



Defying the Sweatshop, Sociologically Speaking

Steve Sacco

FROM MACHILADORAS TO MY WALLET

It's one of those contemporary things everyone's heard of, but not many people have the details—a lot like Bigfoot or the exact origins of Thanksgiving. It's something we all know about, but you'd have to be pretty lucky or pretty driven, or both, to really learn the whole story on the matter.

I'm talking here about sweatshops. A sweatshop is the term coined to refer to a working environment (usually a factory) in which working conditions are inhumane and terribly uncomfortable. Usually, the typical symptoms of a sweatshop include long drawn out hours without enough breaks, poor ventilation, dangerous machines and other hazardous health conditions, low wages, usually those far below the living wage (or the minimum amount of income one needs to be able to live), and abuse of workers by management such as verbal abuse, exploitation (pregnant women and children of very young ages are made to work long hours) and in some cases even physical threats. Being deprived of the right to unionize is also a typical characteristic of a sweatshop, and in the worst case accounts some people have even “disappeared” or been shot at when attempting or preparing to unionize or defy their man-

agement. Sweatshops are found mostly in third world nations, although they can be present in the lower socio-economic regions of first world nations, such as in New York City's Chinatown. Consequently in some places these sweatshops are run illegally in secret, but in others they are built and run inside the vicinity of trade zones, and can sometimes be out of the reach of local governmental authorities (Kline 2000).

Sweatshops can produce anything from toys to designer jeans to computer chips, anything made in a factory—and the term has even been used to apply to the conditions under which those who pick coffee beans for companies like Starbucks, or tomatoes for companies like TacoBell, endure in the hot sun for far too many hours, for far too little pay. In Mexico, factories with these kinds of appalling working conditions are called Machiladoras.

But why do these horrid working conditions exist and who keeps contracting them to make things? The larger Mega-companies that are based out of and sell to markets in the first world (namely North America, Europe, and the Far East) have made it a habit since the early 1980s to practice what is called ‘outsourcing.’ In outsourcing a company in, say, the united states,¹ will sign a contract with one of these sweatshops or Machiladoras, to make a certain amount of their products using that factory's local labor. This allows the company to save ridiculous amounts of money as it does not have to run a factory of its own nor pay its workers anything near what it would have to if it owned a factory in the U.S. Because of this, modern Mega-companies like Wal-Mart and Nike, for example, own far less property than they used to but make exponentially larger amounts of profit. The products made in these overseas factories are then shipped to

1.[Editor's note: the author's style of capitalization (of united states, Human being, Salvation army, etc.) are expressions of his thesis, and are thereby left intact.]

commercial stores in the U.S. and sold for prices that are extremely high in comparison to what it cost to make them. This system boils down to a simple equation—when a person in the first world buys a pair of pants from one of these stores, it increases the demand for those pants to be made in the factory on the other side of the planet, both perpetuating the use of these sweatshops and placing larger quota burdens on the people working there. Hence, if we remove the demand, we remove the sweatshop.

A common myth about this process is that only some stores partake in outsourcing and therefore some people will only steer clear of Nike, or only steer clear of Wal-Mart, but shop everywhere else. Unfortunately the ugly truth is that ALL commercial clothing stores, and most other companies—be they makers of toys, electronics, coffee, or fast food—employ sweatshops in some form or another. They all outsource and they all contribute to the climate of despair in the third world.

Even if they're outlet stores that do not themselves outsource, they are still purchasing their merchandise from a larger company that does. Only stores selling strictly used items or small mom-and-pop stores who make their own products or perhaps own a factory or two of their own within the united states, are free of this cycle of abuse. No other company, at least no other clothing company (as clothing is the thing most made in sweatshops), is safe to do business with if you do not wish to perpetuate the cycle. Even some companies like Espirit, nominated by the Council of Economic Priorities for a Corporate Conscience Award for moves it made in the name of environmentalism and in the fight against AIDS, among other awards, has been proven to be a contractor with garment sweatshops in San Francisco (Udesky 1994). So it is no surprise that Naomi Kline writes in her book, *No Logo*, that it is "nearly impossible" to find any mainstream

sweatshop free company, anywhere. It is a sad state of affairs. When it comes to companies that don't support abuse of their garment workers, there simply aren't any left.

CONSEQUENTLY, MY RULE (OF COMMERCIAL DISOBEDIENCE)

In light of my knowledge of these facts and of this system of workers abuse, I have set up for myself a rule, which I follow in order that I might avoid contributing to and supporting the misery surrounding sweatshops. I have made this decision for ethical reasons, but it was not a decision made lightly. Like most people I had always had knowledge of sweatshops, and maybe I had even heard some of the names accused of the crime. Nike, Roebuck, Wal-Mart—But like others I did not know the extent and hugeness of what I was up against. Over the past few years I have made an effort to educate myself and learned just what the dimensions are of this issue and after thinking over the context, the facts and my abilities as one man, I came to the conclusion that the only Christian and Gandhian thing to do (as I am both a Christian and a self-proclaimed student of Gandhi's social tactics) was to defy all such companies and refuse to do business with them no matter what, or at least as much as I possibly could.

The idea behind this action, or in-action, is a sort of civil disobedience, normally used against governments or institutions in power during times of war or crisis. This being a business oriented thing and not a government oriented thing, I suppose it's more like commercial disobedience, as we are disobeying the commercial pressure to buy and consume. The goal behind civil disobedience is to use nonviolent methods to both draw the power out of the hands of the tyrant and to therefore show that you are the one in control and not the one trying

to manipulate you. It is a method of taking down tyrants nonviolently—a peaceful way of fighting, Gandhi-Martin Luther King style. The idea is the same with commercial disobedience; If we defy a corporation then it no longer has power over anyone—a military body has no power if people refuse to obey and a commercial body has no power if people refuse to buy. Granted it takes more than one person, but all things must start with one.

The other side of this though is that once these companies start treating the workers they contract as they should be treated, with dignity, freedom, and respect, I will be glad to go back to purchasing their products and will condone the action of doing so on that basis.

When one considers the sociological implications of this rule of commercial disobedience, the first contemporary concepts which immediately come to mind are those of Conflict Theories of Karl Marx and Max Weber, along with a separate school of sociological thought called Functionalism. Marx and Weber's Conflict Theories differ slightly but they both basically state that, in any society, people have "essential natures" and "clearly defined interests," and that "if people do not behave in accordance to these interests it can only mean that they have been deceived about what their 'true interests' are by a social system that works in others' favor" (Wallace & Wolf 71). They talk about certain aspects of society pre-determining the way societies will turn out and predicting the way people will act. For Marx and Weber there is a distinctive struggle between those that 'have' and those that 'have not,' as with the system of capitalism. In time, Marx believes, this system can only self-destruct and with that, the 'have not's (or proletariat) will overthrow the 'have's (or bourgeoisie) in a violent revolution which results in a communist state void of both property and class. Functionalism, however, states that aspects of society (government, business, etc.) each serve different

functions and that these functions serve to sustain "the existence of a 'normal' state of affairs, or state of equilibrium" and generally stresses the "interrelatedness, or interdependence, of the system's parts" (Wallace & Wolf 18). These ideas make us think of concepts like sweatshop labor in either the context of the proletariat just waiting to pull out their sabers and start wailing on the Nike's of the world or serves them up to sociologists simply as an "equilibrium"-maintaining function of the garment industry.

Now, while these theories may be the first ones which come to mind, I happen to think that they are not actually applicable to my decision of commercial disobedience in the name of sweatshop workers for the following reasons: For one, both Functionalism and Conflict Theory propose to predict and sum up all that the Human race is capable of in a few bloody equations. Unfortunately I tend to think that my actions, and indeed my rule in question, tends to prove them wrong. It is my contention that what Conflict Theory and Functionalism are doing here, is taking what has been the case, so far, in Human history and deriving the very nature of Human history from it. I believe this to be a faulty method. My actions in this case, for example, are neither 'bloodily revolutionary' nor are they serving any function other than to respect Human dignity. They are strictly peaceful actions, and have no aim of communism. Marx acknowledged peace as a possible part of revolution but still seems to insist violence as necessarily accompanying it, and Weber would have been more open to the idea of nonviolence as he stressed the value of ideas in social developments; however they both seem to still work within a formulaic construct, and never seem to really grasp the power and influence behind creative non-violence and disobedience, or that societies might eliminate capitalism or certain aspects of capitalism, but that this does not necessarily mean that the elimina-

tion of property and class will follow.

Moreover, my actions are not at all in my own “clearly defined [self] interest” but rather done out of empathy, in the interests of my fellow Human beings. Marx or Weber never consider compassion, empathy or the possibility of the wealthy bourgeoisie (people like myself on the world scene) getting a conscience, as being primary forces in the changing or moving of Human society. They acknowledge them as possible but not as more powerful than violence or self interest—but I do. My point is that they appear to believe that they can derive a ‘this is the only way Humanity is supposed to be’ from a ‘this is the only way Humanity has been up until now.’ And where is the validity in deriving Picasso from a chimp with a crayon? It is a large illogical leap and a terribly presumptuous assumption to believe that new ideas and new forms of everything, from society to governance, will not be further invented and drawn up in the future, I think.

And contemporary sociologists are not without some theories which agree along these lines. Phenomenology, for example, discusses the idea that it is best to understand our “every day” world from as much outside our own experiences as possible, by adopting an outsider’s or stranger’s perspective. So that we understand that the way things are and the way things have been are only products of the way we have acted and are acting, and not some pre-destined formula of Human behavior (Wallace & Wolf 1999). For Phenomenology, the determinist ideas of Conflict Theory and Functionalism not only make trivial the Human will, but also endanger it. In Volume VII of the *Yearbook of Phenomenological Research* (Husserliana 1975), Vincenzo Rapisarda states his professional opinion that “Pressures from the science which has produced the atom bomb, organized crime, international terrorism, anonymity and loss of control over organized political and social forces appear to have further coerced

and blocked the will-power and the decisiveness of individuals for whom the claim has become truer than ever that “the nuclear age has destroyed man’s faith in his ability to control events”” (68). It is logical to follow then that the enormously complex and incomprehensibly global scale sweatshops operate on seems just a little more than intimidating to the average person, especially if they have any doubt in their own ability to change or invent the course of things. This is why traditions such as Phenomenology assure us that, “... the ability to plan ahead which is a fundamental characteristic of the [H]uman race is the foundation of the will and the origin of all feelings, emotions and moods” (Husserliana 66). And that it is my planning ahead in both thought and moral conviction, whenever I approach an Old Navy or J. C. Penny and just keep walking, which is derived from my Phenomenological insight that it is my own will and decisions which will shape the face of everything around me that is shapeable. Indeed it is the self, not the things acting on the self, which tell the self what to do.

And sociologists like George Herbert Mead, in the tradition of Symbolic Interactionism, see the self as “an active organism, not as a passive receptacle that simply receives and responds to stimuli” (Wallace & Wolf 197). He in effect concurs that people take what society and their experiences throw at them (such as sweatshops and their daily decisions that effect it) and interpret what they see in a way they understand, or in whichever way has meaning for them, “a process of self-interaction, in which the [H]uman actor indicates to himself matters that confront him in the situation in which he acts, and organizes his actions through his interpretation of such matters” (Wallace & Wolf 197). Mead echoes the sentiments of someone like Herbert Blumer, who agrees that “individuals point out certain stimuli to themselves and then interpret the appearance of the stimuli

themselves;” for Blumer, Human beings are pictured as “acting, not being acted upon” (Wallace & Wolf 2007). These theories are perhaps more applicable to my rule, and help back up the idea that there are multiple possibilities to what Humans beings are capable of, and of how they can go about improving or moving their world forward, and they tell us that it does not need to follow any pre-determined formula to do so—seeing, as I apparently have done, what matter confronts me and adjusting my actions according to how I interpret those matters, and to no one’s formula but my own.

BUT WHY HAVE I COME TO THIS RULE?

In my own internal monologue, ‘because I must’ suffices for reasoning behind why I apply this rule at any of my commercial decisions. But when calling into question the environmental or sociological reasons why I have made this decision, this is quite another subject. The second part of this is, why haven’t others made the same decision?—A question to be further discussed later on.

First of all, it is possible for us to point to my environmental upbringing as a probable cause of the way I see things today, and therefore the creation of the rule in question. Any environmental aspect of my upbringing could be considered. You could argue that because I was raised within a middle class family (middle class by North American standards anyway) and had all of my needs met—food, clothing, education, etc., that this had, in theory, provided me with both a good work ethic as well as an environment in which I could both learn and thrive, and that this kind of simple lifestyle are all anyone needs to come to appropriate conclusions about the world. However, this alone does not hold up well, as many others have been provided with

the same environment and lack the rule of my choice.

It could lie then, perhaps, in my parents. My mother, by nature, is both outgoing and a risk-taker—she is strong-willed and believes in giving a child a great deal of freedom. My father is quite the opposite by nature, shy, reserved, hesitant to take risks and is a strong believer in keeping a child safe and secure, even to a point of restricting mobility about a city or country. One could argue that any child raised between them would encounter a perfect medium or balance of what was right and what was wrong—just the right amount of freedom and rules, or something to that effect. However I do have a sibling, an older brother, who lacks my rule in question, and this argument therefore also does not hold up.

Perhaps then, it lies in my education—where I was schooled. I was educated from pre-kindergarten all the way to 12th grade within the small and sometimes frustrating confines of Catholic parochial schools. I learned all the same subjects as other students in public schools did, but alongside them I was also educated in the ways, traditions, history, and complexity of Christianity. In my later years of high school, I was also introduced to world religions as well as Christian morality and Ethics. I have had the teaching’s of Christ placed in front of me for 14 of the past 20 years of my life—and consequently I have been forced to think and discuss them accordingly for that time. One might certainly argue that this had a great impact on how I live and what I believe now in life, as some of the core beliefs of Christianity entail compassion, altruism and sacrifice. However, there were at least 15 or so individuals that I know of who, like myself, passed through the same elementary, middle, and high schools as I did, and who therefore also received the exact same 14 years of Catholic education. To my knowledge, none of them shares a similar mode of thinking as myself.

It may be possible then that I was mere-

ly lucky enough to encounter certain people in my life, perhaps a 1 in a million blend of certain persons to have affected me collectively to be the person I am today with the beliefs I have today. The only thing I can base this on is my feeling that many of the people I have met in my time have been, in my eyes, extraordinary Human beings. And while extraordinary Human beings are not rare, perhaps the way in which they were extraordinary was rare. I can count a number of professors, friends, relatives and historical figures who had great impacts on me as an individual. Perhaps then my decision is nothing more than an extremely rare product of probability—that it was only a matter of time before any random person would become a certain kind of receptacle for a certain team of extraordinarily extraordinary individuals. This perhaps makes sense, as I am almost positive there is no one else on the planet who has known the same blend of family and friends that I have known—I am sure there can't be.

There's also the rather shallow sociobiological possibility that it all has to do with genes. We must acknowledge the possibility, at least, that because of some unique genetic makeup I am predisposed to focus more on morality or social constructs than other people—though, to explain this scientifically, such a gene or such a combination of genes would have to be isolated. Genetics being a science, it would have to be singled out using the scientific method in order to decipher whether or not it in fact was the thing causing me to have this outlook on life and therefore this rule.

AND YET OTHERS HOLD NO SUCH RULE

Then there is the more simpler possibility that it is merely my own decisions, being randomly different from those of others, simply by pure chance. However, this may still beg the question—why make

these decisions? Probability would have to suggest that 1 in 6.2 billion are bound to make such decisions at some point, but this may still require a distinct “why.” And then it is possible that it is a combination of all or any certain number of these reasons—any combination of environment, schooling, parenting, professors, luck, or chance that put me where I am today, with the beliefs and ideas I hold today. And so when we ask the question of ‘why am I like this way?’ we are also asking the opposite question ‘why are others not this way?’, and so if their answer does not lie in something I have had (environment, parents, schooling, chance, etc.) that they didn't get, then perhaps it lies in something they did get that I didn't. Perhaps they, then, had a different education or additional extraordinary people that they met that I didn't, or had certain parents I did not have, or anything opposite of the examples we have already mentioned.

However, regardless of what may have caused them to have the opinions and ideas that they have today, the next question we must ask ourselves is, What is it about these questions and answers that dissuades other people from holding the same rule for themselves? Just what is different about our ideas of what is right and wrong?

There are many possible answers to this question, but none that I can truly verify by any means. There are some obvious reasons some people hold, like the idea that sweatshops are not unethical and therefore there is no reason to boycott the companies concerned with them. Or their difference in education might mean that they simply don't know about sweatshops and therefore can't make this decision. Other less obvious answers might be that they lack confidence in themselves, or have more self doubt than I do and therefore feel they would not be able to change their buying habits, make the sacrifice, or stand out that distinctly among others. After all, the odds are certainly against anyone who attempts such commercial disobedience, as we are

constantly thrown ads for these products, and sometimes they are even structured to appeal to us emotionally. This emotional invasion is well-illustrated in the film *Affluenza*, a documentary which discusses how intensely saturated our society and therefore people's individual lives are with consumerism and materialism. Indeed, as this film shows, it is as if once you are born into North American society, there are millions of marketers who begin hunting your wallet down, through all forms of media—and this requires great strength to ignore, deny, and ultimately disobey—especially once you're in the habit, and indeed subconscious ritual, of obeying and enjoying all of the luxuries you can buy. And to wean oneself off of luxury is very difficult, and could be a very probable reason why some still refuse to participate in such commercial disobedience concerning sweatshops. Or, they might be pressured by a parent, group of peers, or political leader (we all remember George Bush's post 9/11 request for americans to do the "patriotic" thing and buy, buy, buy, in order to help boost the economy) to purchase certain items and therefore feel too oppressed to attain the rule. There are some people who may be feeling emotionally exhausted, let down, or defeated by their society and civilization. These people may employ the 'why bother' excuse when cooperating with corporations, governments, and other cultural norms. Believing that nothing they do will actually change anything or have any impact.

And then it is further possible that apathy has overcome some people's heart, and that they, lacking the idea or understanding of what it means to be empathetic or perhaps merely what it means to be in a sweatshop, the pain and despair of it and so forth, has evaded them for whatever of the previously mentioned reasons, and that they therefore feel no responsibility toward Human beings that they never see, hear of, or know about. And then, again, it is possi-

ble that any combination or even a little of all of these things may be contributors to their decision to not partake in this rule of commercial disobedience.

WHAT'S THE GOAL OF MY RULE (OF COMMERCIAL DISOBEDIENCE)?

Let us keep in mind that this rule is also connected to the idea that participation in and support of (and therefore cooperation with and obedience to) any action we deem immoral or unethical is itself immoral and unethical, and by sheer ethics I therefore cannot cooperate to purchase any such items made on the backs of sweatshops workers—so that I am both disobeying the corporation and obeying my conscience at the same time. But as we have mentioned, the ultimate goal of any act of disobedience, be it civil or commercial, is to remove the power from the tyrant's hands and ultimately triumph over them.

However, how does one man doing this ever accomplish such a goal? Do not acts of commercial disobedience require that it be done on a massive scale, with many millions of people to have any effect on the corporation? Indeed it does, and while those who go by this rule are few and far in between (I know in fact, of only a few other people who go by similar rules, and only one of which who refuses to buy sweatshop made products as much as I do myself, that is, without exception). I still hope that in some fashion and in some way, my actions or inactions will inspire others to do the same, or to at least follow their own hearts and fight for what they believe in, whatever that may be. This thought might strike some as either horribly arrogant or just horribly naive, or both, but I think that we as Humans, as social entities, are always setting examples for each other by our nature, and that it is nothing special to do so. When we eat a certain thing or way, when we go a certain place, or say cer-

tain words, when we do the slightest things from the way we walk to the way we go to the bathroom—all of our actions and all of our inactions set precedents for all those who witness them. The only things we can never avoid doing is teaching each other and being taught by each other. It is, I think, the nature of being a social creature.

In addition to that, all movements start with one person—there is no movement which ever occurred by a few million people suddenly acting in unison out of nowhere. One person always must start. Even with something as simple as the telephone—when they were first invented there was no point in only one person owning one, someone, somewhere had to buy one and then convince someone they knew to do the same so that in time everyone could use them, because having only one phone is useless. You need at least 2 for the device to serve any purpose at all and many more if it's going to be a practical purpose. I think anything we do in life basically starts that same way. So while it is only myself out of many other millions who is choosing to fight back in this way, I don't see that as any inclination of hopelessness or silliness of the situation, and I therefore see every reason to continue the rule, as it is the ethical and practical thing to do for the before mentioned reasons.

The film we viewed in class, *Billy Elliot*, illustrates this idea of the individual doing what the individual feels it must ethically do, regardless of the odds or numbers against it. Billy does what he needs to do to be honest to himself and to his ideas, while the world, represented by his father and brother, staunchly object. The world dismisses his wants and needs in the face of its own adversity, and demands that he conform to those concerns the world (his father) sets up for him. It is because Billy as an individual persists that the world eventually catches up to him and appreciates the truth and power in his conviction, once his father accepts him. What must be done,

must be done; the individual is not nearly as insignificant as numbers would seem to indicate. Indeed Phenomenology itself focuses a great deal on the micro-social concept of the individual when referring to the macro—in the sense that society is to be determined and interpreted through how the individual perceives and experiences that society, and on how that individual is perceived and experienced.

Society as a whole is determined by the perceptions, understandings and following actions of the individual (Husserliana 1975). In this way the ideas of the individual and individuals themselves become the society and vice versa—they become one and the same concept, a sort of “Selfciety” or “Socidual.”

WHAT'S THE ALTERNATIVE?

I thought it would be interesting to note here just what alternatives I pursue in lieu of the fact that I cannot shop at any mainstream clothing/sweatshop oriented stores. Indeed I have to go further out of my way to clothe myself, but one would be surprised to some of the interesting perks that come from it.

The most common way is through the use of thrift stores. Since all of the clothing in such stores are used, the money one purchases them with goes only to whichever charitable foundation is involved. The Salvation army's thrift stores particularly often present a fantastic array of unique retro styles which are becoming increasingly popular. Indeed it may take a while to search through the endless racks of options to find anything that suits you, but once you find something, and eventually you do, it's always a great and wonderfully unique piece of clothing. I often get compliments on my pants, sweaters, and t-shirts. This option also has the benefit of being extremely cheap. I once got 2 nice looking t-shirts for 3 dollars.

Another option, if you're not big on used clothes or are capable of affording more, are online stores. These are usually mom and pop stores that make their own clothing and there are many of these tiny stores on the internet which specialize specifically in anti-sweatshop clothing. Stores like American Apparel or Sweat-X are two examples of many other options that are out there. There are also many small online hemp-clothing manufacturers. Clothing made from the hemp plant is expensive, but far more durable than any cotton or wool and because the companies that make them do so because they are environmentally aware, often these stores are also socially aware as well and will sometimes make it a point to mention that they do not contract with sweatshops. And sometimes their small size even assures of this. I myself own several hemp items, including 3 shirts, a hemp wallet and pull over sweater. You can also find hemp shoes, belts, hats and even purses.

Some mom and pop stores aren't just online either, but can be found in your own city. Right here in Oneonta on main street, for example, we have our very own 'free trade store,' a new trend in international nonprofit Non-Governmental Organizations in which individuals in third world countries hand-make items which are shipped directly to these stores and sold for just prices. All of the money made in the stores goes directly back to the artists and workers in the third world—no middle man. The goal of these stores is to give individuals in the third world good, healthy jobs that both pay very well and treat them with great respect and dignity. And some mom and pop stores even sell clothing with "Worker Friendly" tags on them, such as Coyote Moon in Maine (Bole 2001).

Then there is a third, more challenging option. With some thread, a sewing machine, and enough fabric that you can purchase at any fabric store, and maybe a pattern or two (and a lot of time on your

hands), you can make your own clothes. It does sound ridiculously difficult, but one would be surprised. After a while it is actually easy to do, especially if you do it with the help of a friend or person who already knows how to sew. A friend of mine and myself, with the help of his mother who had prior sewing experience, took up sewing for a short time last summer. It took a little over a month, but he eventually made a very nice pair of pants for under 20 dollars. I attempted a shirt, but while it didn't come out right (it was, after all, my very first try)—I'm sure in time I would get better. The point is I feel it is a brilliant alternative to purchasing any mainstream clothing, as self-made clothes both fit better and suit perfectly your personal tastes.

CONCLUDING WITH POSTMODERNISM

I would like to conclude here with something stated in the latter parts of our textbook, in the section concerning Postmodernism. It states that one of postmodernism's messages is that "Human behavior is purposive, and if you tell people that something is going to happen because social laws predict it, they may, unlike fruit flies or crystals, set out to prove you wrong" (Wallace & Wolf 405). While I have not intentionally set out to prove anyone wrong about anything when forming and practicing my rule of commercial disobedience, it appears that while some sociological theories help explain my actions, the pessimistic Humans-do-it-by-formula ones cannot. I have set out to live by my rule; that means an end to sweatshops is only a matter of time.

REFERENCES

- Bole, William. (2001). "Anti-Sweatshop Campaign Mixes Ethics, Economics," *National Catholic Worker*; Sept. 7, v37 i38 p9.
- Husserliana, Analecta. (1975). "The Human Being In Action: The Irreducible Element in Man, Part 2," The yearbook of Phenomenological Research, Volume VII.
- Klein, Naomi. (2002). *No Logo: Taking Aim at the Brand Bullies*. NY: Picador USA.
- Laurie Udesky. (1994). "Sweatshops behind the labels; the 'Social Responsibility' Gap," *The Nation*, May 16, v258 n19 p665(4).
- Wallace, Ruth A., and Alison Wolf. (1999). *Contemporary Sociological Theory: Expanding the Classical Tradition*. NJ: Prentice Hall.

Films:

- "Affluenza." (1997). Bullfrog Films. (56 minutes).
- "Billy Elliot." (2000). Universal Studios. (111 minutes).
- "American Dream." (1990). HBO. Studios. (98 minutes).