am proud to say on this occasion nearly 2000 of the employees that work with me in City Hall are affiliates of AFSCME Council 93. So I want to thank you for that.

I am getting a lot of credit in the city of Boston for transforming a lot of things. From parks, we had the largest budget in parks history this year in the past budget. Transportation, we are looking at a master plan on addressing transportation problems. On nutrition, we are working on making sure the food for the kids in our schools is better. We are making sure that our building inspectors change some policies so that they are looking out for the rights of people who live in apartments and

buildings in the city of Boston. We have health inspectors on the street making sure that our restaurants are clean and making sure that the services they deliver to the public are there. We also have safety engineers working out there making sure that our city is safe.

Every single one of those industries that I just talked about are represented by AFSCME Council 93. So when we talk about making changes, it's not simply making changes in a mayor's office with his Cabinet. It is making sure that the people who are carrying out the changes understand too. And the reason why we are getting the credit isn't because we came up with these ideas. It's because of the professionalism of the city employees.

Our great city and historic city could not run without them. And this great historic union is led by a great president Lee Saunders. Like me, Lee grew up in a union household. His father was a bus driver with the Amalgamated Transit Union in Cleveland Ohio. His mother was a community college professor belonging to the American Association of University Professors. Lee joined the Ohio Civil Service Employees Association in 1975 after earning his master's degree from Ohio State. So both Lee and his mother are proof that workers with college degrees can benefit with union memberships.

Through the roles I mentioned earlier, Lee rose to become executive assistant to the President and Secretary-Treasurer of AFSCME. And at the AFSCME 40th International Convention in 2012, he was elected its president. He is the first African

American to serve in this role. As president, Lee has been a champion of AFSCME's Next Wave initiative to develop a new generation of union leaders. And that is another thing that often we don't hear in the labor movement, people talking about the future. And he is talking about bringing in new workers and new people to understand the importance of them getting involved in the union, but not only getting involved in the union but also rising to the top of that union. And that is what we have to continue talking about.

His advanced program fosters diversity and increases membership participation. And for those of you in the room who don't understand what that means, that means that you don't simply have a union book in your pocket. You are actually involved in your union; you are involved in the movement in that union. Something that is important.

I believe and have said many times this is exactly the direction the labor movement needs to take if we are to remain a relevant force in the lives of the American working class. AFSCME is leading the way to a stronger labor movement, a stronger workforce, and a more equal America.

Lee's talk today is titled, "The Value of Labor: Transforming Unions to Meet the Challenges of Our Time." There could probably be no truer statement today that we need to hear about. Transforming unions to meet the challenging needs of our time. Too many of our union brothers and sisters were stuck in a way of operating for too many years. It is important for us now to start thinking

differently. I look forward to hearing Lee.

Ladies and gentlemen, friends of labor, brothers and sisters, it's my deep honor to introduce to you this year's speaker at the Jerry Wurf Memorial Forum, the president of the American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees, Lee Saunders.

Keynote Address

Lee Saunders

Thank you, Mayor Marty Walsh for that introduction, and for being in the vanguard of mayoral leadership across the country that seeks dignity for workers and economic fairness for all. I am so happy and pleased that we have a mayor in the city of Boston who believes in progressive values and who believes in supporting working families. Give him a round of applause for what he does every day. I was proud to stand with you in your campaign for mayor, we stand with him now, and I am glad that he is standing with all of us.

I have some important people who are in the audience; that is, my AFSCME family. We have folks here from Council 93. International Vice President and Executive Director Frank Moroney is in the room. Give Frank a round of applause for what he does. We have a whole crew of AFSCME folks in the house. I see the Executive Director of Council 20 in Washington, D.C. who is participating in this program, Andrew Washington. The president of Council 94 in Rhode Island is here, brother J. Michael Downey.

We have a group of sisters and brothers who represent technical and administrative personnel at Harvard University. They have been negotiating a contract this past year, and in the last week they have been able to achieve a victory for workers by negotiating a contract that has substantial wage increases, keeps health benefits in place, and lowers the premium for those making less than \$55,000 a year. Give them a round of applause, the Harvard

Union of Clerical and Technical Workers, a part of the AFSCME family.

I want to acknowledge someone and give a special thank you to Mildred Wurf, who I have known since I started working at AFSCME 38 years ago. I started working at the union when I was five years old. They did not have child labor laws then. She was Jerry Wurf's wife and partner in the labor movement. She consulted with him and guided him. Give Mildred a round of applause. Her daughter is also here.

I also want to thank Elaine Bernard, executive director of the Harvard Trade Union Program. She got pretty good applause, didn't she? She must be doing some pretty good stuff.

As president of the 1.6-million member American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, I'm honored to deliver this lecture named for a great labor leader, former AFSCME President Jerry Wurf. I had the privilege of knowing Jerry personally; of working with him closely, and learning from him. For those of you who did not have that pleasure, let me just paint a brief picture.

Jerry Wurf was a ferocious warrior for the working class, especially for those who worked in the public service. You never crossed Jerry Wurf. He was president of AFSCME for nearly two decades. During those years, he led the union in a major strategic shift that had three important characteristics.



Lee Saunders



Lee Saunders and
Mildred Wurf

First, he argued that public service workers face the same oppressive conditions and deserve the same kinds of rights as their counterparts in the private sector, including the right to negotiate on equal terms with their employers for a union contract. At one time, even some brothers and sisters in the private sector union movement did not believe public service workers should have the right to organize. Jerry changed all of that through his commitment and dedication and aggressiveness in supporting the work of public service employees. Second, he agitated public workers to take direct action in support of their demands – to act like a union even when they did not have legal recognition. Finally, he made the case that our mission as a union is about power – about shifting power from employers to workers. He believed in those concepts and lived them every single day.

He led the union through one of its greatest challenges: the sanitation workers’ strike in Memphis, Tennessee – the strike that brought Martin Luther King to Memphis, where he was tragically assassinated in 1968. Thirteen hundred African American sanitation workers went on strike not only for better wages and working conditions, but they also went on strike for dignity and respect on the job. Jerry traveled to Memphis many times to support that strike. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. supported that strike of sanitation workers in the Deep South under threats and the possibility of loss of life. And ultimately Dr. King gave his life in support of that strike of brave AFSCME members. Dr. King understood the importance of linking civil rights, human rights, labor rights, and economic

rights. One cannot go without the other. It is all together.

More than 45 years have passed. We find ourselves at another critical time – not only for the U.S. labor movement but also for working families across this country. You know too well the history of the attacks on the labor movement and the deliberate attempt to undermine progress for working people. It is happening right now. It has been planned for a long time, and it is coming to fruition.

In the private sector, union membership is 6.7 percent. In the public sector, union membership is about 35 percent. It does not take a rocket scientist to see why we have a bullseye on our backs. We still have resources and still have strength. They are trying to take that away from us. It is pure and simple a power play. It is a power play by those who have wealth and want more wealth. Of people who have power and want more power at the expense of the 99.5 percent who play by the rules every day, put food on the table, and send their kids to school.

This well-orchestrated attack spanning more than 40 years was very clearly laid out in what we in labor now refer to as the infamous Powell memo. This plan of attack was hatched by a corporate lawyer named Lewis Powell and drafted for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce just before he was appointed to the United States Supreme Court. Isn’t that ironic? As we consider labor’s attack beginning with a man who would become a Supreme Court justice, it seems fitting that the latest

*“Jerry Wurf
was a ferocious
warrior for
the working
class...”*

attack on working people comes in the form of a Supreme Court case. *Friedrichs v The California Teachers Association* seeks to overturn a long-standing precedent set forth in a 1977 case called *Aboud v Detroit Board of Education*.

In that precedent-setting case, the Court unanimously affirmed that it is constitutional for all employees who are represented by a union in the public sector to share the costs of representation and negotiations, even if they choose not to join. I want to be clear. No one is forced to join a union. But when the majority of people vote to form a union, the union is required by law to represent everyone in the workplace, whether that employee is a union member or not. As all public employees enjoy the benefits, job security and other protections the union negotiates, it is only fair that all employees contribute to the cost of securing those benefits and protections.

I think of it like going out to dinner with friends. If you go to dinner, you chip in – even if you didn't like the restaurant that you and your friends chose. If you eat the food, you chip in. Same exact concept. So why is this long time precedent suddenly being reconsidered? Who is behind this case? To thoroughly investigate this, let's do a little bit of research. Marty Walsh mentioned that I came from the research department.

So let's look at the history here, and who is behind *Friedrichs*? Though a California teacher named Rebecca Friedrichs lent her name to the case, the real group pulling the strings behind *Friedrichs* is the Center for Individual Rights. The Center for

Individual Rights was formed in 1989 to push a conservative legal agenda, especially on civil rights. They brought us the attack on affirmative action admissions standards at the University of Texas Law School. They are the folks who recruited plaintiffs to overturn the 1965 Voting Rights Act. And they are the folks who round up money from conservative foundations – bankrolled by the Koch brothers – to push this anti-civil rights, anti-worker, anti-democracy agenda.

Now, they have turned their attention to attacking workers' rights, especially workers' rights in the public sector where people of color and particularly African-American families have found a pathway to the middle class. For me, that fact isn't just a talking point. It is my life experience. I grew up in Cleveland in the 1950s and 1960s. For African Americans, your only chance of moving into the middle class meant working in three occupations – all unionized. You could be a bus driver. You could work at the post office. Or you could work in the steel mills. That was about it. My dad was a bus driver. He belonged to the Amalgamated Transit Union.

And because of that union job, my family was able to get by. We didn't have to worry about going broke from getting sick because we had health care. And when my father retired, he did so in dignity thanks to a pension. I was able to go to school because of ATU and what they negotiated for their workers.

So it should come as no surprise that an organization like the Center for Individual Rights, which



has long attacked civil rights and voting rights – and has even taken money from the Pioneer Fund, a foundation that supports white supremacist causes – would turn its attention to workers’ rights. We have to understand who is attacking us and what they believe in. You see, so-called “right-to-work” policies were not developed by benevolent do-gooders who wanted to spread their love of freedom and democracy to the American workplace. It did not happen that way at all.

Rather, the roots of right-to-work lie with individuals like Vance Muse, a mid-century oil lobbyist and avowed segregationist. In the 1940s, Muse started an organization called the Christian American Association, which opposed an array of pro-worker causes, including an eight hour work day and the right for workers to have the right to organize collectively. In fact, Muse once said derisively of the union movement “From now on, white women and white men will be forced into organizations with black African apes whom they will have to call ‘brother’ or lose their jobs.” Muse and the Christian American Association got their so-called “right-to-work” law passed in Texas in 1947. Within two years, 14 southern states had enacted the law.

Too few Americans know the racist roots of right-to-work. If they did, one wonders whether we would be where we are today: 25 states are now right-to-work, candidates for president call for a federal law, and the Supreme Court considers making it the law of the land for the public sector.

“...so-called ‘right-to-work’ policies were not developed by benevolent do-gooders who wanted to spread their love of freedom and democracy to the American workplace.”

So why does this Supreme Court case and who is behind it matter? It matters because the *Friedrichs* case will have a huge impact on all working people – whether they belong to a union or not. It’s another thumb on the scale of an unbalanced economy – an economy in which a few wealthy families like the Waltons control the overwhelming majority of the wealth. If the Supreme Court rules for the plaintiff in the *Friedrichs* case, it will make all of this even worse.

Why? Because organized labor remains the most well-organized resistance to rampant corporate greed, even though we are struggling right now.

Make no mistake: *Friedrichs* is not about union dues or fees. That is what they would like you to believe. It is about powerful corporate interests who want to manipulate the economic rules even more in their favor by making it harder for people like university employees, librarians, social workers, child care workers, and sanitation workers to come together, speak up and get ahead.

It is about promoting a so-called “gig economy” where we are falsely told that driving down wages and denying people good health care and a secure retirement are the only pathway to economic innovation and on-demand convenience.

It is about giving aid and comfort to the miniscule few who quietly cheer, as tens of millions helplessly shrug, as academics document America’s slide from a democracy to a plutocracy.

But guess what? Despite the best efforts of these forces over decades, actually the popularity of labor unions is on the rise. According to Gallup's annual survey, unions saw a 5 percent jump in favorability last year to 58 percent – the highest level of support since 2008.



It would be nice to think that increase in support is a sign that working people, through organized labor, will ultimately prevail. But you and I both know that just is not enough. We cannot fool ourselves. Rather, if we are to prevail then I submit to you it is long past time that labor leaders including me undertake an honest critique of labor's role in America today, and whether we are prepared to face the challenges of the future.

I travel all over the country speaking to AFSCME affiliates and union members. Sometimes I feel like being president of AFSCME is like driving a 1957 Chevy. That was a beautiful car. Well built. A classic. But it's 2016. It is not a great car today. To take the analogy even further, the only place you see a '57 Chevy being driven these days is in Labor Day parades. We need a new model.

Unions must look honestly at ourselves. We must build on the things that continue to work well. But we also must be bold, and consider and discard the things that do not, the things that are broken. To build on the things that made us strong, we must examine collective bargaining as a model. I understand that some in the labor movement today believe we live in a post-collective bargaining world.

While I encourage us to think outside the box and explore new models of organizing, I believe collective bargaining is key and must be part of our future. The reason is simple: even in so-called right-to-work jurisdictions, collective bargaining remains one of the most effective tools to reducing income inequality. For example, look at home care workers. More than 15 years ago, unions including AFSCME and SEIU set about organizing home care providers in the state of California. At the time, home care workers in California had to contend with low pay and absolutely no benefits. They were even excluded from the Fair Labor Standards Act, meaning they were not entitled to overtime protections.

But since organizing with United Domestic Workers/AFSCME Local 3930, home care workers have won dramatic gains, which have reduced turnover and improved the quality of home care in the state. In Riverside County, pay rates increased by 62 percent between 2003 and 2010.

The union began providing free and low-cost trainings for thousands of providers on vital topics like CPR and first aid through their training center. We actually established a training center for home care workers. Today, the turnover in California is half the national average. And a more stable workforce means better quality services.

Beyond an increased standard of living and better service for clients, home care workers in California empowered themselves to speak out on the big issues that affected them. When then-Governor Schwarzenegger (he's back doing movies again)

tried to slash funding for the home care program, home care workers, through their union, were able to organize and unite with disability rights and seniors groups to stop the cuts – even participating in civil disobedience when necessary.

At the federal level, they won an administrative rule change so that home care workers could finally get overtime pay. And when President Obama passed the Affordable Care Act, those unions stepped up and signed up thousands of providers in California, acting as a navigator to help people figure out how to get coverage. Ultimately, the biggest change for home care providers in California was the fact that they now had a way to come together to speak up and speak out with one voice. They had a means to express their needs and demands through collective bargaining. I have an old saying: “If you do not have a seat at the table, you are on the menu.”

In a 2013 Supreme Court case called *Harris v Quinn*, a case considered the predecessor to *Friedrichs*, the justices ruled 5-to-4 that home care providers are not public employees in the full sense. The Supreme Court called them “quasi employees.” What the hell does that mean? I guess that makes sense since they’ve only been earning a quasi-living for many years, but I don’t think that was the court’s concern. The ruling had the effect of turning the entire home care and child care sectors right-to-work overnight. The goal was to weaken their power and stifle their voices. Yet the ruling let basic collective bargaining rights stand. So we can still continue to bargain collectively. Today, more than two years on, home care

providers in California still have their union and still getting wages and benefit improvements all through that great state. That is the importance of collective bargaining.

The lesson here is, even in a right-to-work setting, which the *Friedrichs* ruling may institute for the entire public sector in the United States, collective bargaining works if working people stick together as a union. It’s a particularly important lesson as we struggle to build worker power and balance the scales in our so-called “gig economy.” Home care providers are not traditional employees. They are considered independent contractors who set their own hours. Yet we figured out a collective bargaining model that was flexible enough for them, and we can do the same with Uber drivers and other workers of the future. We have to find ways of being creative to represent them.

We have to communicate in a better way, listen to our members and hear their concerns. Talk with them about the importance of collective action to confront all of the issues. We have done some soul searching at AFSCME.

Which brings us to the second thing that labor unions must build upon: internal organizing. Specifically, one-on-one communication. This is something we’ve lost sight of over the years. Too often we take our rank-and-file members for granted, focusing almost exclusively on the members we consider to be activists.

For AFSCME’s part, we made internal organizing the union’s top priority since 2014.

“If you do not have a seat at the table, you are on the menu”

Through a program originally called 50,000 Stronger and its latest iteration, AFSCME Strong, our union has trained more than 14,000 activists who in turn have helped organize more than 200,000 new members, either by converting fee payers to full-fledged members or by bringing new members into the union in right-to-work states.

This renewed focus on internal organizing is causing a culture shift within AFSCME, where public service workers even in the smallest of units and locals are empowering themselves to make change, rather than wait for someone from, quote, “the union” to do it for them.

Consider Regina Freeman, an air pollution control specialist in Louisville, Kentucky. Regina’s unit is only 25 people within a local of 800, in a city and state where the public sector is completely right-to-work. Prior to AFSCME Strong, the local membership stood near zero. Nobody was a member. Not too healthy. Today, every single one is an AFSCME member in good standing. One hundred percent. This works.

When Regina was asked about the value of organizing, here is what she had to say:

“By talking with our co-workers and taking action at work, we have not only grown our membership, we have also taken on issues and won. In my unit, we stopped potential layoffs by putting pressure on management to find another solution.

In other units in my local, we got the city to hire more workers for the juvenile detention center and

settled contracts that were outstanding for two years. I have seen what can happen when we organize and I am proud to say that Local 2629 is AFSCME Strong.”

That is just one example of what we are doing across the country.

Our renewed focus on internal organizing has made us stronger for whatever the future holds. It is what we had to do. It is what unions must continue to do. That’s not to say that it is easy. This is one of the hardest things that AFSCME has ever done. It has required change from all of us. It has required even more of the front-line local leaders and staff representatives who build the union every day.

In AFSCME, we are working to shift the view of those leaders and staff from being service providers to being organizing coaches. That means that they are coaching others to have meaningful one-on-one conversations with co-workers. To look at building power by any means necessary, not just through the grievance procedure or the bargaining process. To represent the aspirations of the entire workforce, not just the few who need the union most on any given day.

I noted a moment ago that unions, AFSCME included, tended to focus our communications efforts almost exclusively on activists. The truth is, the majority are not activists. That doesn’t make them bad people. It just means that, while they may have positive feelings toward their union, they choose to prioritize other things – their fami-



lies, their hobbies, Netflix – over union activism. Or like many Americans, they are stretched way too thin, with second or even third jobs to make ends meet.

At AFSCME, we realized we needed to do something about the disconnect in our communications with them. We had to stop talking, and instead listen to them. So in 2015 we dug deeper than we ever have before in understanding who our members truly are as people. What they want out of their union; heck, what they want out of their lives.

The results will help us not only survive but thrive no matter the outcome in *Friedrichs*. We identified approximately 35 percent of our members as our base supporters. These are our activists. They know right-to-work is a fraud. They prefer an ownership model over a transactional model when it comes to their union. And they believe wholeheartedly in the power and the language of trade unionism: collective action, solidarity, sisterhood and brotherhood.

We also identified approximately 50 percent of our members who view themselves as self-starters or who feel disconnected to traditional appeals of trade unionism and collective action. We must communicate with them in a different way. These individuals want to belong just like anyone else. They do understand the value of being a union member. But they want to be treated as an individual. They want their union to recognize their personal contributions to public service. They want solidarity without conformity.

I submit that our third imperative is to reach these people, who are coming of age at a time of digital-powered fragmentation and personalization. They are the key to AFSCME's future, and the future of the labor movement. We have to recognize their need to be recognized as individuals, but we have to touch them and help them see the value of working with their union brothers and sisters.

The fourth thing that labor must do is to realize that it's not just about us, meaning labor. Whether we are talking about organizing campaigns or legislative pushes or electoral politics, our tendency too often was to go it alone. Take pensions for an example. For many years, we talked about and treated pensions as solely a union issue; something to be bargained at the table or to be legislated at the state capital. We did not bother to engage the broader public.

We did not, for example, work with small business owners to talk about how retirees with disposable income helped keep their shops afloat.

Meanwhile, our opponents were taking advantage of our insular thinking, casting pensions as a costly excess that the overwhelming majority of Americans no longer had, so why should public service workers? When it comes to pensions, the argument should not be "I don't have it, so you shouldn't either." Instead, it must be "I have a secure retirement, and you should, too."

Contrast the old thinking on pensions with our work around the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, another trade agreement that will encourage

"This is one of the hardest things that AFSCME has ever done. It has required change from all of us."

the offshoring of more jobs and undermine protections for consumers and working people. I'm proud that AFSCME has taken a lead role in this fight. We helped pull together a coalition that includes consumer protection groups, health care organizations and environmental advocates.



Mildred Wurf and daughter Abigail

The Sierra Club. Food and Water Watch. The NAACP. Faith groups. The Citizens Trade Campaign. Together under one umbrella and united under one cause. The Obama administration wanted this trade pact done last fall. Yet today, in 2016, its fate remains uncertain. And in the meantime, every Democratic presidential candidate has publicly announced their opposition to the pact, and members of both parties are raising strong objections.

Now, I've been around Washington a long time. When you have the votes to pass something today, you hold the vote today. The votes are not there to pass the TPP. And a big reason why is because labor looked to build relationships that look beyond our immediate self-interests and toward the common good.

Beyond the TPP, AFSCME is working more closely than ever with the National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers and the Service Employees International Union because we realize that we can do far more work for public service workers together than on our own. The four of us used to compete against each other – and honestly, the word “compete” is a little euphemistic. You can look to the not-too-distant past to find campaigns in which we would spend millions

of dollars fighting each other instead of coming together and working out our differences.

Beyond the four of us, a coalition called America Works Together has formed around the *Friedrichs* case to highlight the importance of the Supreme Court's decision to all Americans. More than 35 groups in the faith, civil rights and labor communities have published op-eds, participated in press events and showed up outside the Supreme Court on January 11 during oral arguments.

I've logged over a quarter-million miles crisscrossing the country since being elected AFSCME president in 2012. I have yet to meet a cafeteria worker who does not want a voice on the job. I have yet to meet a social worker who does not want a safe and secure workplace. I have yet to meet a transportation employee who does not want to level the playing field with management.

The reason is, the value of the labor movement is enduring. It is about the simple yet profound idea that together we are stronger. It is about the need to make individual lives better in a concrete way. And it is about shifting the balance of power—from bosses to workers, from the ridiculously wealthy to the unfairly impoverished, from the ruling class to the working class.

I do not underestimate or trivialize the legal, political and legislative challenges before us. I know they are huge. But I will not wring my hands and worry whether this moment in our history is labor's last stand. You should not either.

If we are willing to look honestly at ourselves and embrace change and reforms; if we are ready to abandon the tactics that don't work, and experiment with and embrace the tactics that do; if we are ready to seize this moment in history – then we will rediscover collectively the value of labor, and its movement, for all Americans.

That is our charge. That is our responsibility. That is what we must do. And we will do it. Because I have hope. You have hope. It is time. People are sick and tired of being sick and tired. You see people rising up, whether it is the Fight for Fifteen, when the fast food workers are standing up and saying “Enough is Enough”; and going back to those sanitation workers in Memphis, Tennessee in 1968 with that sign that said “I Am a Man” and I deserve dignity and respect. All of us deserve dignity and respect. And damn it, we will fight for it every single day! Thank you very much.

Questions and Answers

Q: Desiree Goodwin, Harvard staff and union member.



Desiree Goodwin

I have talked to a lot of union members, and many of us are really frustrated by the sense of the lack of futility of our union leaders that they must accept concessions. We are getting less and less in our benefit packages. And looking at the big picture, I talk to other people who are members of unions outside of Harvard and they say that it's happening everywhere. And everyone just seems to be resigning themselves that it's happening everywhere. So we have to accept a little cut. And then what are we going to have to accept next, a little more, and give away a little more. It's very frustrating to see our rights sliding away from us. And then you look at globalization and jobs being transported overseas, and that is our competition. And it just seems like our leaders have a real sense of futility that they are passing along to the membership.

A: I'll just give you an example of the commitment and dedication that was shown by workers right here at Harvard, with HUCTW. When they were able to fight and they were able to achieve a good contract with wage increases, with no loss in benefits. We have been able to do that across the country. But what it takes is, not giving up. But what it also takes is organization. And what it also takes is building a structure that will support you when you have to go into battle. And that is what it is all about, it's about going into battle. If you

don't have that structure that is in place, then you are going to be taken advantage of. So that is what is so important about communicating with our members, talking to them about the issues, talking to them about the importance of being together. Talking to them about the importance of collective action. So you are showing power. And I think that people back up when you show power. But what we haven't done is be creative enough and to be bold enough, to show power and to develop power. And I think you can change a number of things. It's hard. This is not easy work. It really is rebuilding, it is rebuilding the trust and commitment of individuals within that union.

But we have got to do it. Because if we don't do it, then we are going to be faced with exactly the situation that you said, with folks shoving stuff down our throats. And our leaders and our members saying, nothing is going to change and we are accepting the inevitable. We cannot accept the inevitable. We have got to develop tools with a plan and a strategy to fight back. To say no. That might be civil disobedience, it could be a strike. I mean it could be a variety of things. We could go to the legislature, rallying and doing phone calls. I mean putting all kinds of pressure on whomever you need to. But Fredrick Douglass used to say this, "If there is no struggle, there is no progress." There has got to be struggle. And we have to have that fire in our belly to be willing to fight. And, yes sometimes, to be willing to take a chance and to take a stand. I've got to tell you that a lot of folks are not taking a stand right now. And we have the ability to do so if we possess confidence in one an-

other and confidence in ourselves. And that is the only way that we are going to be able to deal with this, the only way. I don't know if that answered your questions, but that is what we are doing in AFSCME and it's working.



Mike D'Intinosanto

Q: Mike D'Intinosanto: Thank you President Saunders for your presentation. I am a registered nurse, a member of Mass Nurses Association Unit 7, State Chapter for Health Care Professionals, representing the health care professionals who work for the Commonwealth of Mass. MNA is an affiliated member of National Nurses United, one of the first unions to endorse Bernie Sanders for President.

My question for you is, how did the executive council come to the decision, given that you have to know that some of your locals are defying the national endorsement and supporting Bernie Sanders? Robert Reich, a Massachusetts economist and Secretary of Labor under Bill Clinton, recently said that "Hillary is the right candidate for the government we have. Bernie Sanders is the right candidate for the government we should have." So respectfully, as a labor leader in Massachusetts, I feel that these types of endorsements are the "politics as usual, endorse the most likely candidate BS" that is undermining unions right now in this country.

A: I appreciate the question. I just came from Iowa, and I'm going back on Saturday. AFSCME endorsed Hillary Clinton. It was not me endorsing Hillary Clinton, it wasn't the executive board endorsing Hillary Clinton. We went through the

most in-depth and exhaustive process. Frank was sitting at the table, and he knows everything that we have done. Henry Garrido, Executive Director from District Council 37, knows exactly what we did. We did poll after poll of our members. Every meeting that we had of our affiliate conventions and national meetings, we did polls there. We invited folks to get on our website and tell us who they wanted us to support. And maybe not support anybody and just wait it out. So we went through an exhaustive process. We had town hall meetings in Iowa, where we had Senator Sanders, Governor O'Malley, and Secretary Clinton speak to our members. We live streamed it across the country so all of our members had the opportunity to participate in the process. All of our members had the opportunity to participate in the website poll and all of the other polls we were doing at the conferences that we had.

It wasn't even close, as far as our members were concerned. That is who guides us. It's not an individual, it's not me. I personally believe that all three are great. I think that Hillary Clinton has the best chance of winning. But I will tell you this, I'm not going to get into a bloodbath when I'm in Iowa. When I go back, I'm not criticizing the Democratic candidates, because all three of them would be and are a world of difference when you look at the Republican candidates. So we can have an honest and respectful debate about what we think, but we went through a very lengthy process that made the determination for us of who we should endorse. Other unions did the same kind of thing. I know that your union went through their own process. Here is the deal, you look at the

Democrats that are running, we know Bernie Sanders. I have known him a long, long time. I have known Martin O'Malley a long, long time since he was Mayor of Baltimore, Governor of Maryland. Obviously we have known Hillary Clinton a long, long time. What we have to make sure that we do, because I am telling you, it is scary out there. The stuff that is coming out of mouths of these Republicans is just unbelievable. Unbelievable to me. And if there is any questions in anyone's mind in this room that if in fact anyone of them, Trump, Cruz, any of them. Listen to what Trump has to say, and he is gaining more popularity. And for those who think that he is just a flash in the pan, you are wrong. This guy has got some juice. And we need to pay attention to him. But you look at that crop, they will take us back so far. I don't want to think how far they will take us back. Those three candidates on the Democratic side, their values are the same. They might have some difference of opinions, but we can't tear each other apart because one of those three is going to be the Democratic nomination candidate. And in the end all of us are going to have to get behind that candidate. Depending on what process we took, I respect your process and you have to respect ours. Just like we have to respect any other union's process and the kind of due diligence that we did. In the end all of us have to come together. Because if we don't, we will have hell to pay in January of 2017.

On the Supreme Court, three or four justices are going to be gone. It is just human nature, and the odds are that 3-4 will be gone. Do you want Trump, or Cruz or Rubio to nominate someone on the Su-

preme Court? Come on, I mean, they have control over a lot of the state legislatures and governor's offices right now. What we have to do is not only important on the national level, but we have to recommit ourselves to fight at the state and local government level to get appropriate governors and the right governors and the right mayors in office. This is not just a national fight. These folks have been strategic as far as what they have done. State legislatures, governors coming after us. Don't let this issue divide us. It can't. We have to get together after it is all over with. If we do that, and that is what they want. They want to continue to divide us. We can't fall for that crap.

So, I am comfortable with the decision we made, and the process that we took. Just as I am sure you are comfortable with your own union, with the process you took. There are unions that are supporting Bernie, there are unions supporting Hillary. But in the end all of us have to come together. Is that fair?

Q. Jim Gleason: You mention the 99 percent who want to play by the rules, and yet last fall you endorsed Obama's executive order granting de facto amnesty to over four million illegal aliens who don't play by the rules. Maybe his executive order as well isn't playing by the rules. We will find out in a few months. You also endorse virtually every blanket amnesty program proposed in the Congress for people who do not play by the rules. Now most of your members have salaries and consequent union dues come from public money which is paid to them. You appear now to use that to undermine the laws and borders of this

country. How can you have a society functioning for workers or anyone else without secure borders and without a reliable rule of law? How can you reward people who are knowingly breaking the rules?

A: Well I respectfully disagree with you, brother. I think that what President Obama has tried to do, in my mind, is not enough. In my mind, you have got people in this country who are living in the shadows, who have been here for a long, long time. Who have proven their worth. And I think that it is unAmerican, and I think that it is undemocratic not to recognize that these are people's lives. And we should develop ways in which, appropriate ways, with checks and balances to make them citizens of this country. It's just as simple as that. That has a direct impact on workers in this country, because as long you have individuals working in this economy with low wages, with no benefits, then it undermines those who have higher wages and higher benefits. It brings us down. And it is the same argument I used before with the pensions. I mean we are a better country than this. We are still, brother, the richest country on the face of the earth. And it is unacceptable in my mind to bring people down, to bring workers down. And try to create havoc rather than saying, "Enough is enough." And you are right that 99 percent are standing up, and they are standing up to say that this economy is rigged. It's not fair. And we are not going to take it anymore. And that includes everyone, including those individuals that you are talking about. So we just respectfully disagree on that point.

Q: Edie Brickman, from Brookline. One thing that I would say that I always say to people when they say why do we have pensions for our workers in the town of Brookline. I say that they do not get Social Security. Do not forget, everyone else gets Social Security. A lot of AFSCME workers do not get Social Security. The other thing that I will tell you, I had words with a few other people was by joining the financial committee and trying to tell the town, no outsourcing. That was not addressed today. I had to tell people when you outsource you are paying these companies, if you are getting the work done at a less amount of money it is on the backs of workers. And we in towns and cities should not agree to that.



Edie Brickman

A: I appreciate what she said. But let me clarify what she stated. In a number of state governments and local governments, public service workers working for those entities do not receive Social Security. That is not a fact for all state and local governments. The majority of state and local governments do pay into the Social Security program. But many do not. And you are right, for those who have not paid into the Social Security program, then you are relying on the amount you pay into the state or local pension program. And that is another argument that we can use. I wanted to clarify that point.

Q: Henry Garrido, Executive Director, District Council 37, NYC. I just want to say for the record no human being is ever illegal whether documented or not. To deny their contributions that immigrants have made to this country is to deny history. But on to the issue at hand, I am a testa-

ment to the work that the AFSCME Strong campaign has brought to New York City. In 2004, we had 28,000 agency fee payers, people who did not and chose not to belong to the union. By talking to them, we have been able to cut that number by more than half in a year. We are now at 13,000 and still going down. We have about 20,000 people we have talked to, and I think that even having worked in the union for over 20 years, what is coming out collectively has been very revealing to me, about what the do's and don'ts and what the members expect and the things that we think they think. This has been very clear to me.



Henry Garrido

But I guess my question to you as a leader, and I thank you for your leadership, is more directed at the Supreme Court. I was there that Monday on January 11, when the oral arguments were taking place inside. We have seen one of the most activist courts in the history of this country. Whether it is voter rights or Citizen's United or a number of other cases that have had a profound effect on working people.

My question is, it is the question in the minds of many people like myself: is there still time to influence this court to not undo one of the most important rulings that we have seen in over four decades?

A: Henry, there is always time, and we are going to use that time until the last minute to try to influence the court. Obviously it is a different kind of strategy, because you are not dealing with elected officials. I mean you are not dealing with the governor, you aren't dealing with the state legislature,

you are dealing with folks who are appointed for life. So it's not like we can say we are going to vote you out of office next time you run. They are not running. But you are right, I think what we can do is put as much pressure as we can on them. I think Roberts reacts to this because he reacted to it with the ACA decision. He doesn't want his court to be viewed as a political court. Now it is, but he doesn't want to cross that line. Whatever that line might be for him. So, what we are going to do, is continue to put pressure on the court, through a public relations campaign. We are working very closely with the National Education Association, AFT, SEIU and AFSCME. We have a coalition. Those are among the largest unions and are the four largest public sector unions in the country.

At one time, we used to fight one another and organize against one another and spend millions of dollars against one another. Now those days are gone. We are working very, very closely together. We are coordinating our resources, coordinating our ability to fight back. We are working very closely with those unions. As a matter of fact, I have a meeting with the three presidents next week. So we are coordinating a plan and working with the AFL-CIO and our community partners to try to put political pressure on the Supreme Court. One of the things we are doing is we have made a decision based upon focus groups and polling that the leaders not be out front on this issue. Once we are, then it will turn into an argument that the only reason they are saying this is because they want dues. They want those resources coming into the till. So we have made a concerted effort, for all four unions to use as spokespersons, mem-

bers. Actual members who are providing vital public services who are members of unions. And they talk about the value of collective bargaining, and the value of the work that they perform every single day. We have stepped aside and moved into the background and let our members talk. We are doing training programs for our members so they are saying the right kinds of things, and we are working with them very closely. But we are going to continue to put the pressure on until that decision will be rendered.

Again, that decision will probably be rendered between April of this year and June, no later than June of 2016. We are not taking our foot off the pedal, but we also have to be realists too. I don't anticipate that the ruling will be a good one. That's just my own personal opinion. It's based on what happened in the oral arguments. I think Abood will be overturned. That means that the public sector is going to take a hit. As much as we are doing within AFSCME, we know that we are still going to lose members. And every other public sector union is going to lose members. That is not going to be healthy, not only for the public sector, but it is not going to be healthy for the private sector because you heard me talk about the figures and the representation in the private sector. This could very well be, if we don't change the way we are doing things, folks are hoping this will be, the death knell of labor. I don't think it will be, because I think we are smart enough, and we are brave enough and we are bold enough to figure this out. But you have the trade union movement working together on this. You have our coalition partners working. We even had a number of Republican legislators,

some out of Pennsylvania, and other states, who supported Abood staying in place. They supported our position. And made briefs for the Supreme Court, because collective bargaining gives them order in the workplace. And they believe it is just nutty to take it away. And to have a system where it is being torn apart. So we will just continue to do it. Hope for the best.

But this is something in the process that AFSCME is doing. And what we are doing as far as communicating with members. I have to tell you, even without *Friedrichs*, we would have been doing this anyway. I think every union should be doing this. Maybe we are doing it a lot quicker because of the pressures we are under. But it's something that all of us need and must do.

We cannot be afraid to look at the mirror and say, that looks good or that looks bad and we have to fix it. We have to come up with different types of programs, because this is a changing environment. We are dealing with a changing workplace, we are dealing with a changing workforce and we have to make those adaptations. We will be going through this process with or without *Friedrichs*.

Q: Maria Cirillo, Sydney Australia, Director of Organizing at the Public Service Association of New South Wales.

I first learned about the AFSCME Strong campaign just a couple of nights ago from a few of your leaders, Andrew Washington, Joyce Carlson, and Jeremy Sanders. And it really excited me. I am keen to hear, what advice would you give us



Maria Cirillo

if we wanted to pursue a similar initiative for our union there?

A: The first thing that we did, I will just give you our experience, we called all of our leaders from around the country together. Not just our executive board, but our leaders: affiliate leaders, local union leaders. We sat down and talked about what we needed to do. Things that were working and things that weren't. And what our plan and what our strategy should be. We have had these meetings every year. For three days, we argued and cussed and we disagreed, but at the end of the third day we came together to talk about a plan and talk about a program.

The first thing that is absolutely necessary is that you have buy in. Everybody walks out that door believing that this is something that must take place. If you walk out that door and there are still questions, or folks are saying that was a nice three days now we are going back to business as usual. Then it's not going to work. We actually had buy in. Now, are there different levels of buy in? Yes. But what we have to do is look at the examples where the folks have bought in and they have worked with us to develop a program, and they have had major successes. Henry just mentioned the success in New York City. We have had successes all over the country. In that way, when you show that it can be done. It is not impossible. Then you start going to the folks who said, "We believe this, but we don't know if it can be done." Then you can say, "Here is the example. You can do it too." Then you just build upon it. But you

have to have buy in from the group, understanding that we have to make a change.

Q: Ekaterina Yordanova, president of the Federation of Transport Trade Unions in Bulgaria, member of the Executive Board of the National Confederation, and member of executive board of International Transport Workers Federation. I have two questions. I will start by saying that I am really, really happy and privileged to be here, and I would like to thank you for this opportunity. It is a great opportunity for me and for my colleagues from Europe, Australia, and Canada to be here. I would like to start by saying that the three weeks now we are listening to our colleagues from Canada and the United States, and when you are talking about the international you are talking about United States and Canada. You said, and this is the reality, you are the richest nation in the world and you are exporting practices. You are exporting good practices, best practices, and bad practices as well. Because you exported to our part of the world Uber. You exported many multinationals and corporations. And these clever people they have their agenda, and the business in the capital they have is very strict and very wide agenda. They fight with us very severely in our part of the world.

One, I have a feeling that we still have a lot to do to be more united. We really miss you, our brothers and sisters from United States and Canada. We miss you in the international arena. We want you to be more visible and to export your knowledge. And to be with us, because when we need to fight Uber, we need you to tell them back home they



Ekaterina
Yordanova

do not behave properly in their own country. Our words and our fight will be more successful if we are fighting together with you. If we can fight together with you more actively in international labor organization... I believe that we have to work a lot to build a strong front together worldwide. And at the end, I would like to share with you my other field and my other big topic is working women. Working women need a space. We would rely on you if your candidate can become president of the richest and strongest country in the world, she defends the working women's rights. You can give us a chance to have her on our side.



A: You are exactly right, this is not only a problem in this country. It's not only a problem in Canada, but it's worldwide because it's a global economy right now. In the public sector, I will give you an example where we are faced with the privatization of waste water systems. That is an international problem, because they are international conglomerates that are doing that. So it's incumbent upon us to share information and work more closely with our Sisters and Brothers in Europe and across the globe. Because we are faced with the same types of issues. I will just tell you a quick story, something we just did within AFSCME. In November, we had a meeting with an organization called Public Services International, which is an alliance. We had public service unions represented from around the world come to AFSCME, and we talked about privatization and the contracting out of public services. What we can do jointly and how we can coordinate our activities, because it's not just confined to one area. We met for three days to talk about it, and we pledged to

continue to meet just so we could share the kind of information that is so helpful for others. There is no cookie cutter approach. Our experience with AFSCME Strong works for us very well. I would urge any other union to take a look at what we are doing but then adapt it to your own union. The concept and the premise is the same, but how you implement it could be different from union to union. There needs to be much more cooperation and coordination because we are dealing with the global economy, and it affects not only the private sector but it also affects the public sector also. We have to do more, no question.

Q: Arturo Reynoso: I have been a member of Service Employee International Union for over 30 years. I am retired now, but I was very proud to be a member of a union for that long. I had to respond to the fellow behind me because he seems to me that we don't seem to know the history of this country when it comes to these places that have been exporting people as illegals. I just so happen to be one of those people who came from one of those countries. There are a lot of books that talk about how exclusively people in this country have gone out and have gotten all of those richness that you talked about. My recommendation is that you really read and get to a point you can actually understand where these people come from and what actually are the things. I am concerned because behind all of these people, there are a lot of kids who are getting the message daily that they are illegal in this country. And that is the next generation to come, that will be the majority in this country. So I am concerned that these kids are going to be lost in the process by this rhetoric here.

A: I think he is right on.

Elaine Bernard: I love that, a President who doesn't want to get the last word in. Who actually does listen to members.

On behalf of the faculty, staff, students, alumni, and friends of the Harvard Trade Union Program, I would like to thank you, Brother Lee.