Populist Just Transitions

Judson Charles Abraham

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
In
Social, Political, Ethical, and Cultural Thought

Scott G. Nelson, Chair
Shannon E. Bell
Nicholas Copeland
Timothy W. Luke
Besnik Pula

December 19, 2019
Blacksburg VA

Keywords: labor unions, just transition, climate change, populism, internationalism, Antonio Gramsci, Tony Mazzocchi

Populist Just Transitions
Judson Charles Abraham

ABSTRACT

This dissertation argues that the just transition policy framework may not vivify labor internationalism or erode support for right-wing populists if just transitions are not part of left-wing populist projects. Labor internationalism, which involves labor unions cooperating across borders to pursue common goals, is increasingly important as unions strive to work with their foreign counterparts to influence the international community's urgent efforts to address climate change. Right-wing populism is a growing threat to organized labor and climate protection efforts. Some labor activists hope that advocacy for the just transition policy framework, a set of guidelines for compensating workers in polluting industries who are laid-off as a result of environmental protections, will unite labor organizations from around the world and improve their approaches to international solidarity. Progressives hope that just transition policies will discourage voters from supporting right-wing populist candidates, who are often climate skeptics, out of fear of the job losses that accompany environmentalist reforms. However, I question the assumption that just transition policies, in and of themselves, can serve as solutions to the challenges posed by right-wing populism or overcome divisions within the global labor movement. It is possible for economic nationalism at the expense of global solidarity to continue and for right-wing populists to maintain support in decarbonizing areas where policy makers have indemnified laid-off fossil fuel workers.

Integrating just transition policies into left-wing populist politics could potentially make just transitions more useful for countering the far-right and promoting labor internationalism. This dissertation looks to the political theorist Antonio Gramsci's thoughts regarding the "national popular," which Gramsci's readers often associate with left-wing populism. The national popular entails intellectuals from different fields (such as the academy, journalism, and manufacturing) coming together to modernize patriotism and strip it of chauvinistic nationalism. I point out that the original proposals for just transitions prioritized providing free higher education for the workers laid-off from polluting industries. The just transition framework's stress on higher education has populistic implications. Educators, particularly members of teachers' unions, may practice populism throughout the implementation of a just transition for laid-off coal workers by encouraging the displaced workers to cooperate with knowledge workers to rethink nationalism. If workers displaced from polluting industries rethink nationalism in university settings while maintaining their connections to the labor movement, then these workers may in turn reject far-right politicians and discourage organized labor from supporting trade nationalism.

Populist Just Transitions
Judson Charles Abraham

GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT

Climate change renders strong environmental regulations increasingly necessary. Environmental protections aimed at curbing greenhouse gas emissions will reduce employment in carbon intensive industries. Climate protection measures may therefore disadvantage labor unions by eliminating jobs in well-organized, heavy industry occupations. For this reason, relationships between labor unions and environmentalists can be tense. Some labor organizers and environmental activists seek to overcome divisions between their movements by promoting just transition policies. Just transition policies aim to reconcile the needs of workers in polluting fields with the imperative of environmental protection by guaranteeing generous public supports (including free higher education and wage replacement) for all workers laid-off from polluting industries because of environmental reforms.

Some advocates of just transitions are optimistic that such policies will be politically advantageous for progressives. Some progressives expect that state compensation for displaced fossil fuel workers will discourage working class voters from backing right-wing, climate skeptical politicians out of desperation and anger. Some labor activists hope that cooperation between unions in different countries will flourish as the workers of the world unite around the shared goal of promoting just transitions. I contend that it is overoptimistic to believe that just transition policies can assure victory over the far-right or overcome major divisions within the international labor movement. However, just transition policies that involve free higher education for displaced workers may marginally advance working class intellectual influence within environmentalist and international solidarity activist circles by increasing labor's influence within the university. Internationalism and climate protection will become more appealing to workers, and thus more resilient against the right, as more activists committed to these causes draw from working class influences.

Acknowledgements

Chapter Two was presented at the Second Biennial Conference of the Caucus for a New Political Science in February 2019, and was subsequently published in the September 2019 issue of *Journal of Labour and Society*. The research that went into Chapter Two could not have been possible had I not spent a semester studying at Technische Universität Darmstadt in the fall of 2014 with generous support from the Virginia Tech political science department.

Chapter Four was presented at the Symposium on Appalachian Studies in the Digital Age in November of 2019.

Chapter Five was presented at the Sixth Annual Rural Studies Student Conference in November of 2018.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

ACE	Affordable Clean Energy
AfD	*Alternative für Deutschland*/Alternative for Germany
AFL-CIO	American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations
AFT	American Federation of Teachers
BLDTF	Black Lung Disability Trust Fund
CS	Climate Solidarity
DGB	*Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund*/German Federation of Labor
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FFW	Fossil Fuel Worker
IGBCE	*Industriegewerkschaft Bergbau, Chemie, Energie*/Industrial Trade Union Mining, Chemical, Energy
JT	Just Transition
LNS	Labor Network for Sustainability
MSHA	Mining Safety and Health Administration
NUW	National Union of Workers
NTEU	National Tertiary Education Union
OCAW	Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers
OSMRE	Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement
SPD	*Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands*/Social Democratic Party of Germany
TUED	Trade Unions for Energy Democracy
UMWA	United Mine Workers of America
USW	United Steel Workers of America

Preface

On February 7th, 2019, New York Congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez submitted a nonbinding resolution entitled "Recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal." The resolution, which drew intense media attention for its expansive proposals to advance progressive social and economic causes while dramatically reducing greenhouse gas emissions, is notable not only for its policy prescriptions but also for its unabashed ideological content. Ocasio-Cortez, who refers to herself as a democratic socialist and intends to challenge the Democratic Party's leadership from the left (Taylor 2019), hopes for her resolution to alter the political landscape by inserting ambitious progressive initiatives into mainstream discourse. The call for a "just transition," a series of measures to assist workers and communities negatively affected by the decline of carbon intensive industries over the course of the transition to a clean energy economy, is one of the resolution's most contentious proposals.

Although some labor unions have endorsed the Green New Deal (Cohen 2019), other unions have expressed skepticism of the resolution's rather vague language about what just transition actually means (see Stephenson and Roberts 2019; Patterson 2019). Trade union officials representing workers in carbon intensive industries have expressed fears that quick and decisive efforts to decarbonize the economy will eliminate well-paying union jobs and that attempts to compensate workers will be insufficient. Much reporting on the resolution emphasizes unions' negative reaction to the Green New Deal (e.g. Irfan 2019).

However, few commentators have mentioned that an American labor activist with deep connections to petrochemical workers, Tony Mazzocchi, was among the first to propose just transition policies (see Mazzocchi 1993; Leopold 2007). Perhaps returning to Mazzocchi's original proposals could shed light on the conflicts between progressive politicians and the labor

movement. Perhaps Americans would better understand the stakes of the Green New Deal and the seriousness of its just transition proposals if they knew more about the just transition policy's origins. In this dissertation, I argue that discussions of just transitions informed by labor politics and political theory underscore the political significance of such initiatives at the present national and geopolitical moment.

Ocasio-Cortez's Green New Deal resolution is both an infrastructure plan aimed at dramatically improving America's cities and transportation systems and a vision "for America to achieve net-zero carbon emissions by 2050 . . . designed with an eye toward achieving full employment" (Levitz 2018). The document's far-reaching proposals include guaranteeing all Americans access to clean water; ending hunger by "building a more sustainable food system that ensures universal access to healthy food;" providing universal access to higher education "so that all people of the United States may be full and equal participants in the Green New Deal mobilization;" creating a network of public banks to fund clean energy projects; dramatically strengthening workers' rights; guaranteeing a living wage job to any American willing to work; and providing universal, energy efficient housing (H.R. Res. 109, 2019). Most important for the purposes of this dissertation, the resolution calls upon the federal government to "achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions through a fair and just transition for all communities and workers." While the resolution does not provide many specific policy details about just transitions, the document's pro-labor focus is noteworthy: just transitions are to involve creating "high-quality union jobs that pay prevailing wages" and guaranteeing "wage and benefit parity for workers affected by the transition" (H.R. Res. 109, 2019).

The Green New Deal's proponents desire not only to change American environmental and economic policies, but also to transform Americans' ways of thinking about politics,

specifically encouraging Americans concerned with climate change and inequality to abandon the dominant liberal capitalist ideology and embrace democratic socialism. As Jessica Green (2019) has recently noted, the resolution's calls for the state to provide the public with environmentally sustainable transportation and housing (rather than use carbon pricing to encourage the private sector to sell green goods) represents a direct challenge to the individualism of American liberal ideology. John Bellamy Foster claims that the Green New Deal could loosen the American people's commitments to private property relations. The resolution's proposals may not be revolutionary (as some would suggest), but the call for public banks could make Americans more comfortable with the state endeavoring to restrict private property rights. Such regulatory interference will be necessary if society is to protect the climate by preventing Exxon and other oil giants from exploiting all their know reserves of fuel (Foster and Triantafyllou 2019).

Changing settled ways of living and thinking is a critical task for Americans facing a climate crisis and dangerous levels of economic inequality. The Green New Deal may challenge the country's established political consensus because reversing America's reliance on fossil fuels and uplifting American workers will require deep, difficult, and rapid transformations. Ocasio-Cortez's resolution arguably justifies its ambitious proposals by referencing a 2018 report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that says the international community must achieve net-zero carbon emissions by 2050 to prevent unacceptable rises in global temperatures. The resolution notes wage stagnation and deindustrialization to justify its inclusion of progressive economic and social proposals (H.R. Res. 109, 2019). The high stakes of this political moment motivate the Green New Deal's champions. According to Héctor Figueroa, the president of the first union local to endorse the resolution, the Green New Deal is necessary because the labor

movement must collectively "recognize the urgency of the climate crisis" to unify around an approach to addressing "the problems of income inequality and declining labor standards" (qtd. Cohen 2019). Aronoff emphasizes that the Green New Deal must convey urgency because there is little time to resolve the climate crisis. Progressive leaders will have an opportunity to pursue extensive economic and social reforms when the next recession hits, necessitating new stimulus measures. Only decision makers prepared to take decisive, serious action can use the next fleeting crisis to institute crucial climate protections (Aronoff 2019A).

Despite the Green New Deal supporters' efforts to convey resoluteness and timeliness, some union organizers in relevant fields question the seriousness of Ocasio-Cortez's proposed just transition. While stressing their awareness of the climate crisis and its urgency (e.g. Stephenson and Roberts 2019), the United Mine Workers of America's leaders claim the Green New Deal recklessly threatens union jobs while promising unrealistic, unachievable solutions for displaced workers. The mine workers official Phil Smith doubts that congressional democrats are actually capable of passing just transition measures that replace jobless miners' wages. Smith says "it's very important to find out what a 'just transition' actually means and who gets to define it…none of that has been clarified" (qtd. Cohen 2019). Cecil Roberts, president of the miner's union, points out that congress has routinely failed to support economically distressed coal mining communities in the recent past. Given lawmakers' unreliability, asks Roberts, "how do you think we're going to believe that you're going to able to give us a just transition from the coal industry to some other employment?" (qtd. Patterson 2019). To satisfy the miners' concerns, Green New Deal advocates could commit to clarifying their stances on just transitions and explaining how they plan to enact just transitions. The absence of a consensus within the labor movement around just transitions could threaten the Green New Deal's overarching goals of

rebuilding the working class's bargaining power as well as rapidly decarbonizing the U.S. economy.

Reassessing the just transition policy's history could help Green New Deal advocates explain how they intend to assist workers in carbon-intensive industries while simultaneously cutting carbon pollution. Green New Dealers could ground their thoughts on labor protections in American history by reconsidering Tony Mazzocchi's work. Mazzocchi, a leader of the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, developed the just transition proposal in response to politicians' attempts to ban asbestos production and reduce pollution in the late 1980s and early 1990s (see Leopold 2007, 409-414). As a representative of workers in the petrochemical industry, Mazzocchi was keenly aware of the need to reduce pollution, yet he believed that chemical workers should not have to shoulder the burden of environmental protections. Mazzocchi demanded stringent protections for all workers threatened by environmentalist reforms:

> We're for an environmentally safe economy and a just transition strategy to achieve it. We need to phase out toxic substances being used but we have to compensate the workers accordingly. It should not be at their expense. We understand, especially in my own union, the nature of what we produce and we're concerned about it. We're also concerned about our livelihood. And if these substances have to be removed from the environment, we think those who create pollution should be forced to pay so working people are treated equitably in that transition (Mazzocchi and Mannix 1997).

Much like contemporary Green New Deal proponents, Mazzocchi associated his proposals with grand, ambitious desires to change how Americans live and think about politics:

> We have many proposals that speak to the immediate concerns of the residents of this country. In short, we want to redefine what society is all about. Not just for that one-half of one percent who are the richest people in this country. Society should be about taking care of everyone. Everyone wishes they could win the lottery but in reality we all deserve a bit of security…Life should have a meaning and not be just to serve as a tool to enrich the few (Mazzocchi and Mannix 1997).

If Mazzocchi wanted his proposals, including just transitions, to balance the immediate needs of workers with broader political transformation, then perhaps reclaiming Mazzocchi's legacy could help progressives pursue ambitious environmental and economic aspirations without alienating union members.

Inquiries that leverage political and social theory could just as well help Green New Dealers use immediate, detailed just transition proposals to advance long-term ideological and structural changes. In particular, leveraging the work of Antonio Gramsci could help progressive decision makers design policies that balance concrete and universal concerns. According to one of Gramsci's best interpreters, Stuart Hall, one of Gramsci's tasks was to translate pedestrian policy into popular images of a new and better world (Hall 1988, 167). Forging lasting political change, for Gramscians, requires seizing upon policy proposals that speak to the people's lived experiences and using them to enlarge common sense perceptions of the possible (Hall 1988, 170-171). Gramsci's writings show that big change is always multifarious. Enduring political changes never occur only in the realm of politics. Long-term power shifts take place "economically, socially, culturally, technically" (Hall 1988, 162). If the Green New Deal's purpose is to bring about a new ideological, technological, and economic reality by leveraging timely and immediate goals to establish a new long-term consensus, then Gramsci's writings have much to offer Ocasio-Cortez and her allies.

This dissertation is not concerned with the Green New Deal, but it does endeavor to find lessons for contemporary labor and environmental relations in the works of such thinkers as Mazzocchi and Gramsci. I will explore labor policy and Gramscian political theory to find out how decision makers can get the specifics of just transitions right and how doing so may advance progressive aspirations. If progressive environmentalists want to win over organized labor, then

they will need to explain what just transitions are and how just transitions address working class anxieties over job losses, precarious work, and deindustrialization. For initiatives such as the Green New Deal to effect important changes in a relatively short amount of time, its promoters must leverage their legislative priorities to expand the left's ideological influence over the broader society. This dissertation may help them do so.

Chapter One
Does The Just Transition Framework Amount to Climate Solidarity?

This dissertation explores tensions between conflicting goals associated with the just transition (JT) policy framework. When environmental and climate protection legislation threatens the jobs and tax revenues of workers and communities that rely on polluting industries, environmentalists and labor unions sometimes propose JT policies aimed at securing economic benefits for those dispossessed and tax revenue for inconvenienced local governments (Roessler, Uehlein, and Healey 2016). The climate solidarity (CS) narrative, which holds that organized labor must unite across national borders to exercise independent leadership over climate protection initiatives (Hampton 2015, 203-204), attaches three ambitious social justice goals to the JT framework. First, the CS thinkers (Paul Hampton, Jeremy Brecher, and Sean Sweeney) argue that JTs should enable workers and their communities to democratically control energy production. Second, the CS discourse presents JTs as a way to discourage the rise of right-wing populists who threaten progressive social and environmental causes. Third, the CS thinkers see the JT framework as a means to forging an effective labor internationalism for the twenty-first century. Labor activists might establish a new union internationalism by using the JT framework as a platform for pursuing the long deferred goals of coordinating socially and environmentally just standards of global economic integration.

I see two main contradictions between JTs as mainstream policymakers and union officials have conceived and implemented them and the social justice pursuits CS thinkers associate with JTs. First, tensions between fossil fuel-dependent communities and workers' short-term and long-term interests could limit the effectiveness of social control of energy resources for advancing JTs. CS thinkers do not fully explain which workers should lead the struggle for social control of energy infrastructure, nor do they detail how to overcome

disagreements between workers over what to do with the energy system once labor controls it. Second, given the nationalist symbolism of fossil fuel extraction, the JT framework's valorization of heavy industry workers could in fact benefit the far right. Although CS thinkers promote JTs as a way to prevent the growth of right-wing populist parties, generously aiding workers in carbon intensive industries may do little to counter right-wing populists' claims that these workers and industries are uniquely patriotic and strategically significant. An overarching ambiguity connecting both of the aforementioned contradictions is the problem of *who* should directly benefit from JT policies. Should policymakers craft JTs to benefit discrete groups of relatively well-paid fossil fuel workers (FFWs), or should JTs have a more universal reach?

In this dissertation, I argue that left-wing populism may be poised to mediate the tensions between the JT framework as it exists in practice and the higher objectives CS associates with JTs. My thesis is that the pursuit of JTs cannot catalyze a renewed labor internationalism, empower workers and communities, or effect the downfall of right-wing populism unless climate activists articulate JTs to a politically viable, internationalist left-wing populism. This dissertation draws from Gramscian theorists of populism[1] to explore the contradictions of climate solidarity and its goals. The climate solidarity thinkers present JTs as a solution to the problem of right-wing populism, but they have rather little to say about populism's political features and potentials. Gramscian theorists of populism (particularly Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe) argue that left-wing populism uplifts labor by encouraging workers to associate their interests and responsibilities as citizens with the radical democratization of the liberal state. A strategy for

[1] Gramscians depict populists as intellectuals steeped in national tradition who appeal to suppressed, rebellious elements of common sense instincts to inspire mass criticism of normalized hierarchies and chauvinistic versions of nationalism. Populism involves thought leaders appealing to popular symbolism and beliefs to provoke their followers to rethink who constitutes the people, who constitutes the elite, and what constitutes oppression of the people by the elite (e.g. Gramsci 1971, 394-398; Laclau 1979; Laclau 2005A; Mouffe 2018).

promoting JTs informed by left-wing populist thought could thus advance CS goals of overcoming right-wing populism and securing social control of energy production on a sustainable basis by encouraging workers to reassess resource nationalist rhetoric and reconsider their ultimate interests as workers.

JT and CS: What are they and who do they help?

The CS discourse holds that combating climate change is a key interest of the labor movement and that organized labor is uniquely capable of exercising progressive leadership during industrial transitions.[2] Center-left political parties and green NGOs appear incapable of anchoring broad-based social movements and inconsistently supportive of workers, so unions must be the ones to lead societies to sustainable and just forms of economic production. Unions should come together to lead the climate protection movement by leveraging their power at the point of production and engaging in mass protests to unite other actors around a labor-oriented environmental agenda. The CS thinkers say a central goal of the labor and environmental movements should be promoting JT policies, which aim to guarantee tax revenue replacements for communities and income replacements for workers who depend on fossil fuel extraction for employment as environmental protection initiatives close workplaces (see Brecher 2012A). CS thinkers say that JTs have a transformative political potential and may advance far-reaching progressive priorities that empower all workers, not just those currently employed in polluting industries. Brecher, Sweeney, and Hampton rightly acknowledge the need to maintain labor's independent initiative in defining and implementing JTs. These intellectuals are admirably

[2] For clarity's sake, consider climate solidarity's relationship to labor-environmentalism. Silverman (2006) defines labor-environmentalism as unions' efforts to defend the natural environment. I see CS as a subspecies of labor-environmentalism. CS thinkers not only believe that trade unions should prioritize environmentalism, but also take the argument a step further and claim that unions are uniquely capable of leading global climate protection efforts. Unions, so the CS narrative goes, should enjoy a privileged, independent position as agenda-setters for international efforts to avert catastrophic climate change.

committed to maintaining the integrity of the JT framework and preventing anti-labor actors from distorting the concept of JTs.

However, there is an ambiguity in CS thinkers' presentation of the task of defining JTs as a prerogative of trade unions and their desire for labor-environmentalism to assist the entire, unorganized underclass -- to whom union officers can be only indirectly responsive -- with full employment initiatives, affirmative action, and Nordic-style welfare state policies. Brecher's work suggests that it is possible to reconcile the needs of currently-employed industrial workers with the aspirations of marginalized people who want to become well-paid industrial workers. The task of encouraging workers and other stakeholders to work together on JTs for FFWs, according to Brecher, deserves the progressive community's immediate attention. The CS narrative holds that activists should attempt to prevent the shutdown of fossil fuel infrastructure *if* legitimate JT plans are not in place to help the workers (e.g. Sweeney and Treat 2018, 39; Brecher 2017A, 76-77). While CS promotes generous welfare state policies to assist the unemployed and underemployed, the narrative does *not* encourage activists to slow the energy transition until the state is prepared to guarantee economic security for *everyone* (including frontline community members who are not FFWs) that the clean energy economy risks leaving behind. I will contend that the ambiguity of *who* should benefit from JT policies limits the potential of JTs to counter the rise of the far-right. JTs may appease FFWs who would otherwise support far-right politicians, but JTs may also provoke less protected workers to resent FFWs' organizers. The far-right uses anti-union and anti-welfare messaging to benefit from bitterness and jealousies among the working class. The second and third chapters of this dissertation explore the potential of left-wing populist mobilizations to ease the potential tensions between

the workers at the point of carbon-intensive production that stand to immediately benefit from JTs and frontline community members who could be left behind during a fossil fuel phaseout.

For the sake of clarity, a fuller explanation of the concept of JTs is in order. Observers typically trace the JT proposal's origins to Tony Mazzocchi, an organizer for the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers (OCAW), which later merged with the United Steelworkers (USW) (e.g. Cervantes 2018; Hampton 2015, 68-69). Mazzocchi began developing his famous policy proposal, which he initially called the "Superfund for workers" and the "G.I. Bill for workers," in the late 1970s. His union later renamed the proposition "just transition" in the early 1990s (Leopold 2007, 412). Mazzocchi's vision of the JT is specific and bold. OCAW insisted that JTs require governments and employers to provide generous aid for all who lose work during the phaseout of polluting industrial practices.[3] Such aid consists of at least two years notice before any layoffs, "full income and benefits until retirement or until comparable work is found," up to four years paid tuition with full wages for all redundant workers wishing to pursue higher education and/or retraining, and additional stipends for workers who cannot find work after graduating. A JT also requires hefty state compensation to communities that lose tax revenue to environmental reform (Young 1998, 44; Mazzocchi 1993). The USW now adds that workers must have a voice in the design and implementation of any energy transition program. In the USW's words, it "is essential that American and Canadian workers play a role in both designing these [environmental] policies and in the clean energy economy itself" (USW 2014). In short, JTs guarantee long-term economic stability and enable displaced workers to help design their own compensation packages.

[3] While OCAW originally intended for this policy to help workers in the petrochemical industry, the JT concept now usually refers to initiatives aimed at helping workers in fossil fuel extraction and fossil fuel-burning power plants.

Whereas Mazzocchi's vision for a JT is quite specific and sweeping, critics point to the vagueness and weakness of other conceptions of JTs. Many organizations with different politics embrace the term "just transition" and not all of them have the same standards for a JT. The exact meaning of the JT concept is now "hotly debated" and "up for grabs" (Stevis and Felli 2015, 29; Brown 2016). Consider former mayor of New York Michael Bloomberg's appeals to the language of JTs (see Bloomberg and Pope 2017, 260). Bloomberg is a billionaire with an anti-labor record (Surico 2013) who funds philanthropic initiatives aimed at developing coal country, such as the Just Transition Fund and the Coalfield Development Corporation (Leon 2017). Some of the organizations Bloomberg supports do important work, but these apolitical initiatives cannot provide a JT for workers, at least not a rigorously defined JT. Charities can contribute to local development, but they cannot grant workers the dignity and independent voice on the job they need to arrange acceptably munificent, industry-wide transitional compensation. Giving money to startups that may hire unemployed miners is different from directly compensating redundant workers. Bloomberg's work risks hollowing out the meaning of JTs and, rather than easing the establishment of a post-coal economy in the U.S.'s coal country, often provokes Appalachians' ire (e.g. Mullins 2017). Richard Branson, a billionaire transportation magnate, similarly abuses the concept of JT by using it to implicitly argue *against* labor unions. The Just Transition Centre and the B Team feature Branson prominently in their video "A Net-Zero Future that Leaves No One Behind." The video depicts Branson as the hero of green energy and creator of JTs (see Just Transition Centre 2017). Sean Sweeney and John Treat note that the B Team (headed by Branson) goes to great lengths to avoid using the word "union" in their videos, even when discussing negotiations between workers and employers (2018, 28-29).

Opportunistic, liberal political parties, businesses, and NGOs may try to dilute JTs because they could find the JT's class orientation threatening. Hampton warns that if center-left political actors like the UK's New Labour define the conditions and pace for a JT, then they will water-down Mazzocchi's original vision of a G.I. Bill for Workers that guarantees economic stability to workers displaced by environmental reforms (Hampton 2015, 74). Although labor cannot afford to abandon electoral politics, writes Brecher, politicians cannot be the primary agents of a JT. He envisions state-labor cooperation occurring organically as workers themselves vet and train candidates, draft legislation, and control legislators' attention through militant protests (Brecher 2017B, 71). Sweeney writes that activists must firmly counter state and local governments' attempts to set emissions reduction targets without first setting plans for JTs and job creation (Sweeney and Treat 2019, 39). The CS discourse claims that organized labor should set and enact the agenda for a fossil fuel phaseout and JTs. Mainstream political parties, NGOs, and state bureaucrats will not reliably follow through with implementing robust JTs unless unions goad them into so doing. Labor activists cannot see any parties as permanent allies until the parties are directly accountable to working people (Brecher 2012B, 201 and 164-165; Sweeney and Treat 2018, 20-23).

According to the CS narrative, organized labor should lead the energy transition because workers are uniquely capable of defending the atmosphere. Brecher's book *Climate Solidarity* captures labor's distinct role in climate protection by distinguishing between "climate alienation" and "climate solidarity." Alienated workers toil to enrich others instead of laboring for socially-beneficial purposes. Climate alienation entails workers producing through their "own labor the greenhouse gasses that are destroying the climate on which we all depend" and thereby misusing "human capacities for our own destruction" (Brecher 2017B, 3). Overcoming climate alienation

is part of labor's essential struggle to overcome all alienation by liberating work from self-interested employers' control (Brecher 2017B, 5-7). Workers undermine alienation by building solidarity, which Brecher defines as broad recognition of shared challenges that require collective action and mutual aid to resolve (Brecher 2017B, 21). Building solidarity requires workers to abandon special interest unionism and instead "pursue their own interests in a way that is congruent with the needs of all" by voluntarily forgoing their immediate interests to advance their class's overarching interests (Brecher 2017B, 50). Climate solidarity challenges bosses' authority to oversee unsustainable production. Workers can withhold their labor to stop managers from exploiting the planet and the people living on it (Brecher 2017B, 19). Climate solidarity is ultimately the conviction that "workers should protect each other by protecting the climate on which our common life depends" (Brecher 2017B, 35). Unions are potentially the strongest climate activists because their "capacity for solidarity" at the workplace allows them to be a "direct counterpower to employers and fossil fuel corporations" (Brecher 2017B, 66).

JTs aim to give labor leeway to defend nature. "Workers whose jobs are threatened by climate protection policies must be guaranteed a 'just transition' that protects them from adverse consequences of fossil fuel reduction" to eliminate "dependence on fossil fuel related jobs" (Brecher 2017B, 19). By assuring workers that environmentalism does not threaten their livelihoods, JTs encourage labor activists to stand up for sustainability by educating workers about ecology on the shop floor, negotiating anti-pollution clauses into contracts, assisting whistleblowers who expose pollution at the workplace, demanding employers make and sell more environmentally responsible products, and erasing sources of energy inefficiency in supply chains (Brecher 2017, 41-43 and 54). Strong unions operating in favorable political conditions

could develop "worker climate action plans" that set timelines and goals for industrial shifts to sustainable production and oblige assistance to impacted communities (Brecher 2017B, 54-58).

Climate Solidarity exhorts organized labor to lead the way on climate protection by fighting for robust JTs. By arguing that organized, industrial workers should embrace singularly ambitious goals and responsibilities throughout the clean energy transition, Brecher implies that the unorganized and unemployed cannot play the same transformative role in climate protection as their unionized counterparts. Brecher prioritizes policy interventions and political processes that may provoke bitterness and jealousy by uplifting some workers more than other workers. Enacting Mazzocchi's proposed GI Bill for Workers may embitter liberals toward organized workers who feel entitled to job security while others adapt to the gig economy's contingency. The journalist Richard Martin quotes an anonymous, eminent Democratic Party strategist's derisive statement about Coloradan coal miners: "I've never had a job for more than five years at a time...Nobody has a job for life anymore. If they have to move, that's part of the global economy that everybody lives in now" (qtd. Martin 2015, 137).[4] Moreover, some argue that JTs could anger FFWs who lose their jobs to market forces *before* fossil fuel phaseouts begin yet blame environmentalism for their downward mobility. JT programs tend to serve recently redundant FFWs while excluding the FFWs who lose their jobs in the years before the JT's implementation (e.g. Cha 2017, 217). Out of work American coal miners sometimes blame environmental regulations for displacements stemming from a mix of factors, including cheap natural gas, global market fluctuations, coal seam depletions, and (to a lesser extent) Obama-era

[4] In a 1990 *Playboy* interview, Donald Trump, who was then considering running for office as a Democrat, had this to say about coal miners: the "coal miner gets black-lung disease, his son gets it, then *his* son. If *I* had been the son of a coal miner, I would have left the damn mines. But most people don't have the imagination—or whatever—to leave their mine" (Trump and Plaskin 1990). Trump's statement reveals that business-oriented, socially liberal politicos can sometimes see miners as too lazy and ignorant to deserve public support. This attitude may limit political support for JT policies.

energy policies (see Lewin 2019, 55; Kolstad 2017). As Americans negotiate JTs for current FFWs, out-of-work former coal workers could express a desire for JT benefits. However, even the most progressive American, federal-level JT proposals do not call for income replacement for everyone who has ever worked in a coal mine or coal-fired power plant (see Pollin and Callaci 2016; Sanders 2016, 253).

Granted, Brecher's climate justice ambitions go beyond providing JTs to support immediately impacted energy workers. He also aims for the clean energy transition to improve the lives of the unemployed and underemployed in fossil fuel-dependent communities as well as uplift women and racial minorities who have been historically excluded from unionized jobs in heavy industry. Alternative jobs "should be provided not only where existing jobs are lost but where potential fossil fuel jobs are not created because of climate protection policies" to help workers who grow up expecting to take a conventional energy job before such jobs become scarce (Brecher 2017B, 64). Brecher thinks Keynesian full employment policies, Nordic-style welfare state programs, aggressive affirmative action policies, and a federal jobs guarantee should accompany the GI Bill for Workers "to provide a jobs pipeline for those individuals and groups who have been denied equal access to good jobs" and use the energy transition to counter the racism and sexism that continues to divide the working class (Brecher 2017B, 65).

It is instructive to examine why Brecher is enthusiastic for Nordic welfare policies. According to a 2011 publication by his organization, the Labor Network for Sustainability (LNS), Nordic-style welfare policy is desirable because it fulfills organized labor's long-standing priorities. The LNS explains that Scandinavian welfare states are relatively capable of undergoing disruptive industrial transitions while maintaining social stability. Centralized wage setting prevents Nordic workers from experiencing a significant decline in pay by moving from

one sector to another. Unemployment benefits in Scandinavia are extensive and replace a hefty portion of previous pay for everyone who loses a job. By promoting trust and social cohesion, these welfare states make people willing to accept an environmental protection agenda and disruptive industrial restructuring. Nordic FFWs, so the LNS's thinking goes, will have faith that climate scientists, public servants, and environmentalists are not trying to maliciously cheat them out of a job (LNS 2011).

Coal-dependent American workers and communities do not have the Nordic labor force's trust, flexibility, and mobility. Research on coal dependent areas of central Appalachia reveals a lack of trust and insufficient social cohesion. The bitter residue of union busting in West Virginia leaves many residents divided and unwilling to help neighbors (Bell 2009), residents of West Virginia's coal-dependent counties often see welfare recipients as untrustworthy scroungers (Duncan 2015), and even West Virginians who acknowledge the downsides of extractivism frequently express conspiratorial and paranoid skepticism toward the United Nations and federal government's intentions toward the mountain state (Nesbitt and Weiner 2001). Under such conditions, it will be difficult to convince people to accept an active welfare state. Additionally, moving from coal employment to the renewables industry is exceptionally difficult for former coal miners because uneven investment prevents renewable energy jobs from growing as fast in central Appalachia as they grow in other parts of the country, the cost of living in metropolitan areas makes moving burdensome for rural Americans, and jobs in renewable energy are often less lucrative (Frazer 2017; Adamy and Overberg 2018; Harrington 2016). Under these conditions, it is difficult to predict whether or not developing a Nordic style welfare state to accompany JTs is possible in central Appalachia and whether or not these policies would necessarily prevent right-wing populists from finding receptive audiences in mining

communities. Distrust of welfare recipients, overdeveloped skepticism of green Keynesianism, resentments toward unions, an atmosphere of jealousy, and barriers on mobility may prevent JTs policies from shielding the public from right-wing populism's rise.

My research leads me to believe that climate activists will be wise to think ahead and consider how to respond to pushback from the groups who feel left out from Mazzocchi-esque presentations of the JT framework. The CS thinkers aim for broad solidarity, but they may be too optimistic about the breadth of support for JT policies from all segments of the working class. Chapter Two of this dissertation examines in more detail how JTs can be insufficient on their own to overcome resentments between organized, industrial workers with good benefits and job security and the precarious underclass and why these divisions benefit right-wing populists. The chapter investigates German policymakers and unions' implementation of JTs for hard coal miners over the course of the *Energiewende* (a long-term energy transition). The German miners' union IG BCE won security and job replacements for their workers as their government phased out hard coal mining between 2007 and 2018. IG BCE will continue to fight for decent compensation for surface miners and power plant workers as the rest of the German coal industry fades by 2038 (see Perry 2019). While threatening mass strikes to prevent unfair outcomes for their workers, the union engaged in corporatist collective bargaining alongside government and industry stakeholders to negotiate a gradual transition and impressively generous compensation for their membership (Abraham 2017). Although the outcomes of the transition have been fairly benign for unionized miners, the JT has not halted the growth of an economically insecure underclass in coal mining areas of western Germany. Although Germany is not usually regarded as a Nordic economy, Germany has some of the qualities Brecher associates with Nordic countries, including relatively high rates of unionization and centralized wage negotiations in

heavy industry. While less generous than Swedish unemployment benefits, German unemployment benefits dwarf those found in the U.S. (Bowman 2014, 227). Despite some policymakers' assumption that JTs hinder the growth of right-wing populist parties (see Appun, Egenter, and Wettengel 2018), the lack of stable jobs in the Ruhr Valley drives some workers to embrace the Alternative for Germany (Nasr 2017), a far-right party that rejects climate science, promotes coal energy, wants to slash welfare benefits, and lambasts immigration (Alternative for Germany 2017).

Gramscian political theory could help climate activists articulate a left-wing populist politics that overcomes the division between FFWs who directly benefit from JT policies and less established workers who could feel left out of the transition to a clean energy economy. Given that I depict the *energiewende* as an imperfect industrial transition, I ought to specify my standards for a better industrial transition. The third chapter of this dissertation presents normative standards for a just industrial transition. Drawing from Antonio Gramsci's writings, I discuss the relationship between political progress and technological/industrial progress. How does one distinguish between a progressive industrial transition and a reactionary industrial transition? How, exactly, will progressive industrial transitions reduce the threat of rightist populism? A close reading of Gramsci's work on industrial relations and populism could provide the answers.

Gramsci suggests that welfare state and active labor market policies, if poorly implemented, may hinder proactive industrial policy and erode trust among various fragments of the working class. Gramsci insists that progress must involve all productive workers (including unskilled, informal workers) acting together to implement new technologies in a way that benefits everyone, instead of only benefiting some class fragments. Progress relies on a shared

working class culture and common political aspirations. Progressive industrial changes result in production that is simultaneously more efficient, more centralized, and more beneficial for the whole of society (Gramsci 1971, 352-363). During a progressive industrial transition, workers will be willing to make sacrifices to implement technological upgrades at the workplace that lead to their own redundancy so long as doing so benefits society as a whole. Gramsci's work on the concept of progress in industrial relations is relevant to current discussions of JT because a clean energy transition, while beneficial for the whole of humanity, will eliminate carbon intensive jobs. Inducing workers to go along with such a shift voluntarily could require them to develop and exercise a class-oriented morality at the workplace.

FFWs will not be willing to accept such changes without first developing a self-conscious awareness of their potential status as climate defenders -- this is where populism and welfare policy come into the picture. Gramsci urged intellectuals to inspire a populistic "national-popular" sentiment among the masses to create a "people-nation" (1971, 418-419 and 132-133). The national-popular is a progressive nationalist sensibility that encourages workers from many different backgrounds to join and participate as equals to create a new national identity through projects of cultural, moral, technological, and economic development (see Lilmaz 2011; Jayatilleka 2017). Paradoxically, Gramsci was a communist who frequently criticized statism and poorly administered labor and welfare policies that co-opt middle class intellectuals with jobs as superfluous public administrators and hinder the evolution of a broad-based, progressive national culture by entrenching a stifling bureaucratism. The presence of administrative sinecures and a privileged labor aristocracy can contribute to fascism by stoking resentments between insecure middle class office workers, the industrial working class, and the nonworking poor (Gramsci 1971, 292-293; Gramsci 1994, 112-117).

Gramsci's critiques of welfare bureaucracies could inform climate activists' promotion of JTs. Mindful of Gramsci's accomplishments, Stuart Hall laments bureaucratic, top-down welfare administration as a barrier to solidarity and calls for a more participatory approach to social service provision:

> That bureaucratic conception of politics has nothing to do with mobilizationation of a variety of popular forces. It doesn't have any conception of how people become empowered by doing something: first of all about their immediate troubles...Their bureaucratic politics has ceased to have a connection with the most modern of all revolutions -- the deepening of democratic life. Without the deepening of popular participation in national cultural life, ordinary people don't have any experience of actually running anything. We need to reacquire the notion that politics is about expanding popular capacities, the capacities of ordinary people (Hall 1988, 171).

Environmental justice requires social justice programs that come with a degree of community consensus building and open participation in the development and implementation of social programs to rebuild trust in divided communities. A populist JT will strengthen national cultures by improving people's political capacities to cooperate for shared environmental and economic goods. It will project and reinforce a vision of a more equal, modern, and clean nation. The provision of JTs must therefore avoid stoking inter-class resentments or smothering people's capacities for self-government.

Worker/Community Control Over Energy Production

Sean Sweeney defines climate solidarity as workers not only exercising solidarity with other workers as a class, but also exercising solidarity with Earth's biosphere. Profit-driven energy production is incompatible with climate solidarity, writes Sweeney, because market incentives cannot prompt a clean energy transition fast enough to avert catastrophic climate change. JTs can go beyond defending displaced workers, says Sweeney, and proactively expand the public's control over energy policy. Enacting a JT worthy of being called a JT, so Sweeney's thinking goes, requires transferring control of energy infrastructure over to the democratically

accountable labor unions who are uniquely capable of setting the terms for a socially just and environmentally sustainable energy system and developing plans to implement a clean energy transition without contributing to the misery of vulnerable groups. Sweeney believes that democratic control over energy is necessary to stop right-wing populists from drawing more supporters from fossil-fuel dependent communities. However, Sweeney is hardly specific about which workers will take over existing fossil fuel infrastructure and how they will do it. He also could afford explain how climate activists can convince FFWs to support public control of energy resources. In Chapter Four and Chapter Five of this dissertation, I will draw from Gramscian theory to argue that climate activists ought to consider reclaiming the educative aspects of Mazzocchi's original GI Bill for Workers plan and highlighting the moral and strategic significance of downwardly mobile public servants for climate politics. Doing so could potentially help labor outmaneuver right-wing populists and assert some control over energy policy making.

If workers are going to insert themselves into the energy transition, then they ought to practice solidarity with the planet. Sweeney thinks climate change could spurn workers to rethink solidarity:

> Ecological unionism can begin by acknowledging that workers are connected to and dependent upon the ecosystems that are being destroyed at an alarming rate. The same economic system that abuses and commodifies the environment also abuses people, animals, and all organic life. Today's labor movement could benefit enormously from a fresh narrative, one that is deeply ecological and capable of connecting workers' needs to a vision for a truly sustainable society. An ecological narrative conveys the urgent need for radical change and new relationships between production and consumption -- a realignment of society's relationship to the natural world. Let there be growth -- in human development, social solidarity, and building an economy based on sufficiency and cooperation" (Sweeney 2012A, 13).

Sweeney and Treat's 2019 essay "When 'green' doesn't 'grow'" accuses union officials who endorse unsuccessful, market-based climate policies of failing to practice solidarity with Earth.

Governments typically see private investors as the clean energy transition's privileged agents. Neoliberal climate policy presents global warming as a market failure for governments to fix by incentivizing investments in green energy ventures through carbon pricing, gas taxes, and guaranteed profits for environmentally conscious investors. Market-driven climate policy fails because corporations use their political power to suppress prices on carbon markets, banks do not lend enough money to upstart renewables producers, and the investor class cares more about quick returns than environmental ethics. The private sector is not installing renewable technology quickly enough to avoid catastrophic climate change (Sweeney and Treat 2019). Sweeney and Treat say that most unions who actively pursue JTs accept the mainstream expectation that the investor class will conduct the clean energy transition. Sweeney and Treat accept that the JT legislation recently passed in Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, and Spain are steps in the right direction. The writers nonetheless think these JTs treat displaced FFWs as passive recipients of welfare benefits by leaving control of energy infrastructure in private hands. These JTs are merely reactions to the fluctuations of volatile energy markets. They are not a needed means to rationalize an unpredictable market that cannot deliver job security or acceptable progress toward decarbonization (Sweeney and Treat 2019).

The CS narrative holds that JTs should configure FFWs not as "passive recipients of wages or handouts" but rather as "active agents who can intervene and shape" the "shift to a lower carbon economy" (Hampton 2007). Sweeney's organization Trade Unions for Energy Democracy (TUED) roughly outlines in their video "This is What Energy Democracy Looks Like" how workers should use the JT to decarbonize the economy. The video presents a fundamentally just energy transition as one in which workers and frontline communities unify around a shared agenda of ending capitalist property relations in the energy sector. TUED urges

the “workers of the world” to unify around a demand for “social ownership over the energy industry” such that “workers, communities, and municipalities democratically decide how utilities will serve them.” Under such conditions, it will be easier to enact “a planned and orderly transition to renewable energy” while protecting FFWs from economic ruin (Rosa Luxemburg Foundation and TUED 2015). TUED sees the energy democracy approach as an indispensable solution to the problem of right-wing populism. Only an energy system under public control, not one dependent on the investor class, can deliver enough green jobs to delegitimize “right-wing populists and climate change deniers who take advantage of legitimate working class concerns about jobs and precariousness” (TUED 2016).

Moreover, Sweeney believes that American labor unions could develop a more internationalist approach to labor-environmentalism if they assert independent control over energy policy. CS intellectuals envision a “radical, independent, and internationalist trade union alternative” to market-focused environmental policy (Sweeney and Treat 2019). Sweeney suggests that a more independent union movement would prioritize the demands that third world unions associate with JT policies, such as green technology transfers, sustainable development aid from the Global North to the Global South, the defense of national resource and land commons, and public control of energy resources (Sweeney 2012, 12-13; Sweeney 2016). This independent labor internationalism would reject the AFL-CIO’s beggar-thy-neighbor environmentalism, which presents green manufacturing as a chance to boost American exports, and urge the AFL-CIO to redouble their criticisms of Bretton Woods Institutions by endorsing calls to replace the International Monetary Fund with a Keynesian International Clearing Union

(Sweeney 2004, 64-65; Sweeney 2015, 14).[5] Such changes could open more leeway for underdeveloped states to implement JTs (see Gilbert 2019). A revamped labor internationalism could encourage FFWs to look beyond the immediate needs of workers (and the geopolitical aims of governments) and expand the concept of solidarity not only to class, but also to the planet. Sweeney thus defines CS as unions "not just speaking to all workers and all people, but also extending that solidarity to the biosphere and to the ecosystems" (Sweeney and Flanders 2013).

Sweeney leaves his readers wondering how exactly labor will come to accept and enact such a dramatic change. Which workers will lead this shift? What will convince FFWs to embrace climate solidarity and energy democracy? Sweeney suggests that the unions with the strongest grasp of environmental justice are not the unions which stand to benefit most directly from JTs. The unions most accepting of sweeping labor-environmentalist policy, Sweeney indicates, are not those representing FFWS, but rather those representing healthcare workers, who keenly understand carbon pollution's health effects, and those disproportionately representing women and immigrants, who often have firsthand experience with climate migration (Sweeney and Flanders 2013). Who should have more responsibility in delineating the pathways to a post-carbon society: workers who will suffer the most directly from the transition or those who are most exposed to the negative consequences of delaying the transition? Moreover, Sweeney laments that most unions who accept the need for climate protection and endorse the JT framework remain committed to market-oriented conceptions of the JT as a social safety net measure for a discrete group of workers facing an unstable labor market (Sweeney

[5]At the 1944 Bretton Woods Conference, John Maynard Keynes proposed establishing an International Clearing Union that would penalize large trade surpluses to discourage states from promoting domestic development at the expense of foreign development (see Monbiot 2008).

2018B). How does he intend to convince union officers to accept his radical approach to labor-environmentalism? Sweeney encourages workers to wage rank-and-file rebellions against union officials who are too close to the fossil fuel industry. A more internally-democratic and anti-establishment labor movement, implies Sweeney (2016), will be less committed to maintaining jobs in fossil fuel extraction and more open to energy democracy. However, successful rank-and-file uprisings are rare in the U.S. (see Cox 1996, 442 and 484). Sweeney's appeals to the possibility that a rank-and-file uprising could advance transformative versions of the JT framework would be stronger if he further detailed how labor activists could effectuate such an uprising.

Perhaps more importantly, Sweeney does little to explain how right-wing populists gain consent among fossil fuel-dependent communities by promoting resource extraction as a development strategy. Sweeney's contention that social control over energy systems will politically disadvantage rightists deserves closer scrutiny. By symbolically associating the aggressive extraction and export of fossil fuel resources with the nation's strength, right-wing populists offer their constituents a vicarious feeling of control over their energy future. Right-wing populists and their followers reject climate science because they find the nationalist symbolism of extractivism attractive. Almost all right-wing populist parties embrace extractivism, even when fossil fuel extraction is of little economic significance to their supporters (Lockwood 2017, 1 and 12-13). For example, the Trump administration's "energy dominance"[6] rhetoric overstates coal's economic importance but skillfully mobilizes political support in Appalachian coal country by weaving cultural grievances over national hegemonic

[6] Donald Trump's energy dominance slogan refers to an imperialistic drive to gain geopolitical advantage, militarize energy policy, subsidize overextended energy corporations, and patronize supportive domestic constituencies by extracting and exporting as much coal, oil, and gas as possible while funding foreign countries' fossil fuel infrastructure development (see Klare 2017; Foster, Holleman, and Clark 2019, 77-81).

decline with anxieties over the coal industry's slump (see Schneider and Peeples 2018). The climate solidarity narrative should perhaps expand discussion of social control to include not only structural considerations of who controls the means of production but also address superstructural issues of how workers define their economic interests, political responsibilities, and relationship to their nation. Who decides which people and activities contribute to the nation?

Chapter Four makes the case that the original GI Bill for Workers plan contains educative potentials and could expand (former) FFWs' organic intellectual capacities to participate as equals in their nation's twenty-first century social and cultural shifts. Mazzocchi wanted his JT proposal to grant workers displaced by environmental reforms, many of whom lack a higher education, the time and resources for intellectual enrichment and political empowerment through education. Mazzocchi and his colleagues thought granting full income replacement and free college education to workers displaced from polluting industries would encourage the jobless to perform intellectual labor and participate in the emergence of a sustainable society as public administrators and engineers (Merrill 1991, 10-11; Leopold 2007, 413-418). Reclaiming the JT framework's original emphasis on education could discourage the far-right's growth. The sociologist Elizabeth Currid-Halkett[7] (2017) suggests that right-wing populists' anti-intellectualism is popular because rural Americans feel excluded from their country's intellectual and cultural life. Maybe using tuition waivers and income replacement to help jobless FFWs participate in their country's intellectual scene could alter culture war mentalities and dampen

[7] Here is a representative quote from Currid-Halkett: "Bringing up Krugman at a Manhattan dinner party would be met with approval or would be a nonevent that assimilates one into the group. In contrast, while Krugman's subjects (inequality, tax policy, presidential elections) may be of interest to those attending a Christmas party in small-town Pennsylvania, citing Krugman doesn't garner any social points" (2017, 52-53). Currid-Halkett thinks the insularity of intellectual circles polarizes American politics as the information "consumption practices of the aspirational [culturally distinguished] class set up destructive ingroup/outgroup distinctions across social and economic classes" (2017, 196-197).

extractivism's symbolic, nationalist appeal. Gramsci's writings on the national-popular collective will, which some analysts associate with left-wing populism (e.g. Jayatilleka 2017), encourage working class participation in the creation of a shared, progressive national culture (see Lilmaz 2011). Climate activists may strengthen popular consent for a clean energy transition by stressing the JT framework's educative potential to foster broad, active, working class participation in the formation of a contemporary, forward-looking, eco-Americanism.

Chapter Five examines worker and community agency in the JT process. I attempt to build upon Sweeney's presumption that insurgent rank-and-file action can open FFWs' union representatives to the prospects of JTs by thinking through the question of *who* among the workers is most responsible for JTs and *how* rank-and-file activism contributes to JTs. Focusing on the Appalachian coal industry, I have ascertained that the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA)'s leadership is often cold toward proposals for JTs and accepts much of the substance of the president's energy policy. I examine the prospects for West Virginian teachers' rejuvenated militancy (see Blanc 2019) to potentially push some miners to accept JTs and question their bosses' managerial prerogatives. Lending credence to Sweeney's belief that pink collar workers are among the most advanced on questions of energy policy, the American Federation of Teachers endorses and pursues the cause of a "just transition to 100 percent renewable energy" (American Federation of Teachers 2017; Thomhave 2018). For an Appalachian JT to come about organically, the teachers' militancy and labor-environmentalist inclinations may need to spread to other working class fragments.

Chapter Five also draws from the monopoly capital school of Marxian political economy, particularly James O'Connor's discussions of public sector unionism's transformative potentials (1973). The consolidation and stagnation of major industries brings about corrupt government,

complacent and defensive unions, and underfunded public services (O'Connor 1973; Braverman 1974; Baran and Sweezy 1966). Under these conditions, industrial union leaders will reject calls for JTs and the phaseout of polluting practices because austerity and job losses are already immense strains on their organizations (Foster 2002, 130-132). Public sector unionists, having a different relationship to the state, could be in a better position to challenge the state's relationship to big business and compel the state to be more proactive with regards to industrial stagnation and redundancies. A left-populist political narrative that foregrounds the relationship between an active state, clean government, committed public servants, industrial progress, and justice for FFWs might help actualize the labor-environmentalism of Appalachian teachers.

Chapter Two

Just Transitions in a Dual Labor Market: Populism and Austerity in the German *Energiewende*

Germany's energy transition, the *energiewende*, created 4000,000 green jobs over 10 years and cut carbon emissions by 24% between 1990 and 2013. Germany's *energiewende* aggressively promotes renewable energy, which now is said to provide one third of the country's energy production and 55% of the country's energy capacity (Haas 2018, 6; Klein 2014, 131-136; Wilders, Parkin, and Dezem 2018). Among the most celebrated aspects of the *energiewende* is the assurance of fair treatment for coal workers as coalmines and coal burning power plants close. German labor unions understand the need for climate protection and have worked throughout the *energiewende* to prepare their members for the coming phaseout of dirty energy (e.g. Bryce 2017). Analysts of Germany's just transition (JT) policies aimed at easing the economic strain of the *energiewende* for coal-reliant regions and workers emphasize how the German model of social dialogue/corporatism enables unions to participate in designing JTs for their membership (e.g. Rosemberg 2017, 8-9). Advocates for JTs sometimes suggest that other countries and international bodies should follow Germany's lead by committing to social dialogue (e.g. Galgoczi 2014; Mavrogenis 2018). Some view such JTs as a potential new source of purpose and solidarity for the global labor movement (e.g. Rosemberg and Chivers 2016). Many believe that helping redundant coal workers prevents extremism and fosters political stability (e.g. Morena *et al* 2018, 13). Yet, as Polish President Andrzej Duda's endorsement of the JT framework reveals, the rhetoric of JT is not guaranteed to repel the far right (see Osaka 2018). Moreover, the question of who pays for JTs and who benefits from them may at times be a source of division rather than a source of international labor solidarity. Not all countries have the same capacities for carrying out JTs or the same historic responsibilities for climate mitigation (Uzzell and Rathzel 2013).

In this article, I argue that Germany's corporatist efforts to provide a JT for coal workers *have often neared* the labor movement's most robust, tightly defined standards for a JT *without* discrediting Germany's ascendant right-wing populists or revitalizing international labor solidarity. Corporatism as practiced in Germany bifurcates the labor market into high-wage, protected, skilled workers and low-wage, contingent workers. The far-right, climate change denying, and culturally regressive party Alternative for Germany (AfD) attracts low-wage, underemployed protest voters who feel betrayed by social democracy and labor unions (Dorre 2018; Kim 2017; Wilkes 2019). Recent practices of 'crisis corporatism' (see Marx 21 Network 2017) make German exports more competitive and, in the process, disadvantage southern European countries undergoing austerity. Competitive corporatism may work against the internationalist potentials of the JT framework by complicating the Greeks' efforts to implement a JT for coal workers in Western Macedonia. If JTs are to revitalize the global labor movement and deflect the far right, then climate activists must pursue JTs *as populism* instead of seeing them as shields *against* populism. A populist JT will go beyond assisting one fragment of the working class and instead benefit the masses that are disadvantaged by neoliberalism and climate governance. A populist JT may reverberate with efforts to reorient international financial institutions away from austerity as well.

What are JTs and why are they Associated with Social Dialogue, International Solidarity, and Anti-Populism?

One may broadly define JT as the process by which unions and governments create "just social conditions during the transition from the polluting production model to a sustainable economy" (Gil 2013, 73). The trade union organizer Anthony Mazzocchi developed the concept of JT, which he also called a "Superfund for Workers" and a "G.I. Bill for Workers" in the late

1980s and early 1990s. Mazzocchi proclaimed that any worker who experiences a layoff stemming from environmental reforms should have the opportunity to retire early or receive at least four years of free tuition at a school of her choosing (Leopold 2007, 415-418). Since Mazzocchi's time, many unions and social movement all over the world have adapted the concept of JT, but his standards remain some of the strictest benchmarks for compensating displaced workers in polluting industry (see Hampton 2015, 191-192). One newer element of the most robust calls for JTs involves workers' input into the design of transitional compensation packages. Recent overviews of JT standards often focus on workers' needs to participate in the negotiation of compensation packages in order for them to be sufficiently just (e.g. Porter 2016). For instance, the Canadian Labour Congress vigorously stresses that new climate protection policies must have the consent of affected workers and their communities:

> Unions, together with allies on this issue, are urging policymakers to act on our urgent climate change needs while promoting inclusive economic renewal…As green jobs are created, government must work with communities, union and business to develop streamlined transition plans for affected workers and ensure workers can access innovative social support, skills training and apprenticeship programs. At every step of the process, we must meaningfully engage affected workers and communities. Not doing so risks division and alienation from the process, which puts our climate work in jeopardy. To succeed, workers input must be central to our vision of a better future for our environment and our economy (Canadian Labour Congress 2017).

Given the JT framework's heavy emphasis on involving workers in climate and industrial policy, it is not surprising that Germany would be a leader in establishing JT policies. The German corporatist system of collective bargaining allows democratically accountable unions to participate in industrial decision-making. Germany's "policymaking style has generally been characterized as corporatist…Policy is formulated by bureaucratic experts in cooperation with peak associations representing major societal interests (usually labor and industry)" (Hager 2015, 4). In this chapter, I use the word "corporatism" to refer to the neo-corporatist systems that developed in Europe after World War Two alongside the emerging social democratic welfare

state. Such systems formally incorporate representatives of business and labor into economic planning and regulatory agencies (Wiarda 1997, 72-74). Other phrases for this kind of corporatism are "tripartitism" and "social dialogue." The International Confederation of Trade Unions (ITUC)'s Anabella Rosemberg defines social dialogue and tripartitism in the context of JT policies – "institutional processes of discussion among trade unions, employers, and governments" in which "those affected by the transition can discuss, decide on, and be provided with resources to design responses to the challenges of the transition" (Rosemberg *n.d.*).

Tripartite corporatism enabled the German coal miners' union, IG BCE, to secure stability and generous compensation for their members as Germany phased out hard coal mining. The European Commission pressured Germany to stop subsidizing hard coal both because coal pollutes and also because German hard coal is uncompetitive against cheaper imported hard coal (Hornberg *et al* 2017, 18; Klean Industries 2010). The Christian Democratic Chancellor Helmut Kohl attempted to slash funding for hard coal mining operations in the Ruhr Valley (which were not organized according to market imperatives and required stated support) in the mid-1990s to fulfill the Maastricht Treaty's budget requirements and prepare to join the Eurozone. After coal miners engaged in a militant strike and the social democratic governors of Saarland and North Rhine-Westphalia expressed strenuous objections to Kohl's plans, the chancellor resigned himself to negotiating a "corporatist agreement par excellence" alongside the miners' union, the state governments, and RAG (a quasi-public coal company that operated all of Ruhr's underground mines). The stakeholders agreed to gradually reduce the hard coal workforce "in a socially acceptable way to reduce redundancies" from 85,000 to 37,000 employees as subsidies were gradually halved between 1997 and 2005 (Zagelmeyer 1997).

In 2007, tripartite negotiations established a plan for a full phaseout of hard coal. The stakeholders agreed to eliminate Germany's remaining 35,000 hard coal jobs by 2018. The decision came with generous provisions to allow the displaced miners to avoid significant financial loss. Miners received "early retirement with extensive salary compensation" and "guarantees for substitution jobs and incomes" (Hornberg *et al* 2017, 24). In 2012, peak bargaining between IG BCE and the German Coal Association strengthened protections for displaced hard coal miners. RAG established and funded the Ruhr Coal Vocational Training Society, which creates "an individual re-employment strategy" for every affected worker who still needs help getting a new job (Galgoczi 2018, 7). This retraining has an 80% success rate (Rosemberg 2017, 8-9). Young miners who are ineligible for early retirement may choose to transfer (after sufficient training) to a new high-wage and high-skill job in another coalfield or a decently-paid service sector job in Ruhr (Galgoczi 2014, 232-233; Sheldon, Junankar, and Pontello 2018, 33). Despite Ruhr's persistently high unemployment rate, the unemployment rate among miners is only 3% (Morena *et al* 2018, 21). While there has never yet been an ideal type JT (Rosember 2018), the assistance available for Ruhr's underground miners approximates some of Mazzocchi's original standards for JTs, such as early retirement, income replacement, and guaranteed economic stability (Leopold 2007, 415-417); Mazzocchi 1993, Young 1998). Corporatism facilitated the ancillary JT requirement of union input into designing the clean energy transition. According to IG BCE President Michael Vassiliadis, throughout the hard coal phaseout the union's input "made sure nobody was left high and dry" (qtd. "Juncker Attends Closure of Germany's" 2018). Despite his disappointments with the phaseout, Vassiliadis expresses pride for his union's efforts to protect coal workers:

> In Germany, even though we have plenty of coal reserves, a political decision has been taken to end industrial coal mining by this year. The IG BCE always considered this

> decision to be wrong, nevertheless we supported it and we guaranteed that not a single mine workers is left at the bottom of a pit without employment. IG BCE and the entire German public are interested in implementing the Paris climate decisions (qtd. IndustriALL 2018).

The phaseout of hard coal, while important for the economy of the Ruhr region, does not resolve a matter that is more pressing from the perspective of climate protection – the phaseout of Germany's much dirtier and more economically significant lignite coal mining operations and 120 remaining coal-fired power plants (Wilkes, Parkin, and Dezem 2018). Twenty thousand people still work for Germany's coal sector (Heilmann 2018). Germany must rapidly decommission coal infrastructure to reach the *energiewende* goal of becoming almost greenhouse gas-neutral by 2050 (see Amelang, Wehrmann, and Wettengel 2019). To this end, the German government formed the Special Commission on Growth, Structural Economic change, and Employment (better known as the Coal Commission) as a platform for social dialogue between environmentalists, labor, local governments, and capital. In early 2019, the commission's stakeholders recommended a phaseout of lignite mining and coal-fired power plants by 2038 (Morena *et al* 2018, 22; Perry 2019). The commission recommends investing forty five billion dollars in coal-reliant regions to catalyze job creation and improve digital and transportation infrastructure (Goodman 2019; Wettengel and Appun 2018).

Although the details of the compensation packages available to displaced lignite workers are hazy for now, the commission's recommendations nonetheless indicate IG BCE's strength and influence. By stressing their willingness to strike, the strong union representing 80% of German coal workers secured a phaseout date much later than Greenpeace and the Green Party desired (Heilmann 2018; Perry 2019; Prinz and Pegels 2018, 216-217). The environmentalists' concern is not without merit: in order for Germans to achieve their Paris Agreement commitments, the commission's stakeholders will likely have to decide to accelerate the

phaseout when they meet to assess their progress in 2023, 2026, 2029, and 2032 (Kaiser 2019). Vassiliadis expresses satisfaction with the commission's plan, explaining that his union "managed to shield the employees in coal power generation from social hardships from the structural change" (qtd. Perry 2019). Labor is unlikely to accept further cuts before relevant stakeholders arrange detailed plans to provide economic security for all coal workers throughout the ongoing *energiewende*. The German Trade Union Confederation (DGB) demands that in all future environmental restructuring "employment growth, good quality jobs, and collective bargaining coverage are to be guaranteed" (qtd. Kraemer 2018).

German coal workers have won strong guarantees of economic security in the emerging clean energy economy. They won these assurances by participating in corporatist negotiating bodies and, when necessary, demonstrating their strength with strikes and mass protests. This is an impressive feat for the miners themselves, but some decision makers think the significance of IG BCE's accomplishments extends beyond the benefits for this fragment of the German working class. Politicians hoping for an answer to the growing influence of populist parties have embraced the JT framework. Consider the German Environmental Ministry's state secretary Jochen Flasbarth's implicit warning about the climate denying AfD. At the COP 22 Climate Summit, Flasbarth warned that a "poorly managed transition from fossil fuels to cleaner forms of energy and industry will lead to a rise in populist and illiberal forces" so the promotion of renewable energy must "leave nobody behind" (qtd. King 2016). Labor union officials sometimes echo this argument. Luc Triangle, the general secretary of IndustriALL Europe, argues that the loss of well-paying, stable, skilled jobs in heavy industry is what drives the anger behind increasingly influential European populist parties. It follows that states and international bodies must respond to populism by providing hefty investments in new renewable infrastructure

to create decent green jobs and guaranteeing income security for all workers displaced from carbon intensive jobs (Triangle 2019). It is thus not a stretch to see JTs as a defense against the far right. Mazzocchi believed workers who face environmental restructuring without help from a proactive labor movement would find fascism attractive (Leopold 2007, 413). But what exactly makes JT progressive? How does one prevent right-wing populists from using JTs to their own ends? I contend that climate activists must immerse JTs within broader social justice goals to prevent social dialogue from reinforcing a labor aristocracy, fueling contingent workers' resentments of big labor, and abetting anti-labor politicians.

European trade unionists seeking respite from neoliberalism's ongoing erosion of workers' rights and decent work (see Broussalian 2012) look to the JT framework as a way to energize their movement and facilitate cross-border unity. Uzzell and Rathzel's (2013) interviews with union leaders from both the Global North and Global South reveal a widespread hope that the issue of climate change and green jobs may infuse new urgency and focus into international solidarity building. Some union intellectuals are inspired by the German experience of using social dialogue to negotiate JTs for coal workers. The ITUC's Rosemberg includes social dialogue in her definition of JT:

> In brief, "just transition" refers to the need for long-term sustainable investments that create decent jobs, offer pro-active training and skills development policies; ensure social dialogue with unions, employers and other stakeholders; favor research and early assessment of social and employment impacts of climate policies, the development of social protection schemes, and create the conditions for local economic diversification plans (Rosemberg 2013, 20).

Sweeney and Treat explain that the literature on the concept of JTs is so concerned with social dialogue because neoliberals have degraded institutions of social dialogue for the last 40 years; nostalgic trade unionists hope JTs will bring new life to social partnership (Sweeney and Treat 2018, 20-22). Union officials may also advocate for JTs in hopes of fulfilling the long

deferred aspiration of a "social Europe" in which social democratic labor protections and welfare policies are harmonized across European borders to counteract competitive pressures (see Panitch 1994, 85). It is necessary for international labor institutions to promote best practices for JTs and social dialogue makes JTs easier to organize. However, language about social dialogue and JTs is not enough to help fossil fuel workers during the coming green energy transition. For social dialogue to work as a tool for labor's empowerment, workers must be willing and able to hold capital and the state accountable (see Wahl 2014, 50). In what follows, I will show that the goals of JTs and climate change will not necessarily motivate stakeholders to use social partnership for the benefit of all workers or for the enactment of a progressive, internationalist vision.

Crisis Corporatism, Austerity, International Solidarity, and JT

Criticisms of social dialogue/triparitism, especially as a standard embraced by international bodies like the ITUC and International Labor Organization, abound. Some scholars argue that tripartitism is an outdated and Eurocentric concept that cannot work in every country as well as it has worked in northern Europe and Scandinavia (Cox 1996, 423-425; Sweeney and Treat 2018, 19). Activists warn that corporatism lulls labor bureaucrats into complicity with the agendas of capital and the state (e.g. Day 2018). In this article, I follow a different line of criticism. After the 2008 financial crisis, German unions practiced crisis corporatism to legitimize wage restraint, international competition, and deflationary measures, all of which disadvantaged southern European countries undergoing austerity measures. Austerity is potentially the greatest threat to the JT framework because robust public spending is necessary to assist displaced fossil fuel workers and develop alternative employment opportunities in coal affected areas. Greeks will find it difficult to pursue clean energy and social justice given that

they remain under their creditors' thumb (see Smith-Meyer 2018). Although Vassiliadis expresses support for labor internationalism, IG BCE remains committed to international competition and Germany's export-based growth model – which is one source of the Greeks' misery.

German unions and employers have responded to globalization and the 2008 financial crisis by adjusting their traditional postwar approach to corporatism and adopting "crisis corporatism" and "competitive corporatism" marked by deference to financiers and a nationalistic focus on economic competitiveness through wage restraint and devalution of the euro (Bergfeld 2015; Lehndorff 2012). Crisis corporatism is the "tripartite management of acute crisis processes" in which the financial sector transposes "large parts of the burden of crisis management to production, the public and labour." Industry, the state, and workers respond to the financial crises by negotiating the distribution and implementation of the sacrifices necessary to maintain a strong economy (Bieling and Lux 2014, 160). The closely related concept of competitive corporatism involves unions, government, and capitalists working together to negotiate the freezing or moderation of wage increases and cuts in working hours to reduce labor costs, thereby increasing export competitiveness and corporate profitability. German unions began experimenting with competitive corporatism in the late 1990s as the labor-allied Social Democratic Party (SPD) grew increasingly budget conscious. The SPD backed away from expensive, active labor market measures and instead encouraged employment growth through competitiveness (see Bispinck and Schulten 2000, 12).

IG BCE's approach to competition and solidarity is contradictory. Vassiliadis advocates for international solidarity against wage dumping (Vassiliadis 2014) and endorses the DGB's harsh criticisms of the austerity measures imposed on Greece ("Greece After the Election"

2015). However, IG BCE's mission statement, the Berlin Declaration, commits the union to international competition in cooperation with capital (Schulten 1999). IG BCE has been the most committed labor participant in the Alliance for Jobs, a competitive corporatist body established by the SPD-led Gerhard Schroeder administration in 1998 (Bispinck and Schulten 2000, 12 and 21). Union-backed wage moderation is a source of German prosperity. Yet the wage restraint is too successful: Germany's orderly labor relations produce an unusually large trade surplus and impede growth in southern Europe ("Why Germany's Current-Account Surplus" 2017). In recent years, IG BCE has threatened strikes to push for higher wages in the chemical sector ("German Chemicals Union Threatens Strike" 2015), but IG BCE and other German unions' growing wages have not been sufficient to help the European Central Bank meet their inflation targets (Sims and Chambers 2019). Even while prodding chemical industry employers for higher wages, IG BCE remains committed to advancing international competitiveness through social dialogue (BAVC 2015). Panitch (1998) insists that European trade unionists and social democrats cannot truly square their advocacy for international solidarity with their commitment to international competition.

German unions' participation in wage restraint to promote competitiveness disadvantages southern Europeans by deflating the euro. The euro is both overpriced and underpriced. The euro is overpriced because it has allowed the weakest countries in the Eurozone to consume and borrow "beyond their ability to support such behavior," thereby placing southern European producers at a competitive disadvantage. On the other hand, the euro's value is lower than what Germany's macroeconomic fundamentals could support, thus placing German exporters at a competitive advantage and encouraging needlessly cautious consumer behavior among German shoppers (Ezrati 2018). German labor's wage restraint distorts the value of the euro, props up the

"German economic model of exportism at the expense of other countries" and brings deindustrialization and high trade deficits to Greece, Portugal, Italy, and Spain (Candeias 2013, 6-7). Deflation is good for bankers and bad for debtors because it increases the value of existing debts (Schweickart 2011, 105-106). The deflationary policies European officials pursued in the wake of the great recession *increased* Greece's debt burden even as Greece pursued drastic austerity measures, such as enormous wage cuts, spending cuts, and tax increases (see Elliot 2018).

Greece cannot continue undergoing austerity, decarbonize, and protect coal workers from unemployment all at the same time. Greece is one of Europe's most coal dependent countries and coal mining is one of Western Macedonia's few stable job opportunities (Popp 2019). Austerina privatizations of Greece's national energy company and utilities have extended the life of Greek coal-fired power plants ("Coal Mining is Causing this Greek Village" 2018). Despite former Greek Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras's stated commitments to upholding the JT framework (see "List of Leaders and Parties Endorsing" 2018), any SYRIZA government will have a difficult time organizing a JT while undergoing austerity because austerity erodes relationships between union members and environmentalists, decentralizes collective bargaining, and limits governments' abilities to invest in coal affected regions. The austerian administration of former Greek Prime Minister Antonis Samaras strained relations between environmentalists and trade unionists by granting a Canadian mining company permits to extract copper on formerly protected beaches in the Halkidiki peninsula to signal Greece's openness to foreign investment (Wilton 2013). The resultant dispute between the Greek miners' union and environmentalists prompted the union to engage in "US-style company unionism" and accept divisive jobs vs. environment rhetoric. Police in Thessaloniki stood by as miners physically attacked

environmentalist demonstrators (Ovenden 2015, 145). Greece's creditors demanded the decentralization of the country's formerly corporatist collective bargaining system (Skalkos 2018). If the Greek labor establishment cannot constructively communicate with environmentalists or effectively engage in social dialogue, then they will have an exceptionally difficult time negotiating decent compensation for coal workers during any future coal phaseout. Moreover, Greece's fiscal restraints limit the Greek state's ability to pay for protections for those displaced (see Fielder 2017).

Corporatism, Dualization, and the Rise of the AfD

German corporatism, despite facilitating JTs, arguably intensifies the problem of contingent work under neoliberalism. In the mid-aughts, the neoliberal Gerhard Schroeder Administration used corporatist institutions to legitimize welfare reforms that made temporary work more common and made it much harder for the long-term unemployed to access social benefits. Disgruntled Germans sometimes blame unions and the SPD for the growth of low-wage, contingent work and resent well-paid, well-represented industrial workers. Precarianization has a deep impact in places like the Ruhr Valley, a traditional industrial heartland where stable jobs are increasingly difficult to find. JTs hep well-established coal workers, but they do not necessarily empower post-Fordism's less visible victims, those who want stable, traditional, breadwinning jobs but cannot access jobs in heavy industry to begin with. Low-income workers find the AfD's mixture of neoliberalism and welfare chauvinism attractive because they feel excluded from corporatists bargaining processes. Resentments of corporatism and the labor establishment partially explain why the AfD is gaining support in Ruhr *in spite* of earnest efforts to treat coal workers justly as Germany transitions to clean energy economy.

Schroeder's labor market reforms, known as "Agenda 2010" (see Schmidt 2005), increased Germany's international competitiveness while making life more difficult for precarious, non-unionized workers. In 2002, aiming to foster employment growth and signal the SPD's pro-business pivot, Schroeder "tasked a corporatist commission of high-ranking representatives of leading unions and business associations, presided by Peter Hartz, working director of Volkswagen, with producing policy proposals to reform the labour markets and social system" (Voss 2018, 16). The reforms, implemented between 2002 and 2004, "Opened the door to temporary work agencies, tightened the eligibility criteria for unemployment benefits, gave tax incentives for low-wage employment and massively reduced long-term unemployment benefits" (Scherer and Hachmann 2012, 143-144). Agenda 2010 forces jobless Germans to accept unstable, low-wage work instead of collecting unemployment benefits until better work opportunities materialize (Voss 2018, 16-17). Given that German corporatism has historically marginalized women and immigrant workers (Schierup 2006, 140-141), one may see Agenda 2010 as exacerbating and transforming the dual nature of German labor relations. While the reforms had backing from heavy industry unions like *IG Metall*, the service sector union *Ver.di* and most of the general public opposed the measures (Scherer and Hachmann 2012, 147; Schmidt 2005, 56-57). *IG Metall* entered negotiations over the reform package in a position of power over *Ver.di*. The metalworkers union had more legitimacy within the debate over competitiveness as a representative of workers in export-dependent industries and *Ver.di*'s leaders fielded to mobilize anxious yet poorly-organized service sector workers against the impending cuts (Schmidt 2005, 56-57; Scherer and Hachmann 2012, 147; Voss 2018, 25). While employment numbers and exports have increased since the reforms, so has the proportion of Germany's workforce without union representation (Voss 2018, 17).

The reforms appear to have dualized the labor force between regular workers with access to unions, job stability, and decent benefits and irregular workers with precarious work, poor representation, and meager benefits (Voss 2018, 2-3). Even as the Hartz Commission's recommendations improved employment numbers, they also contributed to rising inequality and poverty (Dietl and Birner 2017). The dualized labor market induces anxiety in the Ruhr Valley. The *Financial Times* quotes a retired miner in the Ruhr Town of Gelsenkirchen who claims the "Schroeder story" has "really upset a lot of people around here" (qtd. Chazan 2017). The same article profiles Thomas Steinberg, an IG BCE official who laments that all "the good, well-paid, secure jobs have gone and they're not being replaced by work of the same quality" (qtd. Chazan 2017). Steinberg contrasts the current job market's instability with the reliability of traditional industry: "if you worked in mining you had a job for life. You'd stay at the mine until you retired and got your pension" (qtd. Clifford 2017).

The decline of industrial work has encouraged a backlash against corporatism, the SPD, and environmentalism. Resentment of corporatism fuels right-wing populism as "well-developed corporatism may be viewed as an exclusionary and elitist institution by labor market outsiders (e.g. semi- and unskilled workers harmed by globalization)" (Swank and Betz 2018, 22). The AfD's anti-union, anti-welfare, anti-*energiewende*, and pro-corporate neoliberalism thus ironically attracts the support of many workers experiencing anxiety over economic restructuring, including many union members (Dietl and Birner 2017). The AfD is gaining support in Ruhr. In 2017, the far right party's votes doubled in the Rehn-Erft Kreis district of North Rhine Westphalia (Parking and Wilkes 2018). Ruhr voters recently elected the AfD's Guido Reil, a retired miner and outspoken opponent of both Agenda 2010 and the coal phaseout, to North-Rhine Westphalia's state legislature (Bennhold 2018). This is a bitterly ironic

development because the AfD has espoused anti-labor neoliberalism and proposed cuts to unemployment benefits (Seibt 2016). JTs and traditional social dialogue alone are therefore insufficient for suppressing right-wing populists' support.

Conclusion: JTs as Populism

We have seen that German corporatism facilitates JTs for coal workers but also complicates the related environmental justice goals of defeating right-wing populists and fostering international labor solidarity. Whereas some progressives hope JTs will promote international solidarity by reinvigorating the global labor movement, the very corporatist system of bargaining that enables JTs also facilitates German practices of wage restraint and export promotion that add to the economic burdens facing southern European economies. Greece will have a rather difficult time achieving a coal phaseout and a JT while encumbered with austerity. Although some on the broad political left expect JT policies to depress support for right-wing populists, the practices of social dialogue that many labor officials associate with JTs have increased the AfD's appeal by further dualizing the German labor market. Is it possible to reconcile the JT framework's corporatist processes with the goals of international solidarity and anti-extremism?

I will conclude by arguing that a JT that reaches these aspirations will not be a JT *against* populism, but rather a JT *as* populism. I draw my understanding of populism from Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau, who argue that left-wing populism is a necessary response to the ascendant far right and the growth of contingent, service sector, and informal work. Technological change, globalization, and the casualization of work under neoliberalism polarizes society between "those who work in stable, regular jobs and the rest who are either unemployed or have part-time, precarious, and unprotected jobs" (Mouffe 2000, 126). Mouffe argues that

Third Way social democrats like Gerhard Schroeder's responses to changing employment patterns are misguided. Third Way centrists believe policies like tax cuts, deregulation, and retraining will promote growth, enable displaced workers to find new jobs, and avoid the worst social disruptions. Such centrist legislation, so its backers believe, will soothe tensions between rich and poor, reduce the appeal of class struggle rhetoric, and promote political stability (see Mouffe 2000, 112-114). Schroeder underestimates the pull of aggressive political rhetoric. People need distinct and strident political causes to defend. If they cannot choose between differentiated alternative left and right projects, then they will drift toward cynicism, apathy, and anti-democratic forms of collective identification (Mouffe 2000, 104). Right-wing populists are winning because the left stopped trying to present a distinctively left-wing project and instead appealed to the center.

The left can respond to changing patterns of work by creating a populist rhetoric and platform that unifies different kinds of workers with dramatically different backgrounds and social identities. Laclau writes that left-wing populist messaging may well appeal to the working class *if* traditional leftists broaden their understanding of working class politics. A populist politics may unite diverse groups of people around working class demands, but not by defining working class politics in a narrowly sociological fashion. Laclau implies that a "working class" person is not just someone with a low income, a menial occupation, or an unprivileged background (Laclau 2005A, 182-183). The growth of the welfare state, regulatory regimes, and commodified emotional labor under advanced capitalism potentially expands the scope of working class politics to include ecological concerns and feminists positions that many associate with middle class liberalism (Laclau and Mouffe 1985, 157-160). Under such conditions, the phrase "working class" may come to signify all kinds of restorative, reproductive, and

nonproductive activity that does not fit with ingrained images of the industrial proletariat. A left-wing populist political project should aim to unify the various new social movements (feminism, environmentalism, anti-racism, LGBTQ activism) with traditional socialist class actors around calls for a more generous, participatory government (Mouffe 2018, 2-4). Mouffe says the act of demanding state support for informal and non-marketized work, a guaranteed basic income, and a shorter work week may unify fragmented identity and occupational groups around the shared, progressive identity of "the people" (Mouffe 2000, 126). The needed populist politics will distinguish the left from the right with bold demands that inspire collective, passionate loyalties from diverse swaths of the population.

The JT should be part of a broad political project that appeals to everyone disadvantaged by the post-Fordist economy. A populist JT will speak to the service sector workers and unemployed people in coal mining communities, who are just as reliant on coal as formally employed miners. Coal extraction exploits service workers and the unemployed in frontline communities, not just those who work directly for coal operators. For example, in Canada, "women and immigrants are disproportionately represented in jobs supporting fossil fuel workers – such as accommodation and food services" and lose income when extraction ceases. However, workers who sustain coal communities without extracting coal do not directly benefit from most JT programs (Morena *et al* 2018, 19). A populist JT could fulfill the Leap Manifesto's calls for income replacement for extractive workers and a guaranteed basic income for everyone in fossil-fuel extraction communities, including informal workers, as conditions of JT policies (Klein 2017, 238-239). A populist JT may also incorporate the South African scholar activist Brian Ashley's proposals for a JT that recognizes and compensates women's unpaid, informal work in mining communities (see Angel 2016, 24). Economic stability for extractive workers and the rest

of the working class in frontline communities could be a package deal in a populist JT. If the left advocates for JTs in a way that brings together *all* workers displaced in an energy transition, then the JT may be more useful for depressing support for the far right.

It is important that the concept of the JT maintain its character as a labor policy stemming from the labor movement. It is not primarily an environmentalist policy meant to cover for environmentalists' failure to appeal to workers; it is not primarily a developmentalist policy aiming to support entrepreneurship in depressed areas; and it is not primarily the regular mix of training and targeted welfare spending that marks so much globalist rhetoric. It is a labor-environmentalist policy meant to empower workers to engage with environmental protection on their own terms and assure the labor movement' active participation in clean energy transitions. However, policymakers can synthesize basic income with JTs without betraying JTs' labor movement origins. Mazzocchi's Labor Party outfit responded to the rise of service sector employment by proposing a constitutional amendment that would make the government an employer of last resort and provide a basic income to those for whom no work is available (McClure 1996). Those presenting the universal basic income as an alternative to job retraining for coal dependent areas (see Cooper and Price 2019) do not necessarily embrace Mazzocchi's call for full income replacement for fossil fuel workers. JT can incorporate a basic income, but basic income alone is no substitute for JT.

A populist JT will not necessarily give up on corporatism. Workers should have a say in industrial planning. However, a populist JT would have to be part of a populist project that addresses the problem of beggar-thy-neighbor international competition. Mouffe (2014) insists upon an internationalist, European populism that outmaneuvers rightist Eurosceptics by rejecting austerity and reclaiming European social democratic values of equality and liberal democracy.

To this end, every labor activists and environmentalist should endorse Bernie Sanders and Yanis Varoufakis's proposed Progressive International, which Varoufakis, says will counter austerian financial institutions and promote Keynesian policy to even out Europe's trade surpluses and deficits. Varoufakis desires a Progressive International to unite left-wing leadership all over the world and reorient existing international financial institutions toward social justice. Specifically, Varoufakis wants to use the International Monetary Fund to implement John Maynard Keynes's old call for an international clearing union, which could discourage destabilizing trade surpluses and deficits (see Monbiot 2008). The "new clearing unions would help to rebalance trade and create an international Wealth Fund to fund programs to alleviate poverty, develop human capital and support marginalized communities in the United States, Europe, and beyond" (Varoufakis 2017). If it works, Varoufakis's plan could potentially provide Greece the money necessary to help coal workers in Western Macedonia in spite of Greece's tight budget. It would also allow Germany to continue with corporatist industrial relations without the German model leading to trade imbalances in the Eurozone. Varoufakis promotes the Progressive International as the solution to the rise of far-right parties like the AfD (Varoufakis and Adler 2018). An international clearing union and better coordination between leftists against austerity may be necessary preconditions for JT policies to undermine the bad kind of populism.

Chapter Three
The Just Transition Framework as Progressive Populism – A Gramscian Analysis

Climate solidarity intellectuals want the fight for just transition (JT) policies to hinder the growth of right-wing populist parties and reinvigorate labor internationalism. Drawing from Antonio Gramsci's work, I caution against chiliastic expectations for JT policies while encouraging thinkers to continue searching for internationalist and anti-authoritarian potentials within the JT framework. Gramsci has a nuanced stance on the potentials of reformist activity within capitalism. An economic reform is not the same thing as progress. While necessary, economic reforms come with risks, particularly the provocation of resentments between decently paid industrial workers, the middle class, and the impoverished. Extremists may take advantage of such risks. In this chapter, I caution that the JT framework, a reformist policy that protects fossil fuel workers (FFWs) from the instability of capitalist labor markets, is no shortcut to effective labor internationalism and anti-authoritarianism. JTs risk abetting the far-right by reinforcing occupational divisions and fostering jealousy among underemployed workers and the jobless. On their own, JTs cannot undermine the nationalist associations of fossil fuel extraction, discourage the state from supporting national capitalists, or eliminate the material sources of extremist parties' power. My argument is that overpromising to resolve the most urgent problems of our time through the JT policy obscures certain progressive potentialities of the JT framework. JTs could invite workers to participate in intellectual labor and reconsider the political significance of their own work.

The previous chapter asked what, exactly, makes JTs progressive. I draw from Gramsci's writings on the relationship between industrial progress and political progress to locate JTs' potentials. Gramsci describes progress as a process by which emergent social forces create the collective desires necessary to resolve their times' most urgent moral and economic problems. In

what follows, I will explain how an ideal-type, robust JT could correspond to three phases of progress: the economic-corporate phase, the hegemonic phase, and the state phase. The economic-corporate phase involves consolidation and centralization of economic production as well as a political focus on improving the industrial working class's living conditions. However, improving the living conditions of industrial workers within a capitalist system often requires statist economic policy that divides industrial workers from other kinds of workers (particularly middle class workers) and runs the risk of empowering authoritarians. This is why the socialist movement must proceed to a hegemonic phase, in which intellectuals universalize the workers' program by integrating it with the concerns of potential class allies and using the organs of civil society to build consent for working class political leadership. The hegemonic phase requires populism, a process by which traditional intellectuals based in the academy and related fields work with technical intellectuals based in industry to mutually develop a new national culture. Only after establishing consent for working class rule within civil society can socialists progress to the state phase by seizing control of the government's means of repression. In this phase, socialists can repress reactionary class elements and reorganize the national economy such that workers may manage production in coordination with their foreign counterparts. Progress peaks in the state phase as all workers, in spite of their cultural and occupational differences, cooperate as equals to reorganize society in response to the key problems of their time.

The JT policy framework straddles the economic-corporate phase and the hegemonic phase. It is economic-corporate because it is a bread-and-butter issue with direct relevance to discrete groups of heavy industry workers. It can also advance industrial progress toward a more high-tech and modern economy. However, JTs do not guarantee political progress and may, in the worst-case scenario, bolster the far-right by reinforcing divisions within the working class.

The JT framework has progressive potential because it may build up consent for future dramatic economic changes and social reorganization among key, strategic constituencies while inviting FFWs to participate in intellectual activity. Although the JT itself does not amount to populism because it does not *require* cross-class intellectual experimentation with alternative visions of the national good, it provides opportunities for populist intellectual collaboration between traditional and technical intellectuals. Under ideal conditions, talented populists will have the opportunity to use JTs to encourage former FFWs to reinvent their national culture and, in so doing, question the value of occupational hierarchies and reconsider their rightful place in the world economy. However, suggesting that the JT can achieve the highest ideals of labor internationalism would reinforce the least mature kind of populism -- utopianism. Assuming that the JT can overcome the material sources of right-wing extremism is naive. Only socialists with control of the repressive state have the potential to dissolve the extreme right's sources of power and found new, lasting institutions of labor internationalism. This chapter proceeds by addressing Gramsci's philosophical conception of progress. I then move on to a schematic overview of each of the three phases of progressive political change, explaining how the JT framework fits into each of them.

Why Populism? Why Gramsci?

Some readers may be wondering why it is so important to examine Gramsci's thoughts on populism to explain the JT framework's relevance to class politics, authoritarianism, and internationalism. JT policies are simple and elegant enough to understand without a background in political theory or sympathies to the left. One need not read the *Prison Notebooks* to realize that JTs could potentially appease working class FFWs while benefiting other classes by decreasing the desperation that leads some workers to threaten international stability by

embracing authoritarians, rejecting cosmopolitanism, and holding back climate protection. JTs may decrease the risk of catastrophic climate change (which has uneven impacts but threatens the rich, poor, and middle class alike) by decreasing extractive communities and FFWs' resistance to the phaseout of fossil fuel extraction, decommissioning of dirty energy infrastructure, and implementation of clean energy technology (see Mathunjwa 2017). Advocates of JTs hope the policy will reduce the economic hardship that drives extractive communities to support right-wing populists who scapegoat effete cultural "elites" (e.g. liberal intellectuals, foreign competitors, middle class professionals, sexual minorities).[8] The JT may thereby indirectly defend right-wing populists' targets from mistreatment. Hence, the tendency of some liberals to describe the JT policy as a way to maintain social stability by mollifying those left behind during a turbulent energy transition (e.g. Ranft et al 2019, 3).

Yet reformism and middle class appeal is precisely what irks some leftist critics of JTs and other Green New Deal-esque policies (e.g. Cunningham 2009). *Briarpatch*'s editors argue that JTs that provide assistance for displaced workers without moving to dismantle the processes of colonialism and exploitative property relations at the basis of climate change will have little chance of offsetting the far-right or advancing serious climate protection measures (Desai et al 2019; Gray-Donald and Eaton 2019). Echoing orthodox Marxism's rejection of populism as middle class reformism that cannot liberate the working class from subjugation (see De Leon 1899), Jodi Dean (2015; 2019) rejects green Keynesianism as *too populist* and claims that "class war" is an unavoidable aspect of true climate justice politics. Karl Marx would likely recognize the class anxieties of his own times in contemporary debates over the politics of JTs. He understood how demagogues use anti-elitist rhetoric to conflate liberal democracy with the

[8] Schaller and Carius (2019) and Waldholz (2019) promote JTs as a response to right-wing versions of anti-elitist rhetoric.

snooty rich and win over the disaffected by promising preferential treatment the middle class, privileged sections of the working class, and struggling rural communities (see Marx 2019, 406-408). Reflecting on the rise of Louis Bonaparte, a self-declared defender of the lower classes with a royal background, Marx noted that the dictator "would like to appear as the patriarchal benefactor of all classes" yet "cannot give to one class without taking from another" (Marx 2019, 581). Criticizing social democrats who sought to compromise with Bismarck's ruthlessly anti-socialist government, Marx stressed that preventing strongmen from taking advantage of disaffected workers requires political organizations grounded solely in the interests and perspective of the self-aware working class (Marx 2019, 1049-1056). Only the working class can avoid being co-opted by elites who pose as anti-elitists, thought Marx, because only the working class has consistently liberatory aims that coincide with humanity's universal essence (Marx and Engels 1978, 133-135). Marx was skeptical of middle class philosophers who sought "adulterating" influence within proletarian parties (2019, 1058). Notice the contempt in Marx's discussion of university-trained social theorists from privileged backgrounds:

> [Thinkers] from the hitherto ruling class join the struggling proletariat and supply it with educative elements...in order to be of use to the proletarian movement these people must bring real educative elements with them. But this is not the case with the great majority of the German bourgeois converts...Here there is an absolute lack of real educative material, factual or theoretical. Instead, attempts to harmonize superficially acquired socialist thoughts with the most varying theoretical standpoints which the gentlemen have brought with them from the university or elsewhere...instead of creating clarity anywhere they have only created dire confusion (2019, 1057-1058).

Were Marx around today, he would possibly echo criticisms of the JT framework's reformism and implicit class compromise.

Gramsci associates populism with the eclectic interests of middle class intellectuals attracted to socialism and, like Marx, takes issue with such intellectuals (e.g. Gramsci 1994, 8-11). Gramsci carries forward and sharpens Marx's criticism of middle class progressives by

admonishing professionals for excluding working people with highfalutin language and tastes (1995, 146), absent minded and unproductive behavior (1995, 239-241; 1971, 292-294), and a lack of organizational discipline (1971, 60-61). However, Gramsci's understanding of political change, more so than Marx's conception, involves active participation on the part of intellectual and cultural workers to elevate the proletariat's political consciousness (Adamson 1978, 436-437). Whereas Marx believed that capitalism would continually homogenize class relations until most of society became a part of the working class with an unmistakable opposition to the bourgeoisie (Marx and Engels 1978, 474), Gramsci observed that non-productive intellectual workers would become more numerous and important to capitalism as the system matured and needed to deploy more resources for self-justification (Gramsci 1971, 13). Gramsci attempted to strategize for socialist change in a period in which intellectuals played an increasingly important role maintaining capitalism and, perhaps, could help subvert the system. One finds in Gramsci's work, particularly his discussions of journalism, a series of ethical instructions for intellectuals to break with the bad habits that Gramsci associates with the torpid Italian middle classes: superstructural activity should be industrious and strenuous, just like productive labor (1995, 273); conducting intellectual activity is creative work, but it should require attention to urgent social needs, rather than personal vanities (1995, 277); social critique should instill moral norms by speaking on the terrain of good sense, rather than self-serious put-downs (2017, 420-421). Gramsci wanted middle class thinkers to help with the revolution, but he also expected them to first shape up for the task.

Gramsci's analysis of populism, which he describes as a kind of cross-class intellectual collaboration, is part of his attempt to rethink middle class intellectuals' potential contributions to working class politics. Gramsci seems to think populism may help root oppositional politics in

industrial work even as mature capitalism relies increasingly on intellectual labor. Gramsci models his own commitments as a public intellectual on Francisco De Sanctis, a nineteenth century Italian scholar who advocated national unity and political modernization. Gramsci describes De Sanctis as the ideal "populist": a middle class writer who set out to use his deep familiarity with national traditions and cultural expectations to build a better rapport between working and middle class progressives and alter Italian culture in a forward-thinking direction (Gramsci 2017, 92-93). Whereas middle class politicos are often aloof to workers' grievances, De Sanctis focused on encouraging the parliamentary left to build deep connections with Italy's nascent industrial working class. Although De Sanctis wrote in the aristocratic language of his era's upper-classes, he did so in an attempt to build upon his educated peers' national culture and thereby change their personalities (Gramsci 2017, 92-93). De Sanctis wanted to unify the intellectual classes around a "coherent, integral, and nationwide" outlook that could invigorate "an ethic, a life-style, and an individual and civil pattern of behavior" involving more effective cooperation between classes for a more modern Italy (Gramsci 2017, 92).

Gramsci's writings on populism are relevant to contemporary discussions of the role of middle class intellectuals in the difficult task of improving relations between environmentalists and working class, extractive communities. Shannon Elizabeth Bell's research on environmental justice organizing in central Appalachian coal country reveals how unstrategic cooperation between environmental justice advocates based in extractive communities and middle class activists may sometimes do more harm than good. Countercultural environmental activists who protest coal extraction in Appalachia appear to flaunt work and cultural norms with their outlandish clothing and decisions to demonstrate during the workweek (Bell 2016, 240-241). Pro-industry actors take advantage of "perceived class divisions between many local residents

and the non-local activists who have come into the community" by suggesting that opponents of mountaintop removal mining disrespect the work ethic of Appalachian people (Bell 2016, 241). Nonetheless, middle class activists with consistent liberal and humanitarian principles, knowledge of social problems, and professional skills can serve as assets for labor-environmental struggles. Naomi Klein's best work (e.g. Klein 2015) critiques educated environmentalists' self-seriousness, meritocratic and individualistic outlooks, preoccupations with political purity and ethical consumption, and obsessions with change through conventional electoralism -- all of which impedes collective, community-driven labor organizing. Overcoming the compartmentalizations and hang-ups that prevent activists from effectively cooperating will require "truly progressive populist" responses to climate and economic crises grounded in the leadership and experiences of underprivileged communities (Klein 2017, 233-234). Yet it also will require winning over a critical mass of intellectuals with influence in progressive social movement circles, the absence of which wrecked Bernie Sanders' 2016 presidential campaign (Klein 2017, 124). Klein suggests that when Americans "learn to love economic populism" (2017, 121) progressive politics will have the right balance between intellectual influence and rootedness in working class economic concerns, without middle class neuroses overpowering the later.

It is in Klein's populist spirit that I proceed with my analysis of Gramsci's work. Going far beyond Marx's class analysis, which suggests that strictly proletarian philosophical frameworks and political platforms are necessary to overcome political reactionaries, Gramsci sees more space for middle class intellectual activity in anti-authoritarian politics. Gramsci's work on populism suggests that middle class intellectuals have a distinct purpose in historical change, but fulfilling their historic purpose will require careful, respectful attention to the needs

of working class communities. Writing in a time of growing popular support for totalitarian, colonialist, and anti-union movements, Gramsci understood that intellectuals would have to produce new and more compelling visions of the national well-being that (while grounded in workers' economic concerns) appeal to rebellious sentiments of the middle and working classes alike (see Adamson 1980). To avoid a repeat of the reactionary countermovements that Gramsci analyzed, intellectuals will have to step up to the most urgent political challenges their times lay before them, and they will also have to do so with humility and discipline. If environmental justice advocates are to advance the goals they associate with JTs (anti-authoritarianism and internationalism), then they could afford to understand populism as a way to associate the labor movement's proposed reforms with broader values and desires shared by all of the popular classes.

Gramsci on Progress

Gramsci defined "progress" (1971, 357-360) as change makers collectively elaborating and decisively implementing new moral standards for the fair creation and use of wealth. Progress is a multifaceted and collaborative process of political organization, cultural creation, and productive work to resolve pressing moral and economic conundrums. Achieving progress requires change makers to coordinate their economic, intellectual, and political activities because fundamental progressive change requires overturning outdated political-economic systems and the ideologies that justify them. Progress expands all individuals' free intellectual and moral responsibility so that "mankind as a whole" may become more "sure of its future" and better able to "conceive 'rationally' of plans through which to govern its whole life" (Gramsci 1971, 357).

Materialist, collectivist, and historical relativist moral convictions informed Gramsci's understanding of progress. Gramsci described morality as an ongoing process by which

increasing socio-political sophistication and material well-being render all people progressively capable of freely cultivating their unique personalities. Morality is never the same in any two eras of human development because the availability of resources and technology determines the range of any given society's moral obligations (Gramsci 1971, 409-410). For example, hunger is less acceptable in societies with the means to feed everyone and unemployment is intolerable in societies with the ability to provide everyone with dignified work (Gramsci 1971, 357-360). As societies devote more resources to guaranteeing that their people will live in dignity, people will have more freedom to grow as individuals, establish well-rounded personalities, and realize their personal responsibilities to their compatriots (Gramsci 1995, 274-275).

Understanding the moral responsibilities appropriate for a given time and place is not a straightforward task because "moralism," customary self-denial or petty personal judgment detached from justifiable moral end goals (see Gramsci 1994, 71; 1971, 166), impedes clear judgment. Discerning which conventions practically further desirable moral ends in present material conditions and which conventions have become arbitrary formalities is not an easy task. Dogma, individualism, and knee-jerk common sense leave people ill prepared to behave thoughtfully during social crises. Establishing moral norms befitting present levels of cultural and material maturity requires organized deliberation and group discipline (Gramsci 2017, 127).

Serious yet flexible moral norms are necessary for progress, but moral refinement falls short of collective, intentional action to change the material structures that give rise to moral conundrums. Consider Gramsci's critiques of liberal philosophy. The liberal understanding of intellectual history is somewhat similar to Gramsci's understanding of progress because liberals celebrate how intellectual and material relations are always in a state of change. However, whereas Gramsci's idea of progress entails masses of people choosing to collectively improve

their conditions, liberalism valorizes disconnected, individualized, and unpredictable changes (Gramsci 1971, 358-359). Fear of rapid political change can prevent socially aware liberals from accepting plans to direct bold social developments, so they seek to limit historical progress to reform within the confines of the liberal state (Gramsci 1995, 374-376). Liberals are often aware of their society's shortcomings, but they cannot translate moral awareness into progress. Liberals sometimes substitute moralism for material change by condemning social pathologies without looking to end the inequalities that underlie problematic behaviors (Gramsci 2015, 156). Liberals' unwillingness to act decisively to end hunger and unemployment indicates their incomplete commitment to progress (Gramsci 1971, 358) and the need for liberalism to pass the baton of progress to socialism.

Socialism, like liberalism, is attuned to changing moral norms and possibilities, yet socialism (as Gramsci envisioned it) differs from liberalism by placing far greater emphasis on popularizing and organizing moral awareness so that morality may become a structural reality. Gramsci claimed that Marxist philosophy, with proper reinterpretation for given social contexts, can become a mass ethic capable of inspiring the people to change economic structures (1995, 385). There comes a point in the historical development of every epoch in which history stops inching forward and instead progresses in decisive leaps. This is the time when intellectual innovations go beyond mere philosophical speculation, become socially embedded, and take on a mass life. This is when a new morality appropriate for the age takes hold and gives the people a sense of historical direction and initiative (Gramsci 1971, 369). Liberals are not prepared for such change because liberal intellectuals tend to support gradual cultural innovations. Marxists, on the other hand, often think intellectuals can centralize cultural changes through vanguardist intervention (Gramsci 2017, 131-132). Moreover, Gramsci thought progress toward the

resolution of moral problems would require a departure from the liberal state. Paraphrasing Marx, he claimed that "no society sets itself tasks for whose accomplishment the necessary and sufficient conditions do not either already exist or are not at least beginning to emerge and develop" and "no society breaks down and can be replaced until it has first developed all the forms of life which are implicit in its internal relations" (1971, 177). Gramsci implied that ultimately achieving the possibilities of human well-being presented by industrial development (his very definition of morality) requires systematic and potentially violent change in both the economic and political organization of society.

Gramsci's understanding of progress involved industrial innovations generating new perceptions of the moral obligations of societies and individuals that induce people to abandon old ideologies and political structures for new ones. Gramsci thus thought progress comes in three chronological forms: industrial progress, intellectual progress, and state progress. Those who attempt timely change in one form without realizing the need for eventual, corresponding change in the other two forms have an incomplete approach to progress. Gramsci indicated as much when he discusses the three "phases" of Marxist thought:

> To the economico-corporate phase, to the phase of struggle for hegemony in civil society and the phase of State power there correspond specific intellectual activities which cannot be arbitrarily improvised or anticipated. In the phase of struggle for hegemony it is the science of politics which is developed; in the State phase all the superstructures must be developed, if one is not to risk the dissolution of the State (1971, 404).[9]

In what follows, I will discuss each of the phases and how the JT policy framework relates to specific progressive tasks in each stage.

The Economico-Corporate Phase

[9] Marx defined the "legal and political superstructure" as the "social, political, and intellectual life process" conditioned by a given mode of production (Marx and Engels 1978, 4). In other words, superstructures are the broad social, political, cultural, and intellectual relations that derive from and justify existing forms of economic organization.

Gramsci was both an advocate and critic of industrialization. He celebrated the potential of technological innovations and an increasingly sophisticated division of labor to provide the underprivileged with the means to live more free and enriching lives. By establishing cooperative, challenging, and creative work opportunities, industrial progress sets the stage for further intellectual and political progress. However, under capitalism, a step forward in industry often results in a step backward in morality and politics. Stimulating heavy industry requires an interventionist state willing to sacrifice rural economies for the good of corporations and cooperative union leaders. Trade unions are a necessity for upholding workers' rights under capitalism, but unions are frequently content with reformism and unsupportive of bold, progressive changes. Unions may reinforce sectoral and occupational hierarchies that divide the working class. Labor-backed trade and industrial policy may benefit union members while harming the underclass. Resentments and stagnation that accompany recklessly pro-labor policies may enable anti-union, far-right politicians to present themselves as guarantors of growth and unity. Some of the perils and promises Gramsci associated with economico-corporate development are on display in contemporary dilemmas facing labor and environmental communities: ongoing industrial changes could empower workers to cooperate for greenhouse gas emissions reductions on the job, but narrow-minded unions, jealousies among working people in different sectors and income brackets, and nationalistic industrial and trade policies benefit an ascendant far-right by preventing workers from coming together in support of shared goals. Climate and labor activists may use the JT framework to overcome narrow-minded self-centeredness and national chauvinism among FFWs and their unions.

Gramsci was of two minds on industrialism. He praised its material potentials while noting its regressive social and political effects. In response to the Great Depression, Gramsci

argued that one cannot blame the crisis on unions, high taxes, and industrial trusts without acknowledging that these are necessary features of functional capitalism. High taxes, labor unions, and industrial trusts are problems when they are "out of all proportion to the administrative needs" (Gramsci 1995, 225). Yet big government, big labor, and big business can be socially beneficial as long as they arise in response to real needs and not arbitrary mandates (especially those springing from economic nationalism). The problem with trusts is the accompanying protectionism that props up politically-connected businesses at the expense of solidarity and equality. Gramsci hated the import restrictions that insulated Italy's metals and manufacturing industries from competition while perpetuating sharecropping and rural poverty by depriving peasants of the technology and capital needed for larger-scale, centralized agriculture (1995, 188). Protectionism entails the capitalist state unfairly "nationalizing losses but not profits" and "compensating for the damage created by speculation...but not by unemployment" (Gramsci 1995, 245). Yet the capitalist system needs trusts because centralization enhances efficiency. He claimed the centralization of production helps people practice group responsibility at the workplace (Gramsci 1995, 275-277). High taxes are necessary because capitalists will not perform some public works, but taxation spreads social distrust when it holds up a haughty strata of superfluous and unmotivated public servants (Gramsci 1995, 238). Trade unions are good because they take great risks to address real problems facing otherwise voiceless workers (Gramsci 1995, 225). Unions help workers gain a sense of class unity and awareness of their historic mission (Gramsci 1994, 97). Unions nonetheless hold back industrial progress when they serve as "the corporate expression of the rights of qualified crafts," block upgrades that diminish the wages of traditional artisans, or blackball unskilled workers (Gramsci 1971, 286).

Gramsci was further troubled with unions' occasional tendency to divide working people. Unionized workers must internalize some elements of competitive individualism to thrive under capitalism. Unions mimic the activity of bosses by serving as brokers for labor power. Labor organizers analyze industrial sectors with the same instrumental reason as speculators and contractors. Such analyses help workers to hold their own against employers, but they are only handy so long as workers remain on the defensive. They are hardly useful for initiating progressive changes to help the entire working class (Gramsci 1994, 116-117). Forced to accommodate capitalist markets, unions sometimes pit workers against each other. For example, unions may support their own country's imperialist resource grabbing and expansionism to the disadvantage of workers' movements in other countries (Gramsci 1994, 109). Domestically, unions have an unfortunate habit of dividing people in different sectors and income brackets. Since trade unions organize workers as labor sellers, not producers, they cannot avoid "bracketing this worker together with those of his companions within the trade or industry who use the same tools or work with the same materials," thereby reinforcing occupational divisions instead of solidarity (Gramsci 1994, 128).

A further source of distrust among working people is the trade unions' "economistic" or "economico-corporate" explanations of political conflict. Economism, for Gramscians, refers to an intellectually meager set of assumptions that pervade poorly organized and/or narrow-minded labor organizations. Economistic assumptions include the idea that unions' key responsibility is the well-being of their dues-paying members, rather than the working class as a whole; the notion that people's political positions must crudely reflect their immediate self-interests; the delusion that one may read macro-level political changes as unidirectional responses to technological innovations and economic fluctuations without regard to political agency; and the

belief that ideology is nothing more than a smokescreen for business people's greed (Gramsci 1971, 162-165). Economistic thinking retards workers' movements by legitimizing electoral abstention and petty reformism. The notion that politics is nothing more than a reflection of the economy sours workers' enthusiasm for political participation and lets them settle for minor changes. Gramsci saw reformism and electoral abstention as amateurish deviations from the socialist movement's responsibility to encourage workers to think of themselves as political and social leaders with immense historical responsibilities toward the broader society (1971, 156-157 and 161). Perhaps worst of all, economism places "economico-corporate" limitations on working class solidarity:

> [at the] economico-corporate level: a tradesman feels *obliged* to stand by another tradesman, a manufacturer by another manufacturer, etc., but the tradesman does not yet feel solidarity with the manufacturers; in other words, the members of the professional group are conscious of its unity and homogeneity, and of the need to organise it, but in the case of the wider social group this is not yet so. A second moment is that in which consciousness is reached of the solidarity of interests among all members of a social class -- but still in the purely economic field (Gramsci 1971, 181).

When economism predominates "modern industrialism shows a remarkable economic-corporate development" but the workers' movement as a whole "advances only gropingly in the intellectual-political field" (1971, 18).

The combination of industrial progress and economico-corporate divisions among workers provides opportunities for reactionaries. Gramsci's work on fascism lamented the Italian working class representatives' indifference toward organizing or assisting downwardly mobile middle class workers. In interwar Italy, the working class's fierce, self-directed protests drew ire from the middle classes, who responded to the radical labor movement by embracing rightist politics. Some Italian socialists made the mistake of dismissing middle class workers as inherently reactionary instead of trying to win over the petty bourgeoisie. The left failed to

prioritize outreach to the middle class, so the middle class fell under the far-right's influence (Gramsci 1971, 225-229). Politically rudderless, downwardly mobile middle class workers facing unemployment embrace parties who promise them jobs, respect, and political/economic stability (Gramsci 1971, 293-294). The fascists attempted to stabilize politics and society with statist schemes to concentrate economic power under corporative representatives of the traditional ruling class without disrupting private property relations or easing exploitation (Gramsci 1995, 349-350). They tried to appease jobless white-collar workers by entrenching the Vatican's influence within the Italian state, which expanded the Catholic educational bodies' payroll (Gramsci 1995, 62-67). Gramsci implored socialists to address middle class workers' legitimate grievances. Writing in 1926, he predicted that middle class Italians would abandon Mussolini as fascism shed its revolutionary veneer and exposed its pro-rich character. In preparation for this defection, socialist agitation would have to strive for "a regrouping of the middle classes on the left" (Gramsci 1994, 298-299) to outmaneuver the Duce.

Current controversies surrounding coal and the far-right highlight labor's economico-corporate divisions and the risks that such divisions pose to democracy. Elizabeth Catte's critique of "progressive" anti-Trumpism echoes Gramsci's concerns that industrial progress that outpaces political and intellectual progress abets reactionaries. Appalachian coal country's salient Trumpism springs from internal divisions among the region's working people that derive in part from economistic labor militancy. Union activism may exacerbate divisions and resentments among working people with productivist rhetoric that draws a stark dividing line between manual laborers their supposedly unproductive counterparts. Rhetoric depicting coal workers as uniquely dignified, masculine, and patriotic pits waged workers against each other and legitimizes extractivism by trivializing the coal industry's impact on the health of low-

income Appalachians and denigrating the service, health care, and public sector jobs that typify the region's employment (Catte 2018, 12-13 and 117-118). Catte exposes how shallow, mainstream American understandings of progress reinforce Appalachia's vulnerabilities to Trumpism. Mainstream liberals ascribe the far-right's prominence to Appalachian backwardness (Catte 2018, 23 and 33-38). The region's people supposedly hamstring industrial progress by refusing to move to dynamic areas and flaunting modern educational norms. Media narratives about Appalachia as "Trump country" do not capture how American culture's ongoing individualistic, competitive orientation conditions regional obsessions with heavy industry employment. Such media oversites uphold misconceptions about progress that lead people to deify coal and obscure mountain people's efforts to organize against extremism and reverse regional decision makers' commitments to industrial expansion at all costs (Catte 2018, 50-53 and 114-115).

The JT framework is one necessary but insufficient response to the growing far-right. My concern is that if progressives treat the JT as a quick-fix for Trumpism, they may inadvertently reinforce the "Appalachia-as-Trump-country" narratives that Catte sharply critiques. Poorly implemented JTs may actually reinforce economic-corporate segmentation within the working class by coding jobless coal workers as more deserving of support than downwardly mobile service sector workers (see Mertins-Kirkwood 2018). A JT cannot, on its own, undo hatreds among and within the disadvantaged that feed extremism unless activists connect JT programs to sophisticated, patient superstructural efforts to shift working class culture (see Mookerjea 2019, 588-589). JTs and other green industrial policies, if poorly implemented, might contribute to economic nationalism because American unions often associate eco-Keynesianism with military security (i.e. as energy independence) and national competitiveness (Stevis 2013, 183). The JT

framework, as Mazzocchi originally articulated it, befitts the economico-corporate phase of progressive change because it helps a discrete group of heavy industry workers address their kitchen table issues. However, the policy framework's standards for education and ecology may also possess transformative, ideological potential. The next section shows how Gramsci hoped socialists could take working class organizing beyond economico-corporate rigidities and infuse class politics with progressive moral and intellectual uplift. In the same spirit, the next section also explains my hope that the JT framework, properly conceived and implemented, may counteract some hierarchies among waged workers that uphold right-wing populism and help intellectuals enrich and popularize progressive thought.

The Hegemonic Phase

The workers' movement may overcome the confines of economism by striving to gain hegemony (Gramsci's word for moral and intellectual leadership) within civil society. A hegemonic progressive movement could universalize the socialist platform by including positions that appeal to the middle class within a distinct, coherent political viewpoint that successfully competes against dominant bourgeois ideas. Building progressive hegemony requires the labor movement go through a period of populist intellectual experimentation. Gramsci described populism as a transitional intellectual process in which the technical intellectuals of the workers' movement rely on support from more traditional intellectuals that are typically from middle and upper-class backgrounds to refine and expand their message. Through populism, traditional and technical intellectuals work together to recreate their national culture and expand the workers' movement's vision. Populism goes astray when traditional intellectuals' idealism drowns out the technical intellectuals' homegrown concerns. Overzealous traditional intellectuals risk degenerating populist pursuits into utopian speculation. I contend

that the JT framework could be useful for inviting American FFWs to participate in populist intellectual collaboration to recreate environmental political thought. This populist intellectual collaboration might have the potential to reduce the appeal of right-wing populism's nationalist messaging by encouraging workers to rethink their country's global responsibilities. However, JT policies can only serve as a beginning, not the end point, of populist collaborations to create a new, broad-based intellectual consensus around labor and environmental issues. Treating the JT as a shortcut to progressive internationalism could amount to a distracting utopianism.

I should here explain Gramsci's concept of hegemony and discuss its relationship to labor politics. Overcoming economico-corporate insularity requires the proletariat's organizers to strive for "the political and cultural hegemony of a social group over the whole of society, as the ethical content of the state" and "the moment of hegemony, of political leadership, of consent in the life and activities in the state and civil society" (Gramsci 1995, 75; 2017, 104). Establishing hegemony requires diverse and inclusive political platforms that appeal to multiple social groups who may frequently disagree with each other (Gramsci 1971, 58-59 and 161). Yet the process of hegemonic consolidation goes beyond formal, electoral politics. This process involves party activists formulating a moral vision that appeals to modern instincts and concerns, perpetuating their novel outlook through arts of various kinds (including pop culture), and establishing a presence in various organs of civil society with cross-class influence, such as the press, universities, churches, and civic groups (e.g. Gramsci 1995, 68; Gramsci 2017, 102; Bellamy 1994, viv; Boothman 1995, xx-xiv). When a class has established a near complete cultural hegemony, subordinate classes will spontaneously enact the hegemonic class's morality, much as ambitious members of the U.S. middle class often imitate the cutthroat behavior and austere efficiency American industrialists (Gramsci 2017, 279).

Such a broad, deep cultural hegemony is beyond the reach of economistic labor movements and socialist parties. Gramsci implores the labor movement to hegemonize society by organizing white collar workers and forging effective relationships with middle class intellectuals. Overcoming the labor movement's economico-corporate divisions will require dissolving the political barriers and egotistical prejudices, sometimes stoked by unions themselves, that serve to divide workers in different trades with varying skill levels and incomes. Gramsci called upon white collar workers, skilled blue-collar workers, and the unskilled to unite for industrial action and political change (1994, 321-326). A hegemonic labor movement will possess a political vision that appeals to a majority of people, including those in the middle classes and some forward thinking rich people, yet emanates from a distinctly working class standpoint that is too radical for the bourgeoisie to co-opt (Gramsci 1971, 159-161). Articulating such a vision will require input from intellectuals with independence from the bourgeoisie because "the proletariat, as a class, is short of its own organizing elements; it does not have its own layer of intellectuals and it will only be able to form such a stratum, very slowly and laboriously, after the conquest of State power" (Gramsci 1994, 336).

Opening up enough breathing room between intellectuals and the economic elite that intellectuals can work effectively for the labor movement will be an extremely difficult task for two reasons. First, many thinkers ingratiate themselves to the upper-class to attain employment and honors. Second, intellectuals are often too fickle and politically cautious to immerse themselves in a struggle for fundamental societal transformation (Gramsci 2017, 131-132; 1971, 7-8). Traditional intellectuals, those with backgrounds in the clerisy and the humanities who are steeped in national tradition and busy themselves cultivating society's sense of national purpose (Gramsci 1971, 7-8), are particularly hesitant to offend the bourgeoisie. Disconnect from

dynamic, collective, industrial production limits the traditional intellectuals' capacity to express a moral vision that is comprehensively modern (Gramsci 1971, 277). Envisioning a distinctly progressive moral standpoint requires the traditional intellectuals to work closely with technical intellectuals engaged in skilled industrial work and economic planning (Gramsci 1971, 14-15). To build socialist hegemony, traditional intellectuals will have to strengthen the technical intellectuals' scope of political vision and deliberative abilities so that the technical intellectuals may expound upon and enrich Marxist philosophy (see Gramsci 1995, 156-157). A thinker who develops both the deliberative skills of a political leader or philosopher and the organizational, technical skills of an industrial worker becomes what Gramsci calls an organic intellectual (Gramsci 1995, 18). Gramsci seemed to think progress requires a preponderance of organic intellectuals so that the workers with the most contact with emergent economic problems may organize themselves, express their own values, and control production for their own, self-determined purposes (e.g. 1995, 394-396).

Creating the critical mass of organic intellectuals who are to enact progress requires traditional intellectuals with progressive sensibilities to first subject themselves to a volatile period of trust building and popular education that Gramsci calls populism. Gramsci's discussion of contemporary Marxism's populist qualities depicts populism as an ongoing educational period in which traditional intellectuals help technical intellectuals embedded in the labor movement find an independent voice, come to an internal consensus on political issues, and develop a coherent thought process. Gramsci acknowledged that much current, western Marxist thinking is inchoate. Most of the movement's intellectuals come from "traditional intermediary classes" and have liberal and idealist ideological influences that limit their philosophy's cogency and originality (Gramsci 1971, 398). Marxists are often too eclectic and espouse "heterogeneous and

bizarre combinations" of socialism and outdated ideologies (see Gramsci 1971, 338-341). The philosophy's technical practitioners remain economistic and will not convincingly synthesize Marxism's idealist and materialist tendencies without "dynamic contact" with traditional intellectuals (Gramsci 1971, 394-397). Hence Marxism's populism:

> It is still going through its populist phase: creating a group of independent intellectuals is not always an easy thing; it requires a long process, with actions and reactions, coming together and drifting apart and the growth of very numerous and complex new formations. It is the conception of a subaltern social group, deprived of historical initiative, in continuous but disorganic expansion, unable to go beyond a certain qualitative level, which still remains below the level of possession of the State and of the real exercise of hegemony over the whole of society which alone permits a certain organic equilibrium in the development of the intellectual group (Gramsci 1971, 395-396).

As such, Gramsci thought that a populist is a kind of traditional intellectual willing to "take the plunge into practical life" and "democratize himself, be more in touch with the times" (qtd. Schwarzmantel 2015, 77).

Populism is a politically perilous yet potentially rewarding process that could endear the masses to an internationalist, inclusive conception of patriotism yet runs the risk of cooptation by national chauvinists. Populist intellectuals, being traditionalists, need to work upon the terrain of national traditions and appeal to the people's parochial common sense. Drawing from common sense is not inherently bad so long as intellectuals attempt to refine common sense and reinterpret tradition to address modern problems (Gramsci 1994, 336; Gramsci 1995, 386-387). However, the far-right excels at manipulating the shallowness and incoherence of common sensibilities by, for example, claiming to oppose liberal elites without explaining the sources of elite corruption in any coherent or scientific way (see Gramsci 1971, 272-276 and 422-423). Populism involves rhetorical battle between the left and right over how to interpret national

culture and respond to the people's deeply held beliefs and resentments.[10] As Mussolini's political prisoner, Gramsci lamented that fascists managed to claim the populism of Italian traditional intellectuals, which could have been used for good (2015, 300).

In spite of demagogues' misuses of populism, talented populists of the left may shift national understandings of what it means to be patriotic and, in so doing, undermine chauvinism. Gramsci's concept of the national-popular, which his present-day followers often associate with left-wing populism (e.g. Jayatilleka 2017), is a call for "a deep-seated bond of democratic solidarity between directing intellectuals and popular masses" such that intellectuals become "organically tied to the large national masses" (Gramsci 2015, 325). That national-popular's democratic nature sets it apart from right-wing nationalism. Gramsci rejected fascists' claims that the masses should uncritically place their faith in higher intellectual authorities. Fascists hold back the development of a unified, dynamic national culture by eroding the people's deliberative abilities (Gramsci 1995, 13). It is better for intellectuals to elevate national culture by maintaining "an emotional and ideological contact with the masses and, to a certain extent, a sympathetic understanding of their needs" (Gramsci 2015, 215). Gramsci said sympathetic dialogue between industrial workers and intellectuals will help the people rethink what it means to be patriotic. Intellectuals too often discuss economics in terms of its relationship to national power. They should instead discuss economics from the standpoint of workers' lived experiences at the point of production (Gramsci 2015, 212-213). Thinkers with a more sympathetic "attitude toward the popular classes" could put forward "a new conception of what is 'national', different from the Right, broader, less exclusive, and, so to speak, less 'police-like'" (Gramsci 2015, 92-

[10] Laclau's best work (i.e. 1979) elucidates this theme of Gramsci's thought.

93). Overcoming chauvinistic forms of economic and cultural nationalism would thus require reciprocal, educative engagement between traditional intellectuals and the working class.

Alongside potential right-wing cooptation, populism's reliance on idealistic intellectuals who are not direct industrial producers runs the risk of fostering utopianism. Gramsci wrote that the "attribute 'utopian' does not apply to political will in general, but to specific wills which are incapable of relating means to ends, and hence are not even wills, but idle whims" (1971, 175). This is especially true of utopian literature, which Gramsci explicitly links to populism (2015, 237). Utopian novels express budding progressivism because they praise reason and speak to the masses' aspirations, even as intellectuals who are distant from the masses write them. Despite their upper-class creators, utopias reflect (in a misshapen way) their times' rebellious popular energies, speak to the masses' problems, and attempt "to find a link between intellectuals and the people" (Gramsci 2015, 237-240). Although they may be useful during the earliest moments of the hegemonic consensus building process, utopias are an immature and potentially damaging form of populism. Utopian intellectuals' inability to motivate mass action leaves them grasping for means to their favored ends. Utopians use individual reasoning to imagine new, morally superior societies. The cooperative practice of productive work and the collective problem solving it entails, however, is the true source of the necessary moral principles and technical knowhow to guide a new society. Rationalistic individuals cannot do as much to motivate and direct progressive change as a deeply felt collective will (Gramsci 1995, 16-18 and 276-277; Gramsci 2015, 19). Utopians' isolation from the technical intellectuals leaves their favored changes unappealing and unattainable.

Reinterpreting Gramsci's critique of utopian intellectuals for a contemporary age of neoliberal globalization, the sociologist Michael Burawoy observes a tendency among left

intellectuals to allow their internationalist ideals to get ahead of their political analysis (2010A, 4). This is particularly true among many global labor scholars, who Burawoy accuses of hastily projecting "utopias" of international working class solidarity and participatory democracy that are disconnected from the "lived experience of those who are to enact them" (2011, 74; 2010B, 302-305). Borrowing from Gramsci's famous dictum, Burawoy accuses the utopian professors of subordinating pessimism of the intellect to optimism of the will (2011, 75). Burawoy's depiction of excitable labor scholars could just as well describe certain activists who expect the push for JTs to dramatically enhance progressive, internationalist mobilizations against global neoliberalism. Zarna Joshi (2016) describes JT as a community-based, "spiritual movement" that brings together Global North consumers with exploited producers of solar panels in the Global South as interconnected "children of mother earth." Joshi is right to call attention to the injustices involved in the production of solar panels and populistic in seeking to ground middle class environmentalists' thought processes in productive activity, but she does not explain how exactly the JT policy advances this international relationship building with exploited workers. Joshi does not lay out how labor unions are to participate in her vision of the JT or how her plan benefits union members. She neglects to relate the mean of the JT to the end of labor internationalism and, in so doing, her populism broaches what Gramsci would call utopianism. My concern is that broad, ungrounded discussions of internationalist potentialities within JTs and other concepts related to environmental justice may conceal the difficulty of international labor solidarity building and alienate communities facing more immediate, concrete challenges (see Hultgren and Stevis 2019, 4; Black, Milligan, and Heynen 2016, 292-293).

I will now briefly sketch how I think the JT policy framework has the potential to push labor-environmentalist relations in the U.S. out of an economico-corporate rut and open

opportunities for populist experimentation and hegemonic consolidation. Whereas divisions between heavy industry unions and environmentalists remain a dogged obstacle to bold climate protection (see Stoner 2019), the JT may serve as a plank in labor-oriented platforms that could build trust between union members and greens. Tony Mazzocchi's original vision of the JT as a G.I. Bill for Workers, if implemented, would encourage FFWs to engage in intellectual labor by absolving them of tuition fees at their chosen universities and providing them four years of full income replacement. In the best case scenario, the most advanced FFWs could meet with welcoming, environmentalist intellectuals in a university setting and mutually reconstruct green political thought to make it more appealing to workers' common sense. FFWs and environmental theorists may together begin to reconstruct national cultural values related to the environment, question nationalistic extractivism, and replace resource nationalism with an alternative philosophy that avoids the airiness of middle class, countercultural environmentalism. As industrial workers engage in knowledge work, they may become more skeptical of right-wing populists' anti-intellectualism. If the G.I. Bill for Workers induces FFWs to rethink chauvinistic and anti-intellectual forms of nationalism, then the JT could reduce the far-right's appeal to some conservative-leaning constituencies. The next chapter (Chapter Four) will elaborate in greater detail the educative aspects of Mazzocchi's proposals and how they may serve strengthen environmentalism's organic connections to Americans' cultural traditions and work lives.

The State Phase

Previous sections established that Gramsci rejected abstract internationalism as utopian and cautions that economic reformism cannot end, and may intensify, the ascendance of right-wing authoritarianism. This section discusses the prospects for thoroughly responding to the extreme right and establishing meaningfully internationalist political institutions. The third stage

of Marxism's development is the state phase, in which socialists go beyond establishing hegemony within civil society, seize the state's repressive apparatus, and endeavor to create new superstructures. Progress comes into fruition during the state phase. Organized, progressive forces need unified control over the state before they can successfully establish new institutions of international solidarity and rearrange the economic structure such that human creativity and problem solving will freely flourish. To assure the people's safety from right-wing authoritarianism, socialists will need not only cultural hegemony but also power over the state's instruments of coercion. The left might need to control the nation state's institutions of trade and foreign policy before it is possible to initiate a new approach to international solidarity that works to constrain global capitalism. While labor-environmentalists tend to believe deeply in international solidarity and express their cosmopolitan, anti-authoritarian convictions through advocacy of JTs, it is worth remembering that the JT framework, which could serve as a tool for building consent within civil society for robust green policies, does not grant progressive actors control over the repressive state apparatus and thus cannot resolve the problem of a resurgent far-right or a divided and defensive global labor movement.

Gramsci insisted that no class has hegemony without power over the state, which he defines as both the "'private' apparatus of 'hegemony' or civil society" and the government, with its means of coercion (1971, 261). Achieving full hegemony over the state requires control over the government and its weaponry. Gramsci compared hegemony's mixture of force and consent to a centaur: it is half man (reliant on intellectual persuasion and moral conformity) but also half animal (resting on the ability to repress those who threaten the ruling class's power) (1971, 169-170). Gramsci emphasized the need to suppress the old order (violently if need be) by removing their sources of power and preventing a counter-revolution (1971, 78-79). The Italian liberal

bourgeoisie's reluctance to carry out land reform and snuff out the aristocracy enabled the rise of interwar fascism. The anti-democratic, landowning aristocrats, who remained a formidable Italian political force long after most of western Europe had overcome such semi-feudal relations, made up the initial backbone of Mussolini's support (Laclau 1979, 118-121). Without the ability and willingness to use just enough force, the progressive forces' project remains threatened by the reactionary class elements that fuel the far-right. Gramscians sometimes refer to the disastrous overthrow of Salvador Allende to demonstrate the insufficiency of influence within a government's representative structures without a firm grasp over the military (e.g. Greene 2015).[11]

At the risk of belaboring the obvious, it is worth noting that the JT, while potentially useful for persuading some workers to disavow the far-right, does not end the threat of a resurgent right-wing authoritarianism. A successful JT might increase the labor left's prestige among demographics that are receptive to right-wing populist messaging and strengthen support for progressive parties among unlikely constituencies. The framework does nothing to build the left's influence within repressive institutions. Generously compensating redundant fossil fuel workers does not disrupt patriot militias, private security agencies, the police, the military, or government intelligence agencies, although in the very best case scenarios legislatures could slash military spending to pay for environmental justice priorities. The left would have to extinguish the sources of the far-right's power to quell threat of reactionary counter

[11] Gramsci's arguments about stamping out the sources of counter-revolution rely on the notion that revolutionaries must exercise overwhelming authority against potential rightist authoritarians *before* establishing an open society. Gramsci promoted a repressive socialist state, but (perhaps naively) believed its predominantly coercive nature would be temporary. In reference to the Soviet Union's displays of force, Gramsci wrote, "dictatorship is the fundamental institution guaranteeing freedom, through its prevention of *coups de main* by factious minorities. It is a guarantee of freedom, since it is not a method to be perpetuated, but a transitional stage allowing the creation and consolidation of the permanent organisms into which the dictatorship, having accomplished its mission, will be dissolved" (2000, 50). He underestimated the Soviet dictatorship's longevity.

movements.[12] Moving decisively to the end ruling class's roadblocks to progress would require, at the very least, breaking up the fossil fuel industry, dissolving the militias and security companies that repress environmentalist organizers, ending the influence of the fossil fuel corporations within law enforcement, and comprehensively erasing big capital's ability to influence elections and news media -- all of which can easily provoke a coup if the left is not prepared for self defense. A successful fight for a JT cannot guarantee the end of reactionary violence.[13]

In addition to arguing that control over the coercive state is a necessary precursor to suppressing reactionaries, Gramsci claimed that workers' movements must reconstitute their own nation states before progressive internationalism gains an institutional footing. Recall that Gramsci thought progressives will only begin to create their own superstructures during the state phase (1971, 404). Gramsci associated progress with the planned development of new superstructures that correspond to the changed economic structure (1995, 273). Building new superstructures to coordinate labor solidarity among workers in different parts of the world may be necessary because the International Labor Organization is poorly suited for uniting workers against global capitalism (Gramsci 1994, 223-224), but establishing these new superstructures will take a prerequisite period of patient nation-building. The proletariat must nationalize itself in multiple countries at once before it can act as an international class. In other words:

> "before the conditions can be created for an economy that follows a world plan, it is necessary to pass through multiple phases in which the regional combinations (of groups of nations) may be of various kinds. Furthermore, it must never be forgotten that

[12] Along these lines, Kate Aronoff (2016; 2019B) calls for the socialization of American energy as a class war offensive against fossil fuel executives not only to protect the climate but also to address the sources of the extreme right-wing's power.

[13] Security from extremism is a fairly common argument for JTs. Citing coal miners' support for Donald Trump's erratic leadership, the Global Commission on the Geopolitics of Energy Transformations suggests JT policies as a solution to the threat of disruptive political divisions that may emerge during clean energy transitions (2019, 63-64). However, if Gramsci was right, then resolutely quelling the social forces behind Trumpism may require *more* disruption -- disruption of the far-right's material sources of power and willing enforcers.

> historical development follows the laws of necessity until the initiative has decisively passed over to those forces which tend towards construction in accordance with a plan of peaceful and solidary division of labour [i.e. to the socialist forces]" (Gramsci 1971, 241).

One political theorist who usefully elaborates a Gramscian approach to global politics, Chantal Mouffe, explains how progressive victory within the nation state may facilitate progressive internationalism. Mouffe is a supporter of the alter-globalisation movement and the World-Social Forum, yet she believes these coalitions need more concrete proposals and consistent forms of representation (2005, 112-113). While advocates of global civil society do often have admirably radical goals and ideas for defending those left-behind by neoliberalism (Mouffe 2005, 106), they do not usually have workable proposals for how to connect, represent, and satisfy globalization's discontents. For instance, even if the U.N. becomes more open to input from unions and green NGOs, it will never be able to directly guarantee workers' rights or environmental justice. Only sovereign states can assure these prerogatives (Mouffe 2005, 100-101). Squares movements like Occupy Wall Street and Spain's *Indignados* are noteworthy for their internationalist orientations, but they cannot replace the democratic state -- which remains the arena in which citizens develop their most long-term, fixed, and central representative identities (Mouffe 2014A; Mouffe 2014B). Seizing power at the level of the nation-state is a crucial precursor to linking progressive state actors through multilateral institutions, particularly at the regional level, to build serious climate treaties or trade agreements that meaningfully prioritize workers (e.g. Mouffe 2013, 50-51 and 59-63). Maybe those who associate the JT framework with the alter-globalization movement's transnational organizing models and preoccupation with direct democracy (e.g. Carroll 2015, 667) could afford to glance over Mouffe's work.

Controlling the state enables workers to shed their sectoral divisions and expands their collective freedom to resolve fundamental, urgent moral problems through creative production. Under socialism, workers councils, organizations that represent the entire working class in a given municipality, will assume the responsibilities previously held by government regulatory bureaucracies, labor union staffers, and corporate managers (Gramsci 1994, 98 and 117). Unlike unions under the capitalist state (which may reinforce the sectoral hierarchies that foster mutual distrust among working people), the workers' councils are composed of "representatives of every aspect of the [heavy industrial] work (manual workers, clerical staff, technicians)" and local service workers, such as "waiters, cab-drivers, tram-drivers, railway workers, road sweepers, private employees, shop-workers, etc." (Gramsci 1994, 98). The councils are to infuse productive work with moral urgency and political agency. As workers democratically decide how to use the economic apparatus, work will become an exercise in responsible citizenship and political problem solving. Direct producers will choose to rearrange production for the common good (Gramsci 1994, 117-118). Italian industrial workers will cease backing self-interested protectionism that disadvantages the countryside and instead choose to use their newly appropriated machinery to make advanced agricultural tools, adequate clothing, worthy irrigation systems, and modern electrical infrastructure for the peasants (Gramsci 1994, 98). The state phase thus completes Gramsci's vision of progress as moral sophistication that resonates through a society's material structure as deliberate, collectively implemented changes.

The hope that the working class may overcome its internal divisions and democratically plan for the common, ecological good animates academic and activist discussion of JTs. Michelle Mascarenhas-Swan, for example, defines the JT framework as strategic efforts to "transition whole [extractive] communities toward thriving economies within their control that

provide dignified productive and sustainable livelihoods, democratic governance, and ecological resilience" and asserts that a JT "requires that human labor be organized through democratic and voluntary cooperation, rather than coercion and exploitation" (2017, 38 and 46). Mascarenhas-Swan disappointingly neglects to explain how exactly the JT can end exploitation. Her calls for a fully democratic energy transition for whole communities may well bring about frustration because capitalism grants property owners the right to manage their property as they see fit. Consider the disappointing outcomes of ambitious, community-based JT efforts in Chicago. In 2012 nonprofit workers with the Just Transition Fund attempted to coordinate local residents, architects, and city officials to democratically plan new, green uses for the space occupied by decommissioning coal-fired power plants. Six years later, the community's plans were left unmet because property owners chose to initiate new polluting activities on the former power plant sights (Lydersen 2018). The JT, a policy meant to relieve workers within the reality of neoliberal capitalism (Stevis 2018), cannot confer the decision making powers of capitalists to all subaltern groups. Doing so would require first overcoming the capitalist state, a task for which progressive forces in the United States are not even close to prepared. The JT has counter-hegemonic potential, but it cannot instantiate eco-socialism. In Gramscian terms, the JT may move labor activism from the economico-corporate phase to the hegemonic phase; it does not take the class struggle to the state phase.

Conclusion

We have seen that progress, for Gramsci, involves popular movements working in tandem to upgrade technology and industrial organization, improve the nation's political culture, and capture the coercive state so that the masses' will be more capable of self-government and group and individual expression. Progress starts with an economico-corporate phase, in which

the advanced social forces focus primarily on improving the industrial working class's living standards and, in so doing, may provoke political reactionaries by upholding sectoral hierarchies and underemphasizing the middle class's concerns. To avoid a far-right retrenchment, emphasis shifts from narrowly trade unionist concerns to more universal, hegemonic concerns as the progressive movement strives to establish moral and intellectual leadership over the middle class. Populism, a process by which traditional intellectuals work together with technical intellectuals to recreate national culture, is an important aspect of hegemonic struggles for intellectual realignment. Although populism, at its best, makes intellectuals more responsive to economic change and the challenges facing insecure workers, populism is not always good. Sometimes populist intellectuals entertain utopian notions that rhetorical interventions can bring about significant changes at the level of global political economy. However, making changes that are global in scale and marginalizing rightists really requires moving beyond intellectual activity and parliamentary reformism and taking over the state's means of repression.

This chapter has argued that JT policies may have the potential to push labor-environmentalist praxis from an economic corporate standpoint to the hegemonic phase by enabling labor activists and advanced workers among FFWs to worry less about maintaining economic stability throughout the clean energy transition and instead focus on inserting their values and perspectives into environmentalist discourse, thereby imbuing green social thought with a more national-popular character. The JT policy framework invites FFWs to do populism by going to universities, interacting with traditional intellectuals, and infusing environmentalist discussions with working class concerns. JTs inhabit the first two phases of progress. JTs help FFWs' unions avoid narrowly focusing on their own members' well being and instead take a proactive stance on climate change; as proactive leaders on an issue of universal relevance, they

avoid the sectoral parochialism that Gramsci observed stoking fascism in the economico-corporate phase. JTs empower redundant FFWs to reshape national culture, a task of the hegemonic phase. JTs cannot fulfill the state phase's tasks of declawing the far-right and reestablishing labor internationalism on a more secure footing (to suggest otherwise may amount to inadvisable utopianism).

One need not agree with all of Gramsci's overarching goals to find value in his expression of populism's relation to progress. Gramsci's cautious attitude toward utopianism offers much promise for today's progressives, who could often use a more disciplined and down-to-earth approach to global environmental issues. In his book *Partisans and Partners: The Politics of the Post-Keynesian Society*, Josh Pacewicz argues that Americans in traditional blue-collar occupations often have trouble sympathizing with the cosmopolitan preoccupations of well-educated, progressive knowledge workers. American center-left politics' post-Keynesian drift away from pedestrian, local, mainstream, bread-and-butter economic issues fuels the erosion of intellectual and organizational discipline as otherwise committed liberals lose themselves in a sea of competing, single-issue NGOS and nonprofits and fall prey to hucksters promoting one-worldist techno-utopianism and feel good volunteerism instead of serious economic analysis. The kaleidoscopic state of political organizing and elevation of distant pet causes to central concerns effectively excludes low income workers from crafting liberal-left discourse and prevents the uninitiated from developing consistent, principled political stances, thereby leaving them open appeals from fundamentalist culture warriors and conspiracy theorists (see Pacewicz 2016, 5-18 and 215-225). One need not accept Gramsci's aversion to liberal pluralism to see the need for humanistic thinkers to moor their global concerns to manual workers' pressing economic issues. The task of regaining working people's trust through well-

planned and expansive interventions in the ideological superstructure should perhaps take precedence over lecturing low-income white people about human equality, street fighting with skinheads, and planting community gardens. My hunch is that, with careful implementation, a JT for FFWs can be a step in this direction.

Chapter Four
Back to Mazzocchi: Reclaiming the Just Transition Framework's Educative Potentials

In chapter three, I argued that the just transition (JT) framework, which amounts to a reform of capitalist labor markets, is not itself revolutionary, but it opens new spaces for what Gramsci might have called left-wing populism, a process by which traditional intellectuals (e.g. journalists, professors, priests, artists) work with technical intellectuals (skilled productive workers) to mold organic intellectuals (with skills as deliberators, theorists, and material producers) and sharpen political philosophy. The process of populism has progressive potential because it pushes workers' movements from economism (a narrow focus on the immediate, economic interests of union members) to a focus on building hegemony, a class's ability to exercise moral and intellectual leadership over other classes. Populism is a process by which practitioners and theorists prepare to exercise hegemony by together rethinking their politics to better appeal to the broad masses and build a new conception of the national well-being. In this chapter, I go into more detail about how the JT framework, by guaranteeing displaced fossil fuel workers (FFWs) access to college education with full wage replacement (see Mazzocchi 1993), opens up spaces for populist collaboration between uprooted union members and green intellectuals. Tony Mazzocchi, the labor strategist behind the JT framework, believed that increasing union workers' access to higher education could empower organized labor to exercise political and technical leadership within an emerging, sustainable knowledge economy. My thesis in this chapter is this: the JT policy framework's educative populism is key to its political significance.

In what follows, I summarize various labor scholars' arguments that sufficiently strong JT policies must expand direct, public control over fossil fuel resources and infrastructure to facilitate a rapid phaseout of dirty energy and best assure just social outcomes for affected

workers. Some observers reasonably argue that suitably radical JT proposals must go beyond demanding defensive protections for the FFWs displaced during the clean energy transition and call for workers, communities, and the state to appropriate dirty energy resources and infrastructure and democratically oversee the phaseout of fossil fuel extraction (e.g. Ware 2015; Gowan 2018). It may well be true that the exigencies of climate change call for expansive adjustments to Mazzocchi's original conception of the JT. However, labor scholars tend to overlook the radicalism of the approach to education found in the Mazzocchi's JT framework. I worry that some labor-environmentalists are so focused on expanding and radicalizing the JT framework that they may overlook how, in its original version, the JT framework is already radical and consequently fail to appreciate how Mazzocchi's populistic stance on education informs JTs.

For clarity's sake, here is some brief background information on Mazzocchi and his JT proposal. Mazzocchi was, at various times throughout his life, the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union (OCAW)'s health and safety director, chief of Washington operations, and union legislative director. In his own day, he was famous for his advocacy to pass the 1970 Occupational Health and Safety Act (Serrin 1983). Progressives also remember Mazzocchi for his energetic but ultimately unsuccessful attempt to form an independent Labor Party in response to the Democratic Party's neoliberalism (see Dudzic and Isaac 2012). The JT policy, perhaps the Labor party's most enduring proposal, aimed to overcome divisive "jobs vs. environment" rhetoric by granting all workers displaced by environmental reforms full income and benefits as they look for alternative work (Labor Party 1996, 79 and 86-87). Mazzocchi argued that a just environmental transition would involve workers displaced from polluting industries receiving "up to four years of tuition stipends to attend vocational schools or colleges -

- as well as full wage replacement while in school," communities receiving money to make up for lost tax revenue as polluting workplaces shut down, and heavy taxes[14] on polluting industries raising the revenue necessary to compensate affected workers and communities (Labor Party 1996, 87; Young 1998, 43-44; Mazzocchi 1993).

Arguments for Democratic, Social Control of Energy as a Condition of JTs

Radical scholars of labor relations (e.g. Stevis and Felli 2015; Felli 2014; Cock 2015; Goods 2013; NUW and NTEU 2015; Sweeney and Treat 2018) often think JT policies should involve workers and governments taking over and rapidly decommissioning dirty energy infrastructure, such as coal mines, oil and gas rigs, refineries, pipelines, and fossil fuel-burning power plants. These labor scholars imply that JTs that indemnify displaced FFWs without expanding public control over the energy sector are insufficient for advancing labor internationalism or countering the rise of right-wing populism in areas that depend on carbon intensive industries for jobs and tax revenue. These radical scholars suggest that if JTs go beyond merely assisting displaced FFWs and also expand social control over energy infrastructure such that the public gains democratic decision-making power over their energy future, then self-interested energy corporations will have no ability to prevent international forums of climate diplomacy from fostering cooperation among Northern and Southern labor unions. If the public does not have democratic control over energy projects, some labor scholars imply, then unaccountable technocrats may disadvantage marginal communities and, in so doing, fuel the anger behind the far right's ascendance. However, democratizing the oversight of energy infrastructure over the course of a politically-fraught energy transition will be difficult because not all democratic constituencies agree on how best to pursue decarbonization. This section

[14] Richard Martin calculates that levying a new, one-dollar surcharge on each ton of coal extracted would raise enough revenue to pay for every American coal miner to go to college on a stipend (2015, 253-254).

summarizes two radical labor scholars' arguments for public control of energy production, explains how socializing energy could facilitate labor internationalism and anti-authoritarian politics, and notes some of the obstacles to democratic, public control of energy infrastructure.

Goods (2013) and Cock (2015) rank just transition proposals by the radicalism of their calls for government control over energy production. Goods categorizes JT proposals as either "minimalist" or "transformative." The "minimalist" position on JTs is compatible with mainstream social democratic parties' attempts to humanize capitalism without significantly disrupting market processes. Minimalist JTs involve unions "seeking to reform market processes and outcomes ecologically, but with an overriding emphasis on protecting existing jobs" (Goods 2013, 17). The minimalist position holds that consultation, retraining, and social protections should be available to workers displaced by climate protection efforts (Goods 2013, 16-17). The Austrailian Manufacturing Workers Union's position on JTs is minimalist: this union associates JTs with a carbon tariff on imports to support local green technology startups, retraining and income support for displaced workers, and research and development into domestically-produced renewable technology (Goods 2013, 20). The "transformative" position on JTs calls for a transition to an energy system that is not only carbon-neutral but also non-capitalist. Transformative JT proposals, which lack support among the leadership of Australia's heavy industry unions, place "environmental and social needs first" before the priorities of economic growth and job preservation (Goods 2013, 17 and 28-29). Goods regrets the absence of support for transformative JTs among mainstream Australian labor leaders because minimalist JTs do not undermine the profit motive, which Goods sees as a cause of climate change (2013, 14-15 and 28).

Much like Goods, Cock distinguishes between "defensive" JT proposals (which call for labor and capital to cooperate for more generous social protections, consultation for displaced workers, new green jobs, and more advanced renewable technology) and "alternative" approaches to JTs that involve labor playing an aggressive role in forging the transition to a clean energy economy (Cock 2015, 2-6). Unlike "anodyne" reformist measures, alternative JTs frame "the climate crisis as a catalyzing force for massive transformative change" that alters existing processes of consumption and production. South Africa's National Union of Metalworkers, which explicitly calls for workers and policymakers to socialize energy enterprises and place them under organized labor's democratic control, has an alternative approach to JTs (Cock 2015, 2 and 6). Goods and Cock's unmistakable preferences for more interventionist and socialistic versions of the JT framework are not unusual among scholars of labor-environmentalism (see also Felli 2014 and Sweeney and Treat 2018).

One argument for why policy makers should use JTs to socialize and democratize energy production involves the need to avert technocracy and, in so doing, reduce the appeal of right-wing populists in coal-dependent communities. Szulecki defines technocratic energy systems as those in which engineers and scientists make the most important decisions while social scientists and civil society play only a minimal role in decision making. In technocratic energy systems, the decision makers treat the public as consumers of energy without any say regarding the composition and structure of their nation's energy sources (Szulecki 2018, 29-30). Avoiding technocracy over the course of JTs, suggest Stevis and Felli, could require a "social" approach to JTs that expands public control over energy infrastructure (2015, 38). Stevis and Felli worry that trade union policy statements often come off as "rather technocratic" by overemphasizing clean energy technology's role in JTs while underemphasizing egalitarian social movements' abilities

to fight for JTs (2015, 39). Avoiding technocracy in a green energy transition might take the "socialization of technology production and development" and "a reorganization of the relations between state, capital and labour" such that workers and marginalized communities will have more responsibility to direct the transition on their own terms (Stevis and Felli 2015, 38-39).

Avoiding technocracy could be necessary for overcoming the rise of right-wing populism, a goal that labor-environmentalists often associate with JTs. The far right often draws from technocratic rhetoric. Conventional energy's boosters use technocratic rhetoric to dismiss their critics and delay environmental reforms. Coal industry spokespeople often engage in a "technological shell game" by emphasizing the use of "clean coal technologies" (Schneider et al 2016, 79). The rhetoric about clean coal presents the coal industry as innovative, environmentally responsible, and self-regulating (Schneider et al 2016, 79-82). Such rhetoric is technocratic because it obscures conflict between various stakeholders in energy generation by suggesting that the coal industry, which constantly avoids pollution controls, actively partners with regulators and civic groups to clean up pollution (Schneider et al 2016, 96). Right-wing populism and technocracy are synergistic. The former Trump administration Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke, for example, is both a technocrat and a rightist idealogue. Zinke led the interior department in a technocratic fashion: he thought the department should have a "command-and-control organization structure," he suggested that technological innovation (not regulation) is the only acceptable way to reduce carbon emissions, and he broke with precedent by systematically refusing to consult with environmental groups (Schneider and Peeples 2018, 5-7). Zinke's strongman approach to public administration expressed rightist nationalism. He accused environmentalist protesters and internal dissidents at his own department of disloyalty to the U.S. military and the American flag (Scheider and Peeples 2018, 10)

JT proposals that counter technocratic rhetoric and resource nationalism with calls for more democratic energy systems might serve to weaken right-wing populism. A 2015 position paper by Australia's National Union of Workers (NUW) and National Tertiary Education Union (NTEU) titled "'Power to the People': Australian unions organize around bold climate and energy vision" makes the case that the best way to counter right-wing populism is with a left-wing populist demand for JTs that proposes social control over energy infrastructure. "As a society," the position paper claims, Australians "should take electricity-generation and distribution out of corporate hands and place it into the commons." The paper describes the call for public and community control over power generation as a distinctly left-wing populist demand because it has the potential to polarize debate in a way that benefits progressive candidates while disadvantaging authoritarians. The demand for social control could polarize the debate between energy corporations who profit from the use of fossil fuels and the working class communities who are experiencing exploitation at the hands of energy giants and the impacts of climate change. The demand's beauty further lies in its potential to challenge "neoliberal hegemony" by disrupting "the alliance that corporations and ideologues have built with sections of the populist right" and winning over typically conservative constituencies (NUW and NTEU 2015). The demand for public ownership of utilities could anchor a broad, unexpected political coalition:

> For electricity workers it is about being able to have a voice and real power in a just transition so they can protect existing jobs and living standards while opening up greater opportunities for their children. For consumers, low wage workers and those outside of paid employment it opens up the prospect of lower electricity bills. For the middle-class and those who can afford solar units, the prospect of a more favorable arrangement for selling back into the grid (NUW and NTEU 2015).

Radical labor-environmentalists thus claim that JTs may hinder the far right's growth by challenging technocracy with appeals to democratic choice that could draw fossil fuel workers and middle class consumers into the progressive base.

The NUW and NTEU (2015) are drawing from the political theorist Ernesto Laclau's work on left-wing populism, which instructs progressives to campaign on divisive wedge issues. For Laclau, aggressive political demands are what create the divide in populist rhetoric between "the people" and "the elite." Laclau (2005B) writes that bold and polarizing demands cohere the people into a singular agent. Most political demands speak only to discrete issues that particular groups see as key to their interests. Authorities acquiesce to some demands and reject other demands, but most demands will not take on any meaning to those whose direct interests are not in conflict or alignment with them. A fighting demand, however, is so audacious and offensive to authorities that they gain respect from many groups who feel underserved by politics as usual. A fighting demand may come to symbolize many constituencies' unfulfilled demands in a given political order. Such demands imply a fight because they divide the political arena between supporters (who come to see themselves as 'the people') and opponents (who come to be seen as 'the elites'). Together struggling under the banner of the fighting demand, the people come to see all their various demands as fundamentally equivalent with one another. Populists deliberately use fighting demands to polarize political relations between the people and the elite and, in so doing, rearrange political faultlines (see Laclau 2005B; see also Judis 2016, 14-16). The NUW and NTEU imply that politically feasible, robust JT policies need energy democracy because energy democracy is one such fighting demand that can equate multiple, competing, unfulfilled demands made by consumers, environmentalists, and FFWs. The proposal for public control over energy resources and infrastructure, in the NUW and NTEU's telling, is the one demand

pugnacious enough to bring together green and union constituencies as a left-wing populist formation capable of stealing the thunder from right-wing populists.

Radical labor scholars tend to think that JT policies that socialize energy production are not only useful for reacting to right-wing populism, but also suited for advancing labor internationalism (e.g. Felli 2014, 389-392). Newell and Mulvaney contend that achieving effective international cooperation between unions over JT policies will require states to assert public control over privately owned energy enterprises. The institutions of global governance are presently too weak to oversee and coordinate robust standards for JTs across nation states. The "weak and underdeveloped infrastructure we currently have for global energy governance" stems from private control of energy resources (Newell and Mulvaney 2013, 132). States will not use international climate diplomacy convergences to push for strict, international standards of environmental and social justice so long as governments remain reliant on self-interested corporations for their energy needs:

> We strike a note of caution about the degree of capacity, autonomy and willingness many state and inter-state institutions have to oversee such a 'just transition' in a neoliberal context in which direct control over energy production and consumption is often either shared with or delegated to the private sector and in which global bodies notionally charged with governing energy have been granted few powers by their member states to strengthen themselves in ways which might enable them to manage and reconcile global trade-offs between tackling energy poverty, energy injustice and climate justice simultaneously (Newell and Mulvaney 2013, 132-133).

With all this in mind, it is necessary to discuss the difficulty of expanding public, democratic control over energy systems. Enacting JTs and democratizing energy production at the same time will be rather difficult because not all democratic constituencies support the goals of clean energy and/or JTs. Some unions may lose interest in internationalism when they gain more say in energy policy making. Phasing out fossil fuels and politically empowering FFWs and their communities are often, unfortunately, contradictory goals. Many FFWs will never

voluntarily endorse decarbonization (Mann 2013, 45-46). Sean Sweeney, a vocal and prominent advocate of the socialization of energy resources, admitted as much during a recent conference on JTs when he discouraged attendees from fixating on public opinion in West Virginia. Worrying too much about West Virginians' preferences would "fetishize the local" in spite of the Appalachian coal industry's global climate impact (Sweeney 2018B). Sweeney thereby acknowledges that policy makers cannot escape from the need to exercise decisive and sometimes unpopular political authority to foster a clean energy economy.

Democratizing energy systems could grant unions more decision making power regarding their energy future, but it will not guarantee a smoother path to labor internationalism. If developed world FFWs' union representatives attain too much decision making power over the management of energy technology, then trade nationalism (and the troublesome economic distortions that come with it) may intensify. If American unions decide to boost domestic green technology production by using nationalist strategies to expand exports in competition with China, then they may oversaturate the global market for such technologies (Park 2011, 74-75). American unions tend to emphasize competitiveness against China as a goal of their environmental initiatives. If these unions come to exercise significant influence over energy policy while their favored fair trade policies languish, then their competitive outlook may inadvertently reinforce the far-right's "America first" agenda (Hultgren and Stevis 2019, 12). Opening energy systems to more democratic input from unions and pollution-exposed communities will not necessarily contribute to JTs, internationalism, or anti-authoritarianism if the affected publics do not support these goals.

Educative Elements of Social Control in Mazzocchi's JT Proposal

Given how consistently advocates of JTs call for JTs to be involved in public control over fossil fuel infrastructure and resources, readers may be surprised to learn that Tony Mazzocchi, the union official who first developed the JT policy framework, was skeptical of proposals to nationalize big oil. As a representative of OCAW during the late 1970s, a tumultuous time for American FFWs in which the AFL-CIO demanded that President Jimmy Carter nationalize the oil industry (see Sundy 1979), Mazzocchi held that nationalization would not improve conditions for oil workers (Moberg 1981). Mazzocchi's efforts to launch a viable independent Labor Party frustrated some leftists because the nascent party did not demand the nationalization of any major industries aside from healthcare (Spartacist League 1995, 4; Silbar 1996, 19-20; Labor Party 1996). This is not to say that Mazzocchi did not question conventional property relations. Mazzocchi's preferred response to runaway shops and deindustrialization was a New Economic Bill of Rights that would grant workers some say in certain corporate investment decisions involving "the closing of plants, overseas investments, mergers and acquisitions" (Serrin 1983; Mazzocchi 1986, 4). Enabling workers to block unfavorable investment decisions would challenge property owners' right to manage and sell their property as they see fit. However, given academic labor-environmentalists' pronounced focus on public control of energy production, it strikes me as odd that Mazzocchi, a historically important strategist of labor/environmental relations, did not call for direct public control or ownership of major energy resources and infrastructure.

In this section, I argue that fully grasping the JT framework's use for expanding social control requires an understanding of Mazzocchi's populistic stances on education policy. Mazzocchi was no cheerleader for liberal property relations and, were he alive today, would quite possibly agree with calls to nationalize fossil fuel infrastructure and euthanize the coal

industry. However, setting direct, public control of conventional energy resources as the fundamental goal of JT policies overlooks the JT framework's uniquely radical implications. As an advocate of accessible higher education, Mazzocchi intended for JTs to increase labor's control over production by enhancing organized workers' skills such that unions would be more able to assert themselves in a complex, globalized, high-tech, world with stronger environmental protections. Mazzocchi's views on class and education could be described, in Gramscian fashion, as populistic because Mazzocchi viewed the university as a space in which working class intellectuals involved with industrial production could interact with traditional intellectuals, often with middle class backgrounds, to develop new processes and justifications for reorganizing productive activity to the advantage of labor. Mazzocchi's populist conception of education informed his proposal for a JT granting all workers displaced by environmental reforms during the transition to a sustainable economy the educational opportunities and resources necessary to access and unionize the knowledge jobs that would characterize work in a post-industrial economy. Education is an irreducible and overlooked element of the JT framework's radicalism.

Mazzocchi was a left-wing populist. Recall from chapter three that Gramsci associates populism with academics making themselves useful by helping advanced workers think outside the union bureaucracy box and develop bold, ambitious solutions to their economic and political problems. Gramsci thought Marxism was in a "populist" phase because it was just starting to become intellectually and practically relevant as practitioners in the workplace and theorists in the academy increasingly learned from each other (1971, 395-396). Gramsci hoped "national-popular" intellectual collaboration could move progressives' economic thought beyond trade nationalism (2015, 212-216). If one takes a left-wing populist to be a kind of progressive who

encourages collaboration between rank-and-file union members and non-productive intellectuals with the aim of seeing beyond economism, then Mazzocchi fits the description.

Mazzocchi's populism was evident in his opposition to the economism of conservative Democratic Party politicos and labor bureaucrats. Mazzocchi criticized the business unionism that flourished in the U.S. after Taft-Hartley's passage for pushing organized labor to act as a narrow interest group instead of, in his words, a "crusade for the advancement of the interests of all people"(qtd. Ryan 1990, 8). He believed that restoring labor's rightful place as a noble cause would require unions to reach beyond the working class and speak to the general public's concerns. Mazzocchi embraced environmentalism because he thought challenging pollution and heedless growth could take labor activism beyond the limitations of productivism (Leopold 2007, 77). Campaigning against pollution, thought Mazzocchi, enlivens and diversifies American labor politics by uniting "the young people inspired by [Ralph] Nader, and the growing environmental movement with the millions of workers exposed [to dangerous chemicals] and injured on the job" (Leopold 2007, 282). Uniting labor unions with environmentalist organizations and grassroots social movements could challenge corporate power more effectively than conventional unionism by increasing unions' visibility and esteem among the American public, which Mazzocchi saw as a precondition to winning major strikes against increasingly hostile corporations in the Raegan era (Moberg 1981, 2). He thus rejected the economistic reformism of unions narrowly concerned with wages and workplace issues.

Mazzocchi's populism was further evident in his collaborations with well-educated progressives to energize and inform the rank-and-file. As a high school dropout who founded an academic journal and regularly lectured at the University of Cincinnati on occupational health and safety (Leopold 2007, 117; Mazzocchi 1990; Serrin 1983), Mazzocchi was comfortable in

academic and union circles. Inspired by the student power movement of the 1960s, Mazzocchi hoped that newly radicalized college students could help him reinvigorate labor and push aside labor bureaucrats (Leopold 2007, 199). Mazzocchi endeavored to recruit rebellious science students to help with his campaigns for environmental protection and worker health and safety (Leopold 2007, 223). Mazzocchi welcomed young radicals to educate OCAW members about the hazards involved in chemical production (Leopold 2007, 254). In the early 1970s, Mazzocchi directed Steven Wodka, a former Students for a Democratic Society member and Columbia graduate, to assist OCAW members in Western Pennsylvania who had been exposed to beryllium. Wodka pioneered labor-environmentalism by helping the workers formulate collective bargaining demands related to chemical exposure and pollution. Wodka's demands (which included the right to full pay for workers who shut down unsafe and toxic production) were taken up during a 1972 strike and influenced Mazzocchi's later JT proposals (Leopold 2007, 267-270). As such, Mazzocchi's populism entailed traditional and technical intellectuals working together to update and refine progressive politics.

Much as Mazzocchi sought help from the student movement to educate workers, he also encouraged the rank-and-file to pursue political empowerment through self-education and wanted workers to view their intellectual labor as an extension of their work. Indeed, Mazzocchi's thoughts often echoed Gramsci's statements about the need to combine superstructural with structural activity.[15] Mazzocchi believed workers would need to become

[15] Gramsci put forward a non-deterministic interpretation of Marx's base/superstructure division. He wrote that one cannot explain "every fluctuation in politics and ideology" as "an immediate expression of the structure" (1971, 407). With strong political organizations, socialists can actively transform the base by engaging with the superstructure. By establishing mass organizations, such as the revolutionary party, socialists will gradually integrate the masses into the political process. As the masses consciously engage in political struggle, they will go from viewing their social reality as a "natural" scenario to seeing their conditions as temporary phenomena shaped by malleable, political-economic processes. Steadily gaining political power, the masses come to understand how the base molds their lives, thus acquiring the confidence and political maturity to intervene in and transform the economic system (1971, 158). At this point, the base "ceases to be an external force which crushes man, assimilates

self-conscious of their own intellectual capabilities before the labor movement could realize its latent potentials (Leopold 2007, 119). Mazzocchi's biographer describes the unionist's views on political education thusly:

> Workers were the ones who made the industrial world turn around. But they were also endowed with transformative power -- they had the potential to take over and run an economy, a nation, the world. Every worker had an inalienable right to education for its own sake (not just training) and the right to enjoy high culture. Workers could appropriate the humanities as well as the means of production (Leopold 2007, 119).

More interesting was Mazzocchi's idea that the "redefinition of work should be education" (1986, 4). Realizing that a post-industrial economy was on the horizon, Mazzocchi thought that the labor movement would have to get comfortable with organizing unproductive workers. Mazzocchi thought that unions could rejuvenate themselves by organizing laid-off workers in declining industries and mobilizing them to educate themselves at college campuses, which could not only expand unions' ranks but also encourage workers to appreciate intellectual labor as a legitimate and respectable kind of labor (Denison 1986, 3).

The original JT proposal manifests Mazzocchi's desire for union activists to reconceptualize work and expand their base into nontraditional territory. While Mazzocchi supported free higher education with living wage stipends for all qualified students (Labor Party 1996, 83), his JT proposal was particularly generous for workers who lose their jobs to environmental reforms. The original standards for the JT, as the reader will recall, include full income replacement and free higher education for all such workers[16] (e.g. Young 1994, 43-44). This would allow laid-off FFWs to enroll without going into debt, balancing demanding classes

him to itself and makes him passive" and becomes "an instrument to create a new ethico-political form" (1971, 367). Gramsci thus uses the base/superstructure division to highlight human agency.

[16] Fascinatingly, in one mid-1980s article Mazzocchi seemed to suggest that universities should accept displaced chemical workers who had not finished high school and would usually be considered unqualified for higher education: redefining work would involve "educating anyone regardless of whether they've gone to kindergarten or graduated college. [Anyone] ought to be entitled, if they lose their job, to go to school for four years, tuition paid; they receive wages at the former rate, tuition paid, *et cetera*" (Mazzocchi 1986, 4).

with part time jobs, and/or abandoning previous spending habits.[17] Encouraging displaced workers to pursue higher education could enrich both labor and academic communities. Society will become more aware of the labor movement's concerns when traditional college students and professors regularly encounter JT beneficiaries in classroom settings (Mazzocchi 1986, 5). Mazzocchi claimed that paying redundant OCAW members to work by standing "on the street corner arguing about Plato and Aristotle" (qtd. Leopold 2007, 417) could improve the ambiance of communities undergoing deindustrialization and spark working class kids' interest in reading (Mazzocchi 1986, 5). With workers coming to accept intellectual labor as a legitimate and respectable form of work, the labor movement could become more diverse and powerful. "If we accept the bosses' definition of work," said Mazzocchi, "we lose before we start" (qtd. Leopold 2007, 418). According to Michael Merrill, a labor scholar who helped Mazzocchi launch a workplace safety program at Rutgers University (Leopold 2007, 418), union members could use this free university education to gain the political acumen to engage with environmentalism on their own terms (without employers and green NGOs defining environmentalism for them) and develop the skills to become the engineers and administrators of a coming green society (1991, 10-11). Merrill and Mazzocchi strongly imply an expectation that the former polluters who become green engineers and public servants will ultimately try to unionize their new workplaces. The book *Worker Empowerment in a Changing Economy,* which may have been the first book to discuss JTs, claims that the policy will spread "economic democracy" into post-industrial sectors (Wykle, Morehouse, and Dembo 1991, 80-81).

[17] Coal miners often have high debts and expensive drug habits that prevent them from seeking lower-paid, but less risky, work. Full income replacement may thus be necessary to quell miners' opposition to serious climate protection measures (see Martin 2015, 41).

The JT policy framework's radicalism lies in its educative potentials. Mazzocchi's populistic approach to education called for intellectual participation between blue collar workers and traditional academics with progressive instincts. He viewed free higher education as a way for workers to take control of their own lives, not only as individuals seeking upward mobility but also as a class pursuing solidarity and empowerment. If implemented, Mazzocchi's JT framework could accustom manual workers to the challenging, rewarding task of intellectual work and thereby discourage the economistic view, unfortunately common in coal country, that immaterial work is not truly work (see Scott 2010; Lewin 2019). Mazzocchi and his collaborators thought that the JT, by providing access to higher education with full income replacement to displaced workers, could be useful for transforming American industry in labor's favor by helping union members prepare for an emerging tertiary, sustainable, knowledge economy on their own terms.

JTs as an Educative Solution to Right-Wing Populism and a Step Toward Internationalism

I am aware that some readers will question my Mazzocchi-inspired presentation of higher education as a source of political power for laid-off FFWs on the grounds that education alone does not grant workers power as a class and the American academy, as an institution, is not consistently friendly toward labor. American higher education's elevation of critical thinking over vocational training fosters a flexible, mobile workforce with transferable skills that quickly moves from job to job. In so doing, the academy may discourage public support for generous unemployment benefits by instilling the expectation that the jobless should easily reenter the workforce (Bowman 2014, 315-318). Turning manual workers into knowledge workers will not necessarily guarantee a renewal of working class solidarity or significantly enhance workers' decision-making power within a clean energy economy: knowledge workers typically occupy

middle-tier positions managing the working class but not making the most important business and investment decisions (Gorz 1972, 29-30; Sweezy 1972, 33-37). JTs will not resolve capitalism's contradictions. As I pointed out in chapter 3, the JT framework is a labor market reform that protects a discrete group of workers in an unstable market. JTs cannot overcome classism. This does not, however, mean that JTs lack radical potential. The JT's educative elements could advance labor internationalism and anti-authoritarianism by nudging the dispossessed to rethink globalization and discouraging anti-intellectualism.

Thomas Dunk provocatively makes the case that the vocational training made available to North American workers experiencing industrial restructuring discourages collective, political responses to neoliberal globalization. Dunk observes that, despite undergoing emotional trauma, laid-off working class Canadian men do not often call for full employment policies or stronger labor protections in response to outsourcing and offshoring (2002, 879). Globalization could very well inspire its discontents to revisit traditions of labor resistance and develop new forms of international labor solidarity against multinational corporations and free trade agreements. Dunk maintains, however, that narrow, vocational retraining programs often stop the displaced from thinking through the power relations that condition deindustrialization. The kinds of vocational retraining and job search counseling offered to laid-off workers reinforce capitalist hegemony by encouraging workers to give up their attachments to previous jobs and union cultures, refrain from worrying about globalization because it is beyond the individual's control, focus on individual self-improvement, and throw themselves into the job search (Dunk 2002, 888 and 895). Mazzocchi's proposal differs from the typical retraining programs offered to trade affected workers by encouraging displaced FFWs to pursue a university education, for free, with full wage replacement. More so than vocational schools, universities stress independent, broad-

minded thinking and self-assertion (Gorz 1972, 37). University education could be more likely than narrower forms of job training to inspire FFWs to engage in deep thinking about globalization and the power relations that condition it.

Furthermore, Mazzocchi's original framework for the JT, with its heavy emphasis on education, could be of use for addressing the problem of right-wing populism. In response to the rising costs of college and the perceived marginalization of conservative perspectives within higher education, the far-right often lambasts the university with anti-intellectual invective (e.g. Phillips-Fein 2019). Anti-intellectual sentiment, particularly hostility toward climate science, appears to motivate Trump's coal boosterism (see Kosoff 2017). The Appalachian studies scholar Douglas Reichert Powell makes the case that academics open themselves to the far-right's abuse by failing to relate to rural and working class populations. Anti-university populists appeal to workers by depicting academics as non-workers (Powell 2007, 201). As an example, Powell recalls how Tennessean business elites attempted to entrench their local cronyistic, good old boy network by appointing Jack Campbell, a Johnson City big wig, as president of East Tennessee State University. When faculty criticized Campbell as unqualified, Campbell's allies appealed to Tennessean workers by claiming in the local press that the aloof professors wanted to choose their own boss (Powell 2007, 200-201 and 209). If the perception that one cannot legitimately consider university faculty to be workers fuels anti-intellectualism, then a JT that funnells displaced workers into higher education (which Mazzocchi believed would accustom workers to the notion that intellectual work is work) could help soothe over the anti-intellectual resentments that advantage the far-right.

In addition to facilitating the transition to a sustainable economy by demonstrating to uprooted FFWs that intellectual work is serious work, JT policies may increase

environmentalism's appeal by providing displaced FFWs with time and resources to strengthen environmentalist political thought. Environmentalism in advanced capitalist countries often exudes a middle class bias by neglecting to speak to the working class's urgent concerns and promoting an insular and exclusive green culture. Douglas Reichert Powell encourages academics in regional universities to exercise solidarity with struggles over rural inequality by helping marginalized students discover and reinvent theoretical frameworks through which to perceive local struggles. Here is how Powell describes the academic intellectual's value for progressive, rural change:

> [A] transformation must be carried out by students and teachers who, working collaboratively, learn new methods for using academic literacies to interrogate the problems and priorities of their own communities, who can bring the connective, integrative, critical skills that academic literacies comprise to energize the local public discourses in which they are involved, and situate those places in broader patterns of historical, cultural, and material struggle (2007, 213).

Although Powell distances himself from populism (2007, 214), he is proposing what Gramsci might call a populist solution to the distance between regional universities and the publics they intend to serve. Recall that Gramsci speaks of populism as a process in which traditional and technical intellectuals cooperate to make their shared political philosophy more organic. By funneling displaced FFWs into colleges, JTs may create opportunities for professors, student environmentalists, and union members to mutually rethink and improve upon environmentalist praxis.

The limitations of environmentalist discourses about work retard the organic development of labor-environmentalist thought. The professional-managerial class[18] orientation of many environmentalist thinkers is one reason why industrial workers can find

[18] The Professional-Managerial Class are college-educated professionals, often with middle class incomes, in fields requiring specialized knowledge and autonomous ethical standards. They are distinct from, and often at odds with, the traditional middle class of small business owners (Ehrenreich and Ehrenreich 2013).

environmentalism off putting. The professional-managerial class embraces meritocracy and has a tendency to associate personal worth with educational attainment, ethical personal consumption habits, and individual consciousness of social and environmental issues. Meritocratic thinking inculcates "shaming and individual solutions" as pillars of environmental politics, thereby intimidating people who lack the wealth, time, information, and patience to practice middle class mores (Huber 2019). For example, groceries from Whole Foods signal merit by marking the shopper's ethics and environmental awareness, but they do not help those without the time and means for ethical consumption become more engaged with environmentalism (Halkett-Currid 2017, 119-124). A more inclusive environmentalism could deprioritize lifestyle politics and prioritize demands that reduce ecological harm while addressing the working class's "stagnant wages, debt, and job insecurity," such as expanded public transportation and inexpensive, decarbonized electricity for low income people (Huber 2019). Might inviting laid off FFWs to participate in environmental studies seminars at the university level alter environmentalist politics, opening environmentalist intellectuals to a less meritocratic politics and helping workers articulate their own political interests in environmental protection? I think it is worth trying. Kentucky's former governor Matt Bevin might not have tried to demagogue against French literature (see Jaschik 2016) if more Eastern Kentucky voters had been personally acquainted with literature professors.

The Gramsci-influenced labor scholar Ragnar Lundstrom's recent research suggests rank-and-file union members, with the right help, can do much to refine environmentalist activity. Mainstream environmentalist discourse, including some union leaders' statements, tends to rely on platitudes about sustainable growth and green jobs of the future and does little to quell workers' fears about environmental regulation's threats to their jobs in the present or explain

how to justly transform existing, carbon intensive sectors (Lundstrom 2018, 545-546). Lundstrom suggests that the union leaders who regularly discuss the threats climate change poses to working people with rank-and-file union members will be most capable of articulating far-reaching, concrete plans to decarbonize work. The rank-and-file will not care enough about climate protection to work on developing climate change mitigation plans relevant to their sectors if union activists do not address them about the importance of climate change (Lundstrom 2018, 546). Lundstrom claims that the "organic intellectual" labor activists most prepared to push workers to formulate ways to reduce pollution on the job will be people with extensive experience and connections with both environmental and labor movements and deep intellectual curiosity about global issues (Lundstrom 2018, 541). Mazzocchi's proposal to encourage displaced workers to pursue higher education could, if implemented, lead more FFWs to become the kind of organic intellectuals that Lundstrom describes. A college campus is one place where it is not especially hard to get contacts with environmental activists or cultivate a personal investment in global issues.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have seen that many radical labor scholars think that asserting social control over fossil fuel infrastructure is necessary for JT policies to be sufficiently just. These scholars assume that social control of energy resources is necessary for the clean energy transition to be sufficiently rapid, thorough, beneficial to vulnerable workers and communities, and capable of advancing anti-authoritarianism and labor internationalism. The notion that the public, workers, and/or communities should take over privately held energy infrastructure is absent in the original articulation of the JT framework. While I do not reject social control over energy production as a legitimate goal of contemporary labor-environmentalism, I nonetheless

hope to have demonstrated the ongoing relevance of the early version of the JT framework. I am cautioning that scholars may overlook the crucial, educative aspects of Mazzocchi's political vision by proclaiming popular control of energy resources to be the fundamental or singular condition of justice in an energy transition. Is it not strange that people calling for more radical expressions of JTs often overlook the ways in which the JT framework has always been radical?

Radical, left-wing populism permeates Mazzocchi's JT proposal. The original JT's populism is both educative and electoral. It is electoral because Mazzocchi thought the boldness of his positions would attract Reagan-supporting workers into the Labor Party (Leopold 2007, 383). In this regard, Mazzocchi was a precursor to present left-populist thinkers who, drawing from Laclau, think that electoral demands for JTs and more democratic energy systems could bring about electoral realignments (see NUW and NTEU 2015). While I appreciate strong language about energy transitions in political platforms, I would nonetheless caution against grand expectations that more and more ambitious plans for JTs and publicly controlled energy production will draw in a critical mass of voters from extractive communities. As chapter two showed, even impressive efforts to compensate displaced coal miners and quasi-socialist controls over fossil fuel energy are no guarantees that right-wing populists will lose their momentum, especially in coal-dependent areas. Yet, even if candidates increasingly come to find that demanding JTs does not win them support among fossil fuel dependent communities, the JT proposal will *still* have potential as a left-populist counter to the far right. If one accepts Gramsci's suggestion that populism involves traditional intellectuals working with technical intellectuals to refine philosophy and praxis, then Mazzocchi's proposal to nudge displaced industrial workers into higher education is populistic. Mazzocchi, a ninth-grade dropout with a thirst for both abstract and applied knowledge, believed that intellectual labor is work and that

blue collar workers are just as worthy and capable of performing intellectual labor as anyone else. Mazzocchi designed his JT proposal to encourage workers displaced from polluting industries to experience and respect intellectual labor, gain a foothold in the academy, and influence emerging clean energy and knowledge work sectors. People who benefit from the JT may, therefore, be less receptive to Trump's attempts to stereotype environmentalists as unmanly, fear monger over the spread immaterial work, and stoke national chauvinism.[19] In this regard, Mazzocchi's proposal carries forward some of the socialist tradition's deepest aspirations. The JT embodies Marx and Engels's call for the "combination of education with industrial production" (1978, 490) and Gramsci's statement that "non-intellectuals do not exist" (1971, 9).

An appreciation of the JT framework's superstructural potentials, of course, should not prevent climate and labor activists from adjusting the JT framework in response to changed circumstances. When Mazzocchi first called for JTs, he was worried for chemical workers' jobs as politicians sought stricter oversight of asbestos and other hazardous substances (Leopold 2007, 409-414). The urgent, immense climate crisis dwarfs the environmental justice issues that first inspired the JT. This is why Eddie Cottle, for example, calls for dramatic, eco-socialist changes to the concept of JT. Given that governments will need to act faster and more decisively than they have acted to address acid rain or any other environmental disaster, the scale of JTs should be grander as well: governments should decommodify all energy production, nationalize all major carbon-intensive industries, and make up for the social disruption this action causes by providing public, green collar jobs to everyone who needs them (Cottle 2015, 6-9). Is decommodification of energy production feasible in the short time humanity has to address

[19] Michael Sweeney (2017) argues forcefully that Trump's claim to represent Pittsburgh (not Paris) provokes fear over changing gender and work norms.

climate change? I hope it is and I happen to approve of Senator Bernie Sanders's plans for the decommodification of energy, which do not involve the direct socialization of the oil industry (see Bozuwa 2019). However, those with maximalist standards for public control over dirty energy infrastructure as a condition of JTs should consider Jeremy Brecher's nuanced stance on the prospects of full eco-socialism:

> Whether the abolition of capitalism would be a good thing or a bad thing, it should not be seen as a necessary or sufficient condition for climate protection...Even the most optimistic timeframe for the abolition of capitalism will leave a world devastated for climate protection. Maintaining that capitalism must be abolished before effective climate protection can be implemented is not only false but also discourages effective action to protect the climate (Brecher 2015, 143-144).

Whether socialist planning, conventional regulations, or something in between drives the clean energy transition, decarbonization will displace FFWs and necessitate robust JTs. Preparing strategies and proposals for robust JTs is an important task for labor scholars regardless of whether or not the phaseout of fossil fuels involves public takeovers over energy production. This is why superstructural as well as structural aspects of the JT deserve careful consideration.

Chapter Five
Why, Exactly, Does Trump Dig Coal?: Monopoly Capital and State Intervention in the U.S. Coal Industry

The U.S. government heavily subsidizes the extraction and burning of fossil fuels (Redman 2017), which is a problem because it contributes to climate change, prolongs frontline communities' suffering, complicates the transition to a clean energy economy, and often rewards corporate shortsightedness. Consider one of President Trump's recent attempts to rescue the moribund coal industry. In late 2017, Trump's Energy Department issued a directive that would have compelled coal-fired power plants to constantly store at least three months' worth of coal on site. While ostensibly written to assure the national power grid's resiliency, the directive was more likely aimed at subsidizing well-connected coal interests and appeasing Trump's donors. The directive would have impacted northeastern and midwestern regional coal markets, which happen to be the biggest revenue sources of the Trump-boosting corporation Murray Energy (Dixon and Wolff 2017). Although the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission rejected the first iteration of this plan, the administration has since sought new loopholes, such as using the 1952 Defense Authorization Act, which authorizes the president to take sweeping controls of strategically important industries in the name of national security. Trump claims that the threat of blackouts and cyberattacks requires him to compel grid operators to purchase electricity from economically struggling coal-fired plants (Aronoff 2018). Commentators from across the political spectrum have dismissed such coal bailout plans as short-sighted opportunism that could cause market distortions, reward uncompetitive and inefficient utilities, unfairly disadvantage renewable energy producers, and impede efforts to address climate change (see Hand 2018).

The Trump administration's willingness to intervene in energy markets to assist private actors raises the following questions: why does the state back coal interests? Why does

government regulation sometimes assist wealthy industrialists at the expense of the public? Why do state/industry relationships appear uniquely corrupt in the U.S. coal industry? How should progressives respond to this corruption? The monopoly capital school of Marxian political economy (and its interpreters in Appalachian studies) attempt to explain why the state often attempts to prop up the coal industry. This school of thought also helps explain how and why the crisis of coal prevents U.S. coal workers' union representatives from endorsing just transitions (JTs) and fossil fuel phaseouts. Monopoly capitalism theorists (such as Paul Sweezy, Paul Baran, James O'Connor, Harry Braverman, and John Bellamy Foster) predict that corporations will respond to crises of overproduction by seeking assistance from the state and organized labor to establish the conditions necessary for oligopolistic pricing. The most powerful corporate actors may present themselves as committed to *laissez-faire*, but they are often willing to cooperate with big government and big labor to stabilize industry and, in so doing, co-opt labor unions. In periods of stagnation and austerity, industrial unions' leaders often become defensive and relatively conservative.

The monopoly capital thinkers' insights enhance discussions of JTs by foregrounding the important role public employees have to play in confronting the state's backing for corporate interests and influencing industrial transformations. Central Appalachian teachers' recent strikes for better working conditions and decent pay indirectly challenged their state governments' overcommitment to economic growth through resource extraction. James O'Connor's stress on the agency of unionized public servants in periods of austerity and industrial transition illuminates the significance of the Appalachian teachers' labor activism, reveals the importance of the American Federation of Teachers' endorsement of the JT framework, and bolsters my own

argument that educative populism may imbue JT policies with anti-authoritarian internationalism.

The Monopoly Capital School

This section summarizes the monopoly capital school of Marxian political economy, which I will later use to explain the causes and consequences of state supports for the U.S. coal industry. The monopoly capital school aims to provide a structural explanation for why the state backs capitalists, elaborates the problems with the state's closeness to business, and provides a solution to these problems. The state enables the consolidation of giant corporations and assists them in accessing new investment opportunities to overcome overcapacity and overproduction. The state's assistance for big business helps co-opt organized labor, encourages national chauvinist responses to unemployment, advances imperialist foreign policy, leads to ineffective regulations that are full of loopholes, and culminates in fiscal crises. Challenging the state's backing for corporations will require class struggle on the part of exploited public employees to reorient the government's priorities.

The monopoly capital school of thought holds that in the twentieth century industrialized countries ceased having competitive capitalist systems and developed monopoly capitalist systems in which giant firms tacitly collude to prevent new competitors from entering the market, jointly set high prices, and limit output and investment (Foster, McChesney, and Jonna 2011, 2; Foster and Konat 2018, 1-2). An immense concentration and consolidation of corporate power marks the monopoly capitalist era (Foster, McChesney, and Jonna 2011, 5-8). Although large corporations may compete through product differentiation and cost cutting, they mostly avoid price cutting in hopes of averting price wars and maintaining stable profits. A mature industry's top producer usually serves as a "price leader" who sets prices that other firms imitate.

In so doing, the firms together "maximize the profits of the group as a whole" (Baran and Sweezy 1966, 58-61). The price setting brings temporary stability while introducing new risks. On the one hand, it delays economic crises by allowing the surplus (controlled by the capitalist class)[20] to rise (Baran and Sweezy 1966, 72). On the other hand, price setting leads to stagnation that may prolong crises because capitalists limit investment and output to keep prices high, thereby impeding growth (Foster, McChesney, and Jonna 2011, 2).

Under monopoly capitalism, the state must intervene to boost growth by opening new opportunities for corporations to reinvest their profits (or, in Baran and Sweezy's phrasing, new outlets for the absorption of surplus). Efficient corporations generate a surplus that rises much faster than capitalists can consume or reinvest it. The state must raise demand so that corporations can profitably reinvest the surplus (Baran and Sweezy 1966, 110-111). To avoid depressions, politicians rely on heavy government spending[21] and imperialist ventures to open new foreign markets (Baran and Sweezy 1966, 89 and 142). The government issues extensive corporate subsidies, such as foreign aid spending that underwrites private sector investment in other countries' infrastructure and extensive highway construction as a favor to the auto industry (O'Connor 1974, 120-121). The state provides corporations with favorable loans and funds their research and development spending to the extent that "the lion's share of investment and production cost is borne by the general taxpayer while the profits accrue to the corporations" (O'Connor 1974, 114). One negative consequence of imbalanced state spending is the co-optation of labor unions, which come to accept the growing military-industrial complex and

[20] Baran and Sweezy define the surplus as the "difference between what a society produces and the costs of producing it" (1966, 10).

[21] Baran and Sweezy agree with Keynes on the need for government spending to boost demand and avoid depression. They nonetheless criticize Keynes for overlooking the role of class power in government spending. The bourgeoisie's embedded power within the state restrains the government from investing in the public's wellbeing while encouraging wasteful defense spending and corporate subsidies. Reorienting government priorities would require a major political struggle to transform the nature of the American state itself (1966, 164-169).

corporate consolidation as sources of manufacturing jobs (Baran and Sweezy 1966, 156-157). "The labor movement has failed monopoly sector workers," writes O'Connor, "by binding them to the corporate-defined and corporate-dominated political consensus" (1973, 239).

Counterintuitively, state regulation under capitalism can enhance corporate power. Despite lawmakers' stated fealty to promoting free competition and public wellbeing, state regulations often make the economy more monopolistic (Baran and Sweezy 1966, 66). Government regulation of business amounts to "self-regulation" by monopoly capitalists, who have enough power to influence the legislative process by which regulations are made, have the skills and knowhow to maneuver through regulatory bureaucracies, and benefit from the investor certainty that stable and consistent regulations bring about (O'Connor 1974, 110-111).

The growth of government, driven by the need to respond to monopoly capital's destabilizing tendencies, overburdens the state. The state must grow to absorb "the social costs of production" by paying off the costs of industrialists' air and water pollution and retraining the workers laid-off during downturns (O'Connor 1974, 131-132). Even as the need for spending and regulations grows, the state lacks the ability to sufficiently tax the capitalists it exists to serve (Foster 1982, 281). Politicians do not aggressively tax corporate wealth and income because employment under capitalism requires constant growth. The very wealthy exploit loopholes in the tax code and benefit from low capital gains taxes (O'Connor 1974, 137-141). The competing pressures for low business taxes and active government result in a gap between government income and expenditures that disproportionately harms the working class in the form of frozen state and local budgets, meager public services, and rising sales taxes (O'Connor 1974, 106-107).

James O'Connor and Harry Braverman provide suggestions for how to respond to monopoly's capitalism's influence over the state. Braverman stresses how monopoly capitalism transforms the traditional class struggle between direct producers and capitalists as mechanization (enabled by state subsidies and growing profits) pushes more people out of industrial work and into non-productive service sector and state employment (1974, 195-196). Non-productive clerical work, even when done by well-educated individuals, is increasingly mechanized, exploitative, and monotonous. As the division of labor becomes more complicated, the experience of work becomes increasingly routinized for everyone. The lack of meaningful and interesting work embitters educated, white collar workers, who will in turn become more active in the class struggle (Braverman 1974, 252). Baran (1988) argues that knowledge workers and bureaucrats must make use of whatever values they gain from their humanistic educations by rebelling for more enriching, rewarding, and socially responsible work.

O'Connor expands on Braverman's arguments by suggesting that non-productive, public sector workers may extend "class struggle from the sphere of direct production to the sphere of state administration" (1974, 105). Although O'Connor thinks that most American unions are too reliant on corporations to throw their weight behind anti-corporate politics, he claims that public sector unions are predisposed toward joining economic populist movements of the unemployed, underemployed, and poor because public sector workers suffer along with the impoverished from the privatization of services (O'Connor 2004, 192-194). Government employees are in a unique position to struggle to change the nature of the state such that it is less dedicated to the needs of capital and more dedicated to the needs of the public. O'Connor encourages public employees to radicalize traditional public sector collective bargaining by forming broad alliances with the many social groups disadvantaged by regressive taxation, lousy public services, and inadequate

regulations (O'Connor 1974, 148-149). This will require public employees to articulate how the state's fiscal problems are working class issues and act to unite victims of tax exploitation across geographic and occupational boundaries (O'Connor 1974, 142-144).

The Monopoly Capital School and Appalachian Studies

I will now provide an overview of how scholars of Appalachia have drawn from the monopoly capital school of thought to explain how and why the government so often intervenes in the economy to support the coal industry's consolidation, how supposedly independent regulatory agencies (despite appearances to contrary) reinforce this consolidation, and why these trends are problematic. John Bowman's study of the pre-World War II bituminous coal industry, *Capitalist Collective Action*, aims to show why coal operators seek state help and why this help is so often corrupted. While rejecting any "blunt distinction between competitive capitalism and monopoly capitalism," Bowman acknowledges Sweezy's contributions and recognizes that modern capitalism changes the form and degree of competition between firms and induces firms to seek outside support from the state and labor to organize their competitors (1989, 212). Bowman shows that coal firms both desire oligopolistic consolidation and have an unusually difficult time achieving it. Throughout its history, the U.S. coal industry has been unstable and cutthroat due to low entrance costs, an overabundance of firms, constant price cutting, and unpredictable demand that encourages overproduction (Bowman 1989, 71-75). Under normal conditions, capitalists could respond to crowded markets and price instability by limiting their output, cooperating to set prices in tandem, and (if the market is too crowded to make a decent profit) closing shop (Bowman 1989, 58-59). Coal operators often cannot take such measures because it is difficult to limit coal production: idling mines (which need pumping and ventilation even when they are not producing coal) is nearly as expense as keeping them in operation

(Bowman 1989, 75). Unprofitable firms therefore have trouble liquidating their assets and exiting the market (Bowman 1989, 33).[22]

Bowman shows that certain coal firms desired state regulation and unionization to stabilize the industry. Coal firms had varying responses to the prospect of regulation because of their differing locations, their unequal financial strength, and the market's instability. Midwestern and northern coal operators were more vulnerable to unionization because of their proximity to urban areas. Knowing that unionization was likely unavoidable, some operators provided material support for the UMWA's campaigns to organize southern Appalachia in hopes of eliminating their competitors' advantage in cheap labor (Bowman 1989, 119-121). The northern operators also supported legislation like the 1935 Guffey-Snyder bill, which would have allowed the government to set coal prices and production quotas. They hoped this bill would raise prices and entrance costs, thereby pushing their competitors out of the market. Naturally, the southern operators opposed these measures in hopes of maintaining lower costs (Bowman 1989, 206-208). Bowman suggests that part of the reason state regulations within the coal industry are so often corrupt has to do with the arbitrary nature of capitalists' support for the regulatory process. Firms support regulation to gain advantages over competitors and their attitudes toward regulation vary based on market conditions (Bowman 1989, 205). Firms may even prefer an under-regulated or over-regulated market if they believe poor government oversight will cause a slump from which they may come out in a stronger market position (Bowman 1989, 220-221).[23]

[22] This is an ongoing issue. Even today, small capitalists may lack the means to close unprofitable coal mines (see Fisher 2016).

[23] The UMWA's president Cecil Roberts claims that the ongoing contraction of the coal industry could soon eliminate the market for coal or bring about a situation in which "only the strongest companies will survive" (qtd. Sullivan 2019). I wonder if Roberts assumes, as do I, that the latter scenario is exactly what the strongest companies want.

Bowman captures the arbitrary nature of government intervention in the coal industry. Different coal firms have different regulatory preferences and they struggle among themselves to determine how the government will intervene. Drawing from the monopoly capital school, Appalachian studies scholars sometimes describe the divisions among coal operators by distinguishing between monopoly and competitive wings within the coal industry (e.g. Walls 1974,70). The bifurcation between monopoly and competitive firms crystallized after World War Two, when UMWA president John Lewis (with nudging from Harry Truman's labor department) negotiated agreements with the largest coal producers enabling the mechanization of the industry in return for better health care benefits and wages for unionized workers. Lewis and the largest operators hoped technological change would foster oligopoly, stabilize prices, and limit competition among operators by eliminating small, less efficient outfits that could not afford to mechanize or pay union-rate wages (Couto 1987, 176-177). Braverman considers Lewis's agreements an important turning point in the development of the monopoly capitalist system, in which the top leadership of organized labor moved away from militancy and toward class compromise (1974, 103-104). The social consequences of this agreement included a massive loss of jobs in the coal industry, degraded working conditions at mechanized mines, less workplace autonomy for miners, and a less militant union (Braverman 1974, 103-104; Couto 1987, 186-191).

The state has also used regulations to stabilize conditions for the industry's monopoly capital sector. William Cleaver argues that the federal government first imposed environmental regulations upon the coal industry in the 1970s to "socialize the militance of the coal operators." Invigorated by an influx of capital and a series of mergers with steel and oil corporations, big players in the coal industry attempted to discipline the working class by co-opting the union and

mechanizing production. The result was chaos as laid-off miners began dynamiting mining equipment and encouraging wildcat strikes. The government turned to pollution controls to limit the sabotage by forcing technological expansion to move at a centralized, rational pace (Cleaver 1975). Referencing O'Connor, Shover, Clelland, and Lynxwiller claim that monopoly capitalists are more likely than competitive capitalists to support enforced compliance with environmental regulation (1986, 15). The Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSMRE) regulates large coal companies more leniently than they regulates their smaller competitors. The larger companies have the resources to hire lawyers, environmental specialists, and engineers who can help them avoid regulatory violations and contest OSMRE's fines (Lynxwiler, Shover, and Clelland 1983, 431-433). Recall that Bowman suggests federal regulation of coal is often arbitrary – firms support it when they benefit; the same firms deride it when it harms them. Also drawing from O'Connor work on the fiscal crisis of the state, Thomas Shannon predicted in 1983 that the industry's regulatory process in Appalachia would become more corrupt as the region's economic distress deepens:

> Faced with [stagnation], the current strategy seems clear: massive increases in corporate subsidies, both directly through the tax system and indirectly through changes in the regulatory practices of government…Changes in regulatory orientation will have a major impact on the region: greater laxity in mine safety enforcement, weaker enforcement of environmental laws (e.g. in strip mining), more intense corporate exploitation of federal lands, reinterpretation of labor laws to make unionization more difficult, reduction in efforts to assure worker health (e.g. brown lung programs), and a more supportive environment for corporate mergers (e.g. further concentration of the coal industry in multinational hands) (150-151).

It almost goes without saying that nearly all these predictions have come to fruition, especially under the Trump Administration. Through selective under-enforcement, regulation under monopoly capitalism favors the largest coal corporations.

Ryan Wishart has updated Bowman's work by showing how ongoing debates among coal executives over how to respond to environmental regulation reflect the historic division between

the industry's monopoly and competitive branches. Concentrated monopoly corporations are typically ideologically moderate in comparison to the rest of the business community. Independent, competitive corporations often take more hardline, conservative positions. Since the neoliberal turn of the 1980s, the competitive firms have played an increasingly vocal role in the coal industry's agenda-setting (Wishart 2014, 131-133). Consider the Obama Administration's 2009 attempt to create a cap-and-trade system, which would have fared poorly as a solution to climate change (See Klein 2014, 219-224), but which presented the coal industry's monopoly capital wing another opportunity to improve their market position. Duke CEO Jim Rogers fought for the interests of monopoly capital by inserting lavish coal subsidies into Waxman-Markey, the cap-and-trade bill. Although the EPA predicted that these subsidies would have increased the U.S.'s overall coal production, the benefits would have been skewed in favor of the biggest utilities. The bill increased funding for carbon capture and sequestration (CCS), an expensive (and hardly effective) clean coal technology available only to the most well capitalized utilities. In Wishart's view, the success of the American Coal Council, a trade group that lobbied against Waxman-Markey, indicates the power of the industry's competitive wing relative to the monopoly capital wing. Wishart suggests the competitive capitalists' power will ultimately harm the industry by preventing insiders from effectively unifying against such threats as perpetually fickle energy prices and the growing market share of other, less polluting fuel sources (Wishart 2014, 157-160; See also Taylor 2009).

Consolidation, Overcapacity, and Government Intervention Under Trump

The monopoly capital school posits that the state attempts to prevent capitalism from falling into crisis by intervening to relieve corporations of competitive pressures and creating new investment opportunities for big business. I will draw from these insights to attempt to

explain why the president so brazenly jawbones for coal despite his avowed opposition to crony capitalism. Baran and Sweezy show that, under capitalism, policymakers are damned if they do and damned if they do not. If industries remain competitive, profit rates fall because of anarchic pricing. When industries consolidate and develop oligopolistic pricing, firms need government assistance in propping up demand so that they may resolve their issues with overcapacity and unused surplus. Bowman and other scholars of the Appalachian coal industry reveal how coal is doubly damned. Coal corporations seek government help in consolidating and stabilizing prices, yet they cannot achieve oligopolistic pricing because of the industry's low entrance costs, high exit costs, and perpetually unpredictable demand. This section shows that the coal industry is currently in crisis because coal firms have tried and (as usual) failed to establish oligopolistic pricing. Having recently undergone mergers and acquisitions, coal corporations have overcapacity issues and need government intervention to help absorb their surplus. The Trump Administration's coal boosterism echoes Baran and Sweezy's observations from a half-century earlier. Former EPA chief Scott Pruitt's regulatory approach forthrightly aimed at stabilizing profit and the president's beggar-thy-neighbor foreign policy aims to open investment opportunities and raise demand for domestic fossil fuel companies.

Although the coal industry's present crisis has been widely reported, it is important to recount one of the central causes of this crisis. A poorly timed wave of mergers, acquisitions, and new investments drove the industry into a slump (Riccardi 2016). In 2011, coal producers began seeking to increase capacity to keep up with rising demand for metallurgical coal from China's then-booming steel industry. Anticipating a growing market, coal producers went into debt to buy new equipment and acquire their rivals' assets (Sontakke 2014). In an act of "hubris and overreach" Alpha Natural Resources and Arch Coal failed to adequately stress-test their balance

sheets before acquiring their respective rivals Massey Energy and International Coal Group (Mufson and Warrick 2016). The acquisitions and new capital investments increased the coal firms' economies of scale and ability to produce at high volumes. The coal giants' fortunes reversed when the Chinese steel industry's growth slowed, bringing down the price of metallurgical coal by seventy percent (Puko, Jarzmensky, and Farrell 2017). A wave of bankruptcies struck the industry – three out of the four largest coal firms went bankrupt by 2016 (Mufson and Warrick 2016) and bankrupt firms produced nearly half of all American coal in late 2015 (Kuykendall and Cotting 2016). Corporate consolidation, overcapacity, oversupply, and unstable prices thus contributed significantly to the thirty thousand coal worker layoffs in the U.S. between 2008 and 2016 (Virtranen and Brown 2016).

While the coal industry's long-standing inability to set oligopolistic prices brings frequent boom and bust cycles (Ciccantell and Gillert 2018, 73), market analysts suggest that consolidation and bankruptcy in coal could finally drive up prices and end the present slump (Loh 2017; Poole 2017). After the 2011 acquisitions and subsequent bankruptcies, exporters began to experiment with an "OPEC-like" tactic: they continued to produce high volumes of coal without cutting back despite the glut. This tactic was intended to stabilize the market by pushing out the smallest, least efficient mines to bring down output and increase costs (Vitelli, Sharples, and Parker 2015). Industry spokespeople expect the resultant bankruptcies to leave behind strong, efficient producers (see Count on Coal 2017) and the industry's depressed state eases the acquisition of mines, which some have hoped will grant the newly-expanded corporations more price-setting power. Bob Murray, Murray Energy's chair, then in the midst of a buying spree, claimed "if you control the fuel supply, you can price it how you want it" (qtd. Denning 2018).

However, there is reason to doubt that more efficient, post-bankruptcy operations and a more consolidated industry will resolve coal's oversupply and pricing issues. Previous departures of small and inefficient operations have not made the industry any less competitive (see Kuby and Xie 2001, 1028-1029). Previous waves of consolidation have not resulted in oligopolistic pricing for coal: in "the early 2000s, the top ten coal companies were producing nearly three-quarters of total output, making concentration in coal comparable to that in other oligopolized industries" (Christensen 2014, 151) and yet the coal industry remained competitive (Kuby and Xie 2001, 1019). Moreover, the industry's oversupply may well get worse with consolidation. In the mid -1970s through the 80s, oil and gas conglomerates bought up forty-four percent of the U.S. coal industry in hopes of receiving "oligopolistic rent" (Elmes and Harris 1996, 522). The opposite occurred. The oil and gas giants' acquisitions merely created a glut of coal that depressed prices (Koerner, Rutledge, and Wright 1995, 660-664).

Given the historical failures of the coal industry to consolidate, it is quite possible that the industry will continue to seek extensive government help to reorganize the market to their advantage yet fail to overcome the present slump. The Trump Administration boosts coal with two of the approaches that Baran and Sweezy identified as ways the U.S. government advances the interests of monopoly capitalists – imperialism and an industry-friendly regulatory regime. For this administration, acting to increase global demand for American fossil fuels and reproducing U.S. hegemony are mutually overlapping foreign policy goals. Trump's bullying on the international stage aims to reverse the U.S.'s decades-long hegemonic decline. Projecting American might by asserting control over other countries' energy resources and exporting as much oil, gas and coal as possible, in Trump's mind, will enhance the U.S's "greatness" (Trump 2015, 34-35 and 63-64). In other words, it will reinforce U.S. power and influence relative to

China and Europe (Wallerstein 2016; Smith 2018). Trump's foreign policy framework of "energy dominance" links American greatness to fossil fuel exports. As Michael Klare puts it:

> In the White House perspective, the United States is engaged in a momentous struggle for global power with rival nations and, it is claimed, the country's abundance of fossil fuels affords it a vital edge. The more of those fossil fuels America produces and exports, the greater is its stature in a competitive world (2018A).

The administration maneuvers to export more coal by seeking to construct a natural gas pipeline to Mexico, finance the construction of coal burning power plants in developing countries,[24] and expedite the export of liquified natural gas to Europe (Klare 2018B). Trump's decision to impose tariffs on Chinese solar panels should be understood as an extension of energy dominance because it will both make coal more competitive against renewables and (in Trump's mind) boost American high tech against Chinese rivals (Smith 2018). Exporting more natural gas fosters America's leverage over Europe and invigorates the coal industry by decreasing the glut of gas and increasing domestic energy prices (Klare 2018A; Conti 2016). Baran and Sweezy would see this energy policy as an example of Washington turning to imperialist ventures to absorb monopoly corporations' surplus. Foster sees energy dominance as a nakedly imperialistic aspiration (Foster, Holleman, and Clark 2019, 77-81).

As discussed above, existing regulations of the coal industry do not threaten monopoly capital. As Wishart notes, "effective climate legislation represents an existential threat to the coal industry" (2014, 126), but the U.S.'s climate protections have never yet been effective. While the Trump Administration is even more lax in enforcing environmental and safety regulations than the last Republican administration (Allen 2017), it is the current cabinet's explicit ideological

[24] The Export-Import Bank, under the administration's guidance, is looking to boost General Electric by funding a Vietnamese coal-burning power plant's U.S.-made machinery (Ives 2018). This is a particularly galling example of hypocrisy because Trump criticized the Ex-Im Bank as a hindrance to free enterprise during his presidential campaign (see Rubin and Kapur 2015). Moreover, this policy seems to fit well with Baran's (1957) description of post-war foreign development aid. The purpose is not to help poor countries escape poverty, but rather to prop up monopoly capital by fostering client states reliant on American imports.

commitments to serving big business that are the most unique and interesting in the context of the present discussion of monopoly capitalism and coal. Baran and Sweezy argue that the state's true, unacknowledged purpose in regulating industry is to stabilize monopoly corporations. Trump's former EPA administrator Scott Pruitt candidly admitted to this role, claiming the EPA's foremost purpose is not to protect the environment but rather to "provide regulatory certainty to the nation's farmers and businesses" (qtd. Kolbert 2017) and "enhance economic growth" (qtd. Sellers, Dillon, and Brown 2018). Trump's appointees to head OSMRE and the Mining Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) share Pruitt's attitudes. Trump's former nominee to oversee OSMRE, Steven Gardner, is a longtime, vocal opponent of the very agency he hoped to lead (MacDougal 2017). Trump appointed a retired coal mining executive, David Zatezalo, to head MSHA. Zatezalo's policies, which emphasize regulatory discretion, have already contributed to a spike in mining deaths and injuries (Goodkind 2018). Zatezalo offers no specifics about his plans to address the resurgence of black lung and signals an unwillingness to enforce existing safety rules (Ward 2017). While unique in its sheer aggressiveness, Trump's anti-regulatory agenda is a continuation of older patterns of monopoly capitalism:

> Business interests seek protection from the intensified market competition of neoliberal monopoly capitalism…business interests pursue regulatory restructuring in order to pare away specific regulations that diminish profitability or impede the movement of capital, while maintaining interventions that support or create markets (Wrenn 2016, 70).

Such lax regulations benefit monopoly capitalists by slowing technological progress and maintaining existing, outdated equipment. To avoid price cutting and expensive investments in new machines, the monopoly capitalist "will prefer to wait until his existing capital is ready for replacement anyway before installing the new equipment" (Baran and Sweezy 1966, 93-96). The Trump EPA's Affordable Clean Energy (ACE) plan, developed by former coal industry lawyer William Wehrum in close consultation with his recent clients (see Lipton 2018), aims to increase

demand for coal and slow the decommissioning of aging coal plants.[25] The EPA expects ACE, a replacement for the Obama Administration's Clean Power Plan (CPP), to decrease America's carbon emissions by only .7 percent to 1.5 percent (Roberts 2018). To achieve these small reductions, the agency encourages power plants to increase their hourly efficiency rates by installing clean coal technologies (King 2018). Under ACE, relatively efficient plants could burn coal for longer hours without necessarily increasing their hourly carbon emissions (Groom 2018). ACE could result an estimated in 113,000,000 million more megawatt hours of coal generation by 2030 than would have occurred under the CPP (Walter and Freed 2018). ACE discourages utilities from shutting down coal plants and embracing new energy sources by allowing state governments to set weak emissions and efficiency targets. Instead of mandating expensive new upgrades, state-level environmental regulators may let plants to "keep running and change nothing" (McNamara 2018). ACE buffers coal interests from competitors by forcing compliance only on "a plant-by-plant basis, meaning operators don't have the option of turning to other resources to achieve far greater reductions at far lower costs" (McNamara 2018). Powerful capitalists turn to the government for help discouraging competition and the adaptation of alternative technologies and energy sources.

Coal Country's Fiscal Crisis of the State

The last section discussed the coal industry's consolidation without addressing this trend's human costs. The corporate restructuring that accompanies consolidation in coal results in what O'Connor calls the fiscal crisis of the state, a condition in which state help for businesses starves public services of funding. O'Connor sees fiscal crisis as an opportunity to radicalize public servants and sway them to challenge the state's dedication to big business. This section

[25] The average U.S. coal-fired power plant is thirty years old – the age at which coal plants are designed to retire (Revesz and Lienke 2016, 151-154).

explains how the restructuring of the coal industry through acquisitions, subcontracting, and bankruptcies enriches executives while forcing the state to absorb the costs of restoring ecosystems, providing jobs, and caring for workers in coal-dependent areas. The resultant degradation of public schooling spurns teachers to challenge the state's commitment to maintaining the coal industry's vitality at the expense of residents' wellbeing. These educators' protests could articulate JTs for coal workers as elements of broad populist struggles for economic equality, a livable environment, and a clean government.

Acquisitions and subcontracting come with great human costs in the form of weaker and less proactive unions, more mining injuries, defanged regulators, and a bankruptcy process that forces local governments to absorb private actors' liabilities. The relationship between acquisitions and subcontracting is counterintuitive. Starting in the late 1970s, multinational corporations began centralizing the industry through acquisitions while simultaneously contracting and subcontracting more extraction to small operators (Brisbin 2002, 103-105) – a "seemingly contradictory trend" (Elmes and Harris 1996, 526). While subcontracting may appear as the realm of small, independent business, the monopoly capital school understands subcontracting as a "means to maintain and expand the oligopolistic control of multinationals in their attempt to accumulate capital" (Suwandi and Foster 2016, 126). In the 1980s, as multinational oil and gas operators acquired more coal holdings, they turned to subcontracting to deunionize and more intensely exploit their new mines' workers. Massey Energy, then owned by Royal Dutch Shell and the Fluor Corporation, pioneered subcontracting as a union busting tactic. Shell and Fluor, accustomed to low labor costs at their South African coal mines, used expansive capital investments in Massey to pressure the company's management squeeze the UMWA (Cuoto 1987, 198-200). Massey began transferring union mines to nonunion subsidiaries.

Massey would close the mines and subcontract nonunion operators to reopen the mines as separate, non-union companies. Massey's ownership structure, while increasingly complicated, remained centralized. Massey typically maintained a "dominant financial interest" in these subcontractors, who were often captive suppliers (Brisben 2002, 103-105). Small subcontractors have the industry's highest injury rates (Buessing and Boden 2016, 952) and their proliferation one reason why the coal industry's union density fell from sixty-seven percent in 1975 to twenty-two percent in 2012 (Christensen 2014, 148).

Corporate restructuring enables operators to skirt regulations with impunity and transfer their business costs onto the public. Even during the Obama years, in which coal executives faced relatively close regulatory scrutiny, the industry's complicated ownership structures impeded effective federal mine safety enforcement. MSHA allows thousands of mine owners to continue operating without having paid fines – some long overdue – for safety violations. Legal loopholes contribute to poor regulatory enforcement. Given that "corporations go in and out of business, mines go in and out of production, and some mineral rights are leased rather than owned," operators may dodge responsibility for violations that occurred in mines they control but do not officially own (Berkes, Boiko-Weyrauch, and Benincasa 2014). When residents of Sylvester, West Virginia attempted to sue Massey after a nearby strip mine constantly covered their town with coal ash, the courts absolved Massey of responsibility because Elk Run Mining owned the mine – even though Elk Run was a subsidiary under Massey's control (Hedges and Sacco 2012, 164). Subcontracted mines' bankruptcy problems are the public's problems. Paul Nyden notes that hundreds of operators contracted to produce coal for Massey and Island Creek Coal Company went bankrupt in the 1980s and early 1990s and, in so doing, escaped paying

millions of "dollars in wages and benefits, unpaid Workers' Compensation Fund premiums, and a variety of federal and state taxes" (2007, 50).

Within the past few years, monopoly capitalists have replicated their small subcontractors' behaviors by using bankruptcy and unclear ownership patterns to avoid necessary payments, skirt regulations, and externalize liabilities. As noted above, coal executives' misreading of global commodity markets and unsustainable, debt-financed acquisitions bankrupted much of the industry. In bankruptcy court, executives secure exorbitant bonuses for themselves while transferring their own responsibilities for their workers and mine land reclamation to the public. Corporate bankruptcy forces the UMWA to seek government backing for their members' health and retirement security. In bankruptcy proceedings, employers "have sheared off hundreds of millions of dollars in obligations to retired miners" and slashed health care funds, thereby jeopardizing tens of thousands of retired union miners' benefits (Brown 2017). If lawmakers had not recently passed legislation to use pre-existing funding to uphold the miners' benefits, then the government would likely have needed to provide for the workers' well-being through Medicaid (Jenkins 2017; Haeder 2017; Walsh 2019). Consider also the risks to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund (BLDTF), which provides disability benefits for black lung patients' whose employers have gone bust. The Government Accountability Office has warned that Congress must raise coal excise taxes for the BLDTF to remain solvent, yet coal lobbyists recently convinced lawmakers to allow deep cuts to the excise tax by claiming that financial stress warrants them the relief. The BLDTF subsequently fell into deep debt. Taxpayers may soon have to bail out the BLDTF (Volcovici 2018; Richardson 2018; Berkes and Jingnan 2019).

Keep in mind that coal executives received generous bonuses even as their bankrupt companies failed so miserably that they could no longer responsibly oversee their social obligations. Alpha Natural Resources, to take just one example, managed to convince bankruptcy courts to approve nearly twelve million dollars in executive bonuses even as the corporation cut employee benefits (Walsh 2016). Huge compensation packages under such circumstances suggest that the coal industry is not truly competitive – top executives have no real incentives to innovate or manage their businesses responsibly (see Tabuchi 2017). While Peabody underwent chapter eleven bankruptcy, their CEO John Eaves took a thirteen-million-dollar compensation package. With Eaves and other coal industrialists receiving large taxpayer subsidies "consumer groups see the generous pay as wasteful government spending that should otherwise go to cleaning up after mining" (Banerjee and MacClure 2017).

Post-mining cleanup is no small concern. Feeble public oversight of coal industry bankruptcies leaves the public at risk of absorbing land reclamation costs and amount to a subsidy for large corporations. Under the Surface Mine Reclamation Act, firms must post bonds to ensure they will have money to restore mining land even in the case of bankruptcy. State governments often tolerate the practice of self-bonding, a controversial practice in which the largest firms give their word that they will pay to reclaim closed mines *without* posting cash guarantees (Banerjee and McClure 2017). The rationale behind self-bonding rests on the assumption that bankruptcy is unlikely for large corporations. The coal industry's troubles put this assumption to rest. In 2014, Wyoming's Department of Environmental Quality granted Peabody Energy self-bonding privileges despite warnings from Fitch Ratings of Peabody's overextension. Carbon Tracker Initiative argues that such carelessness amounts to "a hidden and

unfunded leverage that has in fact been a capital subsidy from the US government to coal mining company shareholders" (2015, 37).

I have thus far shown that corporate consolidation and restructuring in the coal industry has led the state to subsidize corporations. Subcontracting and mergers both consolidated the industry and brought about bankruptcies that harmed organized labor and forced taxpayers to cover private sector actors' liabilities. I will now discuss how such bankruptcies have affected communities and how public servants have responded by challenging the state's subservience to corporate interests. Consider the Pay Up Peabody mobilization, in which St. Louis's public-school teachers organized alongside Native Americans, mineworkers, and southern Illinois frontline community activists to challenge the state's friendly treatment of Peabody Energy in bankruptcy court. The Pay Up Peabody campaign is exemplary for its broad coalition-building: the American Federation of Teachers and St. Louis community organizers brought together the following groups: unionized teachers upset that the city of St. Louis reportedly cut millions of dollars of funding from local schools to offset the costs of tax cuts aimed at keeping Peabody's headquarters within the city (Green 2016); native American activists from Black Mesa and Big Mountain upset with Peabody's Kayenta mine's damage to indigenous land and the government-enforced displacement of Navajo to make way for more coal extraction (Petrin 2016); southern Illinois mineworkers upset with the bankruptcy proceedings' threat to their employee benefits; and Illinois community activists concerned with Peabody's strip mining (Green 2016). The activists called for the courts to establish a fourteen billion dollar "Just Transition Fund" out of Peabody's assets that would be used to care for the communities impacted by Peabody's decisions before granting executives golden parachutes (Jervery 2016). The Just Transition Fund would pay for reparations for displaced Navajo, a return of money stripped from St. Louis

schools, full payment of Peabody workers' benefits, and funding for renewable energy projects and community development in coal dependent areas (Green 2016; Jervery 2016).

I venture to argue that the Pay Up Peabody Campaign resembles and prefigures the kind of populist class struggle against corporate entitlements and for effective, clean government that O'Connor sees as a solution to the fiscal crisis of the state. The protestors did not achieve their stated goal. Peabody executives did not leave the courthouse under pressure to pay into a Just Transition Fund. Yet the protest resonates with Braverman and O'Connor's arguments that conditions of monopoly capitalism proletarianize white collar public servants, who play a strategically important role within the class struggle as agents of transformation of the capitalist state. The teachers wanted to change the way the state relates to monopoly corporations. Furthermore, the UMWA did not endorse this protest, even though some union members participated. The UMWA's neglect is significant because it highlights the responsibility of other unions and non-organized workers in defining and igniting labor struggles for just transition policies given official mineworkers' representatives' coldness toward the just transition framework.[26] This particular protest lacked the militancy, longevity, and organization necessary to achieve deep political change. Roderik (2013) may well be right in asserting that only mass strikes throughout the coalfields could have fundamentally altered the bankruptcy proceedings' outcomes. While Pay Up Peabody could not enact structural transformation, as a protest action it did an exceptionally good job foregrounding geographically dispersed and occupationally distinct working-class fragments' shared interests in resolving the fiscal crisis of the state.

[26] The UMWA has long expressed skepticism toward the U.S. government's willingness and ability to implement an economic transition for Appalachian coal communities. Union leaders often dismiss JT plans as "fancy funerals" incapable of securing coal workers' livelihoods (qtd Roberts 2008).

Another recent movement by Appalachian civil servants stands out for militancy and organization in the face of the fiscal crisis. The 2018 teachers' strikes, in which educators in West Virginia and Kentucky successfully struck for higher wages, speaks to the potential for public servants to reorient state priorities and contribute to a JT. The state's support for monopoly capital caused the strike. State governments have long used hefty tax cuts and subsidies to attract manufacturing plants to coal dependent areas and make up for falling mining employment. As governor of Kentucky in the 1990s, former coal operator Paul Patton granted eleven million dollars in tax cuts and incentives for business activity on former strip mines. The tax cuts drained state resources and failed to generate long-term employment:

> Four of the seven companies that received subsidies closed or never opened and two more employed far fewer people than projected. One North Carolina company, United Globe, defaulted on its promise to provide 100 jobs after securing a $1 million tax credit and left the state. Another plant, the Sunshine Valley Farms biscuit factory, opened in 1994 promising to create 106 jobs. After employing only 7 people five years later, the company was sued by the state to recover the public's half-million dollar investment (Eller 2008 229-230).

Trickle-down economics also starves West Virginia of revenue. As governor, Joe Manchin cut corporate taxes by $425 million a year and worked to end the business franchise tax (Kunkel 2018). No incremental growth resulted, West Virginia continues to have the country's lowest adult employment rate, and the cuts starved the state of education and infrastructure spending (Swint 2012). West Virginia's severance tax on coal and natural gas is relatively low (Barton and Powers 2018). Starved revenues lead to poorly funded schools and low-paid teachers. The average West Virginia high school teacher made $45,240 a year in 2016. Only North Carolina, Mississippi, South Dakota, and Oklahoma pay their teachers less (Bump 2018).

When Governor Justice (and timid unions) claimed teachers' wages could not increase by more than two percent in 2018, the teachers walked out for a five percent wage increase and in protest of new rules that would have left them with higher health care premiums and deductibles

(Campbell 2018). The teachers won their desired wage increases, but the Republican-controlled legislature hesitated to adjust the public servants' insurance and has considered offsetting the wage increase with cuts to funding for tourism development and community colleges (Jones 2018). The Republicans' proposed spending cuts illustrate one problem O'Connor (1974) identifies with traditional public employee collective bargaining: higher wages may harm the working class as a whole by leading to regressive tax increases or cuts to public services.

Yet O'Connor also sees public employee organization as a potential source of transformation that may force governments to prioritize serving their people over serving capital. While the strike's long-term results are not yet clear, some observers anticipate that teachers' militancy may feed into struggles to push the state government to abandon its focus on growth through fossil fuel extraction and focus on more benign and equitable development strategies. While "hardly phrased as such…among the things that public employees are fighting for is to define an economy where fossil fuels are a much smaller part of the picture, if not gone altogether" (Aronoff 2018). For instance, teachers are petitioning for a substantial increase in the state's gas severance tax (Barton and Power 2018). One teacher writes that she sees the strike as a struggle against the coal industry and for a more responsive government and decent public services for all West Virginians:

> West Virginians have been left with a sense of desperation and hopelessness that comes from years of broken promises by those in charge. The coal industry has left us high and dry, we have rising poverty, our population is declining, and an opioid crisis is ravaging our communities. Teachers and school service personnel, in particular, have a unique window into these effects of the economy when we step into school every day. We have students experiencing homelessness, living in an under-funded foster care system, and facing hunger. Lack of funding for education and healthcare is just one of many failures of leadership that have led to school employees -- and the voters of our state -- saying enough is enough (Comer 2018, 101).

The state's American Federation of Teachers (AFT) is taking an increasingly community-driven approach to labor organizing and focusing their activity on fostering economic diversification in the coalfields, improving public services and infrastructure, and cleaning up government. Reconnect McDowell is the AFT's community partnership in West Virginia's poorest county. Reconnect McDowell creates community schools (which provide GED classes and health services for students' parents); partners with nonprofits, government agencies, and residents to determine what public services are most needed; and builds partnerships with community members to improve perceptions of organized labor and gain trust for public servants. The organization has had measurable success improving schools, including a fourteen percent increase in McDowell's high school education rates since 2011, and some limited successes improving governance, such as pushing through reforms to the county's drug courts (Thomhave 2018). O'Connor would likely find Reconnecting McDowell impressive because the AFT is going beyond traditional public sector labor organizing and building broader alliances to challenge the state to focus more on public wellbeing as opposed to corporate enrichment. Reconnecting McDowell's successes are evidence for O'Connor's argument that public servants' unions have agency to address the fiscal crisis of the state.

Conclusion

Coal executives want what they cannot have. They pursue consolidation in hopes of attaining oligopolistic pricing and high, stable profits. However, setting oligopolistic prices is extremely difficult in an industry with low entrance costs, high exit costs, and inconsistent demand. Industrial consolidation in coal leads to overextension, oversupply, overcapacity, and economic crisis. These factors force the government to intervene in energy markets to prop up coal companies by absorbing their costs, boosting their demand, and opening market

opportunities for them. State backing for coal starves public services of funding and provokes a backlash among public employees who may in turn compose the backbone of the struggle for a JT. Some unionized teachers associate their challenges to austerity with their attempts to change West Virginians' economic prospects. The monopoly capital school of thought helps explain why the government so frequently intervenes to back big coal to the detriment of the public, why organized labor sometimes participates in monopolistic practices, and how organized public servants have a distinct ability to challenge the state's subjugation to capital. In this brief conclusion, I will argue that O'Connor's emphasis on the agency of educators as labor activists in periods of crisis and transition complements Gramsci's presentation of populism as an educative collaboration between traditional and technical intellectuals. The monopoly capital school is thus helpful for understanding the role educators may play as populists during the implementation of a fossil fuel phaseout.

The coal industry's doomed attempts to implement oligopolistic pricing condition labor activists' prospects for developing JTs for coal workers. Climate justice advocates ought to be aware of the structural limitations the coal industry and monopoly capital place upon unions in crisis-ridden, carbon-intensive industries as they think about JTs' prospects for advancing anti-authoritarianism and internationalism. The Trump administration's energy policy aims to consolidate and stabilize the coal industry with corporate subsidies, selective regulatory discretion, and trade and resource nationalism. The circumstances of a coal slump and resultant austerity measures compel the UMWA's leaders, who are keenly aware of Trump's energy policy's ineffectiveness (see Sullivan 2019), to back such statist supports for the coal industry and keep JT advocates at an arm's length. Cecil Roberts, the UMWA's president, wants the U.S. to deploy CCS technology on a mass scale (Pyper 2019), celebrates the ACE plan ("Manchin

Applauds New Trump Energy" N.D.), and expresses skepticism of the JT framework (McGowen 2017). The UMWA does not think the just phaseout of fossil fuels within a ten-to-twenty year timespan as envisioned by the Green New Deal's advocates is feasible (Stephenson and Roberts 2019).[27] The UMWA official Phil Smith intends for CCS to keep the Appalachian coal industry afloat for another thirty years (Beard 2018).

Environmentalists sometimes express exasperation with the UMWA's seeming unwillingness to break with employers on the issue of coal's environmental consequences (see Fisher and Smith 2012, 4; Chary 1997, 446). However, the UMWA's defensive responses to environmentalist proposals should astonish no one. Reflecting on the International Woodworkers of America's reluctance to endorse OCAW's JT proposals as many loggers were losing their jobs to automation and environmental conservation efforts in the 1990s, Foster explains that JT proposals are an unlikely cause for unions representing extractive workers during periods of instability and austerity:

> such a [JT] program is an extremely difficult strategy for unions in a natural resource industry in an out-of-the-way area of the country to pursue on their own -- particularly under circumstances of a declining natural resource base, economic crisis, capital relocation, union decline, and growing environmental controls (2002, 130).

Much as Foster helps explain why unions in extractive industries are not always proactive in the push for JTs, O'Connor helps explain how and why teachers are the most prepared to take up the cause of JTs as coal dependent areas undergo stagnation and austerity. O'Connor's work on fiscal crises suggests that central Appalachian teachers are victims of the collapse of coal much like coal workers. The seizure of the state by the coal industry and the decline of tax revenues from coal causes state governments to squeeze teachers, so teachers' representatives have democratic legitimacy in calling for a JT. The AFT's recent resolutions endorsing the JT

[27] This point is disputed. One 2016 study finds that a fossil fuel phaseout within a decade is technically possible (Sovacool 2016).

framework (AFT 2017; AFT 2018) call on decision makers to leave all untapped fossil fuel resources in the ground, end the construction of new fossil fuel infrastructure, and dramatically downsize the carbon intensive military-industrial complex. The resolutions are also notable for their emphasis on the role of the teaching profession in furthering the clean energy transition. "Whereas, the education and health sectors are, in fact, the epitome of green jobs -- low in carbon emissions and vital to the well-being of our communities," resolve the teachers, the AFT "will takes its place at the center of the climate justice movement" (AFT 2017). Implementing the JT policy framework requires a state that is responsive to the needs of citizens (rather than the needs of capital). The proximity of unionized public servants to the state, writes O'Connor, grants them the ability to challenge the budgetary priorities of the state itself through their labor activism (O'Connor 1973, 255). O'Connor would not be surprised that teachers would be the ones to challenge the state's support for coal extraction and militarism.

Although thinkers associated with the monopoly capital school can be skeptical of left-wing populism (see Foster and Chowdhury 2019, 7), my analysis in this chapter (and my focus on populism's educative aspects in previous chapters) reveals how populist practice may enrich discussions of JTs in central Appalachia and imbue the crisis of coal with internationalist and antiauthoritarian potentials. Recall from Chapter Two and Chapter Three that populism, for Gramsci, involves technical and traditional intellectuals cooperating to refine progressive thought and, in so doing, helping form the organic intellectuals who can enact socialism. A populist JT could involve traditional intellectuals based in the university and technical intellectuals laid-off from carbon intensive industry gaining the opportunities to work together to create modern expressions of ecological and labor politics that are unburdened by middle class meritocracy, less committed to resource nationalism, and more expressive of the full range of

American work experiences. The AFT may be in a position to advance a populist type of JT, which could involve endorsing Tony Mazzocchi's standards of the JT as a GI Bill for Workers and acting, as educators, to prepare for an influx of displaced FFWs into higher education. The AFT might do so by identifying professors at universities in coal-reliant states who are open to challenging and expanding environmentalist thought and practice; drafting college orientation materials for FFWs that highlight the political significance of their enrollment; and identifying the most advanced among FFWs and acting to make sure they have intellectual support, advice, resources, and connections to like-minded thinkers. Teachers' unions may be able to act to make sure the JT not only guarantees economic stability for displaced FFWs, but also empowers workers to act as labor activists and citizens in a greener, knowledge-based economy.

Chapter Six
Conclusion

Contemporary discussions of the just transition (JT) framework involve enduring assumptions about the relationship between labor unions' self-interests and political commitments to solidarity. The JT framework reflects long-standing, American assumptions regarding the political role of organized labor, such as the notion that labor is a uniquely responsible agent of progressive historical change, the belief that labor organizations should have independence from the state, and the understanding that labor needs populist politics in order to serve the broader public. The climate solidarity thinkers want JTs to revamp the aforementioned assumptions for a rapidly warming, politically polarized world. Climate solidarity intellectuals echo these lasting ideas about labor politics by arguing that unions must independently design plans for JTs and portraying the working class as a key historical agent of climate protection. The climate solidarity discourse could afford to say more about how populism can make labor-environmentalist causes meaningful for people outside of organized labor's immediate orbit. This dissertation complements the climate solidarity discourse by probing JTs' populistic potentials. I conclude that JT policies that are fixed within populist projects will be more likely to serve internationalist and antiauthoritarian causes. A populist JT could involve political education that nudges displaced fossil fuel workers (FFWs) to exercise hegemony by improving upon contemporary environmentalist praxis and spreading the benefits of industrial unionism to reproductive workers. Teachers' unions in areas that stand to benefit from JTs may be the actors best suited to make JTs populist by overseeing and designing the educational components of compensation for the workers displaced during the transition to a clean energy economy.

American labor organizers have long seen themselves as distinctly responsible for advancing progressive political change for the betterment of the country's working majority and

furthering antiauthoritarian, internationalist values. In the 1950s, James B. Carey, a leader of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers and high-ranking AFL-CIO official, defended American unions from the accusation that they are a "narrow, special interest pressure group" by noting that many of labor's high-priority political demands (such as civil rights, a higher minimum wage, and a stronger social safety net) do not primarily benefit union members. Carey confidently stated that "what is good for all Americans is good for labor" (1958, 62). The GOP impedes unionization *because* unions effectively advocate liberal causes (Bowman 2014, 216-217). The prominent United Auto Workers organizer Victor Reuther proclaimed that American unions' political activities express democratic and cosmopolitan values:

> By improving the lives of wage-earners and their families, by expanding job opportunities within the society, by demanding housing, health, education, and other socially necessary programs, unions deal directly with the national discontents that are the source of social instability, unrest, and war. The international solidarity of free-trade union members is not an abstraction. It expresses the hopes and aspirations that workers hold in common throughout the world (Reuther 1966, 307).

Contemporary labor-environmentalist policies like JTs seem to embody the progressive, internationalist, and anti-authoritarian potentials of labor to which Carey and Reuther refered. Climate change may present historically unprecedented opportunities for labor unions to revitalize their movement by throwing their weight behind green efforts to expand public goods, promote a more democratic and humane public sphere, and promote fair trade instead of economic nationalism -- thus advancing the interests of both union members and the general public (Klein 2014B).

Another assumption that has guided American labor, and may sometimes contradict labor's political idealism, is the belief that unions must maintain a healthy independence from the state. Historically, American workers have experienced fierce repression at the hands of the state for merely attempting to collectively bargain for better contracts. Unions' repeated encounters with

the repressive side of the state have encouraged them to avoid becoming too dependent, as organizations, on big government. Mainstream unions have often hoped for the government to stand aside from their affairs and act as a neutral observer toward the bargaining process between labor and capital (Taft 1966, 134-140). Tony Mazzocchi's opposition to federal control of the oil industry (Moberg 1981) and elevation of self-directed labor militancy over partnerships with employers and state regulators (Leopold 2007, 364) was a more-or-less benign incarnation of American labor's focus on maintaining independence from the government. However, skepticism of government interference can lead to a political insularity that may clash with progressive efforts to support American society as a whole. Union leaders' avoidance of entanglement with the state can limit the ambition of their political projects (see Friedman 1988, 406-411).

American labor's independence from the state resonates with unions' service function, which can discourage labor from pursuing political causes. American unions' service function holds them accountable to their dues-paying members, not the working class as a whole. Unions uphold contracts and protect members' jobs; these tasks require unions to devote much of their money and time to their own members' momentary concerns, rather than the project of building up the labor movement for long-term, far-reaching change (Durrenberger 2007, 75). The former AFL-CIO head George Meaney summarized the service function with his quip that "the organized fellow is the fellow that counts" (qtd. Fitch and Yates 2006). The service function is one factor that hinders labor-environmentalism. The United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) has long questioned climate protection because the threat that decarbonization poses to coal jobs "puts legitimate beliefs that the union's role is to protect and preserve good, union jobs as much as possible" into conflict with "the desire to create a broad coalition of progressive forces and to

prepare for a shifting economy" (Cohen-Rosenthal, Fabens, and MacGalliard 1998, 346-349). The UMWA's servicing function is a reason for the union's skepticism of the Green New Deal and JTs. The UMWA spokesman Phil Smith says his union cannot accept the Green New Deal because his members are more "worried about putting food on the table" than enthusiastic for green efforts (qtd. Valcovici 2019). Labor unions' immediate responsibilities to their members' pedestrian needs can override their commitments to dramatic political change.

Populistic third parties with expansive visions of social justice could potentially reconcile the tensions between labor's progressive and service functions by enabling union activists to independently formulate solutions to problems facing the entire public. American populists have long sought to create an electorally viable, internally-democratic party capable of both responding to local concerns of rank-and-file unionists and channeling the desires of the American people as a whole (Grattan 2016, 82-86). Even Seymore Martin Lipset, a noted skeptic of American labor unions' supposed radicalism (Coker 2002, 39), suggested that a workers' party could help American labor politics overcome the political limitations of service-oriented unionism (Lipset 1971, 17). Mazzocchi's Labor Party outfit aspired to be a grassroots-oriented, democratic party in which workers could propose and debate solutions to the labor movement's conundrums. It could have prepared workers to find political ways around their disputes with the broader progressive movement by speaking to progressive issues from a distinctly working class perspective (see Leopold 2007, 437-442). The JT, the labor party's keystone proposal, was meant to overcome divisions between environmentalists and workers in polluting industries by making the prospect of job losses stemming from environmental protections seem less threatening (Young 1998). An independent party based in the labor movement, speaking to multiclass issues, and producing substantive change through representative democracy could

help overcome the tension between unions' service functions and progressivism. However, Mazzocchi's Labor Party faced formidable obstacles to making inroads in the U.S.'s two-party, winner-take-all electoral system and collapsed after his 2002 death (Dudzic and Seidman 2015).

Building a mass political movement embodying both labor and environmentalism could be an even more difficult task now than it was in the 1990s and early aughts. Workers in carbon intensive industries may well be more distrustful of environmentalists now than they were during Mazzocchi's lifetime because the class biases of liberal environmentalism have been conspicuous in recent years. Observers often viewed Barack Obama's environmentalism as pro-business and milquetoast (e.g. Johnson 2015; Revesz and Lienke 2016, 126-127). Nancy Fraser argues that the Democratic Party, in recent decades, has embodied "progressive neoliberalism," a fusion between "mainstream liberal currents of the new social movements (feminism, antiracism, multiculturalism, environmentalism, and LGBTQ rights)" and "the most dynamic, high-end 'symbolic' and financial sectors of the U.S. economy (Wall Street, Silicon Valley, and Hollywood)" (Fraser 2017). The progressive neoliberals' approaches to climate policy and labor are too compromised by loyalty to the business community to seriously address global warming, deindustrialization, and declining living standards among the working and middle classes. Centrist democrats' failure to aggressively address these problems enables Donald Trump to pose as a champion of the people and gives environmentalism an elitist connotation that will be difficult to shake off (Fraser 2017). Moreover, attempts by conservative policymakers and well-endowed foundations "whose commitment to social justice is questionable to say the least" to appropriate the concept of JTs could undermine the JT policy framework's usefulness for advancing labor-environmentalism by repelling sincere environmentalists and labor activists (see Stevis, Morena, and Krause 2020, 2-5).

The climate solidarity intellectuals (Jeremy Brecher, Paul Hampton, and Sean Sweeney) understand the challenges confronting labor-environmentalists working within today's deeply polarized political space. They seek to update and expand the JT framework in such a way that it could bring together environmentalists and FFWs at at time in which strong climate protection efforts are increasingly divisive. Although climate solidarity thinkers seek to maintain the generous benefits for workers displaced from polluting industries that characterized Mazzocchi's original proposal (see Hampton 2015, 191-192), they want to add demands to the JT framework to make it more useful for addressing environmental protection and labor relations in an era marked by political dysfunction and climate instability (see Sweeney and Treat 2019). Climate solidarity intellectuals want to use the JT to speak to the whole of the people. They argue that the best JT proposals involve the rapid phaseout of fossil fuels, public and democratic control over the phase-in of renewable energy, and a commitment to assisting climate activists in the developing world (Sweeney and Treat 2018, 1-4; Sweeney 2018; Hampton 2015, 189-190). Only a decommodified energy grid can create enough good green jobs that the working class as a whole can economically benefit from the clean energy transition (Sweeney 2012B, 28-29). Brecher wants unions in the carbon-intensive industries to play an independent, agentive role by asserting public control over energy and drawing up the plans for *how* to carry out the phaseouts and phase-ins (2017C, 7-8). The climate solidarity intellectuals' commitments to the energy plans of populist candidates like Bernie Sanders and Jeremy Corbyn suggest a populist approach to the JT framework (See Sweeney 2017). The climate solidarity thinkers' call for unions to lead an epochal energy shift is an attempt to overcome the contemporary obstacles to labor-environmentalism by intensifying unions' progressive imperatives, highlighting unions' independence as actors in a clean energy transition, and actualizing labor's populism.

The climate solidarity discourse could afford to do more to formulate an effective populism that brings to the fore the JT framework's antiauthoritarian and internationalist potentials. Despite their efforts to globalize the process of decarbonization and respond to Trumpism with detailed plans to empower workers, the climate solidarity thinkers do little to explain how to counteract nationalist ideology among FFWs and their communities. More can be done to strategize to use JT policies to win over coal dependent communities to Green New Deal-esque decarbonization strategies and push back against the chauvinistic mentalities that foster right-wing populism. This dissertation has explored the JT's relationship to progressive internationalism, authoritarianism, and populism. Chapter Two, which examined organized labor's role in the German *energiewende*, demonstrated that providing generous compensation for displaced coal workers during a clean energy transition does not guarantee that labor will abandon economic nationalism or that right-wing populists will lose support in coal-dependent areas. Chapter Three explored how populism may help reformist labor policies, like the JT, speak to far-reaching progressive goals of internationalism and antiauthoritarianism. Gramsci's work suggests that progressive populism entails traditional intellectuals grounded in knowledge work and technical intellectuals grounded in industrial production cooperating to establish a new vision of the national good that undermines chauvinistic versions of patriotism. Chapter Four used Gramsci's thoughts on populism to locate the anti-authoritarian and internationalist potentials of Mazzocchi's JT proposal in the proposal's educative aspects. Mazzocchi's vision of a GI Bill for Workers, if implemented, could open space for cooperation between technical and traditional intellectuals by pushing workers with a history of labor activism into the universities. If displaced FFWs engage with and transform environmentalist political thought within universities, then they may update environmentalism to better speak to Americans' good sense.

This intellectual collaboration could reduce the appeal of anti-intellectualism and resource nationalism among FFWs and their communities. Chapter Five proposed that unionized teachers may have a decisive role to play in bringing about JTs in the U.S. and articulating them to a progressive populism. Organized teachers have the economic positionality and democratic legitimacy to influence the JT's implementation. Teachers can propose approaches to the JT that convey the importance of education for labor-environmentalism. I hope this dissertation has contributed to the climate solidarity discourse by pondering how JT policies, through their relevance to education, can be populistic and convey an antiauthoritarian, internationalist, labor-environmentalism.

Chapter One raised the question of who, exactly, the JT policy framework should benefit. Stevis, Morena, and Krause similarly wonder "who should drive the just transition, and for whom" (2020, 4)? While this question remains an open one, I am now in a position to suggest a partial and provisional answer. At least with regard to JTs during any future phaseout of coal in Appalachia, teachers' unions might exercise a special responsibility to oversee and design the conditions of a JT. The teachers' unions can maintain the JT framework's basis in the labor movement (even if the coal workers' representatives are uncooperative with the phaseout) while also leveraging their positions as public employees to challenge the austerity measures that accompany the contraction of major industries. The teachers might shape JTs in such a way that they benefit displaced coal workers, public employees, and (less directly) the general public. In so doing, the teachers' representatives would act upon both the servicing and progressive functions of their unionism. They would act upon the service function by demanding compensation for their communities, which are harmed by the loss of tax revenue from the coal industry, and by designing expansions of public education (which could, in turn, produce more

teaching jobs). They would act upon the progressive function by preparing displaced coal workers to improve upon green political thought (perhaps critiquing its meritocratic and nationalistic tendencies) and spread their experiences with unionism to new spheres. Coal workers who benefit from a GI Bill for Workers could become more resistant to anti-intellectual populism. If the JT policy sharpens environmentalist discourse, discourages overheated nationalism, and weakens the far right, then it will be good for the whole of the American people. If this is to happen, then JT advocates may have to appreciate the educative aspects of populism and recover Mazzocchi's original proposal's emphasis on education. Proposals to assert public control over the energy system are appropriate, but they are not the only potentially populistic aspect of worker-driven renewable energy transitions.

Further Research

I hope that this dissertation has encouraged readers to think critically about the political aspirations that activists attach to the JT policy framework. I have tried to strengthen labor-environmentalists' analysis of the JT framework's progressive qualities by recovering JTs' educational basis and exploring the relationships between higher education, labor politics, and populism. It goes without saying, however, that this dissertation is not the last word on JTs. Much more research on JTs and other labor-environmentalist policies is necessary. I will now pose two directions for further research into the politics of JTs. First, I must consider the question of how best to coordinate the decline of fossil-fuels with the implementation of JTs in liberal capitalist countries like the U.S. Second, the usefulness of JTs as a progressive electoral plank requires more research and debate.

In the 1990s, Lin Kaatz Chary posed insightful questions about JT policies that remain unanswered. Chary asked which workers who are laid-off during the course of a transition to a

sustainable economy should be entitled to JT benefits (Chary 1997, 451)? This is a difficult question because legislators cannot predict the impacts of their decisions on employment with full certainty and it is hard to know exactly which laid-off workers have lost their jobs because of environmental reforms. Chary further asks what kinds of legislation should contain JT policies: "should [the GI Bill for Workers] be language in the [Clean Water Act] itself, or should it be separate, independent legislation that takes a more global, universal approach to the issue" (Chary 1997, 451)? Here is how one may phrase Chary's questions for today's context in which global warming necessitates extensive and inevitably disruptive environmental regulations: should only those FFWs displaced by government-mandated, deliberate phaseouts of polluting practices receive JT benefits, or should all FFWs displaced during the implementation of market-oriented protections (such as Obama's so-called war on coal) also be JT beneficiaries? Should there be one, standard approach to the JT policy for all workers in every polluting industry, or should there be distinct JT plans for each sector and industry vulnerable to the negative employment impacts of clean energy transitions? While the latter option affords greater flexibility, the former could afford greater predictability and fairness.

Philippe Le Billon and Berit Kristoffersen's distinction between supply-side and demand-side carbon constraints could help researchers address the aforementioned questions. Demand-side carbon constraints (such as carbon taxes) aim to limit the consumption of fossil fuels. Supply-side constraints (including production quotas, divestment, and moratoriums) aim to cap the production and distribution of fossil fuels (Billon and Kristoffersen 2019, 3-7). Supply-side cuts are more conducive to JTs because "supply constraint initiatives can offer more directed and intentional options...purposeful political intervention can help producers manage the economic (and political) fallouts of a transition away from fossil fuels" (Billon and Kristoffersen 2019, 16).

In the spirit of Chary's questions, American researchers should prepare JT proposals that live up to rigorous standards of social justice while being compatible with demand-side carbon restraints. Whereas coordinated market economies, such as Germany, stand the best chance of undergoing relatively organized, effective, supply-side fossil fuel production caps (Newel 2019, 33), liberal capitalist countries, such as the U.S., are more likely to implement market-driven, ineffective, demand-side carbon protections. American environmental justice advocates ought to innovate by thinking of ways to attach strong and relatively consistent protections for workers to environmental reforms that rely on diffuse, unpredictable markets. How can policymakers identify JT beneficiaries and prepare JT programs in response to market-driven reforms with results that are spontaneous and decentralized? This challenging question will likely consume much of my future research.

Additionally, researchers should continue investigating the electoral politics of JTs. Some analysts claim that the Democratic Party, having lost their base in West Virginia and other former union strongholds by embracing neoliberalism, could potentially regain the Appalachian working class vote by focusing on economic issues and proposing grand, exciting solutions to inequality (Catte 2018, 26-30; Davis 2017, 79-81; Luce 2019). Bill Fletcher (2016) argues that running on JTs and other bold, economic proposals will help progressives make inroads against Trump and other right-wing populists. Other observers, supposing that coal-dependent communities are too conservative to accept liberal policies that benefit laid-off miners (Roberts 2014) or recalling the recent defeats of economic populist campaigns in the region (Tavernise 2018), seem to doubt that Appalachian voters will respond to such messaging. Whether or not left-wing populist campaigns and JT proposals can open Republican-leaning areas to progressive politics is an open question. In this dissertation, I have cautioned against needlessly optimistic

rhetoric claiming that JTs will decisively put a stop to the growth of right-wing populism in coal-dependent areas. However, I have also suggested that JTs could discourage some displaced coal workers from accepting the far-right. Given the ambiguity of the JT's potential as an electoral plank, the dearth of research into the political appeal of the JT framework within the communities it means to serve is regrettable. Although qualitative researchers have documented extractive communities' pervasive anxieties over renewable energy (e.g. Olson-Hazboun 2018), social scientists could still do much more to determine how rank-and-file coal workers and their communities will respond to JT proposals. Focus group and survey research could be particularly helpful toward this end. I intend to continue studying the relationship between JTs and electoral politics in the near future.

References

Abraham, Judson. 2017. "Just Transitions for the Miners: Labor Environmentalism in the Ruhr and Appalachian Coalfields." *New Political Science* 39.2: 218-240.

Adamson, Walter. 1978. "Beyond 'Reform or Revolution'" *Theory and Society* 6.3: 429-460.

Adamson, Walter. 1980. "Gramsci's Interpretation of Fascism." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 41.4: 615-633.

Adamy, Janet and Paul Overberg. 2017. "Struggling Americans Once Sought Greener Pastures -- Now They're Stuck." 2 August https://www.wsj.com/articles/struggling-americans-once-sought-greener-pasturesnow-theyre-stuck-1501686801 (web 1 May 2019).

Allen, Greg. 2017. "Environmental Penalties Down Under President Trump." 10 August https://www.npr.org/2017/08/10/542603483/environmental-penalties-are-down-under-president-trump (web 3 August 2018).

Alternative for Germany. 2017. "Manifesto for Germany." https://www.afd.de/wp-content/uploads/sites/111/2017/04/2017-04-12_afd-grundsatzprogramm-englisch_web.pdf (web 28 April 2019).

Amelang, Soren, Benjamin Wehrmann, and Julian Wettengel. 2019. "Germany's Climate Action Plan 2050." 21 March https://www.cleanenergywire.org/factsheets/germanys-climate-action-plan-2050 (web 10 May 2019).

American Federation of Teachers. 2017. "A Just Transition to a Peaceful and Sustainable Economy." https://www.aft.org/resolution/just-transition-peaceful-and-sustainable-economy (web 6 April 2019).

American Federation of Teachers. 2018. "AFT Resolution: A Just Transition to 100 Percent Renewable Energy." http://www.aft.org/resolution/just-transition-100-percent-renewable-energy (web 28 October 2019).

Angel, James. 2016. "Strategies of Energy Democracy." https://www.rosalux.de/fileadmin/rls_uploads/pdfs/sonst_publikationen/strategies_of_energy_democracy_Angel_engl.pdf (web 24 February 2019).

Appun, Kerstine, Sven Egenter, and Julian Wettengel. 2018. "Just Transition in Germany could help counter populism -- state secretary." 28 November https://www.cleanenergywire.org/news/just-transition-germany-could-help-counter-populism-state-sec (web 4 May 2019).

Aronoff, Kate. 2016. "In the War Against Climate Change, Physics Isn't the Enemy -- It's Corporations and the Far Right." 7 September http://inthesetimes.com/article/19432/the-war-on-climate-change-is-already-underway.-will-we-fight-back (web 10 August 2019).

Aronoff, Kate. 2018. “The Trump Administration is reshaping the country under the guise of national security. The energy sector is next.” 29 June https://theintercept.com/2018/06/29/coal-bailout-rick-perry-department-of-energy/ (web 7 August 2018).

Aronoff, Kate. 2019A. “We Need A Green Bailout For The People.” 12 November https://www.thenation.com/article/climate-bailout-economy/ (web 2 January 2019).

Aronoff, Kate. 2019B. “How to Burry the Fossil Fuel Industry.” 22 April http://inthesetimes.com/article/19432/the-war-on-climate-change-is-already-underway.-will-we-fight-back (web 10 August 2019).

Banerjee, Neela and Robert McClure. 2017. “How federal giveaways to big coal leave ranchers and taxpayers out in the cold.” 29 December https://www.wyofile.com/federal-giveaways-big-coal-leave-ranchers-taxpayers-cold/ (web 6 August 2018).

Baran, Paul. 1957. *The Political Economy of Growth*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Baran, Paul. 1988. “The Commitment of the Intellectual.” *Monthly Review* 39.10: 51+.

Baran, Paul and Paul Sweezy. 1966. *Monopoly Capital: An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Barton, Tyler and Ryan Powers. 2018. “The Energy Bosses Can Afford to Pay.” 18 June http://socialistworker.org/2018/06/18/the-energy-bosses-can-afford-to-pay (web 13 September 2018).

BAVC. 2015. “Chemical Collective Agreement.” 30 March https://www.basf.com/global/en/media/news-releases/2015/03/p-ir-15-03-30.html (web 15 March 2019).

Beard, David. 2018. “WVU report: coal demand unlikely to last.” 16 August http://wvmetronews.com/2018/08/16/wvu-report-coal-demand-unlikely-to-last/ (web 30 January 2019).

Bell, Shannon Elizabeth. 2009. “There Ain’t No Bond Like There Used to Be: The Destruction of Social Capital in the West Virginia Coalfields.” *Sociological Forum* 24.3: 631-657.

Bell, Shannon Elizabeth. 2016. *Fighting King Coal: The Challenges to Micromobilization in Central Appalachia*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Bellamy, Richard. 1994. “Introduction.” In *Pre-Prison Writings*, ed. Richard Bellamy. New York: Cambridge University Press, ix-xxiv.

Bennhold, Katrin. 2018. “Workers of Germany, Unite: The New Siren Call of the Far Right.” 5 February https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/05/world/europe/afd-unions-social-democrats.html (web 3 March 2019).

Bergfeld, Mark. 2015. “The Upsurge in Germany.” 15 June https://www.jacobinmag.com/2015/06/germany-strikes-railroad-teachers-nurses/ (web 6 March 2019).

Berkes, Howard, Anna Boiko-Weyrauch, and Robert Benincasa. 2014. “Coal Mines Keep Operating Despite Injuries, Violations, and Millions in Fines.” 12 November https://www.npr.org/2014/11/12/363058646/coal-mines-keep-operating-despite-injuries-violations-and-millions-in-fines (web 6 August 2018).

Berkes, Howard and Huo Jingnan. 2019. “Coal Miners To Demand Congress Restore Full Black Lung Benefits Tax.” 23 July https://www.npr.org/2019/07/23/743152782/coal-miners-to-demand-congress-restore-full-black-lung-benefits-tax (Web 29 October 2019).

Bieling, Hans-Jurgen and Julia Lux. 2014. “Crisis-induced social conflicts in the European Union – trade union perspectives: the emergence of ‘crisis corporatism’ or the failure of corporatist arrangements?” *Global Labour Journal* 5.2: 153-175.

Billon, Philippe Le and Berit Kristoffersen. 2019. “Just cuts for fossil fuels? Supply-side carbon constraints and energy transition.” *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* (January): 1-21.

Bispinck, Reinhard and Thorsten Schulten. 2000. “Alliance for Jobs – is Germany following the Path of ‘Competitive Corporatism’?” April https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/bitstream/handle/document/23428/ssoar-2000-bispinck_et_al-alliance_for_jobs_-_is.pdf?sequence=1 (web 6 March 2019).

Black, Sara Thomas, Richard Milligan, and Nik Heynen. 2016. “Solidarity in Climate/Immigrant Justice Direct Action: Lessons from Movements in the US South.” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. 40.2: 284-298.

Blanc, Eric. 2019. *Red State Revolt: The Teachers’ Strike Wave and Working Class Politics*. New York: Verso.

Bloomberg, Michael and Carl Pope. 2017. *Climate of Hope: How Cities, Businesses and Citizens can Save the Planet*. New York: St. Martins.

Boothman, Dererk. 1995. “Introduction.” in *Further Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Ed. Derek Boothman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, xiii-lxxxvii.

Bowman, John. 1989. *Capitalist Collective Action: Competition, Cooperation and Conflict in the Coal Industry*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bowman, John. 2014. *Capitalisms Compared: Welfare, Work, and Business*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Bozuwa, Johanna. 2019. "Bernie Sanders Calls to Seize the Means of Electricity Production." 22 August. https://inthesetimes.com/article/22025/bernie-sanders-calls-to-seize-the-means-of-electricity-production-climate (web 27 September 2019).

Braverman, Harry. 1974. *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degeneration of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Brecher, Jeremy. 2012A. "Jobs Beyond Coal: A Manual for Communities, Workers, and Environmentalists." http://report.labor4sustainability.org/coal_2012.pdf (web 7 May 2019).

Brecher, Jeremy. 2012B. *Save the Humans? Common Preservation in Action*. Boulder, CO: Colorado.

Brecher, Jeremy. 2015. *Climate Insurgency: A Strategy for Survival*. West Cornwall, CT: Stone Soup Books.

Brecher, Jeremy. 2017A. *Against Doom: A Climate Insurgency Manual*. Oakland: PM Press.

Brecher, Jeremy. 2017B. *Climate Solidarity: Workers vs. Warming*. West Cornwall, CT: Stone Soup Books.

Brecher, Jeremy. 2017C. "Jobs for Climate and Justice: A Worker Alternative to the Trump Agenda" March https://www.labor4sustainability.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Jobs-for-Climate-and-Justice.pdf (web 9 November 2019).

Brecher, Jeremy, Tim Costello, and Brendan Smith. 2006. "International Labor Solidarity: The New Frontier." *New Labor Forum* 15.1: 8-18.

Brisbin, Richard. 2002. *A Strike Like No Other Strike: Law & Resistance During the Pittston Coal Strike of 1989-1990*. Morgantown: West Virginia University Press.

Broussalian, Kasia. 2012. "Labour Market Insecurities and the Rise of Far Right Parties." *Journal of Political Inquiry* 4 (Spring): 1-22.

Brown, Jaron. 2016. "Defending the Dignity of Our Bodies, Our Communities, and Mother Earth." Presentation at the 2nd Pacific Northwest Just Transition Assembly, Seattle.

Brown, Dylan. 2017. "Mining union faces 'life-and-death' test." 11 April https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060052929 (web 6 August 2018).

Bryce, Emma. 2017. "Germany's Transition from Coal to Renewables Offers Lessons for the World" 5 September https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/germany-rsquo-s-

transition-from-coal-to-renewables-offers-lessons-for-the-world/ (web 21 February 2019).

Buessing, Marric and Leslie Boden. 2016. "The Impact of Contract Operation on Safety in Underground Coal Mines." *Journal of Occupational & Environmental Medicine* 58.9: 952-956.

Bump, Philip. 2018. "How striking West Virginia teachers' salaries compare with teacher pay in other states." 2 March https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2018/03/02/how-striking-west-virginia-teachers-salaries-compare-to-teachers-in-other-states/ (web 28 October 2019).

Burawoy, Michael. 2010A. "Facing an Unequal World: Challenges for a Global Sociology." http://burawoy.berkeley.edu/Global%20Sociology/Facing%20an%20Unequal%20World.pdf (web 12 August 2019).

Burawoy, Michael. 2010B. "From Polanyi to Pollyanna: The False Optimism of Global Labor Studies." *Global Labour Journal*. 1.1: 301-313.

Burawoy, Michael. 2011. "On Uncompromising Pessimism: Response to my Critics." *Global Labour Journal*. 2.1: 73-77.

Campbell, Alexia Fernandez. 2018. "The West Virginia teachers strike is over. But Oklahoma and Arizona may be next." 7 March https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2018/3/7/17081826/teacher-strike-west-virginia-oklahoma-arizona (web 29 October 2019).

Canadian Labour Congress. 2017. "Involving Workers to Tackle Climate Change." http://canadianlabour.ca/news/news-archive/involving-workers-tackle-climate-change (web 21 February 2019).

Candeias, Mario. 2013A. "Left-Wing Strategies in the Euro-Crisis: A Commented Overview." https://www.rosalux.de/fileadmin/rls_uploads/pdfs/Analysen/Analysen_Left-Wing.pdf (web 3 March 2019).

Carbon Tracker Initiative. 2015. "A Framework for Assessing Thermal Coal Production Subsidies." September https://earthtrack.net/sites/default/files/uploaded_files/Thermal%20Coal%20Prod%20Subsidies_final%2012-9.pdf (web 6 August 2018).

Carey, James. 1958. "Organized Labor in Politics." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 319 (September): 52-58.

Carroll, William. 2015. "Robust Radicalism." *Review of Radical Political Economics*. 47.4: 663-668.

Catte, Elizabeth. 2018. *What You are Getting Wrong About Appalachia.* Cleveland: Belt Publishing.

Cervantes, Jamila. 2018. "Just Transition: A Pathway to Environmental Justice." 26 July https://www.presbyterianmission.org/opw/2018/07/26/just-transition-a-pathway-to-environmental-justice/ (web 1 May 2019).

Cha, J. Mijin. 2018. "From the dirty past to the clean future: Addressing historic energy injustices with a just transition to a low-carbon future." In *Routledge Handbook of Climate Justice* Ed. Tahseen Jafry. New York: Routledge, 211-221.

Chary, Lin Kaatz. 1997. "Pollution Prevention and Income Protection: Fighting with Empty Hands -- A Challenge to Labor." In *Work, Health, and Environment: Old Problems, New Solutions*. Eds. Charles Levenstein and John Wooding. New York: The Guilford Press, 446-457.

Chazan, Guy. 2017. "Germany's working class turns away from SPD." 21 August https://www.ft.com/content/ac8f5060-7da7-11e7-9108-edda0bcbc928 (web 3 March 2017).

Christensen, Kimberly. 2014. "'Dark as a dungeon': technological change and government policy in the deunionization of the American coal industry." *Review of Keynesian Economics* 2.2: 147-170.

Ciccantell, Paul and Paul Gellert. 2018. "The *Loungue Duree* and Raw Materialism of Coal: Against the So-Called Death of Coal." In *The World System as Unit of Analysis: Past Contributions and Future Advances*. Ed. Roberto Korzeniewicz. New York: Routledge, 65-74.

Cleaver, William. 1974. "Wildcats in the Appalachian Coalfields." http://libcom.org/library/wildcats-appalachian-coal-fileds-william-cleaver-zerowork (web 27 July 2018).

Clifford, Michelle. 2017. "Far-right taps into 'anger' over Merkel's policies as German election looms." 22 September https://news.sky.com/story/far-right-taps-into-anger-over-merkels-policies-as-german-election-looms-11047268 (Web 3 March 2019).

"Coal mining is causing this Greek village to sink into the ground." 2018. https://nypost.com/2018/12/19/coal-mining-is-causing-this-small-village-to-sink-into-the-ground/ (Web 6 March 2019).

Cock, Jacklyn. 2015. "Alternative Conceptions of a 'Just Transition' from Fossil Fuel Capitalism." March http://rosalux.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/JCock-Futures-Commission-3_2015.pdf (web October 2017).

Cohen, Rachel. 2019. “Labor Unions are Skeptical of the Green New Deal, And they Want Activists to Hear them Out.” 28 February https://theintercept.com/2019/02/28/green-new-deal-labor-unions/ (web 2 January 2020).

Cohen-Rosenthal, Edward, Bruce Fabens, and Tad McGalliard. 1998. “Labor and Climate Change: Dilemmas and Solutions.” *New Solutions* 8.3: 343-363.

Coker, Jeffrey. 2002. *Confronting American Labor: The New Left Dilemma*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

Comer, Emily. 2018. “Emily Comer: South Charleston High School, Kanawha County.” In *55 Strong: Inside the West Virginia Teachers’ Strike*. Eds. Elizabeth Catte, Emily Hillard, and Jessica Salfia. Cleveland: Belt Publishing, 101-103.

Conti, David. 2016. “Promised upturn for American coal still a few years off.” 15 May https://triblive.com/business/headlines/10404234-74/coal-gas-mines (web 3 August 2018).

Cooper, Lovey and Liz Price. 2019. “Could a Universal Basic Income Solve Appalachia’s Post-Coal Poverty?” 6 February https://www.100daysinappalachia.com/2019/02/06/could-a-universal-basic-income-solve-appalachias-post-coal-poverty/ (web 3 March 2019).

Count on Coal. 2017. “Coal, the Comeback Kid.” 16 August https://www.countoncoal.org/2017/08/coal-comeback-kid/ (web 3 August 2018).

Couto, Richard. 1987. “Changing Technologies and Consequences for Labor in Coal Mining.” In *Workers, Managers, and Technological Change: Emerging Patterns of Labor Relations*. Ed. Daniel Cornfield. New York: Plenum Press, 175-202.

Cottle, Eddie. 2015. “The Myth of a Green Economy and Green Jobs: What Strategy for Labor.” February https://www.rosalux.de/fileadmin/rls_uploads/pdfs/engl/2015-Green-Economy-E-Cottle-02_20151.pdf (web 27 September 2019).

Cox, Robert. 1996. *Approaches to World Order*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Cunningham, John. 2009. “A climatic disorder? Class, coal, and climate change.” 20 January https://libcom.org/library/climatic-disorder-class-coal-climate-change-john-cunningham (web 16 October).

Currid-Halkett, Elizabeth. 2017. *The Sum of Small Things: A Theory of the Aspirational Class*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Davis, Mike. 2017. “The Great God Trump and the White Working Class.” In *US Politics in an Age of Uncertainty*. Ed. Lance Selfa. Chicago, Haymarket, 61-83.

Day, Meagan. 2018. “Friends in High Places.” 28 December https://jacobinmag.com/2018/09/unions-corporatism-state-strikes-political-participation (web 22 February 2019).

Dean, Jodi. 2015. “This changes some things: Jodi Dean on Naomi Klein’s ‘This Changes Everything.” http://links.org.au/node/4339 (web 18 March 2019).

Dean, Jodi. 2019. “Climate Change is Class War.” 5 August http://londongreenleft.blogspot.com/2019/08/climate-change-is-class-war.html (web 16 October 2019).

De Leon, Daniel. 1899. “Reform or Revolution.” http://projects.vassar.edu/1896/deleon.html (web 16 October 2019).

Denison, Dave. 1986. “Rejuvenating the Unions.” *The Texas Observer* 78.17: 2-5.

Denning, Liam. 2018. “Analysis: Coal mogul’s novel plan to save coal is to buy it.” 12 April http://www.crainscleveland.com/article/20180412/news/158021/analysis-coal-moguls-novel-plan-save-coal-buy-it (web 3 August 2018).

Desai, Saima, David-Grey Donald, Sharmeen Hkan, and Andrew Loewan. 2019. “Just transition: a vision and a plan.” 29 April https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/just-transition-a-vision-and-a-plan (web 16 October 2019).

Dietl, Stefan and Kathrin Birner. 2017. “Is blue the new red for workers? – Urgent question in face of the rise of the German AfD.” 28 October http://stefandietl.net/2017/10/28/is-blue-the-new-red-for-workers-urgent-questions-in-face-of-the-rise-of-the-german-afd/ (web 3 March 2019).

Dixon, Darius and Eric Wolff. 2017. “Trump coal backer wins big under Perry’s power plan.” 6 November https://www.politico.com/story/2017/11/06/trumps-coal-backers-energy-power-rick-perry-244535 (web 7 August 2018).

Dorre, Klaus. 2018. “Distant cousins: Trumpism and Germany’s right-wing labor movement.” 17 April https://thehill.com/opinion/international/383555-distant-cousins-trumpism-and-germanys-right-wing-labor-movement (web 24 February 2019).

Dudzic, Mark and Derek Seidman. 2015. “What Happened to the Labor Party?” 11 October https://www.jacobinmag.com/2015/10/tony-mazzochi-mark-dudzic-us-labor-party-wto-nafta-globalization-democrats-union/ (web 6 November 2019).

Dudzic, Mark and Katherine Isaac. 2012. “Labor Party Time? Not Yet.” http://www.thelaborparty.org/d_lp_time.htm (web 25 September 2019).

Duncan, Cynthia. 2015. *Worlds Apart: Poverty and Politics in Rural America*, 2nd Ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dunk, Thomas. 2002. “Remaking the Working Class: Experience, Class Consciousness, and the Industrial Adjustment Process.” *The American Ethnologist* 29.4: 878-900.

Durrenberger, E. Paul. 2007. “The Anthropology of Organized Labor in the United States.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 36: 73-88.

Ehrenreich, Barbara and John Ehrenreich. 2013. “Death of a Yuppie Dream: The Rise and Fall of the Professional-Managerial Class.” February http://www.rosalux-nyc.org/wp-content/files_mf/ehrenreich_death_of_a_yuppie_dream90.pdf (web 25 September 2019).

Eller, Ronald. 2018. *Uneven Ground: Appalachia Since 1945*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.

Elliot, Larry. 2018. “Greece’s bailout is finally at an end – but has been a failure.” 14 August https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/aug/19/greeces-bailout-is-finally-at-an-end-but-has-been-a-failure (web 6 March 2018).

Elmes, Gregory and Trevor Harris. 1996. “Industrial Restructuring and the United States Coal-Energy System, 1972-1990: Regulatory Change, Technological Fixes, and Corporate Control.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 86.3: 507-529.

Ezrati, Milton. 2018. “The German Swindle Built into the Euro.” 23 January https://www.forbes.com/sites/miltonezrati/2018/01/23/the-german-swindle-built-into-the-euro/#74430f2427da (web 6 March 2019).

Felli, Romain. 2014. “An alternative socio-ecological strategy? International trade unions’ engagement with climate change.” *Review of International Political Economy* 21.2: 272-298.

Fielder, Malte. 2019. “Just Transition.” 19 January https://www.rosalux.eu/topics/social-ecological-transformation/just-transition/ (web 6 March 2019).

Fisher, Marc. 2016. “In West Virginia coal country, voters are thrilled about Donald Trump.” December 6 https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/in-west-virginia-coal-country-voters-are-thrilled-about-donald-trump/2016/12/06/8eb0b0ca-b8c2-11e6-b994-f45a208f7a73_story.html?utm_term=.4615f3934d35 (web August 3, 2018).

Fitch, Robert and Michael Yates. 2006. “What’s the Matter with U.S. Organized Labor? An Interview with Robert Fitch.” 30 March https://mronline.org/2006/03/30/whats-the-matter-with-u-s-organized-labor-an-interview-with-robert-fitch/ (web 6 November 2019).

Fletcher, Bill. 2016. “To Fight the Right, We Need to Understand it Better.” 1 September https://www.dissentmagazine.org/online_articles/fighting-trump-right-wing-populism-vs-neoliberalism (web 14 November 2019).

Fraser, Nancy. 2017. “From Progressive Neoliberalism to Trump -- and Beyond.” 1.4 https://americanaffairsjournal.org/2017/11/progressive-neoliberalism-trump-beyond/ (web 6 November 2019).

Frazer, Reid. 2017. “As Coal Jobs Decline, Solar Sector Shines.” 6 May https://www.npr.org/2017/05/06/527047720/as-coal-jobs-decline-solar-sector-shines (web 1 May 2019).

Friedman, Gerald. 1988. “The State and the Making of the Working Class: France and the United States, 1880-1914.” *Theory and Society* 17.3: 403-430.

Foster, John Bellamy. 1982. “Marxian Economics and the State.” *Science & Society* 46.3: 257-283.

Foster, John Bellamy. 2002. *Ecology Against Capitalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Foster, John Bellamy and Farooque Chowdhury. 2019. “The Rise of the Right.” *Monthly Review* 71.5: 1-11.

Foster, John Bellamy and Grzegorz Konat. 2018. “‘The Present as History’ and the Theory of Monopoly Capital.” *Monthly Review* 69.9: 1-13.

Foster, John Bellamy, Hannah Holleman, and Brett Clark. 2019. “Imperialism in the Anthropocene.” *Monthly Review* 71.3: 70-88.

Foster, John Bellamy, Robert McChesney, and R. Jamil Jonna. 2011. “Monopoly and Competition in Twenty-First Century Capitalism.” *Monthly Review*. 62.11: 1-39.

Foster, John Bellamy and Vaios Triantafyllou. 2019. “A Green New Deal is the First Step Toward an Eco-Revolution.” 9 February https://truthout.org/articles/a-green-new-deal-is-the-first-step-toward-an-eco-revolution/ (web 2 January 2020).

Galgoczi, Bela. 2014. “The long and winding road from black to green: Decades of structural change in the Ruhr region.” *International Journal of Labour Research* 6.2: 217-240.

Galgoczi, Bela. 2018. “Just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all - ILO ACTRAV Policy Brief.” https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_dialogue/---actrav/documents/publication/wcms_647648.pdf (web 22 February 2019).

“German chemicals union threatens strike over wage disputes.” 2015 https://www.reuters.com/article/germany-wages-idUSL5N0WE5IG20150312 (web 15 March 2019).

Gil, Begoña María-Tome. 2013. “Moving towards econ-unionism: Reflecting the Spanish experience.” In *Trade Unions in the Green Economy: Working for the Environment*. Eds Nora Rathzel and David Uzzel. New York: Routledge, 64-77.

Gilbert, Geoff. 2019. “Enough ‘Free Trade.’ We Need Solidarity Economies and Reparations.” 20 January https://truthout.org/articles/enough-free-trade-we-need-solidarity-economies-and-reparations/ (web 1 January 2020).

Global Commission on the Geopolitics of the Energy Transformation. 2019. *A New World: The Geopolitics of the Energy Transformation* http://geopoliticsofrenewables.org/assets/geopolitics/Reports/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Global_commission_renewable_energy_2019.pdf (web August 4 2019).

Goodkind, Nicole. 2018. “Trump Says He ‘Saved Coal,’ but Miner Deaths Nearly Doubled in His First Year.” 27 January https://www.newsweek.com/2018/02/23/coal-miners-safety-health-trump-788576.html (web 3 August 2018).

Goodman, Amy. 2019. “Germany to Shut Down All Coal Plants by 2038.” 28 January https://www.democracynow.org/2019/1/28/headlines/germany_to_shut_down_all_coal_plants_by_2038 (web 26 October 2019).

Goods, Caleb. 2013. “A Just Transition to a Green Economy: Evaluating the Response of Australian Unions.” *Australian Bulletin of Labour* 39.2: 13-33.

Gorz, Andre. 1972. “Technical Intelligence and the Capitalist Division of Labor.” *Telos* 12 (Summer): 27-41.

Gowan, Peter. 2018. “A Plan to Nationalize Fossil-Fuel Companies” 26 March https://www.jacobinmag.com/2018/03/nationalize-fossil-fuel-companies-climate-change (web 8 October 2019).

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1994. *Pre-Prison Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1995. *Further Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gramsci, Antonio. 2000. *The Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings, 1916-1935*. Ed. David Forgacs. New York: NYU Press.

Gramsci, Antonio. 2015. *Selections from Cultural Writings*. New Delhi: Aakar Books.

Graham, Andrew. 2017. “Greens say feds don’t want help in coal-tax suit.” 21 March https://www.wyofile.com/conservationists-fear-trump-led-feds-wont-stand-coal-industry/ (web 13 August 2018).

Grattan, Laura. 2016. *Populism’s Power: Radical Grassroots Democracy in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gray-Donald, David and Emily Eaton. 2019. “A just transition requires a planned economy. But whose plan?” 10 October https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/a-just-transition-requires-a-planned-economy-but-whose-plan (web 16 October).

“Greece After the Election -- Not a Threat but an Opportunity for Europe.” 4 February https://newpol.org/greece-after-election-not-threat-opportunity-europe/ (web 15 March 2019).

Green, Carl. 2016. “Coalition demands ‘Just Transition’ in Peabody bankruptcy case.” 2 May https://labortribune.com/coalition-demands-just-transition-in-peabody-bankruptcy-case/ (web 27 September 2018).

Green, Jessica. 2019. “It’s Time to Abandon Carbon Pricing.” 24 September https://jacobinmag.com/2019/09/carbon-pricing-green-new-deal-fossil-fuel-environment (web 2 January 2020).

Greene, Doug. 2015. “Nicos Poulantzas: State, class, and the transition to socialism.” 5 August http://links.org.au/node/4543 (web 27 July 2019).

Groom, Nichola. 2018. “Trump’s EPA unveils weaker alternative to Obama power plant rule.” 21 August https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-epa-climate/trumps-epa-unveils-weaker-alternative-to-obama-power-plant-rule-idUSKCN1L61AK (web 27 September 2018).

Haas, Tobias. 2018. “Germany as a ‘Climate Saviour.’” September https://www.rosalux.de/fileadmin/rls_uploads/pdfs/Analysen/Analysen41_Klimaretter_engl_web.pdf (web 24 February 2019).

Haeder, Simon. 2017. “Mine wars: The struggle for coal miners’ health care and pension benefits comes to a head.” 30 April https://www.salon.com/2017/04/30/mine-wars-the-struggle-for-coal-miners-health-care-and-pension-benefits-comes-to-a-head_partner/ (web 13 September 2018).

Hager, Carol. 2015. “Germany’s Green Energy Revolutions: Challenging the Theory and Practice of Institution Change.” *Germany Politics & Society* 38.3: 1-27.

Hall, Stuart. 1988. *The Hard Road to Renewal: Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left*. New York: Verso.

Hampton, Paul. 2007. “Review of Joel Kovel -- the limits of eco-socialism.” 17 November https://www.workersliberty.org/blogs/2017-07-26/review-joel-kovel-limits-eco-socialism (web 4 May 2019).

Hampton, Paul. 2015. *Workers and Trade Unions for Climate Solidarity: Tackling Climate Change in a Neoliberal World*. New York: Routledge.

Hand, Mark. 2018. “Everybody hates Trump’s coal and nuclear bailout.” 7 June https://thinkprogress.org/renewable-and-nuclear-companies-oppose-trump-coal-bailout-plan-3bd1aa4fb3cf/ (web 7 August 2018).

Harrington, Rebecca. 2016. “Obama revealed a big shift in the energy industry at his last state of the union address.” 13 January https://www.businessinsider.com/sotu-fact-checking-solar-energy-compared-to-coal-industry-2016-1 (web 20 May 2019).

Hedges, Chris and Joe Sacco. 2012. *Days of Destruction, Days of Revolt*. New York: Nation Books.

Heilmann, Felix. 2018. “Why are German coal workers so powerful, when they are so few?” 14 August https://www.climatechangenews.com/2018/08/14/german-coal-workers-powerful/ (web 22 February 2019).

Hornberg, Claudia, Manfred Niekisch, Christian Calliess, Claudia Kenfert, Wolfgang Lucht, Lamia Messari-Becker, and Vera Susanne Rotter. 2017. “Start Coal Phaseout Now.” October https://www.umweltrat.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/EN/04_Statements/2016_2020/2017_10_statement_coal_phaseout.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=4 (web 22 February 2019).

Huber, Matt. 2019. “Ecological Politics for the Working Class.” *Catalyst* 3.1 https://catalyst-journal.com/vol3/no1/ecological-politics-for-the-working-class (web 23 September 2019).

Hultgren, John and Dimitris Stevis. 2019. “Interrogating socio-ecological coalitions: Environmentalist engagements with labor and immigrants’ rights in the United States.” *Environmental Politics* (August): 1-22.

IndustriALL. 2018. “Coal mining unions demand Just Transition.” 15 October http://www.industriall-union.org/coal-mining-unions-demand-just-transition (web 6 March 2019).

Irfan, Umair. 2019. “The Green New Deal is fracturing a critical base for Democrats: Unions.” 19 June https://www.vox.com/2019/5/22/18628299/green-new-deal-labor-union-2020-democrats (web 2 January 2020).

Ives, Mike. 2018. “The U.S. May Back a Vietnam Coal Plant. Russia is Already Helping.” 26 January. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/26/business/exim-bank-vietnam-russia-coal.html (web 3 August 2018).

Jaschik, Scott. 2016. “Kentucky’s Governor vs. French Literature.” 1 February https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2016/02/01/kentuckys-governor-vs-french-literature (web 14 November 2019).

Jayatilleka, Dayan. 2017. “The Great Gramsci: Imagining an Alt-Left Project.” 2 March https://www.21global.ucsb.edu/global-e/march-2017/great-gramsci-imagining-alt-left-project (web 30 April 2019).

Jenkins, Jeff. 2017. “Manchin, Capito, others reintroduce Miners Protection Act.” 17 January http://wvmetronews.com/2017/01/17/manchin-capito-others-reintroduce-miners-protection-act/ (web 6 August 2018).

Jervey, Ben. 2016. “Peabody Energy Bankruptcy Claim Must Put Lands, Water, and People Above Executives and Bankers, Say Protestors.” https://www.desmogblog.com/2016/04/19/peabody-energy-bankruptcy-just-transition-community-impacted-protest (web 13 September 2018).

Johnson, Brad. 2015. “What’s Wrong with Obama’s Clean Power Plan?” 5 September https://www.jacobinmag.com/2015/09/clean-power-plan-global-warming-epa/ (web 8 November 2019).

Jones, Sarah. 2018. “Requiem for a Strike.” 7 March https://newrepublic.com/article/147307/cost-west-virginia-teachers-strike (web 13 September 2018).

Joshi, Zarna. 2016. “Defending the Dignity of Our Bodies, Our Communities, and Mother Earth.” Presentation at the 2nd Pacific Northwest Just Transition Assembly, Seattle.

Judis, John. 2016. *The Populist Explosion: How the Great Recession Transformed American and European Politics*. New York: Columbia Global Reports.

“Juncker attends closure of Germany’s last black coal mine” 2018. https://www.euractiv.com/section/energy/news/juncker-attends-closure-of-germanys-last-black-coal-mine/ (web 22 February 2019).

Just Transition Centre. 2017. “A Net-Zero Transition that Leaves No One Behind.” 19 September https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c7HsQt_TPEw (web 3 April 2019).

Kaiser, Martin. 2019. What’s Happening with Germany’s Coal Phaseout. 29 January https://unearthed.greenpeace.org/2019/01/29/whats-happening-with-germany-coal-commission-phase-out/ (web 10 May 2019).

Kim, Seongcheol. 2017. “The populism of the Alternative for Germany (AfD): an extended Essex School perspective.” *Palgrave Communications* 3.5: 1-11.

King, Ed. 2016. “Climate deal must offer hope for coal miners, says German Minister.” 15 November http://www.climatechangenews.com/2016/11/15/climate-deal-must-offer-hope-for-coal-miners-says-german-minister/ (web 22 February 2019).

King, Ledyard. 2018. “Coal comeback? EPA plan would prolong life for power plants seen as climate change culprit.” 21 August https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2018/08/21/coal-comeback-trump-epa-plan-would-extend-life-aging-power-plants/1049002002/ (web 29 September 2018).

Klare, Michael. 2017. “Oil is Donald Trump’s Foreign Policy.” 31 July https://warisboring.com/oil-is-donald-trumps-foreign-policy/ (web 3 April 2019).

Klare, Michael. 2018A. “Donald Trump’s Extract Everything Energy Policy.” 12 February https://www.thenation.com/article/donald-trumps-extract-everything-energy-policy-dooms-us-all/ (web 3 August 2018).

Klare, Michael. 2018.B “The Strategy of Maximal Extraction.” 11 February http://www.tomdispatch.com/post/176384/tomgram%3A_michael_klare%2C_militarizing_america%27s_energy_policy/ (web 3 August 2018).

Klean Industries. 2010. “EU Parliament backs German demand to prolong coal subsidies to 2018.” 23 November http://www.kleanindustries.com/s/environmental_market_industry_news.asp?ReportID=432032 (web 22 February 2019).

Klein, Naomi. 2014A. *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. the Climate*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Klein, Naomi. 2014B. “Why Unions Need to Join the Climate Fight.” 29 June https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2KLd6Q5WQ4g (web 6 November 2019).

Klein, Naomi. 2015. “Climate Change Is a Crisis We Can Only Solve Together.” 19 June https://www.commondreams.org/views/2015/06/19/climate-change-crisis-we-can-only-solve-together (web 17 October 2019).

Klein, Naomi. 2017. *No is Not Enough: Resisting Trump’s Shock Politics and Winning the World we Need*. Chicago: Haymarket.

Koerner, Richard, Ian Rutledge, and Philip Wright. 1995. “The impact of oil company investment on the world coal industry.” *Energy Policy* 23.8: 659-667.

Kolbert, Elizabeth. 2017. “The E.P.A.’s Dangerous Anti-Regulatory Policies.” 30 June https://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/the-epas-dangerous-anti-regulatory-policies (web 3 August 2018).

Kolstad, Charles. 2017. “What is Killing the US Coal Industry.” May https://siepr.stanford.edu/research/publications/what-killing-us-coal-industry (web 22 April 2019).

Kossoff, Maya. 2017. “Donald Trump’s War on Science has Left the White House Dangerously Unprepared.” 30 March https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2017/03/donald-trumps-war-on-science-has-left-the-white-house-dangerously-unprepared (web 23 September 2019).

Kraemer, Birgit. 2018. “Germany: Trade unions’ approach to climate change policies.” 30 January https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/article/2018/germany-trade-unions-approach-to-climate-change-policies (web 22 February 2019).

Kuby, Mike and Z. Xie. 2001. “The effect of restructuring on US coal mining productivity, 1980-1995.” *Energy* 26.11: 1015-1030.

Kunkel, Cathy. 2018. “Losing West Virginia.” 7 February https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/03/losing-west-virginia/ (web 7 August).

Kuykendall, Taylor and Ashleigh Cotting. 2016. “Companies recently filing bankruptcy produce more than 2/3 of PRB coal.” https://www.snl.com/InteractiveX/Article.aspx?cdid=A-36118340-12086 (web 3 August 2018).

Laclau, Ernesto. 1979. *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory: Capitalism, Fascism, Populism*. New York: Verso.

Laclau, Ernesto. 2005A. *On Populist Reason*. New York: Verso.

Laclau, Ernesto. 2005B. “Populism: What’s in a Name?” In *Populism and the Mirror of Democracy*. Ed. Francisco Panizza. London: Verso, 32-49.

Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. New York: Verso.

Labor Network for Sustainability. 2011. “Labor, Sustainability, and Justice.” 17 August https://www.labor4sustainability.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/labor-sustainability-and-justice.pdf (web 29 April 2019).

Labor Party. 1996. “Labor Party Platform: A Call for Economic Justice.” *New Solutions* 7.1: 79-87.

Lehndorff, Steffen. 2012. “German Capitalism and European Crisis: Part of the Solution or Part of the Problem?” 15 November https://www.transform-

network.net/en/publications/yearbook/overview/article/journal-112012/german-capitalism-and-the-european-crisis-part-of-the-solution-or-part-of-the-problem/ (web 6 March 2019).

Leon, Kaye. 2017. "Bloomberg Pledges $3 Million for Coal Country Transition to a Low Carbon Economy." 5 May http://www.triplepundit.com/2017/05/bloomberg-pledges-3-million-coal-country-transition-low-carbon-economy/ (web 25 October 2017).

Leopold, Les. 2007. *The Man Who Hated Work and Loved Labor: The Life and Times of Tony Mazzocchi*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green.

Levitz, Eric. 2018. "Is a Green New Deal Possible Without a Revolution?" 13 December http://nymag.com/intelligencer/2018/12/what-is-the-green-new-deal-explained-revolution.html (web 2 January 2019).

Lewin, Philip. 2019. "'Coal is Not Just a Job, It's a Way of Life': The Cultural Politics of Coal Production in Appalachia." *Social Problems* 66.1: 51-68.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1971. "Trade Unionism and the American Social Order." In *The American Labor Movement*. Ed. David Brody. New York: Harper & Row, 7-29.

Lipton, Eric. 2018. "As Trump Dismantles Clean Air Rules, an Industry Lawyer Delivers for Ex-Clients." 19 August 2018 https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/19/us/politics/epa-coal-emissions-standards-william-wehrum.html (web 28 September 2018).

"List of Leaders and Parties endorsing the Solidarity and Just Transition Silesia Declaration." 2018. https://cop24.gov.pl/fileadmin/user_upload/files/List_of_Leaders_and_Parties_endorsing_the_Solidarity_and_Just_Transition_Silesia_Declaration.pdf (web 6 March 2019).

Lilmaz, Feyzullah. 2011. "What is National-Popular Collective Will?" 15 January http://neogramscian.blogspot.com/2011/01/what-is-national-popular-collective.html (web 4 May 2019).

Lockwood, Matthew. 2017. "Right wing populism and climate change: Exploring the linkages." Paper presented at the Political Studies Association Annual Conference, Glasgow.

Loh, Tim. 2017. "Coal Miner Murray Lobbies Trump at Home While Looking Overseas." 2 November https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-11-02/coal-miner-murray-is-lobbying-at-home-banking-on-foreign-buyers (web 3 August 2018).

Luce, Edward. 2019. "America's New Redneck Rebellion." 26 June https://www.ft.com/content/327a9c4a-9799-11e9-9573-ee5cbb98ed36 (web 13 November 2019).

Lundstrom, Ragnar. 2018. “Greening transport in Sweden: the role of the organic intellectual in changing union climate change policy.” *Globalizations* 15.4: 536-549.

Lydersen, Kari. 2018. “A ‘Just Transition’ from Coal: Stepping up Efforts in a Difficult Battle.” 9 July. https://energynews.us/2018/07/09/midwest/a-just-transition-from-coal-stepping-up-efforts-in-a-difficult-battle/ (web 4 August 2019).

Lynxwiler, John, Neal Shover, and Donald Clelland. 1983. “The Organization and Impact of Inspector Discretion in a Regulatory Bureaucracy.” *Social Problems* 30.4: 425-436.

MacDougal, Ian. 2017. “Consultant Who Did Work That Was ‘Crap’ Nominated To Head Mining Agency.” 19 December http://www.dailyyonder.com/consultant-work-crap-nominated-head-mining-agency/2017/12/19/22835/ (web 3 August 2018).

“Manchin Applauds New Trump Energy Policy, and Help for Coal Miners.” N.D. https://joemanchinwv.com/manchin-applauds-new-trump-energy-policy-and-help-for-coal-miners/ (web 29 October 2019).

Mann, Geoff. 2013. “Who’s Afraid of Democracy.” *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*. 24.1: 42-48.

Marx, Karl. 2019. *The Political Writings*. New York: Verso.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. 1978. *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2nd edition, ed. Robert C. Tucker. New York: W.W. Norton.

Marx 21 Network. 2017. “A Wake-Up Call for Germany’s Left.” 11 October http://socialistworker.org/2017/10/11/a-wake-up-call-for-germanys-left (web 22 February 2019).

Martin, Richard. 2015. *Coal Wars: The Future of Energy and the Fate of the Planet*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Mascarenhas-Swan, Michelle. 2017. “The Case for a Just Transition.” In *Energy Democracy: Advancing Equity in Clean Energy Solutions*. Eds Denise Fairchild and Al Weinrub. Washington DC: Island Press, 36-56.

Mathunjwa, Joseph. 2017. “A Just Transition from Climate Change and Unemployment.” 14 November https://therealnews.com/columns/a-just-transition-from-climate-change-and-unemployment (web 16 October 2019).

Mavrogenis, Stavros. 2018. “Just Transition is possible! The case of Ruhr (Germany).” 11 April http://www.just-transition.info/just-transition-is-possible-the-case-of-ruhr-germany (web 21 February 2019).

Mayer, Adam. 2018. “A just transition for coal miners? Community identity and support from local policy actors.” *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions* 28 (September): 1-13.

Mazzocchi, Tony. 1986. “New Directions for the Labor Movement.” *The Texas Observer* 78.17: 4-5.

Mazzocchi, Tony. 1990. “Finding Common Ground: Our Commitment to Confront the Issues.” *New Solutions*. 1.1: 3-4.

Mazzocchi, Tony. 1993. “An answer to the jobs-environment conflict.” 8 September https://www.greenleft.org.au/content/answer-jobs-environment-conflict (web 24 October 2017).

Mazzocchi, Tony and Sheila Mannix. 1997. “We Want to Redefine what Society is all About.” 1 February https://zcomm.org/zmagazine/we-want-to-redefine-what-society-is-all-about-by-mark-harris/ (web 2 January 2020).

McClure, Laura. 1996. “Labor has a Party.” September http://www.dollarsandsense.org/archives/1996/0996mcclure.html (web 24 February 2019).

McGowan, Elizabeth. 2017. “Just Transition: Just What Does it Mean for Labor and Energy.” 13 March http://www.renewalnews.org/2017/03/13/first-article-in-renewal-category/ (web 6 November 2019).

McNamara, Julie. 2018. “Trump Administration’s ‘Affordable Clean Energy’ Rule is Anything But.” 31 August https://blog.ucsusa.org/julie-mcnamara/ace-dangerous-clean-power-plan-replacement (web 28 September 2018).

Merrill, Michael. 1991. “No Pollution Prevention Without Income Protection: A Challenge to Environmentalists.” *New Solutions* 1.3: 9-11.

Mertins-Kirkwood, Hadrian. 2018. “Who Deserves a Just Transition?” 13 April https://medium.com/just-transitions/mertins-kirkwood-778748c14a6a (web 7 August 2019).

Moberg, David. 1981. “Tony Mazzochi has a different idea.” 29 April https://www.unz.com/print/InTheseTimes-1981apr29-00002/ (web 14 September 2019).

Monbiot, George. 2008. “Keynes is Innocent: The Toxic Spawn of Bretton Woods was no Plan of His.” https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2008/nov/18/lord-keynes-international-monetary-fund (web 8 May 2019).

Mookerjea, Sourayan. 2019. “Renewable energy transition under multiple colonialisms: passive revolution, fascism redux and utopian practices.” *Cultural Studies* 33.3: 570-593.

Morena, Edouard, Dimitris Stevis, Rebecca Shelton, Dunja Krause, Hadrian Mertins-Kirkwood, Vivian Price, Diego Azzi, and Nicole Helmerich. 2018. “Mapping Just Transition(s) to a Low-Carbon World.” December http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/httpNetITFramePDF?ReadForm&parentunid=9B3F4F10301092C7C12583530035C2A5&parentdoctype=book&netitpath=80256B3C005BCCF9/(httpAuxPages)/9B3F4F10301092C7C12583530035C2A5/$file/Report---JTRC-2018.pdf (web 22 February 2019).

Mouffe, Chantal. 2000. *The Democratic Paradox*. New York: Verso.

Mouffe, Chantal. 2005. *On the Political: Thinking in Action*. New York: Routledge.

Mouffe, Chantal. 2013. *Agnostics: Thinking the World Politically*. New York: Verso.

Mouffe, Chantal. 2014A. “The Crisis of Representative Democracy and the Need for a Left-Wing Populism.” 16 December https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0Gcz0Fb9kUQ&t=3s (web 7 December 2018).

Mouffe, Chantal. 2014B. “Why the EU needs populism.” 5 February https://www.theeuropean-magazine.com/chantal-mouffe--4/8420-why-the-eu-needs-populism (web 14 March 2019).

Mouffe, Chantal. 2018. *For a Left Populism*. New York: Verso.

Mufson, Steven and Joby Warrick. 2016. “Can coal companies afford to clean up coal country?” 2 April https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/can-coal-companies-afford-to-clean-up-coal-country/2016/04/01/c175570c-ec73-11e5-a6f3-21ccdbc5f74e_story.html?utm_term=.72377b9a6718 (web 3 August 2018).

Mullins, Nick. 2017. “Coal Miners are Good People.” 5 September https://thethoughtfulcoalminer.com/2017/09/05/coal-miners-are-good-people-2/ (web 25 October 2017).

Nasr, Joseph. 2017. “Germany’s poor hold key to election as inequality grows.” 27 April https://www.reuters.com/article/us-germany-election-inequality-analysis/germanys-poor-hold-key-to-election-as-inequality-grows-idUSKBN17T0N8 (web 1 May 2019).

National Union of Workers and the National Tertiary Education Union. 2015. “‘Power to the People’ Australian unions organize around bold climate and energy vision.” 9 May http://unionsforenergydemocracy.org/power-to-the-people-australian-unions-organize-around-bold-climate-and-energy-vision/ (web 11 September 2019).

Nesbitt, Todd and Daniel Weiner. 2001. “Conflicting Environmental Imaginaries and the Politics of Nature in Central Appalachia.” *Geoforum* 32.3: 333-349.

Newel, Peter. 2019. "*Transformismo* or transformation? The global political economy of energy transitions." *Review of International Political Economy* 26.1: 25-48.

Newell, Peter and Dustin Mulvaney. 2013. "The political economy of the 'just transition'." *The Geographic Journal* 179.2: 132-140.

Nyden, Paul. 2007. "Rank-and-File Rebellions in the Coalfields, 1964-1980." *Monthly Review* 58.10: 38-53.

O'Connor, James. 1973. *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

O'Connor, James. 1974. *The Corporations and the State: Essays in the Theory of Capitalism and Imperialism*. New York: Harper & Row.

O'Connor, James. 2004. "On Populism and the Antiglobalization Movement." In *Confronting Capitalism: Dispatches from a Global Movement*. Eds Eddie Yuen, Daniel Burton-Rose, and George Katsiaficas. New York: Soft Skull Press, 183-195.

Olson-Hazboun, Shawn. 2018. "Why are we being punished and they are being rewarded?' Views on renewable energy in fossil fuels-based communities of the U.S. west." *The Extractive Industries and Society* 5.3: 366-374.

Osaka, Shannon. 2018. "This Year's UN Climate Talks -- Brought to You by Coal?" 10 December https://www.motherjones.com/environment/2018/12/this-years-un-climate-talks-brought-to-you-by-coal/ (web 21 February 2019).

Ovenden, Kevin. 2015. *Syriza: Inside the Labyrinth*. London: Pluto Press.

Pacewicz, Josh. 2016. *Partisans and Partners: Politics of the Post-Keynesian Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Panitch, Leo. 1994. "Globalization and the State." *Socialist Register* 30: 60-93.

Panitch, Leo. 1998. "'The State in a Changing World': social-democratizing global capitalism?" *Monthly Review* 50.5: 11+.

Park, Mi. 2011. "Imagining a Just and Sustainable Society: A Critique of Alternative Economic Models in the Global Justice Movement." *Critical Sociology* 39.1: 65-85.

Parkin, Brian and William Wilkes. 2018. "Germany's Coal Habit Proves Hard to Kick." 27 September https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-09-27/germany-struggles-to-end-coal-reliance-despite-clean-power-shift (web 22 February 2019).

Patterson, Brittany. 2019. "UMWA's Cecil Roberts Talks Climate Change Ahead of 2020 Election." 4 September https://www.wvpublic.org/post/umwa-s-cecil-roberts-talks-climate-change-ahead-2020-election#stream/0 (web 2 January 2020).

Perry, Elizabeth. 2019. “German Coal Exist Commission Recommends Just Transition Measures but a 2038 Deadline.” https://workandclimatechangereport.org/2019/01/28/german-coal-exit-commission-recommends-just-transition-measures-but-a-2038-deadline/ (web 1 May 2019).

Petrin, Katelyn Mae. 2016. “Protestors March on Peabody HQ, Urging Reparations in Bankruptcy.” 21 April https://www.riverfronttimes.com/newsblog/2016/04/21/protesters-march-on-peabody-hq-urging-reparations-in-bankruptcy (web 13 September 2017).

Phillips-Fein, Kim. 2019. “How the Right Learned to Loathe Higher Education.” 31 January https://www.chronicle.com/article/How-the-Right-Learned-to/245580 (web 23 September 2019).

Poole, Claire. 2017. “Troubled Coal Industry Could Use Some Consolidation.” 27 September https://www.forbes.com/sites/clairepoole/2017/09/27/troubled-coal-industry-could-use-some-consolidation/#578f229b731c (web 3 August 2018).

Popp, Rebekka. 2019. “A Just Transition of European Coal Regions.” January https://www.e3g.org/docs/E3G_2019_Stakeholder_Mappings_European_Coal_Regions_Final.pdf (web 6 March 2019).

Porter, Eduardo. 2016. “The Challenge of Cutting Coal Dependence.” 30 August https://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/business/economy/the-challenge-of-cutting-coal-dependence.html (web 21 February 2019).

Powell, Douglas Reichert. 2007. *Critical Regionalism: Connecting Politics and Culture in the American Landscape*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Prinz, Lukas and Anna Pegels. 2018. “The role of labour power in sustainability transitions: Insights from comparative political economy on Germany’s electricity transition.” *Energy Research & Social Science* 41 (July): 210-219.

Puko, Timothy, Matt Jarzemsky, and Maureen Farrell. 2017. “Coal Miners Begin Selling Shares to the Public Again After Period of Tumult.” 3 February. https://www.wsj.com/articles/coal-miners-begin-selling-shares-to-the-public-again-after-period-of-tumult-1486123204 (web 3 August 2018).

Pyper, Julia. 2019. “Coal Miners Doubt Promises of an Inclusive Energy Transition.” 6 September https://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/coal-miners-energy-transition (web 6 November 2019).

Ranft, Florian, Sabrina Schulz, Johannes Uhl, Philipp Wendel, and Fiona Wollensack. 2019. “Foreign Policy and the Just Transition: Dimensions, Challenges, Opportunities.” September http://www.progressives-zentrum.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Policy-Brief_Foreign-Policy-Just-Transition_final.pdf (web 16 October 2019).

Recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal, H.R. Res. 109, 116th Congress (2019).

Redman, Janet. 2017. "Dirty Energy Dominance: Dependent on Denial." http://priceofoil.org/content/uploads/2017/10/OCI_US-Fossil-Fuel-Subs-2015-16_Final_Oct2017.pdf (web 7 August 2017).

Reuther, Victor. 1966. "The International Activities of American Trade Unions." In *Labor in a Changing America*. Ed. William Haber. New York: Basic Books, 298-310.

Revesz, Richard and Jack Lienke. 2016. *Struggling for Air: Power Plants and the 'War on Coal.'* New York: Oxford University Press.

Riccardi, Nicholas. 2016. "AP FACT CHECK: Trump wrongly says nation is short of coal." https://www.seattletimes.com/nation-world/nation-politics/ap-fact-check-trump-wrongly-says-nation-is-short-of-coal/ (web 3 August 2018).

Richardson, Jeremy. 2018. "Black Lung Resurgence: Without Action, Taxpayers Will Foot the Medical Bills." https://blog.ucsusa.org/jeremy-richardson/black-lung-resurgence-without-action-taxpayers-will-foot-the-medical-bills (web 6 August 2018).

Roberts, David. 2014. "Should the feds bail out coal miners?" 14 October https://grist.org/climate-energy/should-the-feds-bail-out-coal-miners/ (web 14 November 2019).

Roberts, David. 2018. "The 6 things you most need to know about Trump's new climate plan." 25 August https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2018/8/24/17772268/trump-climate-power-plants-affordable-clean-energy-clean-power-plan (web 27 September 2018).

Roberts, J. Timmons. 2008. "The Senate and the union hall: Where American climate policy will succeed or fail." 2 November https://grist.org/article/america-at-the-turning-point/ (web 13 September 2018).

Roderik, Brad. 2013. "Patriot, Peabody, Bankruptcy and the Relentless Drive to Exploit Workers." 23 May. http://socialistappeal.org/news-analysis/labor-movement/1160-patriot-peabody-bankruptcy-and-the-relentless-drive-to-exploit-workers.html (web 9 August 2018).

Roessler, Christina, Joe Uehlein, and Richard Healey. 2016. "'Just Transition' -- Just what is it?" 6 July https://www.labor4sustainability.org/uncategorized/just-transition-just-what-is-it/ (web 6 April 2019).

Rosa Luxemburg Foundation and Trade Unions for Energy Democracy. 2015. "This is What Energy Democracy Looks Like." 21 January https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A2c9vsJeGFM (web 4 May 2019).

Rosemberg, Anabella. 2013. “Developing Global Union Policies through the International Trade Union Confederation.” In *Trade Unions in the Green Economy: Working for the Environment*. Eds Nora Rathzel and David Uzzel. New York: Routledge, 15-28.

Rosemberg, Anabella. N.D. “Embedding Just Transition in Long-Term Decarbonization Strategies: Why, What, and How?” https://www.wri.org/climate/expert-perspective/embedding-just-transition-long-term-decarbonization-strategies-why-what (web 22 February 2019).

Rosemberg, Anabella. 2017. “Strengthening Just Transition Policies in International Climate Governance.” April https://www.stanleyfoundation.org/publications/pab/RosembergPABStrengtheningJustTransition417.pdf (web 3 March 2019).

Rosemberg, Anabella. 2018. “The hidden pitfalls of the Just Transition narrative: A response.” 26 June https://medium.com/just-transitions/the-hidden-pitfalls-of-the-just-transition-narrative-a-response-39c4ed0c0624 (web 22 February 2019).

Rosemberg, Anabella and Danny Chivers. 2016. “It’s heating up: ‘Unions can play a vital role in the battle for climate justice.’” 17 August https://newint.org/features/2016/08/17/on-the-right-side-of-history (web 10 May 2019).

Rubin, Richard and Sahil Kapur. 2015. “Donald Trump Likes Volcker – and His Rule.” https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-08-04/trump-the-developer-loves-low-interest-rates-trump-the-candidate-sees-a-bubble- (web 3 August 2018).

Ryan, Joseph. 1990. “Union leader, Anthony Mazzocchi, calls on labor to form its own party.” *Socialist Action* 8.1: 8.

Sanders, Bernie. 2016. *Our Revolution: A Future to Believe In*. New York: Thomas Dunne Books.

Schaller, Stella and Alexander Carius. 2019. “Climate justice versus populism.” 8 April http://jordantimes.com/opinion/project-syndicate/climate-justice-versus-populism (web 16 October 2019).

Scherer, Christoph and Luciana Hachmann. 2012. “Can a Labour-Friendly Government be Friendly to Labour? A Hegemonic Analysis of Brazilian, German, and South African Experiences.” *In Labour in the Global South: Challenges and Alternatives for Workers* Eds. Sarah Mosoetsa and Michelle Williams. Geneva: International Labour Office.

Schierup, Carl-Ulrik. 2006. “Germany: Immigration and social exclusion in a declining welfare state.” In *Migration, Citizenship, and the European Welfare State: A European Dilemma*. Eds. Carl-Ulrik Schierup, Peo Hansen, and Stephen Castles. New York: Oxford University Press, 137-162.

Schmidt, Ingo. 2005. “Can Germany’s Corporatist Labor Movement Survive.” *Monthly Review* 57.4: 49-62.

Schneider, Jen, Jennifer Peeples, Peter Bsumek, and Steve Schwarze. 2016. *Under Pressure: Coal Industry Rhetoric and Neoliberalism*. London: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Schneider, Jen and Jennifer Peeples. “The Energy Covenant: Energy Dominance and the Rhetoric of the Aggrieved.” *Frontiers in Communication* 3.5: 1-12.

Schulten, Thorsten. 1999. “IG BCE and employers adopt joint declaration on partnership and branch-level bargaining.” 27 February https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/sr/publications/article/1999/ig-bce-and-employers-adopt-joint-declaration-on-partnership-and-branch-level-bargaining (web 22 February 2019).

Schwarzmantel, John. 2015. *The Routledge Guidebook to Gramsci’s Prison Notebooks*. New York: Routledge.

Schweickart, David. 2011. *After Capitalism*, 2nd ed. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Scott, Rebecca. 2010. *Removing Mountains: Extracting Nature and Identity in the Appalachian Coalfields*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Seibt, Philipp. 2016. “The AfD is so anti-social.” 14 March https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&sl=de&u=https://www.spiegel.de/forum/wirtschaft/wirtschaftsprogramm-so-unsozial-ist-die-afd-thread-432153-1.html&prev=search (2 January 2020).

Sellers, Chris, Lindsey Dillon, and Phil Brown. 2018. “EPA Staff Say the Trump Administration is Changing their Mission from Protecting Human Health and the Environment to Protecting Industry.” 10 June https://www.desmogblog.com/2018/06/10/epa-staff-trump-administration-changing-mission-protecting-human-health-environment-protecting-industry (web 6 August 2018).

Serrin, William. 1983. “The Man Who is Taking the Labor Movement to Task.” 15 May http://nytimes.com/1983/05/15/business/the-man-who-is-taking-the-labor-movement-to-task.html (web 14 September 2019).

Shannon, Thomas. 1983. “Appalachia and the State.” *Appalachian Journal* 11.1-2: 143-153.

Sheldon, Peter, Raja Junankar, and Anthony De Rosa Pontello. 2018. “The Ruhr or Appalachia? Deciding the future of Australia’s coal power workers and communities.” https://www.ituc-csi.org/IMG/pdf/ruhrorappalachia_report_final.pdf (Web 10 May 2019).

Shover, Neal, Donald Clelland, and John Lynxwiler. 1986. *Enforcement of Negotiation: Constructing a Regulatory Bureaucracy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Silbar, Earl. 1996. "Report on LP convention." *Chicago Workers Theoretical Journal* 4.3: 19-20.

Silverman, Victor. 2006. "'Green Unions in a Grey World': Labor Environmentalism and International Institutions." *Organization & Environment* 19.2: 191-213.

Sims, Tom and Madeline Chambers. 2019. "ECB's Rehn sees eurozone economy weakening." 17 February https://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-ecb-policy-rehn/ecbs-rehn-sees-euro-zone-economy-weakening-idUKKCN1Q60GO (web 15 March 2019).

Skalkos, Dimitris. 2018. "Collective Bargaining and Greek Labour Market Reforms." 20 November https://www.socialeurope.eu/collective-bargaining-and-greek-labour-market-reforms (web 6 March 2019).

Smith, Ashley. 2018. "Illiberal hegemony: The Trump administration strategy for US imperialism." *International Socialist Review* 109 (Summer). https://isreview.org/issue/109/illiberal-hegemony-trump-administration-strategy-us-imperialism (web August 2018).

Smith-Meyer, Bjorke. 2018. "Greece's creditors push bailout exit in name only." 23 May https://www.politico.eu/article/greece-creditors-bailout-in-name-only-european-commission-ecb-imf/ (web 15 March 2019).

Sontakke, Mayur. 2014. "Greed led to a fall in met coal prices." https://finance.yahoo.com/news/greed-led-fall-met-coal-141953178.html (web 3 August 2018).

Sovacool, Benjamin. 2016. "How long will it take? Conceptualizing the temporal dynamics of energy transitions" *Energy Research & Social Science* 13 (March): 202-215.

Spartacist League. 1995. "Why 'Labor Party Advocates' Doesn't Advocate a Labor Party." *Workers Vanguard* 622 (May): 3-5.

Stephenson, Lonnie and Cecil Roberts. 2019. "IBEW UMWA Letter on Climate Change." 14 February https://www.ibew29.org/political-action/ibew-umwa-letter-climate-change (web 10 November 2019).

Stevis, Dmitris. 2013. "Green Jobs? Good jobs? Just jobs? US labour unions confront climate change." In *Trade Unions in the Green Economy: Working for the Environment*, eds Nora Rathzel and David Uzzell. New York: Routledge, 179-195

Stevis, Dmitris. 2018. "(Re)Claiming Just Transition." 13 April https://medium.com/just-transitions/stevis-e147a9ec189a (web 4 August 2019).

Stevis, Dimitris, Edouard Morena, and Dunja Krause. 2020. “Introduction: The genealogy and contemporary politics of just transitions.” In *Just Transitions: Social Justice in the Shift Towards a Low-Carbon World*. Eds. Edouard Morena, Dunja Krause, and Dimitris Stevis. London: Pluto Press, 1-31.

Stevis, Dimitris and Romain Felli. 2015. “Global labour unions and just transition to a green economy.” *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law, and Economics* 15: 29-43.

Stoner, Rebecca. 2019. “Why are Unions Joining Conservative Groups to Protect Pipelines?” 31 May https://psmag.com/environment/why-are-unions-joining-conservative-groups-to-protect-pipelines (web 5 August 2019).

Sullivan, Kate. 2019. “Miners union president: ‘Coal’s not back. Nobody saved the coal industry.’” 5 September https://www.cnn.com/2019/09/05/politics/coal-miners-union-president-coals-not-back/index.html (web 29 October 2019).

Sundy, Muffy. 1979. “Business Unionism as Usual.” Winter https://socialism.com/fs-article/business-unionism-as-usual/ (web 17 September 2019).

Surico, John. 2013. “Mayor Bloomberg’s Record with New York’s Unions is Pretty Terrible.” 16 July http://www.alternet.org/mayor-bloombergs-record-new-yorks-unions-pretty-terrible (web 25 October, 2017).

Suwandi, Intan and John Bellamy Foster. 2016. “Multinational Corporations and the Globalization of Monopoly Capital.” *Monthly Review* 68.3: 114-131.

Swank, Dane and Hans-Georg Betz. 2018. “Globalization, Institutions of Social Solidarity, and Radical Right-Wing Populism in Western Europe.” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston.

Swint, Jack. 2012. “US Senator Joe Manchin and the Tax Cut Fairy.” 8 June http://westvirginianews.blogspot.com (web 7 August 2018).

Sweeney, Michael. 2017. “Donald Trump’s New Slogan Isn’t About the Climate. It’s About Gender.” 9 June https://time.com/4805659/donald-trump-pittsburgh-paris/ (web 26 September 2019).

Sweeney, Sean. 2004. “The Case for Global Justice Unionism.” *New Labor Forum* 13.3: 56-65.

Sweeney, Sean. 2012A. “Earth to Labor: Economic Growth Is No Salvation.” *New Labor Forum* 2.1: 10-13.

Sweeney, Sean. 2012B. “Resist, Reclaim, Restructure: Unions and the Struggle for Energy Democracy.” October http://unionsforenergydemocracy.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Resist-Reclaim-Restructure.pdf (web 9 November 2019).

Sweeney Sean. 2015. “Green Capitalism Won’t Work.” *New Labor Forum* 24.2: 12-17.

Sweeney, Sean. 2016. “Contested Futures: Labor After Keystone XL.” May https://newlaborforum.cuny.edu/2016/05/31/earth-to-labor-dispatches-from-the-climate-battleground/ (web 4 May 2019).

Sweeney, Sean. 2017. “Winning Clean Energy & Climate Justice for All” 20 June https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kbuTPH_l14k (web 6 november 2019).

Sweeney, Sean. 2018A. “A Bridge to Somewhere? Progressive Democrats’ ‘Climate Action’ Must Confront Energy Realities.” *New Labor Forum* 27.1: 105-109.

Sweeney, Sean. 2018B. “Labor as a Driver of the Just Transition towards Energy Democracy.” Presentation at the Climate Futures, Design, and the Just Transition Symposium. Providence, Road Island.

Sweeney, Sean and Laura Flanders. 2013. “Sean Sweeney: Trade Unions and Extending Solidarity to the Ecosystem.” https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ino7LheLh1s (web 22 April 2019).

Sweeney, Sean and John Treat. 2018. “Trade Unions and Just Transition: The Search for a Transformative Politics.” April http://www.rosalux-nyc.org/wp-content/files_mf/tuedworkingpaper11_web.pdf (web 3 April 2019).

Sweeney, Sean and John Treat. 2019. “When ‘green’ doesn’t grow’: Facing up to the failures of profit-driven climate policy.” 3 January https://mronline.org/2019/01/03/when-green-doesnt-grow/ (web 19 April 2019).

Sweezy, Paul. 1972. *Modern Capitalism and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Szulecki, Kacper. 2018. “Conceptualizing Energy Democracy.” *Environmental Politics* 27.1: 21-41

Tabuchi, Hiroko. 2017. “Coal Jobs Prove Lucrative, but not for those in the Mines.” 2 May https://www.seattletimes.com/business/coal-jobs-prove-lucrative-but-not-for-those-in-the-mines/ (web 6 August 2018).

Taft, Philip. 1966. “The Philosophy of the American Labor Movement.” In *Labor in a Changing America*. Ed. William Haber. New York: Basic Books, 132-142.

Tavernise, Sabrina. 2018. “Why an Economic Populist Pitch Failed in Trump Country.” 8 November https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/08/us/west-virginia-midterm-election-richard-ojeda.html (web 13 Nobember 2019).

Taylor, Phil. 2009. “Waxman-Markey dangles cash to lure CCS ‘first movers.’” https://www.eenews.net/stories/80742 (web28 July 2018).

Taylor, Keeanga-Yamahtta. 2019. “Why Nancy Pelosi Hates the Squad.” 31 July https://www.jacobinmag.com/2019/07/nancy-pelosi-alexandria-ocasio-cortez-ilhan-omar-squad-aoc (web 2 January 2020).

Thomhave, Kalena. 2018. “West Virginia Teachers Won Their Strike. Now, They’re Rebuilding the Local Economy.” 7 May https://prospect.org/article/west-virginia-teachers-won-their-strike-now-theyre-rebuilding-local-economy (web 6 May 2019).

Trade Unions for Energy Democracy. 2016. “Facing up to the Failure of Carbon Markets – an Introduction to TUED Working Paper 6 – Carbon Markets After Paris: Trading in Trouble.” 11 March http://unionsforenergydemocracy.org/facing-up-to-the-failure-of-carbon-markets-tued-working-paper-6-carbon-markets-after-paris-trading-in-trouble/ (web 4 May 2019).

Triangle, Luc. 2019. “Low carbon economy without a just transition risks adding fossil fuel to populist fire.” 5 February https://www.euractiv.com/section/economy-jobs/opinion/climate-change/ (web 22 February 2019).

Trump, Donald and Glenn Plaskin. 1990. “The Playboy Interview with Donald Trump.” https://www.playboy.com/read/playboy-interview-donald-trump-1990 (web 10 November 2019).

Trump, Donald. 2015. *Great Again: How to Fix our Cripled America* New York: Simon & Schuster.

United Steelworkers. 2014. “Resolution No. 24 - Economic and Environmental Sustainability https://www.usw.org/convention-2014/resolutions/Resolution-No.-24-Economic-and-Environmental-Sustainability.pdf (web 24 October 2017).

Uzzell, David and Nora Rathzel. 2013. “Local place and global space: Solidarity across borders and the question of the environment.” In *Trade Unions in the Green Economy: Working for the Environment*. Eds Nora Rathzel and David Uzzel. New York: Routledge, 241-256.

Varoufakis, Yanis. 2017. “Yanis Varoufakis: A New Deal for the 21st Century.” 6 July https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/06/opinion/yanis-varoufakis-a-new-deal-for-the-21st-century.html (web 3 March 2019).

Varoufakis, Yanis and David Adler. 2018 “We shouldn’t rush to save the liberal order. We should remake it.” 1 December https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/dec/01/liberal-world-order-new-international-yanis-varoufakis-david-adler (web 3 March 2019).

Vassiliadis, Michael. 2014. “2014 USW Convention: Michael Vassiliadis.” 12 August https://www.usw.org/video/2014-usw-convention-michael-vassiliadis (web 15 March 2019).

Virtranen, Michael and Matthew Brown. 2016. “Trump’s vow to bring back coal gives hope to weary regions.” 21 November https://elections.ap.org/wyomingnews/content/trumps-vow-bring-back-coal-gives-hope-weary-regions (web 3 August 2018).

Vitelli, Alessandro, Ben Sharples, and Mario Parker. 2015. “Coal keeps dropping as OPEC-like tactic stymied by dollar.” 29 January https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-01-30/coal-keeps-dropping-as-opec-like-tactic-stymied-by-dollar (web 3 August 2018).

Volcovici, Valeri. 2018. “Coal Lobby Fights Black-Lung Tax as Disease Rates Surge.” 1 June https://www.usnews.com/news/top-news/articles/2018-06-01/us-coal-lobby-fights-black-lung-tax-as-disease-rates-surge (web 6 August 2018).

Volcovici, Valerie. 2019. “Labor Unions fear Democrats’ Green New Deal poses job threat.” 12 February https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-greennewdeal-coal/labor-unions-fear-democrats-green-new-deal-poses-job-threat-idUSKCN1Q11D2 (web 6 November 2019).

Voss, Dustin. 2018. “The Political Economy of European Populism: Labour Market Dualisation and Protest Voting in Germany and Spain.” March http://www.lse.ac.uk/european-institute/Assets/Documents/LEQS-Discussion-Papers/LEQSPaper132.pdf (web 22 February 2019).

Wahl, Asbjorn. 2014. “European Labor: Political and Ideological Crisis in an Increasingly More Authoritarian European Union.” *Monthly Review* 65.8: 36-57.

Waldholz, Rachel. 2019. “‘Green Wave’ vs right-wing populism: Europe faces climate policy polarisation” 5 June https://www.cleanenergywire.org/news/green-wave-vs-right-wing-populism-europe-faces-climate-policy-polarisation (web 16 October 2019).

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2016. “The U.S. Election: It’s over at last, or is it?” 15 November https://www.iwallerstein.com/the-u-s-election-its-over-at-last-or-is-it/ (web 3 August 2018).

Walls, David. 1974. “Three Models in Search of Appalachian Development: Critique and Synthesis.” Presented at a meeting of the Rural Sociology Society and the Society for the Study of Social Problems, Montreal. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/Ed125806.pdf (web 27 July 2018).

Walsh, Ben. 2016. “Coal Companies Paid Lobbyists Millions Before Going Bankrupt.” 29 June https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/coal-companies-bankrupt_us_57740670e4b0cc0fa1362dbb (web 13 September 2018).

Walsh, Mary Williams. 2019. “Congress Saves Coal Miner Pensions, but What About Others?” 24 December https://www.nytimes.com/2019/12/24/business/coal-miner-pensions-bailout.html (web 1 January 2020).

Walter, Lindsey and Josh Freed. 2018. “Trump’s Coal Plan Will Kill People, but at Least It’ll Create Jobs, Right? Wrong.” 29 August. https://www.thedailybeast.com/trumps-coal-plan-will-kill-people-but-at-least-itll-create-jobs-right-wrong (web 28 September).

Ward, Ken. 2017. “Trump regulatory initiative targets black lung protections.” December 14 https://www.wvgazettemail.com/news/politics/trump-regulatory-initiative-targets-black-lung-protections/article_0710897c-7059-5343-a586-88fbfa0afaa8.html (web 27 September 2018).

Ware, Michael. 2015. “What Kind of ‘Just Transition’?” 1 December https://socialistworker.org/2015/12/01/what-kind-of-just-transition (web 25 September 2019).

Wettengel, Julian and Kerstine Appun. 2018. “Germany’s coal commission agrees first post-coal strategy steps.” 26 October https://www.euractiv.com/section/climate-environment/news/germanys-coal-commission-agrees-on-post-coal-strategy/ (web 22 February 2019).

“Why Germany’s current-account surplus is bad for the world economy.” 2017. https://www.economist.com/leaders/2017/07/08/why-germanys-current-account-surplus-is-bad-for-the-world-economy (web 15 March 2019).

Wiarda, Howard. 1997. *Corporatism in Comparative Politics: The Other Great “Ism.”* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharp.

Wilkes, William. 2019. “Europe’s Populist Right Threatens to Erode Climate Consensus.” 25 February https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-02-25/europe-s-populist-right-threatens-to-erode-climate-consensus (web 3 March 2019).

Wilkes, William, Brian Parkin, and Vanessa Dezem. 2018. “Germany’s Last Coal Miners Get Shafted.” 30 November https://www.bloombergquint.com/politics/germany-closes-last-coal-mine-despite-decades-of-supplies-needed#gs.wWiwopgh (web 21 February 2019).

Wilton, Jen. 2013. “Mining interests trump local democracy in Greece.” 9 October https://newint.org/features/web-exclusive/2013/10/09/mining-greece (web 16 March 2019).

Wishart, Ryan. 2014. “Underdeveloping Appalachia: Toward and Environmental Sociology of Extractive Economies.” Ph.D. diss. University of Oregon.

Wrenn, Mary. 2016. “Surplus Absorption and Waste in Neoliberal Monopoly Capitalism.” *Monthly Review* 68.3: 63-76.

Wykle, Lucinda, Ward Morehouse, and David Dembo. 1991. *Worker Empowerment in a Changing Economy: Jobs, Military Production, and the Environment*. New York: The Apex Press.

Young, Jim. 1998. “Just Transition: A New Approach to Jobs v. Environment.” *Earth Island Journal* 2.2: 42-48.

Zagelmeyer, Stefan. 1997. “Miners’ revolt ends in ‘corporatist compromise.” 27 March https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/article/1997/miners-revolt-ends-in-corporatist-compromise (web 22 February 2019).