Chapter 1

EMPOWERING WORKERS THROUGH ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

Warner Woodworth

This chapter introduces the range of tools and methods that have been implemented around the globe over the past decades to develop stronger economies, empower workers, and fuel greater productivity. Such strategies have been used to develop economies in transition such as the Third World, as well as redesign the new societies emerging from the former USSR and its satellites. Many of those lessons bode well for economic renewal in the United States, and suggest implications for Third World strategies as we enter the new millennium. While many individuals worry about the negative effects of globalization and Big Business spreading its tentacles around the world, there are also signs of resistance and self-determination. While the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, and the World Economic Forum meet annually to plan for expanded trade that benefits rich nations, alternative groups gather in even larger numbers to strategize about more humane options such as the World Social Forum.

Today as we attempt to reverse the financial losses of recent years, numerous U.S. firms have launched quality circle programs, just-in-time production, etc., as executives become enamored with the ideas and techniques of Japanese practices. *Kaizen*, or continuous improvement, for example, has led to an average of 220 suggestions a month at the joint partnership between General Motors and Toyota in California, called NUMMI. But instead of looking eastward to the Orient for answers, we may see that the trends most significant to American industry today are to be found in Europe. It is from there that we derive our roots—the Judeo-Christian ethic, our major theories of political democracy, economic development, and indeed, most of the underpinnings of our contemporary culture.

I propose to review the thrust of organizational changes in the European workplace and perhaps extrapolate from them shifts America might expect in the coming decade. As we reflect on changes in European political and economic spheres, are there any signs that similar seeds have been planted in American soil? What parallels are emerging in the United States? Finally, we will explore several frameworks for a restructuring of organizational power that are beginning to emerge and discuss their implications for truly changing the world.

After 150 years, Europe is again giving birth to a new industrial age. The first was a technological revolution, an era of mechanization and mass production, of assembly-line organizational logic and the triumph of the machine. The second revolution going on now is a transformation of power, a shifting of economic and political control in society, from the few to the masses, from the owners to the producers of labor, from the haves to the have-nots. The results are yielding significant outcomes as the social structure is altered, as political expectations change, as a new psychology of entitlement emerges, and the nature of work itself is redefined.

Today in many advanced countries of Europe, a job no longer means simply arriving on time, operating a machine, and producing one's quota of quality products. Work has been infused with the notion of individual rights, the quality of working life, and the democratizing of

corporate bureaucracy from the shop floor to the boardroom. Whether the national rhetoric is capitalistic or socialistic, the underlying thrust is a push for participation and power. For millions of workers across Europe, new institutional forms have been created in order to guarantee the redistribution of power. The range of these mechanisms makes up a phenomenon known as Economic Democracy (Hall, 1989; Involvement and Participation Association, 1992).

Instead of merely reporting to work and receiving orders for the day, the new worker's role is one of decision-maker and policy setter. The experiments of the 1970s and 1980s have been institutionalized in the 1990s. Indeed, the past decade, especially in Eastern Europe, can be characterized as the most sweeping economic reform of the 21st Century. While the arguments from the political left and right vary on *how* to distribute the fruits of labor throughout society, the debate about *whether* to share the benefits of production more widely is all but over.

Immediately after World War II, France began the drive toward economic democracy by establishing mandatory works councils in 1945. Germany went further in 1947, allocating to workers one-third of the board of directors' seats in the coal and steel industries. Since then, an explosion giving rise to full-fledged economic democracy has culminated in over thirty changes in corporate-union relations among some ten countries. Table 1 is a sampling of these developments which empower workers and labor with new organizational and economic clout in different nations:

Table 1: Co-Determination	
The Netherlands establishes works councils	(1971)
Sweden passes one-third co-determination law	(1972)
Austria legislates labor constitution	(1973)
Britain creates Bullock Commission	(1974)
Denmark establishes co-determination system	(1974)
Sweden considers Meidner profit-sharing plan	(1975)
Norway creates work environment act	(1976)
Germany passes 50-50 co-determination law	(1978)

The sum total of these legislative and social innovations means profound industrial change. Consider the following pushes for European economic democracy: A more focused description of major types of change will suggest the flavor of these alternatives in the reform of industrial relations.

Collective Bargaining

The fundamental basis for union-management relations in Europe is still the labor contract, although it is built on a foundation of cooperation, in contrast to the adversary system of the United States. Trade union membership is high, often exceeding half of the work force, and in some Scandinavian countries, up to 80 percent are unionized. This includes not only blue-collar employees, but white-collar and managerial personnel in many countries. In contrast to

the dominant bread-and –butter concerns of bargaining in America, the agenda of European labor unions over the years has been broadened to include not just physical safety and health, but mental well-being also. Other top priorities consist of joint decision making, and the social rights of workers. Sweden, for example, established a Democracy at Work Law in 1977 which essentially tore the lid off issues once considered managerial prerogatives. On the other hand, Italian unions have achieved economic democracy gains through collective bargaining rather than political means. In many cases, the unions have used arbitration along with legislation to widen the focus from wages and working conditions to employment policies, capital investments, production schedules, and new plant construction.

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

British labor advocates, Coates and Topham (1970) declare: "For us, the question is whether the workers are to control their own destinies, or be subjected to ever more intensive and minute control themselves, as the power of the oligarchs becomes ever more arbitrary and ever more irresponsible" (p. 240). Likewise the French trade union, CGT pushes for its agenda: "We demand steps be taken to fight against the extreme divisions of labor, loss of skills, and the subservience of man to machines."

Workplace Democracy

The participation of workers at the shopfloor level of the firm has become a major focal point for economic democracy. Early experiments in British coal mines and Swedish automobile assembly plants have led to widespread attempts to alter the relationship between the individual and the machine. Specific tactics and terms may vary: Norwegian work restructuring, job enrichment, British socio-technical systems, Swedish autonomous work teams, and labor-management cooperation. The important goal is to restore meaning and growth to the work experience. Most European nations have as a high priority the improving of the quality of working life, illustrated in Germany's expenditure of over $100 million to carry out research under the Humanization of Work Act. The underlying principle seems to be that if workers participate in the design and execution of shopfloor activities, there will ensue a more productive process and higher-quality results, as well as a closer correspondence between bureaucratic organizational life and genuine societal democracy. In numerous cases, organized labor even wants to shift the very nature of products being produced. Consider, for instance, what the Lucas Aerospace Combine Shop Stewards Committee has advocated to combat mass layoffs through the creation of alternative, peace invoking economics: "What we are insisting from Lucas is a move away from weapons production for the arms trade—toward socially useful production: goods accessible to all, products which conserve resources and improve the environment."

Works Councils

National legislation exists which mandates the formation of a works council at the enterprise level in numerous European countries—France, the Netherlands, Sweden, Belgium, and so on. Usually the councils are established as union-management consultative bodies to monitor factory working conditions and strengthen operations. These councils may range from groups of "all talk/no action" to very powerful committees which basically run the business. Usually between 10 and 20 people in number, membership is either decided by one's formal

position in the company or union hierarchy, or by the election of representatives. In Belgium, the works councils are mainly an advisory group of top management, while in Italy and the Netherlands they are union-dominated and have heavy control over company decisions. In the latter case, the councils have access to corporate information about future business plans and financial data. Executives must involve the council in such decisions as plant relocations, mergers, product development, and layoffs. The councils have veto power over safety issues, changes in pensions and profit-sharing, and disciplinary policies. Operating a works council consumes a good deal of the time and energy of management and labor, but many argues the effort pays off as the council becomes a vehicle through which decisions get reached and plans are implemented.

Co-Determination

In attempting to mitigate against a rebirth of Nazism after World War II, the West German government attempted to democratize the economy by giving workers board of directors representation in key industries. Since then, the percentage of workers' board seats has grown from 33 percent to parity (50 percent) in Germany. Similar legislation is now on the books in the Scandinavian countries, France, the Netherlands, and Austria. The Bullock Commission Report of Great Britain advocated a similar structure of U.K. industries, but the political support for such a move has not yet been achieved. The European Union has been implementing a two-tier board system for all European companies in which the top level has equal representation for workers and executives, with a second-level board consisting wholly of upper management, accountable as a group to the top board. Some nations mandate co-determination only in certain industries, and only in large companies. On the other hand, Sweden requires labor representation on the board of all firms employing 25 or more people. In most cases of co-determination, trade union power seems to consist mostly of information; i.e., access to profit-and-loss statements and employee relations data, rather than workers using their power to redirect or block corporate activities.

Income Redistribution

Perhaps the potentially most profound and far-reaching European changes have to do with worker participation in the corporate financial picture. The essence of sharing in the profits of a firm, however, is not simply a question of depositing an extra bonus in one's bank, but broad-ranging societal control. The ultimate goal is for the masses to obtain decision-making power through widespread stock ownership—a fundamental form of democratizing the economy. Labor leaders and economists have debated trade union control of the means of production throughout Europe. In Sweden, for example, proposals have been considered that anticipate turning 20 percent of the country's corporate profits over to a central fund administered by the national union. Such a move would give labor virtual control of Sweden's economy within the next few years by creating a political economy of a Third Way, an alternative to the traditional dichotomy of having to choose between capitalism or socialism.

U.S. WORKERS' EMPOWERMENT

While the shifts toward worker participation have perhaps been more dramatic in Europe, the American case also suggests the seeds of change. From human relations training and

organizational development techniques which emphasized trust and working together, but left the central issue of organizational power untouched, the push today in countless firms is on the quality of working life, worker empowerment, and participative management. The underlying thrust seems to be that *it is not enough to do things differently; what is needed is to do different things*.

Hundreds of firms, like Procter & Gamble and Westinghouse, have designed and built new plants based on a logic of "small is beautiful." These new wave factories tend to be single-storied facilities with plenty of sunlight, access to the out-of-doors, and brightly colored work spaces. Rather than ten thousand workers packed into crowded pigeonholes, the new firms usually have 500 employees at the maximum, a size that is more consistent with human-scale organizations. Such enterprises do not suffer from hierarchical overkill, but are simpler to understand and they generate feelings of belonging to the company family. Smallness enhances the possibility that when difficulties emerge, the organization is not so large and complex that problems are unchangeable.

A number of other aspects of today's new American plants reveal the cumulative effect of change: no time clocks; no uniforms; teams of workers doing their own scheduling, hiring, and firing; quality control and light maintenance, often without even immediate supervisors. Job design and/or job enrichment are also increasingly important. As Studs Terkel (1997) found when interviewing Americans across the country, people are seeking new changes in the nature of the work they accomplish: "I think most of us are looking for a calling, not a job. Most of us, like the assembly-line worker, have jobs that are too small for out spirit. Jobs are not big enough for people" (p. xxiv).

Meanwhile, dramatic alterations are also appearing in the old manufacturing industries of the Northeast United States. To combat community deterioration caused by strikes, low productivity, and runaway plants, dozens of cities have created area labor-management committees. Among the most widely heralded successes are those of Muskegon, Michigan and Jamestown, New York, where union officials, industrial owners and managers, and elected representatives of the public have created regional councils engaged in cooperative problem-solving (Meek, 1985).

In many cases such efforts have led to reduced work stoppages, improved health and safety records, the retention of once-threatened jobs, and revitalization of the regional economy. These new forums for anticipatory joint planning, rather than post facto reactions to a crisis, have resulted in job guarantees, improved percentages of corporate bids on new work, redesign of plant layouts, and community-wide commitment to a better quality of life.

The 1980s-1990s American era of labor concessions was not merely a period of union givebacks, but a tradeoff. In numerous cases workers agreed to not demand wage increases and even to accept reductions in benefits or other settlements which minimize costs to the firm. However, labor has sought and gained power in exchange for such agreements, illustrated by the following sampling of new contracts: Ford and General Motors agreed with the United Auto Workers not to close down assembly plants and to reduce outside competitive buying of parts; American Telephone and Telegraph agreed to consult electrical workers' "technological change committees" before any innovations were implemented; the United Rubber Workers won the

right to inspect Uniroyal's books in exchange for concessions; workers at Northwest Airlines, United, and a number smaller firms gained seats on the board of directors so they could monitor corporate performance and have access to critical financial data.

Worker Ownership

Perhaps one of the most fundamental signs of the new industrial revolution in America is the shift toward workers' self-management and employee ownership. Sharing in the fruits of one's labors has been an evolutionary idea for some years, illustrated by the proliferation of profit-sharing schemes, Scanlon plans, and newer programs like Improshare. However, more recently, employee stock ownership has mushroomed. As a strategy for economic democracy, in some cases, the workers simply obtain stock through special company arrangements, illustrated by Hallmark Card or Sears, Roebuck, and Company (which is 30 percent employee-owned). In other instances, employees gained major blocks of stock through some sort of financing package, such as the Chrysler autoworkers obtaining 15 percent of the company's stock, 12 million shares, as part of a large revitalization plan. In hundreds of cases during the last decade, small business entrepreneurs have also turned their firms over to their employees upon retirement. In other instances, workers and communities have fought imminent plant closings through the tactic of a worker buyout, and thousands of jobs have been salvaged (Whyte and others, 1983).

All told, today there are over 11,000 worker-owned firms across the country, employing at least nine million worker-owners whose stock is valued at over 400 billion dollars (NCEO, 1999). In Poland when the heroic trade union, Solidarity, demanded as one of its core economic reforms a program of workers' self-management and ownership, leaders of the regime criticized the union proposal as bourgeois capitalism.

In contrast, in the United States when one speaks of worker ownership, the idea is often rejected as socialism. Curiously, however, congressional legislation reveals the notion of employee ownership to have widespread bipartisan support in Congress, and even in the White House. So today worker ownership is growing, from 17 plywood corporations in the Northwest to an insurance company in Washington where workers elect their own managers. From Okonite, a New Jersey wire and cable firm to the Springfield Remanufacturing Company in Missouri; from Parsons, a Pasadena-based engineering business with 12,000 worker-owners to Science Applications International in San Diego with 41,000 employees; from large-scale agricultural co-ops to new wave collectives in light industry, crafts, and other economic alternatives. The idea was embraced by one of the largest employee-owned firms in the country, a steel mill in Weirton, West Virginia which was bought by 10,000 steelworkers and became the eighth largest steel company in America. Ultimately, American steel workers at other sites bought out over 20 more such companies. Likewise, some 121,000 employees now own the majority of shares in Publix supermarkets, headquartered in Florida.

While the transporting of the new economic revolution across the Atlantic is far from complete, the winds seem to be blowing in this direction. Although we should not overstate the differences between Europe and America, the "Europeanization" of U.S. industry tends to look like the future. A key difference is that much of the shift in power to American workers is coming about through voluntary agreements between unions and companies, not because of political alliances or state-mandated legislation typified by much of Europe. In other words,

while the thrust of the change is similar, the means differ and seem to be based on a distinctly American approach in which the federal government largely stays out of the picture.

Another factor which distinguishes change between the two continents is that in the United States there is generally not a coherent policy among employers' associations or international labor organizations regarding workers' participation. Rather, the process is occurring in piecemeal fashion. There have been several exceptions, such as the creation of plant-level labor-management committees throughout the steel industry, and the General Motors-UAW formal commitment to participative structures which ensure a higher quality of working life. But the norm generally seems to be that the union local and/or plant management propose changes which lead to more of a bottom-up empowerment.

In attempting to analyze quality of working life as an approach to organizational change, it may be useful to look at the global picture from different angles. One view that might be taken arises from consideration of the *level* of worker participation (shown in Table 2).

Table 2: Levels of Organizational Participation
Ownership—Stock control
Governance—Co-determination of policy
Management—Administration
Terms and Working Conditions—Labor Agreements

To explain this chart, let us being with the lowest level of participation, *Terms and Working Conditions*. In America, the labor contract has been the historical vehicle for worker participation. Collective bargaining was the process for setting the pay, benefits, duties, and it otherwise defined the relationship between management and labor. Essentially, it boiled down to an assumption that "management's job is to manage and workers do the work."

A step up in participation has developed over the past few years in cases where the union has been invited to become a partner with management in the administration of the firm. Under the rubric of P*articipative Management*, Ford Motor Company has created Employee Involvement Committees in over a hundred of its plants in which workers and supervisors jointly assess problems and brainstorm possible solutions. Quality of working life specialists at General Motors have likewise labored for a number of years to bring UAW and management representatives together for team-building programs in which trust and a new level of open dialogue are established for joint management of the factory. For example, the mission statement mutually agreed to by the management at GM's Oldsmobile division declares that:

> We encourage and support the shared responsibility of all people at Oldsmobile toward a common goal: producing a quality product at a competitive price, in an atmosphere of cooperation and shared recognition, in which everyone has the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process (Union Steering Committee, 1991).

Elsewhere, Dana Corporation increased productivity 126 percent by involving most of its 24,000 workers in participative management programs. Cummins Engine, General Foods, and others began to restructure decision making so that work teams became self-managing. Prominent European parallels consist of the Swedish new plant designs, socio-technical redesign of work experiments in Britain, and so on.

Other efforts have raised the degree of organizational participation even higher, to a third level—the inclusion of workers in a firm's *Governance*. Examples from Europe consist of works councils at the plant level in France, the Netherlands, and Belgium, and co-determination of the corporation in the cases of Germany, Austria, and Scandinavia. U.S. examples of co-determination include the election of United Auto Workers President Douglas Fraser to the board of Chrysler Corporation, and union seats on the boards of Northwest, United Airlines, Weirton Steel, and others. In other firms, such as Donnelly Mirrors, all employees are represented by an elected committee which sets all policy for personnel issues in the corporation.

Perhaps the most powerful level of participation is that of *Legally Owning a Business*. European instances include worker buyouts in Sweden, Britain's Scott Bader Commonwealth, and the 200 industrial cooperatives of Mondragon, Spain, which employ 60,000 workers in an intricate network which includes a worker bank, R & D center, engineering school, and housing complex.

Worker ownership in America may arise from a profit-sharing program which gives employees a stake in the business, as illustrated by firms like Kodak which is partially owned by employees. Or the ownership may include over 50 percent of the stock held by the workers as is the case with Publix Supermarkets, Parsons and Okonite.

To look at economic democracy from another angle, three basic *forms* of participation may exist (see Table 3).

Table 3: Forms of Participation
Individual—Direct
Group—Direct
Organizational—Representative

One form is the involvement of the *Individual*. In this case, the employee approaches management with ideas and/or criticisms. These may be verbal or written, solicited or unsolicited, and are often obtained through such programs as an open-door policy or suggestion box. A second form is that of *Group* activity—quality circles, Scanlon committees, semi-autonomous or autonomous work teams, and so on. The third form is *Organizational*, which, in contrast to the two direct approaches, is representational. Illustrations of this include the innovative structure of participation at W.L. Gore, the hi-tech fabric maker. Another case may be the Management Councils created at Westinghouse Corporation in which representatives from supervisory ranks in various departments are elected to open up channels of communication, make recommendations regarding management needs, and so on.

Another angle from which a different perspective of organizational change appears is to look at a scale of participative power. Table 4 attempts to suggest a hierarchy of decision making and is illustrated with examples from cases discussed above. While the range of worker input varies considerably, one might argue that the higher on the ladder worker participation in decisions goes, the more potential exists for genuine workers' control and economic democracy.

Table 4: ***Range of Economic Democracy***

Word Station Decisions	Day-to day Team Management	Technology and Planning	Business Products	Profits Distribution and Investment
Collective bargaining decisions regarding job bidding, place of work, speed, etc.	Labor-management committees, quality circles: GM, Ford, Kelloggs.	Socio-technical design, layout of new plant start-ups: Volvo, Saab, Procter & Gamble, General Foods.	Worker involvement in the creation of new product lines, socially beneficial products: Scott Bader, Ben and Jerry's, Saturn.	Control of financial budget and corporate investments: Mondragon, U.S. plywood co-ops.

Decision-making under conditions of economic democracy tends to move from the lower inputs of the work station, up a step to team structures that operate in the workplace day-to-day, like those at Ford Motor Company. Another step up is the involvement of labor in matters such as long-term planning strategies and the introduction of new technology, illustrated by European companies like Volvo and U.S. firms such as Procter and Gamble.

At the next higher step of joint decision-making is worker participation in the design and creation of new business products. Examples may include Ben and Jerry's ice cream which has launched flavors like "Rain Forest Crunch." It utilizes Brazil nuts purchased from indigenous village cooperatives in the Amazon jungle, and workers determined that profits from this flavor should go to help environmental groups fight deforestation in the Amazon. Likewise, Scott Bader Commonwealth in the U.K. elected workers to the firm's board of directors. In turn, they developed a "Peace Strategy" that shifted the firm's chemical business away from military/defense contracts, and toward products for peaceful uses. Likewise the Saturn Action Council made up of top management and UAW Local 1853 created a new structure to design and build a whole new line of U.S. automobiles (Woodworth & Meek, 1995, pp. 39-48).

Finally, Table 4 culminates at the highest range of worker participation, the step in which workers become involved in the distribution of profits and investments. At this level workers may determine policy decisions such as channeling some of their profits to the surrounding community, illustrated at Mondragon by the policy of giving 20 percent of pre-tax income for

schools and housing. Mondragon workers also invest 20-40 percent back into the firm for new, state-of-the art high tech equipment that will continue to ensure Mondragon's role as a leading-edge cooperative enterprise.

A central thesis of this report is that the impetus for organizational change in the United States has its roots in European culture, not Japan. Shifting worker expectations, "new breed" values about one's job, and the current economic crisis all serve to enlarge the context for an increasingly democratic organizational life. The range of behavioral science theories, managerial practices, and labor proposals are designed to give workers more of a voice, heightened autonomy, and an enlarged share of responsibility in company operations.

During the 1990s, there were a number of innovations in labor/management partnerships that were launched. The United Steel Workers of America (USWA) and National Steel Corporation forged a unique agreement that included a policy of no layoffs and the company opening all its books and financial records to the union. National ran a Wall Street Journal article entitled, "We're Partners With Labor Because We Can't Imagine a Future Without Them." The collaboration saved over a hundred million dollars in cost cutting and productivity increases, and it became a model for other steel plants (Bryne, 1993, p. 10). Similar examples include Scott Paper and the United Paperworkers International, the Communication Workers of America and AT&T, Alcoa and the aluminum workers union, and the American Federation of Grain Millers union and Kellogg Company.

New policies generated from Congress and the White House also supported cooperative moves toward economic democracy during the 1990s. As soon as he became president, Bill Clinton overturned Ronald Reagan's ban on rehiring fired air traffic controllers, allowing some PATCO strikers to finally return to their jobs. Labor Secretary, Robert Reich, pushed forcefully for increased worker training and empowerment. He created the new Office of the American Workplace that brought together 600 business and union leaders to plan strategies for building high performance organizations through labor-management partnerships (Brown & Reich, 1993).

There seem to be two basic premises for changes toward worker participation, whether at the factory floor, or in the boardroom. One is the pragmatic rationale which argues that such participation will ensure corporate profits, improve productivity, and better utilize the firm's human resources. The other view stems from an ideological premise that until the rights of the individual penetrate the company gates, the fundamental ideals of economic democracy in society will not be achieved.

While the thrust of this effort seems to portend a future of dramatic alterations in the social and economic infrastructure of modern society, this movement in America is not without its problems and failures. One of the best-known cases of a worker takeover, the Vermont Asbestos Group, was largely a financial success, but the worker-owners eventually lost a controlling interest in the stock and the firm reverted to a more traditional system. Similarly, the worker participation experiments that the Harvard Project on Technology, Work, and Character launched with Harmon International Industries and the UAW in Bolivar, Tennessee ended up being dismantled, or extensively altered, from an earlier, progressive form to more of a status quo organization.

Doubts and resistance to genuine democratization of industry are articulated in many management and trade union circles. Executive attitudes often reflect the view a CEO once expressed to the author, that the current crisis over productivity and hard economic times is forcing business to seek employee input and listen to shopfloor-level ideas. His expectation, though, is couched in the hope that when the economy bounces back, channels from below will be blocked, and the fortress-type practices of the past will again become the *modus operandi*.

Organized labor also has its concerns about joint union-management problem-solving. Said an official of the International Association of Machinists and Aereospace Workers, "We have a feeling that if we get into bed with management, there's going to be two people screwing the workers instead of one." And certain aspects of economic democracy have been referred to as "rainbow chasing" by Thomas Donahue, former executive assistant to the president of the AFL-CIO, who once told the author, "We do not seek to be a partner in management—to be, most likely, the junior partner in success and the senior partner in failure."

Regardless of the controversies surrounding these new mechanisms for change and worker participation, the likelihood is that these developments may become the norm within a decade or two. Cosmetic changes of the organization's facade only will die quickly. But the substantive shifts of power beginning to occur suggest a future groundswell as we enter the Twenty-First Century. These changes are exploding from the guts and the heart of middle America. Top management and union officials who do not begin to articulate a coherent new vision of a truly democratized society may be overthrown by the hard hats now clamoring at the company gates.

Who knows, maybe economic democracy will also begin to expand in The Third World and other nations in transition such as the former Soviet Union.

REFERENCES

Brown, Ronald H. and Reich, Robert B. "Workplace of the Future." *A Report of the Conference of the American Workplace*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1993.

Bryne, Michael. "Unions Show Partnerships Help Companies." *AFL-CIO News*, March 1, 1993.

Coates, Ken and Tony Topham (eds.). *Workers' Control: A Book of Reading and Witnesses for Workers' Control*. London, UK: Panther, 1970.

Hall, Edward T. *The Cultures of France and Germany*. New York, NY: Intercultural Press, 1989.

Involvement and Participation Association. *Towards Industrial Partnership*. London, UK: 1992.

Management-Union Steering Committee. "Mission Statement." Oldsmobile Division and United Auto Workers Local Union 652, 1991.

Meek, Christopher. "Labor-Management Outcomes: The Jamestown Case." In Warner Woodworth, Christopher Meek, and William Foote Whyte (eds.). *Industrial Democracy: Strategies for Community Revitalization*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1985, pp. 141-159.

NCEO. *A Statistical Profile of Employee Ownership*. Oakland, CA: National Center for Employee Ownership, 1999.

Terkel, Studs. *Working*. New York, NY: New Press, 1997.

Whyte, William Foote and others. *Worker Participation and Ownership*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press, 1983.

Woodworth, Warner, P. and Christopher B. Meek. *Creating Labor-Management Partnerships*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Publishing, 1995.