and its resistance to the power imposed by Pittston and the legal establishments. Chapter 7 is titled “Lawbreaking” and emphasizes the resistance techniques employed by UMWA members.

Chapter 8 begins the situational analysis and notes that different explanations can be posited about the actions of the participants. Chapter 9 follows by examining the “domestication” of the resistance efforts, which is further analyzed in Chapter 10. Chapter 11 concludes the book but is more allegorical in nature than a true theoretical summary. Its purpose is perhaps best seen as the summary of the morality tale, rather than an academic conclusion, as its focus is on the outcomes of the strike and the effect on the participants.

Although the book does not establish itself as a simple chronicle of the strike, the richness it develops as a constructed tale of resistance to power and authority does just that. Embodied in the book are chronological events, time lines, legal judgments, interviews, and all the other aspects that situational analysis requires but that also provide an accurate historical account of the strike. The book fulfills its own stated goals, and, through that action, provides a depth of information about the strike, its actors, and its effects.

Robert C. Hoell
Georgia Southern University

Labor Relations: Striking a Balance
John W. Budd

I had not used a textbook in my labor relations course for nearly a decade. So, when I received the promotional materials for John W. Budd’s new textbook, Labor Relations: Striking a Balance, I wondered what might be so “new” about this one. In his preface, Budd asserts that “traditional labor relations textbooks are dominated by rich descriptions of the how, what, and where of the major labor relations processes. But what’s missing is the why” (p. v). That was enough to convince me to review the book for adoption. After an initial review, I adopted it and am glad I did. The text exceeded my expectations in many ways, especially in addressing why questions. Having prepared a course that I am now delivering using the text, I offer this review.

Budd “presents labor relations as a system for striking a balance between the employment relationship goals of efficiency, equity, and voice, and between the rights of labor and management” (p. v). Any text in its first edition is bound to have some rough edges, and this one does, but overall Budd warrants acclaim on two main counts. First, the text is comprehensive, well-documented, readable, and theoretically and empirically sound—of the quality we have come to expect from the University of Minnesota’s Industrial Relations Center. Second, he has succeeded masterfully in going beyond the what and how, encouraging students to confront the why and equipping them with the tools to do so with his emphasis on “striking a balance.”
Organization of the text is straightforward. Part One introduces student to the topic of labor relations, articulates the author’s point of view on the subject matter, provides alternative points of view, and gives students a framework for evaluating the material that follows. Part Two—“The U.S. New Deal Industrial Relations System”—includes chapters on history, law, organizing, bargaining, dispute resolution, and contract administration. Part Three—“Issues for the 21st Century”—includes chapters on workplace flexibility and employee involvement, globalization, comparative labor relations, and concludes with a chapter about the future of U.S. labor relations.

Some highlights. After a thoughtful articulation of his “striking a balance” framework in the first chapter, Budd leaps boldly to the question “Labor Unions: Good or Bad?” in Chapter 2. At first blush, tackling this question before mastery of the subject matter might seem disconcertingly premature. But it works. Budd gives an overview of the empirical evidence on the question What Do Unions Do? (Freeman and Medoff, 1984) and juxtaposes it with views on the labor problem from alternative schools of thought (neoclassical economics, human resource management, industrial relations, and critical industrial relations). Next he presents alternative theories of the labor movement, including several well-chosen excerpts from major theorists. It is all pretty heady stuff that, as introductory material, could easily be intimidating for many students, but it is presented in such a compelling fashion that it serves as a wonderful foundation for introducing the subject matter. From the outset, Budd simultaneously conditions students to ask the tough why questions and provides them the analytical tools for answering them. Even in Part Two—the New Deal labor system—Budd peppers the material with rich illustrations, excerpts, vignettes, and cases that continually go beyond the who, what, how, when, and where, encouraging students to question and examine the why. Part II forms the core of the text and, in content, is most similar to traditional labor relations texts. In Part Three, the chapters on workplace flexibility, globalization, and comparative labor relations are exceptionally well done. The text comes with the standard supplements—competently developed test bank, lecture notes, and powerpoints. But it also comes with access to a veritable treasure trove of Budd’s teaching materials including cases, assignments, and classroom exercises.

There are a few rough spots. Consider Chapter 3, “Labor Relations Outcomes: Individuals and the Environment.” Ironically, it is in this chapter that Budd presents a traditional model of an industrial relations system. While the model is presented competently, it is excruciatingly complex and, rather than giving students an appreciation of systems theory, it almost seems calculated to turn students off. Later in the chapter Budd offers an “Introduction to Business Ethics.” This section seems disconnected from the rest of the text. While it is actually a very good introduction to ethical theory, it is not effectively integrated into either the chapter itself or the rest of the book. To be sure, Budd repeatedly confronts moral and ethical issues throughout the text, but he never really returns to the framework presented here in doing so. The few other rough spots in the book seem to be of this type. Sections that are competently presented, but not sufficiently connected to the material around them. But that is what second and third editions are for.
It is worth noting that one of Budd’s senior colleagues in the University of Minnesota’s Industrial Relations Center is John Fossum, author of the leading labor relations text, *Labor Relations: Development, Structure, Processes*. Ironically, it is Fossum’s structure and processes approach—industrial relations systems theory and its “web of rules” (Dunlop, 1958)—against which Budd rebels. Where Fossum is the master of the what and how issues, Budd goes beyond to stress the why. Instructors familiar with Fossum’s text might want to compare and contrast the two. Those comfortable with Fossum should know that he likely has, at the very least, one more good edition in him before he retires. Those who are using other texts or, like me, no text at all, should consider Budd.

So, how does it come to pass that a junior colleague publishes a competing text with a senior departmental colleague using the very same publisher? It’s simple. John Fossum recommended John Budd to McGraw Hill/Irwin. That is an impressive recommendation. I suspect Professor Fossum’s text will continue to lead the market for some time, but that in subsequent editions, John Budd’s *Labor Relations: Striking a Balance*, may well prove to be a worthy successor.

Hugh D. Hindman
Appalachian State University
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**Reorganizing the Rust Belt: An Inside Study of the American Labor Movement**

Steven Henry Lopez

This book purportedly is a study of the trials and tribulations of organized labor in the United States with particular emphasis on the Pittsburgh area. This is certainly an interesting topic worthy of some investigation. Organized labor in the Midwest has taken quite a hit as structural changes away from manufacturing employment (though not necessarily manufacturing) and capital mobility to other states and nations have eroded the traditional union employment base. Union membership in Ohio and Pennsylvania is down to 16.7 and 15.1 percent, respectively (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004a). Unions have begun to react to these changes by trying to organize workers in service sectors that heretofore have not been heavily unionized.