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Movement Theory and International Labor Solidarity

This paper is an introduction to several exciting presentations on international solidarity. They include the very successful Kukdong victory in Puebla, Mexico and other important cases in northern Mexico and El Salvador. From STITCH, we also have examples of how women workers have overcome special barriers. I’d like to lay out some theoretical reflections on solidarity as a social movement which to a lesser or greater degree these cases may illustrate. While solidarity is something more than a social movement, I believe its advocates can benefit from considering social movement literature since movements help sustain local organization (Giugni, 1999). While this introduction is designed for LASA scholars and activists, such theories are accessible to local unions. In fact, their consideration may improve communication among all the principal stakeholders of international labor solidarity.

Various social movement theories lend themselves to differing interpretations of international solidarity. Three important approaches are structural theory which often focuses on class-based movements; resource mobilization and network theory which explains why certain movements are more successful than others; and reflexive awareness and identity theory which emphasizes the subjective aspects of movement participation.

Traditional movement theory is rooted in the sociologies of Karl Marx and Max Weber, both of which have stimulated a vast literature others have reviewed (e.g. Tilly, 1978). By stressing social responses to inequality, both Marx and Weber direct our attention to the structural aspects of organizing solidarity, or one might say the bones and sinews of struggle. This theory gives solidarity activists a clearer understanding of the specific aspects of upper class exploitation, and the objective likelihood of working class and status group reactions. Guided by structural theory, solidarity supporters communicate this understanding and build on the class factions identified in their
analysis. The theory can help identify various pressure points that can be brought to bear. For example, activists could take a different approach to highly competitive market situations than they would to monopolistic conditions. Structural theory also aids supporters understand the manner in which the working class itself is capable of self-organizing, and where assistance can be most useful.

Resource mobilization and network theory help explain why similar structural conditions can produce differing results. We can liken this to related skeletal frameworks that have differing “nerve impulse” responses. By looking at nerve networks, the resource approach focuses on the more dynamic and interactive aspects of movement organization. It provides solidarity activists with fresh ideas about how to confront organizational barriers using informal linkages in addition to regular channels. It also reveals how contradictory approaches endemic to purely structural considerations may play out in practice.

A third approach, New Social Movement theory, emphasizes the more subjective aspects of solidarity. It examines identity formation and the symbolic expression of shared meanings that emerge in movements that often impact labor campaigns. Such theory motivates activists to examine why certain individuals become involved in solidarity, and what sustains their involvement. It probes more deeply into personal self-definitions that can be affected by “outside factors” such as gender, ethnicity, national patriotism or a suspicion of North Americans. It also cues in on what it means for participants to be union members.

Methodologically, as we consider the presentations that follow, we can combine each of these theoretical elements by taking an hermeneutic approach to specific labor struggles. This means devoting careful attention to the perceptions of ordinary labor participants and the interactive role of “rank and file” international actors. For them, perhaps we can discover which theoretical elements have most relevance.

**Structural Theory**

Following traditional theory, international solidarity must consider the structural conditions of any labor campaign or union organizing effort. This includes an analysis of specific class and status relations within an industry, as well as the organizational arrangements of the workers themselves. One task of international solidarity, then, is to help assess class-based structural aspects that affect a particular organizing campaign, to determine upper class divisions and areas of organizational weakness, and to identify structural sources of cross-border strength.

Take the building solidarity around an organizing campaign in the apparel sector. A first task of solidarity activists is to comprehend the way in which class relations are organized. Supporters help by examining the manner in which brand-name companies contract for production; and how, where, when, and under what conditions factory owners produce and deliver the product. Often the company preference is for “full packaging,” which means that the local factory must provide the client with every clothing item packaged, priced and labeled. Some factories are only able to deliver “a mixed sourcing package” which meets part of supply as demand increases. An additional factor is the extent to which a factory produces for the higher end retail market, which requires ready adaptation to market conditions and rapid delivery requirements. This could lead to the creation of a modular system in which workers collaborate in
teams to finish the product in less than a week, whereas lower end shipments from China
normally take two months (Klewer, 2002).

Supporters also appraise the particular situation of the target plant, i.e. who owns
the plant and how many other plants are linked with it; how susceptible the plant is to the
various kinds of orders and marketing strategies such as college code scrutiny (see
below), just in time delivery, etc. Activists utilize such information to influence
capitalist class activity vs the workers who are attempting to organize or obtain a
contract. Pressure can also be brought to bear on co-owners, board members,
purchasers etc.

In addition to its guidance about ruling class and industrial sector organization,
structural theory also helps supporters identify the manner in which the working class
itself is organized in order to improve coordination and signal likely areas of success.
both Marxist theory on class organization and Weberian theory on bureaucracy offer
insights into working class organization, first at the local, then at the international level.

Local Labor Structures
When international solidarity supporters step into a local labor struggle, they walk
on ground bloodied with previous class conflicts. Dedicated and competent local
organizers have achieved major victories and defeats. What structurally remains
embodies both of these. Theoretically, supporters must consider:

1. The nature of the local leadership, their commitment to union processes
2. The types and training of local organizers
3. The relationship between the local leaders, the local organizers, and the
sponsoring federation

For example, solidarity activists may encounter local leaderships in certain sectors
who are very skilled and have a strong tradition of labor militance. One example, noted
below was found among the textile plant daughters of Honduran banana workers. On the
other hand, in the rapidly expanding maquila areas, the recruitable pool of labor leaders
may have little experience with union issues and time-tested union procedures. Women
workers in San Juan Sacatepequez Guatemala know little about unions and have a
negative impression based on what their father told them (Quiroa Cuéllar, 2001).
Emerging leaders may be unfamiliar with basic tenants of union discipline, such as an
agreement that the executive committee not reveal their differences of opinion to
management, but rather to work them out among themselves. This lack of experience
produces vulnerabilities. Spies can be planted, leaders can be manipulated against one
another, and personal preoccupations can easily subvert longer term goals and strategies.
Without having internal mechanisms for resolving internal difficulties, many new
executive committees become quickly vulnerable to divisive subterfuge.

Solidarity supporters may discover that some local organizers also lack crucial
abilities or training. Such organizers may have been recruited for their ideological
commitment, not their skills in supporting a coherent executive committee.

Finally, local federation officials may find themselves caught between conflicts
articulated by international trade union structures, including the International Trade
Secretariats (ITS), the international unions, the AFL-CIO Solidarity Center, and non-
governmental (NGO) support groups. Structural theory can also elucidate these differences.

**International Labor Structures**

Solidarity activists should also be knowledgeable about the primary international labor stakeholders potentially involved in local struggles. They include:

1. The International Trade Secretariat (ITS)
2. The International Union
3. The AFL-CIO or similar national confederation
4. Supportive international NGOs.

International labor organizations are quite different from international corporations. The latter more easily employ “class discipline” to present a unified consensus on issues (e.g. free trade), or to support an IMF structural adjustment program for a particular nation. As much more democratic, and more dispersed with less interactive resources, international labor finds it much more challenging to coordinate common positions and actions. Structurally-based theory mandates that the different levels clarify organizational goals and formats to assure coordination; but they often resist.

The ITS structure is an illustration. We have some good studies on the role of international trade secretariats (Levenson, 1972; Gallin, 1980; Waterman, 1998). They reveal organizations with tiny staffs, usually based in Europe, that have elected regional representatives in Asia and North and South America. The European secretariat staff may create special regional programs but more permanent activities must be approved by the secretariat’s elected regional representatives. Despite the democratic character of ITSs, their regional representatives can become entrenched. This makes it much more problematic for local unions and the secretariat staff to effectuate common goals and strategies.

International Unions represent a second structural component of international solidarity. U.S.-based “internationals” are often nationally-based unions that have made adjustments to include some foreign locals from Canada and Mexico. In the past, certain of them have created their own missions or projects in developing nations, at times in collaboration with and at times independent of their related ITS. The UAW has engaged in collaboration in Canada, Mexico and Brazil. Another example of cross-border union collaboration has been between the U.S. United Electrical Workers (UE) and the Mexican Frente Autentico de Trabajadores FAT (See Hathaway, 2000).

A third structural player offering solidarity support is the AFL-CIO and its new outreach center, the American Center on International Labor Solidarity or “Solidarity Center.” The Solidarity Center supports specific organizing projects, and it maintains a small international staff with somewhat more open funding guidelines than those of ITSs. Solidarity Center representatives have played important roles in maquila organizing campaigns in Mexico, Central America and the Dominican Republic as well as in banana organizing in Ecuador.

The final structural element susceptible to cross-border working class solidarity theory is union-related NGOs such as the Support Team International for Textileras
The U.S./Labor Education in the Americas Project (US/LEAP) and the National Labor Committee (NLC). The NLC grew out of AFL-CIO leaders opposed to the U.S. war in Central America in the mid-1980s. US/LEAP developed from a support group around Coca-Cola workers in Guatemala in the late 1980s. STITCH was organized by a former US/LEAP staffer specifically to provide assistance to women maquila workers. Other NGOs such as the Campaign for Labor Rights, the International Labor Rights Fund and the Canadian-based Maquila Support Network offer informational and legal support to organizing. These NGOs have labor leaders on their boards and are primarily focused on labor solidarity. They relate to international NGOs that have broader political and social agendas, as well as with certain groups that seek corporate code of conduct compliance (see below). A final labor support group is the United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) which has promoted the purchase of sweat-free products on the campuses. USAS promotes the Worker Rights Consortium as a mechanism for assisting higher education institutions in verifying that products bearing their logos comply with a code of corporate conduct toward employees (see Featherstone, 2002).

These groups offer varying models of international labor solidarity that differ in their vision of agency (see Frundt, 2002). The NLC approach has emphasized a U.S.-based approach for mobilizing consumers of products made abroad, rather than the organizing priorities of workers within specific plants. This approach has generated considerable public support against sweatshops, yet at times it has lacked coordination with specific unionization or contract efforts. On the other hand, US/LEAP and STITCH, both of which have field staff abroad, have stressed the importance of following locally determined priorities. At times their strategy has held off an international campaign because workers on the ground had not called for one even when other signals indicated ripe conditions for such an effort within the U.S.

Resource Mobilization and Network Theory

A second strand of social movement theory attempts to explain why similar objective structural conditions can generate stronger or weaker movements or organizational solidarity (Tilly, 1978). We might wonder, for example, why some corporate relocations precipitate militant reactions and union alliances, but others do not. Resource mobilization theory offers one explanation--namely that only some groups within a structural situation locate sufficient resources to respond. The focus then becomes the manner in which successful groups are to obtain what they need to grow and achieve objectives.

One key resource that has been quickly identified as paramount for success is a group’s linkage to a “network.” Network theory adds a dynamism to structural theory, and it has become a widely discussed approach to organizational action (see Narayan, 1999; Wellman, 1999). Successful upper class interests could require tapping a corporate network, or forging ties between a company and the state. For the working class, it could mean a network among union locals and internationals; or between unions and groups in civil society at both local and international levels. For the past decade or so, various scholars have discussed the solidarity question with specific network applications. One example is Keck and Sikkink’s boomerang model in which local groups utilize an
international network to strike back at an organizational blockage they encounter (Keck
and Sikkink, 1998). One could well apply this model to international-local labor
networks.

International labor solidarity relies on a variety of network ties. One is the ties
among official union structures discussed above. A second involves the use of pre-
existing local networks as an organizing resource; a third, the construction of linkages
between unions and international civil society.

Labor relationships via the affiliations of local unions to national federations and
confederations; and in turn the affiliations between national federations, international
federations and ITSs form an in-built network. Such networks among labor unions
themselves have long existed as a resource for material aid and political pressure. In
Latin America, they have included the now defunct, unabashedly pro-U.S. government
American Institute for Free Labor Development AIFLD, as well as specific union to
union contacts and cross-border affiliations such as the UE-FAT alliance. As an
international whose leadership has remained very internationally-focused, the UE has
devoted a significant portion of its small budget toward building an international
network. Despite being outside the AFL-CIO, it has worked collaboratively on border
projects.

In addition to union linkages, an equally important resource are the networks that
exist among the workers themselves, and how they tap these networks for support.
Building solidarity often involves calling upon a pre-existing network that can be
transformed into a specific resource for the movement/organization. International
organizers have noted, for example, that a most fertile ground for labor action exists
among individuals with some historical connection to the labor movement. When the
International Textile and Garment Workers ITS organized a maquila campaign in
Honduras in the late 1990s, it soon realized that the activist women often came from the
families of banana workers that had been unionized (Fieldman, 2002). Such family
networks had historically maintained pro-union sentiments. When a church/labor
coalition emerged in Costa Rica to resist banana company exploitation of area workers,
lands and waterways, it depended on the networks created by both groups separately.
Although some church networks retain a conservative orientation, they have experienced
“conversion” toward labor concerns when corporate practices threaten to reduce church
memberships through lay-offs, displacement, and environmental damage (Emáus, 1998).
Other types of pre-existing social networks within the community can also be vital, such
neighborhood associations, youth groups, and consumer activists. Among the
presentations, we will hear important examples, such as the local support network for
workers that organized in the Kukdong case in Mexico. Such groups can be mobilized
to help other union formations.

Finally, international NGO networks are also key for cross-border action. In
addition to groups like US/LEAP and STITCH, a plethora of organizations exist that
champion issues for specific countries, such as the Committee in Solidarity with the
People of El Salvador (CISPES), the Nicaragua Network, Witness for Peace, the
Network in Solidarity with the People of Guatemala (NISGUA), and the Campaign for
Labor Rights etc. When properly focused, these organizations strengthen the solidarity
campaigns by adapting their specific cause-related activities to focus on what the workers
seek. On certain campaigns, they have turned out substantial numbers of network
supporters to leaflet stores, picket consulates, and lobby officials. USAS has been most effective at mobilizing student networks for anti-sweatshop support, and clearly has made a major difference in corporate identification of its sourcing factories and implementation of third-party monitored corporate codes. It some campaigns, such as Kukdong, the threat of losing the student market has offered a substantial rationale for union recognition and contract settlement. USAS has also created a campus network for other union actions such as living wage campaigns.

Other international NGOs also fund local groups that have a labor interest. Currently in Central America, foreign funders have supported educational and health-based programs of various women’s groups in maquila areas. A more contested area has been the NGOs that monitor company codes of conduct (see Compa, 2002; MSN, 2002 for evaluation). While network collaboration with such groups contains pitfalls, as an organizing campaign develops these networks also deserve attention as potential allies under certain conditions.

Network Issues

For many analysts today, a key network question centers around a group’s ability to mobilize resources via its various network contacts. Therefore a measurable test of labor solidarity could be the degree to which a local union committee is able to summon assistance via its international union or NGO linkages. Such assistance could range from letters of support exerting political pressure to visiting delegations to direct material assistance. It could include actions taken abroad such as pressure on corporate boards or information campaigns aimed at retail consumers. The degree of support might be converted into quantitative measures, or matrix of various indices and types of assistance. Such studies might reveal the extent and manner in which types of solidarity are affected by the orientation of international network leaderships. Descriptive studies could produce parallel results, for example documenting the modifications in international support when the Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees (UNITE) changed leadership in 2001. The international union devoted greater attention to domestic organizing campaigns, and committed fewer material resources to international network action.

A related question is the manner in which a network aids a local committee to generate its own resources internally. This question could be analyzed utilizing hermeneutic data describing certain ITS-created regional programs. The intention of these programs is to provide local campaigns with sufficient seed resources to build a sustainable organization. Wealthier ITS members who reviewed and approved seed program funding believed that in order to avoid dependency, at some point the local committee must learn to fly on its own. For example, following the belief that local organizing struggles must become self-sufficient at an earlier rather than later stage the ILT program on maquila organizing had very strict rules regarding local contribution requirements. The ITS held that local federations must soon cover their own transportation and telephone expenses. Such rules make sense as principles for avoiding the potential manipulation of outside influence. Rigidly applied, however, they lead to local misunderstandings and prematurely end potentially viable organizing efforts. Some contexts require lengthy outside commitments without immediate pay off. Some dependency is difficult to avoid, but other benefits accrue.
Finally, local committees that depend on networks as a resource may sometimes discover that they function at cross-purposes. Organizers may face conflicting pressures as they seek to maintain relations with the local union executive committee, relations with the sponsoring federation, and interventions by representatives from international unions and support network. Resources and funding play an important part of these relationships, such as what transport is available, what cell phones have more time, what funding is assured to feed potential union recruits, i.e. the practical necessities that enable the local committee to function with some independence. Organizers may receive direct assistance from international representatives, but this may be withdrawn abruptly, or given out inequitably. Organizers may then wonder why, for example, they receive transport aid from an international union rep, but not from an ITS rep or the local federation.

Reflexivity and Identity

The third consideration for building solidarity comes from the interactional process of identity formation stressed by New Social movement theorists. As Habermas, 1984, 1989, and other authors have described, movements also emerge in public space outside of state and market relations (see also Snow and Benford, 1988; Snow and McAdam, 2000). First, individuals, and then groups react to different aspects of reality, as guided by their reflective consciousness concerning such needs as peace and ecological balance. Their public actions are often more symbolic than practical, more an assertion of identity than an attempt to achieve a durable organization. Nevertheless, the theoretical debate over these newer social movements has opened the way for solidarity activists to devote more attention to the subjective aspects of cross-border labor support. USAS and anti-globalization activists have tapped symbolic expressions and subjective feelings to challenge objective inequalities (Barlow and Clarke, 2001; Klein, 2000; Featherstone, 2002). In developing nations, we have various studies that apply new social movement theory to explain local activism (in Latin America, Escobar and Alvarez, 1992; Alvarez, 1998).

The reflexive awareness of U.S. students concerning the exploitative conditions of workers who produce products bearing university insignia and products endorsed by college athletic teams has created strong solidarity sentiments. With some success, the Solidarity Center; International unions such as UNITE and NGOs like US/LEAP, STITCH and others have attempted to channel these sentiments to coincide with organizing campaigns in developing countries, as we will hear.

Third world workers warmly welcome and resonate with symbolic support. They understand the importance of global campaigns. Nevertheless, they also experience reservations, such as:

1. Fear that international solidarity is really another form of imperialistic control from above, even when under trade union auspices
2. Confusion over the role of women and appropriate gender relations in organizing actions
3. Dispute over the normative expectations of union functions.
Strictly speaking, only the second of these is outside traditional state-market relations. Each, however, illustrates the more subjective responses encountered in solidarity work, and each is often expressed symbolically and reflexively in public space, at times when it is unanticipated by traditional solidarity approaches.

*Imperialistic Control*

International solidarity builds from historical experience. In Latin America, several ITSs, certain U.S. international unions and the AFL-CIO through its AIFLD program all suffered from their past linkages to imperial U.S. foreign policy. The memory of these linkages lingers even if the structure and leadership do not. An example of collective recollection occurred in 2002 when the U.S. played a role in the attempted coup of President Chavez in Venezuela. A significant portion of that nation’s major union confederation, opposed Chavez. When Solidarity Center representatives held meetings with confederation leadership, they were criticized by US solidarity groups for repeating the traditional AIFLD role.

But even when local unions are clear that international labor representatives are not spokespersons for the U.S. State Department, they may be less clear about the agenda and intentions of U.S. unions and NGOs, suspecting that their primary worry is the loss of U.S. jobs, or the desire to control union affairs. They negatively react to a “go it alone” American style, and similar international staff tendencies to assert northern strategies. At times international reps appear to share ideas with trusted allies, but make less attempt to communicate with labor activists who have different perspectives. Even international union leaders are in insufficient contact with leaders from the Solidarity Center and the ITS regarding coordination of approaches and clarification on areas of disagreement. This partially explains the cool reception by some Central American unions to offers of labor support. Certain unions have also grown suspicious about corporate campaigns, especially when such campaigns are launched without sufficient communication with workers affected. This happened in Honduras and Nicaragua in connection with some NLC campaigns. Even U.S. NGOs interested in labor issues such as the Campaign for Labor Rights, the Nicaragua Network, Witness for Peace etc. have grown to value the importance of local agency, communication and collaboration, following approaches taken by US/LEAP and STITCH.

At stake as well is the issue discussed above in regard to networks: the manner in which programs are funded and then the funding withdrawn. At the level of subjectivity, locals are not always clear about the differing philosophies that exist among labor internationals or ITSs. This confusion may prevent local leaders from fully reviewing outside programs to test potential applicability, or remembering to share information with supportive international representatives. Likewise, labor-based NGOs often express deep frustration that local confederation leaders do not share information with them concerning recent campaign or organizing developments. The same can be said for other “stakeholders” from international unions or the AFL-CIO. In building solidarity, all participant groups must seek to understand more about the “symbolic resistance” that local federation activists have toward such communication.

*Gender Relations*
Gender identity and gender considerations are crucial for solidarity actions to succeed. Historically in Latin America, men have tended to dominate organizational action. Solidarity activists must consider ways in which gender participation can be brought into balance. In addition, at a time when they often face many in-home demands, women need to develop greater self-confidence in their organizational abilities.

Often gender is at play when local organizers face difficulties interacting with executive members of a federation that has had long experience fighting major battles in traditional settings. Federation officials may be accustomed to a male-dominated, hierarchical processes that leave little room for collaborative conceptualizing and strategizing support for long-term organizing. They may view recently-hired organizers as temporary, green, and while well-intentioned, not attuned to larger political realities; or at least this is how the organizers experience their reception (Traub-Werner, 2001). For example in an organizing campaign, when women experience what they take to be a dismissal of their concerns about family relations, they may not react directly but rather through indirect expressions of frustration. Understanding this, cross-border organizers linked with STITCH have helped women to cultivate their sense of identity, to persistently articulate their needs, and to take autonomous action.

Union Identity

A related aspect of identity is how workers see themselves as trade unionists. What often happens after the initial organizing effort is that participants easily fall into divisiveness. They may experience some measure of success without sufficient anticipation of the challenge ahead. Few mechanisms (or available time schedules) enable them to self-educate, accommodate their differences, and deal with the considerable company manipulations to, threaten their families, buy them off and divide them, etc. As Fieldman, 2002, noted concerning difficulties the ITGWLF maquila campaign faced in Guatemala, “the attack against the workers was way off the scale of what employers normally direct against us. It terrorized the workers and they used this fear to prevent other potential actions.” Solidarity activists are studying fresh approaches to these challenges.

Essential for solidarity is that the organizers themselves also have a clear identity. New work by younger scholars on labor organizing (Anner, 2001; Armbruster, 1999; Bonovitch, 1994) offer some guidance. We also have learned more about union cultures of solidarity and subjectivity in organizing approaches (see Bonfrenbenner, 1998). Organizers may be adept at conceptualizing strategies, supporting in-house visits, and working out a plan for expanding membership; but they also must be skilled in personal relations, including factoring in their own roles and biases. Those guiding successful leadership must be clear about their own role viz. their sponsoring federation.

Finally, in terms of identity, local federation officials themselves feel caught between conflicting approaches between the four groups noted above: the ITS, the international union, the solidarity center, and NGO support groups. Although union locals are not engaged in immediate organizing, they may be sponsoring such organizing. They know funding and resources are at stake, and are unsure how to negotiate that in relationship with their other priorities, which include supporting current contracts and membership as well as political obligations. FESTRAS found itself in this position relative to the maquila organizing campaign in Guatemala that it sponsored.
At times local federations blame the AFL-CIO for intervening or supporting a struggle sponsored by another federation, but not one of their own. This can happen even though they did not have sufficient time to explore a way to utilize a Solidarity Center or ITS initiative. They also may not know how to best negotiate among the various NGO labor support groups. At times, they may be persuaded by one, then by another with a different approach to an international campaign. They react by playing out in symbolic form conflicts among themselves that tend to destabilize organizing efforts. International activists are counseled to avoid choosing sides in these symbolic conflicts, even when they prove useful in clarifying divisive realities.

Conclusions

I have drawn on three strands of social movement theory to lay out important components of building international solidarity: structure, network and reflexive identity. Each one deserves our attention as we examine the cases that follow. Solidarity includes a comprehension of the immediate class situation of a particular struggle. This includes both the arrangements of dominant class exploitation and the hierarchies of labor organization at local and international levels. Solidarity’s objective is to pinpoint those structural elements most salient for exerting appropriate campaign pressure. Of course, solidarity is always threatened by the strength and manipulations of the dominant classes and corporate structures, which unleash brutal repression at times. But if the goal of international solidarity is a strong, durable campaign, supporters ought keep in mind that solidarity does not develop without an on-ground organizing effort led by local leaders.

Secondly, we discovered that a primary solidarity resource is the mobilization of pre-existing networks. These can extend from informal labor-related and family networks to broad international networks summoned by international unions and NGO organizations. Network functions can be disrupted by a go it alone “American” approach, as well as the uneven and/or rigid application of support and funding guidelines. Solidarity leaders must struggle to minimize conflicts among international supporters, for example an ITS, an international union, an international labor NGO; as well as to improve coordination and communication among all stakeholders.

Finally, at the subjective level, Solidarity proponents have successfully tapped the symbolic expressions of student concern over sweatshops. Solidarity can be enhanced by sensitivity to gender differences, both a simple and complicated objective. Activists need to avoid situations where union locals feel caught between competing claims, unable to articulate their own sensibilities. The three elements of movement theory, structure, network, and reflexive identity, can thereby guide international support.

1 While Anner has documented cases of detrimental labor dependency in El Salvador, other studies have shown what happens when funding is withdrawn too early in other contexts. Murray, 1997, shows how the withdrawal of payment for tree plantings in Haiti had disastrous environmental consequences. Lecomte and Krishna, 1997 argue that a ten-year funding commitment is required for sustainable community development in the Sahel.

2 Based on interviews in 2002 with Robert Perillo, US/LEAP; Laura Podolski, STITCH; and in 2001, Gilberto Garcia, CEA L.
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