

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL STUDIES

Working Paper Series No. 183

MODELS OF LABOUR AND PRODUCTION: THE ORIGINS AND CONTEMPORARY LIMITATIONS OF THE ANGLO-AMERICAN MODEL

J. Harrod

December 1994

WORKING PAPERS

Comments are welcome and should be addressed to the author:
c/o Publications Office - Institute of Social Studies - P.O. Box 29776
2502LT The Hague - The Netherlands

Summary

The general global developments, the focus on the competitiveness of nations in the world economy and the introduction of new production systems and techniques have brought into question the viability of the existing hegemonic model of labour and production. The Anglo-American model, variously known as the Anglo-Saxon, Atlantic, or "Texan" model of labour and production, which has enjoyed an ascendancy for the past century, has seen its hegemonic power at the global level weaken in the contemporary period. This article argues that this situation posits the need to examine the origins and hidden assumptions of the current hegemonic model before any meaningful discourse can be launched concerning successor models or the definitive move to a multi-model world. For this reason the nature of a hegemonic model of labour and production and its historic and current developments of the model, especially concerning labour-related issues are discussed. It is argued that the assumptions relating to labour control in traditional industrialisation theory of Weber, Marx, Rostow and Kerr supported the incorporation of the unique historic experience of the United Kingdom in the last century to produce an identifiable model. This in turn was modified by the special conditions in the USA in this century to enable elements associated with the names of Ford, Taylor and Keynes to be integrated in the model. The belief that other models, such as the so-called "Rhinelands" model and the Japanese model which have different origins and assumptions may be more suited to the current developments in production techniques, should not prevent the search for new models or adaptations better suited to current industrialisation.

The Hegemonic Model

Theories of imperialism, globalism and the functioning of the transmission of ideas often contain explicit or implicit references to models promoted for emulation from a dominant world centre of power or hegemon. (cf. Rapkin, 1990; Murphy and Tooze, 1991) Through a process of forced or encouraged emulation and internalisation of unquestioned assumptions the power of the hegemon is maintained. Discussions of such models have traditionally been confined to models of governance, economies and, at a different level, industrial organisation, health care, social security and taxation systems. Only recently has there been serious discussion of what is termed here models of labour and production. (Michel, 1991; Hart, 1992; Best, 1990; Porter, 1990)

Any model is made up of various interlinked components. Models of industrial production include, for example, the elements of industrial structure, management practices and attitudes, the organisation of labour for production, the forms of self organisation of labour, labour-management relations, the structure and processes which determine the level of technological innovation. Models of labour and production focus on mechanisms of labour control, motivation and labour-management practices within industrial production.

The hegemonic model of labour and production for this century has been what is called here the Anglo-American which encompasses the UK and USA as jointly the source of model and the USA as the current hegemon. The label Anglo-American coincides with

what in the literature is often called the Anglo-Saxon model (Michel, 1991; Thurow, 1992; Purelli, 1993; Hashim, 1994, Harrod, 1995) although the accuracy of the label is rarely discussed. A combination of a cultural and geographic label is adopted here in full recognition that although labelling models by region, nation and culture is problematic national/geographic labels are more still in predominant usage as for example in the discussions of the "Swedish" or "Japanese" models.

The Anglo-American model appears in the literature of labour relations as tripartitism, industrial pluralism, or industrial relations systems, (Dunlop 1958; Katz, 1993). The contemporary labour relations elements of this model was developed as a reaction to 19th century practices derived from classical and neo-classical ideas of the disciplining of labour and enforcing the labour contract via labour market coercion, that is, by the threat of deprivation of work and therefore sustenance. Thus the position and role of organised labour is a principle feature of the model. It is not surprising therefore that various disciplines addressing the role of organised labour in the model see it principally having a reactive and defensive role. In the Anglo-American model organised labour has been seen as nationally based worker organisations, the function of which is:-a) according to labour economists - to create oligopolistic conditions within the labour market in order to bid up the price of labour; b) according to labour institutionalists - to smooth the enforcement of the labour contract (North, 1986); c) according to conflict theorists - to mediate between structural conflict between owners and workers, and d) according to interest group theorists - to aggregate interests for a distinguishable group of citizens in the civil society (Olson, 1982).

The international legitimacy of the model was derived from the apparently successful industrialisation of the United Kingdom and its subsequent geo-political dominance and then through the similar position of the United States as an industrialised hegemonic power. The model of industrial structure and its concomitant organisation of labour was thus exported throughout the world by an imperial and hegemonic process (Cox, 1977). Particularly important was the process in which the hegemonic model was internalised and made the source of unquestioned conventional wisdom.

The model is now being questioned for two reasons first, the general weakening of the USA as a source for hegemonic models and second, associated with the first, the perceived failure to deal with the introduction of new production systems. Thus new production systems associated with such key words as "lean production" "post-fordism" and flexible specialisation" are contrasted with the old "Fordist" systems of the hegemonic model (Best, 1990). It is not surprising therefore that the specific geographic and cultural origin of the hegemonic model is now being realised as its contemporary relevance is being questioned. Thus for example, Perulli (1993) writes

"the industrial relations literature has grossly ignored the local and regional dimensions, limiting itself to the workplace and national institutions. Another significant factor which may explain this neglect is that industrial relations as a discipline was born and developed in Anglo-Saxon countries with a majority of large firms and highly decentralised labour relations at plant level, whereas local and regional labour regulations systems were weak and non-existent."

The disciplines surrounding industrial relations have responded more slowly to the new developments in production. Human resource management (HRM) as a successor to industrial relations and labour relations, which is better equipped to deal with the management of labour needs of new production systems, has so far tended to exclude the macro level issues and in some versions assumes the absence of organised labour.

The realisation that the hegemonic model has weakened, that it has not yet developed a successor model has meant that at the level of discourse and analytical investigation other models are beginning to emerge from the shadow of the hegemon. Michel (1991) has posited the "Rhinelands" model as the alternative to the "Texan" that is the Anglo-American model. The Rhinelands model is that of the "social partners" of organised labour and management in which the enterprise and supporting structures of the welfare state engender a greater commitment and therefore greater labour productivity than in the Anglo-American.

This view is, however, the view that there is an extant and ready-made successor to the dominant model rather than a dialectic process from which new models are born and new processes of adaptation are created. If such a process were to be encouraged then the origins and nature of the dominant model are of crucial importance in the future developments, especially for societies attempting to industrialise (Frenkel and Harrod, 1995). It is to this project that this article is partially addressed.

While preceding research concentrated on revealing the mechanisms of imperial and hegemonic organisational transfer of elements of the model such as trade unions and labour organisation (Harrod, 1972), contemporary research is revealing that nominal conformity arising from the transfer process is no indication of real conformity and that behind the screen of nominal conformity lies indigenous models for which comparative scholars have no labels (Hashim, 1994; Levin and Chui, 1995).

In summary, the current situation is then that the hegemonic Anglo-American model has been weakened through apparent success of competing models particularly associated with Germany, Japan and South East Asia. These new models may be defined as structures and processes with substantial and sustained industrial output derived from production units in which the need for, and presence of, bureaucratised procedures, structural rigidity of functions and a bi-polar hierarchy (production workers and management) is less than was assumed or established in the dominant model.

This situation requires a theoretical or synthesizing research agenda with the objective of a) integrating labour relations explicitly into the development of new models of industrial structure and industrialisation rather accepting the implicit inclusion of undefined and un-researched labour relations based on classical assumptions of the past, b) consideration of the labour aspects of the change in industrial structure and development as an assist to developing an approach which permits an escape from the past national labour relations systems and labour regimes approach without falling into static comparisons and tunnel vision particularism.

To this end this article will first consider some of the labour related assumptions in industrialisation theory to the contemporary period, then examined the 19 century

origins and the 20th century developments of the hegemonic Anglo-American model and conclude by considering attempts to construct alternative approaches.

Industrialisation Theory and the Labour-Market Coercion Thesis

The two salient characteristics of theories of industrialisation and industrial development within a market framework have been first that they are pitched at the highest abstract, national or macro level and, second, they have incorporated within them assumptions about the motivation and disciplining of labour derived from classical views of the functioning of the labour market.

The characteristic of macro level concern has meant that workplace labour or power relations and their effects on productivity have usually been confined to an analysis of their impact on national-level social unrest. Thus such relations were important only if they were the source of social unrest likely to disrupt the course and development of a society.

The labour-market assumption was that labour would initially be made to acquiesce to the rigors of industrialisation by the operations of the labour market. This assumption allowed the luxury of largely ignoring the meso and micro levels of the complex social, cultural and individual dimensions of industrial production.

The following is a brief review of some theories of industrialisation which illustrate the lacunae relating to workplace relations and worker motivation.

Marx's theory of capitalist development which is also a theory of industrial development had three main points of reference to workplace relations. The first concerned management and the organisation of work in abstract. Here Marx accepted without question that labour "requires to a greater or lesser degree a directing authority, in order to secure the harmonious cooperation of the activities or the individuals". Thus once having made such an assumption it was not necessary to question the efficiency of the direction or the possible resistance to it at the workplace. His second entry into workplace relations was via his concept of the labour process. The labour process was another variety of work organisation but it incorporated the classical notion of competition for profit and that the capitalist would be normally efficient in using labour power and the worker normally acquiescent at the workplace. The third link to workplace labour relations was his theory of alienation in which industrial work produced alienation through the workers' loss of control (power) over production. Here again alienation was not seen as producing a decline in production and output, except in the context of a massive dislocation of the productive system and society itself, as workers sought by revolutionary change to solve their social and personal alienated material condition.

With respect to workplace relations Weber followed Marx in the crucial issue of motivation. For Weber the alienation stemmed not from the material aspect of loss of control but from the contradiction between social training of (Protestant) individualism and the social restrictions of labour relations. Predictions as to the future were not that such alienation would lead to a violent revolution but rather to collectivised and

inefficient bureaucracy. There was in Weber some notion that alienation would indeed create inefficiencies but these were not elaborated.

For Rostow (1960), the accumulation process was smooth not, it appears, marred either by a revolt of an alienated mass, nor a social development detrimental to long-term increases in labour productivity as in Weber. At the take off-stage, in his five stages of development, human capital had developed to the point where constantly increasing productivity created a positive-sum distributional situation which avoided income polarisation and obviated the need for class action. The insertion of human capital predated the increasingly heard view that it is this element which produces continued growth and industrialisation rather than technology advances and increases in capital stock (Romer, 1986).

The entry point to workplace relations for Clark Kerr and associates (1962) was the role in social action of workplace-based organisations. Here the maturity thesis relating to trade unions was accepted - namely that at the beginning stage they were likely to be politically involved and militant and, at a later stage, mature into "job-oriented" unionism. This maturity thesis of worker organisations was adopted from S. Perlman (1935) and is still extant (Lieberman, 1986:268-9). What was crucial, however, to this analysis was that in their mature stage the unions would resemble those found in the UK and the USA and that labour relations would therefore be mediated at the workplace through the power relations of management and collective labour. Once again the concern is for macro level social peace and the relations established to achieve it are expected to produce the optimal productivity necessary for the ongoing process of industrialisation.

Contemporary theories of industrialisation have had the advantage of the real experience of the current industrialising countries while those above had to rest on the historical evidence of the industrialisation of the now advanced industrial countries. In these theories import substitution industrialisation (ISI) may lead to export-oriented industrialisation (EOI) (Gereffi, 1990). Two new elements or emphases are introduced in these theories compared with the past - first, the importance of the world political economy and second, the macro level mechanisms of labour control. In both ISI and EOI industrialisation strategies it appears that the relationship to the international economy is crucial. In both cases it is the international competition which is expected to force local managers to discipline labour sufficiently to depress the wages, and therefore unit labour costs, to below those of competing and usually more advanced economies.

In these theories there is, to a limited extent, an abandonment of the assumption of the automaticity of labour control through labour market mechanism but the backlog of the macro-level approach to labour relations in the older theories is hard to defeat. Thus even in a sophisticated attempt to develop a total view, of society and industrialisation as presented by Ellison and Gereffi (1990) there is still little room for the particularity or diversity of workplace relations.

Significantly, scholars seeking to answer the question as to how the current so-called

Asian Tigers have succeeded have put more emphasis on workplace relations, corporate structure and human capital (e.g. Amsden, 1989). But such excellent insights and empirical work have yet to be forged into a theory or model of labour and production in which workplace relations or labour motivation and control are made extant.

The assumptions of labour control via the labour market inherent in classical economics were that labour would be materially motivated, or rather material coerced, through the function of the labour market. Intensity of effort and application to task was assumed to be sustained by the threat of unemployment which in turn would lead to a meaningful decline in welfare of the individual and his/her dependents. The model was entirely and uniformly materially coercive and its assumptions could only be sustained if loss of employment brought meaningful decline in welfare.

Thus Paul Samuelson of textbook fame opined in 1980 that the failing labour productivity rate in the USA may be due to the lack of a "hungriness motive" in workers. This economic social thinking found willing adherents in anglo-saxon societies. Thus, in 1981, Mrs. Thatcher and Mr. Reagan introduced policies designed to increase the hungriness motive via increasing unemployment (that is, the incidence of dismissal/redundancy) and cutting social services (that is, increasing the material detriment associated with loss of employment).

But after a decade of these policies British and American relative labour productivity performance have not improved. British and USA labour productivity increases are still not low and increases in productivity have been achieved have been done so largely by shedding labour rather than increasing the output of existing labour. While some evidence for this appears in overall macro economic performance and productivity studies (Porter, 1990; Dertouzos, 1989) studies closer to the workplace also are starting to indicate differences in the productivity of plants located in different systems (models). Thus Hiromoto (1995:261) notes in comparing Japanese companies in the United Kingdom and Germany "The transplant in the United Kingdom had a deficit for a long time. Only recently has it shown a small profit. The German plant, which was established in 1982, showed a profit soon after operations commenced. One cannot conclude very much from these findings because profit is affected by many factors other than labour management, but clearly a non-Japanese style of factory operation can contribute to good business results, even in Japanese MNC's."

This situation has caused some observers, and especially those outside anglo-saxon societies, to consider the possibility that the cause of the weakness of the Anglo-American model was structural and therefore lying deep within history, national processes and culture.

If this were the case then two aspects of this Anglo-American model need to be emphasised in relation to the development of traditionally viewed organised labour which are that a) by virtue of the complexity of human affairs the labour market never functioned as in the pure model -contemporary evidence for this is overwhelming -(e.g. Evensky, 1991); b) even without this block to the classical assumption the opposition to labour market functioning was intense, universal and persistent (Polanyi, 1944). This has meant that modern society in which "social partners" organised labour, political

parties have been built on the organisations derived from the resistance to the creation and development of labour market as assumed by the classical scholars.

It follows therefore that if governing elites do not attempt to create labour markets of the classical kind, the function of the organisations of resistance will be different. In this logic lies the clue to the perceived dysfunction of labour organisations as derived from the Anglo-American model when set against new production technologies and within different global economic possibilities.

What then deserves attention is history of the development of this role of organised labour within industrial production.

19th Century Origins of the Hegemonic Model of Labour in Industrial Production: Coercion versus Commitment

National work practices, structures of workplace authority and the attitudes to work derived from them, are products of history, culture, thought structures, and technology.

Thus development of the original version of industrialisation would logically incorporate any unique or peculiar characteristics. The model in the United Kingdom reveals a number of unique characteristics compared with other western European societies at that time.

The first of these, was that there was never any emphasis or real discussion of the enterprise as a social unit, nor of what would now be called the democratisation of work and work relations.

There may be many reasons for this phenomena. Probably the most important was that prior to industrialisation in the United Kingdom there was no democratisation of land-holding. The individual ownership or even leasing rights over land supplying a peasant household can be seen as a distributive and democratic process. In the case of the United Kingdom there was never an important social phase in which the individual land-owning peasant was a predominant form of agrarian production. This contrasts starkly with the experience in western Europe, especially in what is now Germany and France.

Labour did not have to be forcibly alienated from land ownership, that is the means of production, to create a labour market as Marx thought because it never owned land. Thus labourers passed from one state of domination and deprivation in agriculture to another such state in industry. Peasant-lord adversarial relations in agriculture were then transferred to industry. Labour relations in industry were wholly adversarial from the beginning.

The second important factor was the minimal role of the state within industrial policy and development. For a variety of reasons, including the later start of industrialisation, other western European countries all started their industrialisation process with a substantive state involvement in encouragement, direction and fostering of industry.

The effect of this was, as has been the case in the currently successful industrialisation models in South East Asia, to direct accumulation and therefore to prevent its excessive concentration and its possible irrational use (in terms of national interest) and, equally important, it provided at least a state policy concern for the nature of income and wealth distribution.

The third important aspect is the role of the state in the development of labour-relations and production systems. Here the common law system of the anglo-saxon countries contrasts starkly with the statute and code based law systems of the Continent. The common law system finally arrives at the proposition that the law is what the judge says it is, or what a lawyer says he said it was. This is elitist law designed not to provide the general population with a prior knowledge of its rights. This situation, somewhat corrected in the USA by the aberrant introduction of a written constitution into a common-law system, was not extended further and certainly not to what was seen on the continent of Europe as essential for both social democracy and workplace democracy - the existence of detailed labour code.

These three factors meant that the only way that redress of grievance, regularity, social justice and equity could be secured was exclusively and uniquely only through the collective organisation of workers for this purpose. Thus was born the system of internal enterprise legislation based upon the outcome of negotiation or power struggle between management and organised labour. In this power struggle power endowments were increased by national linkages and solidarity, thus forcing workplace organisations to become part of a national aggregation of power. This made labour organisation and adversarial relations a functional need of the system rather than an expression of a collapse of cooperation. There could be no other way in which cooperation could be established other than through a stand-off.

A further consequence, which is crucial to the current debate surrounding privatisation, was that all productive organisations had a structurally induced producer orientation. In the internal and external battle between owners or management and labour the voice of consumers was absent. The negotiated outcome may have suited the internal parties of management and labour but not necessarily the external party of the consumer.

It is not clear when the absence of workplace management-labour cooperation, the need for the collective organisation of workers to secure even elemental rights over their own lives, the property-owning based democracy and the general horrors of industrialisation, began to produce a comparatively persistent and chronic low productivity of labour. The inherent inefficiency of a coerced unwilling and uncooperative labour force could only be solved by two possibilities: first, the securing of technological advantage and the prevention of its use elsewhere; and second, in the acquisition of protected markets. Conceivably then imperial ventures by the British were not the need to vent surplus from an efficient production machine but more the need to prevent the possible emergence of more efficient systems which might, within a free trade system, reveal the poverty of the model of the organisation of production in the first industrialised country (Dutt, 1992).

20th Century Developments of the Hegemonic Model: Taylor, Ford and Keynes

The current problems of the hegemonic model, however, is not only rooted in this early historical period but also in the subsequent 19th century developments.

These developments can be considered in two blocks – first the emergence of specific views on labour use and motivation and, second, the application of these views to mass production. The names of importance here are Taylor, Ford and Keynes.

From Taylor came the mechanistic view of human labour. Humans in production were nothing but machines which lacked effective external control mechanisms. The way to maximise such control mechanisms was to be based upon Adam Smith's idea of infinite division of labour plus works study, and organisation and method. Management was the systems control of the robotic arm of the worker.

Taylor has come in for much abuse (eg. Doray, 1981) but he did not invent this functional division of labour between management and workers because it already existed in the United Kingdom when he was writing at the turn of the century. Taylorism is then only an extension into an extreme of a system culturally and historically and intellectually produced. It could therefore be expected that its transfer elsewhere would be accompanied by the normal lack of fit and dysfunction experienced with such transfers.

Henry Ford applied Taylorism to mass production and produced an organisation of production now known as Fordism. But Fordism could not have been effective without a) a mass market and b) a basic disposition to exclude commitment and brain as an attribute of labour. The market came, in the case of the UK, from the Empire and, in the case of the USA, from the population expansion of that time. The basic mechanistic view of labour was already historically and culturally present.

Ford and Taylor are often presented as the brilliant innovators of industrial organisation – but they may be seen in another light – they reacted intelligently to existing circumstances. In France and Germany neither large markets nor an advanced system of separation of person from labour existed, thus neither Taylorism nor Fordism could have taken such a strong hold.

Keynes became important because his economics in fact tried to replace labour market coercion of labour by material incentives – securing intensity of labour by the offer of greater income; this message he could have heard from the voice of anglo-american labour organisations – when asked what unions stood for Samuel Gompers, the US trade union leader, replied "more". If "more" satisfied labour as it did management and capitalists then a self-sustaining system could be created. This Keynesian shift from coercion to material incentive was, of course, opposed by conservatives as socialism and "being soft on labour" but in fact it did not change the situation substantially within the enterprise. It encouraged the strength of national unions, macro level distribution, but did not enter the "real economy" of enterprise and production.

The adjustment of Keynes postponed the realisation that there were long-existing

problems of labour productivity within the dominant model of labour and production. When this problem manifested itself in a relative fashion, especially in relation to Japan and Germany, and in continuing low rates of economic growth the hegemonic model began to be recognised as a particular one and causative aspects were sought within it. (Hart, 1991; Porter, 1990; Dertouszos, 1989; Szirmai & Plat, 1990). Thus Thurow (1992) contrasts the Japanese model with the anglo saxon model and looks deep into the anglo - saxon work ethic. The British disease, he concludes is "adversarial labour relations" while the American disease is "that cheap labour will solve everything". (Thurow, 1992;273)

This distinction, however, is inappropriate in that it does not need an industrial relations expert to know that if the sole objective of employers is to secure the cheapest labour then there would soon be adversarial labour relations. Both the USA and the UK have indeed achieved the lowest labour cost in the rich industrialised countries.

The literature investigating labour productivity recognises a multiplicity of factors contributing to labour productivity including motivation and incentives to work (Frenkel, 1989). Thurow notes that the Anglo-Saxon enterprise is based upon the assumption that more leisure and consumption is the sole motivation of all concerned and this is locked into the rational, utility-maximizing individual. But "The Anglo-Saxon model is not wrong" states Thurow (1992:118). Yet according to Thurow's definition this model eliminate all other possible human motives for engagement in production such as professional pride, satisfaction in work, expansion of power and prestige, status and so on. From the standpoint of commitment-oriented management such an assumption of motivation would indeed be inappropriate to current needs.

Perhaps more remarkable in the current situation is not only the drive for cheaper labour rather than value-added in the Anglo-Saxon model of an enterprise but the equally ferocious drive for expensive executives. In 1980, Sweden had the highest per capita income but the lowest paid executives. UK and USA executives enjoy the highest salaries of all the rich countries with the result that differentials between director and worker are 25 to 1 in the USA, 17 to 1 in the UK and only between 9 and 14 to 1 in Sweden, Japan and Germany.

In all the discussions this relative inequity in the enterprise as the dominating difference between Anglo-Saxon enterprises and all the other rich countries is not mentioned. Yet it may seem evident that wage differentials, that is, income inequity in the enterprise, affects worker morale and thus productivity. Industrial sociologists and psychologists bring no conclusive evidence to this when considering current industrialised countries but significantly much is made of it in relation to industrialising or newly industrialised countries. Amsden (1989) argues, in the South Korean case, that the "more equal" model in Korea was derived from the fact that management and labour had to unite together to deal with an alien technology and paternalism and state intervention prevented the expansion of a visible high income group.

The Anglo-Saxon enterprise, which is at the core of the model, is then one in which profit maximising results in a downward squeeze of wages and conditions of work and an upward thrust on executive salaries, adversarial labour relations, coupled with a lack

of a cultural, historic or legal base for positive commitment enhancement and cooperation.

The Search for Alternative Models and Approaches

The crisis of the hegemonic model may stem from the mismatch between the origin and nature of the model and developments in technology and the changing structure of modern industrial economies. It is compounded by the success with which other models of production organisation have apparently dealt with these changes more easily, especially those of the so-called Rhinelands model, found in Germany and Northern Europe, and the Japanese model.

In technology, in all branches of industry tolerances have become finer - to use an engineering concept. That is, production has more precision, strength is secured by stresses rather than mass, speed is achieved by process rather than by power and output is governed by individual consumer decision rather than a producer's assumption of the nature and dimensions of mass taste. At the same time the greater productivity achieved and the greater collective intellectual input into these processes have combined to create the so-called service economy.

From the standpoint of production organisation these developments have one salient characteristic - the work force involved must pay more individual attention to the tasks assigned them than before. In the service sector, where productivity is hard to measure and supervision difficult to create, individual workers must alone sustain the pace, intensity and quality of output. In manufacturing the sensitivity of a single individual error has increased - fine tolerances require fine work.

All this means that the need for greater commitment to task by the work force is higher. The transition from a coerced to a committed work force is underway. One hour of coerced labour performed unwillingly, under threat of dismissal is worth increasingly less than an hour of committed labour. Thus the system which produces the greatest commitment at least cost is successful - to introduce the institutionalists' notion of lower transaction costs and enforcement of the labour contract.

This latter conclusion is the reason for the apparent success of other models of the social organisation of production. In this area macro-level models begin to proliferate (eg. Emerson, 1988). National claims for labour-relations models - the Japanese, Swedish, German, French, Korean models are all extant.

An attempt to move from one nationally or geographically derived model - the Anglo-American - to another in a world in which the hegemonic promotion of any model is constrained lacks creativity and flexibility. An approach which uses other criteria for model construction or accepts the diversity of industrialisation processes may be more fruitful even if only heuristically. One such approach could be termed the multiple sets of labour relations (Cox, 1987; Harrod, 1987) while another accepts multiple paths of labour relations in industrialisation (Deyo 1987, 1989; Frenkel and Harrod, 1995). The multiple sets of labour relations approach rejects the essential need for nation, region,

enterprise or industry as criteria for the establishment of a typology of labour relations in favour of identifying patterns of power relations or authority structures. Thus, for example, that a certain pattern is found predominantly in small to medium size enterprises does not preclude its appearance in large enterprises or in different industrial sectors. These patterns produce different labour productivities and, therefore, there are terms of trade between them. Several different patterns with their socio-political linkages make a constellation, a system of labour and production or a social formation which may, or may not, correspond to a nation state. These constellations can also be seen as a variety of labour relations' paths in industrialisation.

Such approaches have the advantage of being able to incorporate other approaches as the regionalisation (Perulli, 1993) and economic culture (Levin and Chui, 1993). Thus a regional constellation of patterns can be seen as part of a larger system or social formation. The sectoral approach is accommodated likewise - enterprise corporatism power relations will be found in the high technology sunrise industry and tripartite relations in the sunset industries. The possibility of a variety of combinations enables the macro level to be accommodated by the notion of dominant and subordinate patterns. Thus, for example, the national system ascribed to Japan of enterprise unionism and isolated internal labour markets only ever covered 30 percent of the labour force. It was nevertheless a dominant form in the Japanese social formation which included a variety of other patterns.

The Importance of New Approaches

Different approaches and different models produce different views of elements of the models. The newer approaches and models said to compete with the Anglo-American do not ascribe the adversarial role of organised labour found in that model. Yet in spite of these different roles and place for organised labour, there is a recognition in all of the approaches of the potential for the organisation of employees. The basis for such recognition is the long-standing and accepted sociological dynamic of sub-organisation, whether formal or informal, within an organised production system based on the enterprise. This has been described as the "iron law of worker organisation in the industrial circumstance" (Harrod, 1987). That a specific role for the products of this law has been ascribed in the Anglo-American model does not mean that such a dynamic is not universal nor that it is possible to suppress it. Again, there is no evidence to indicate, for example, that the smaller enterprises of a new production structure as flexible specialisation or polyvalent production will be excluded from this dynamic. It is a mistake to simply ignore the labour relations dimension because it is untidy in neo-classical economic terms or that industrial relations has not traditionally paid much attention to it (Thomas, 1991).

Much of management literature is oriented towards a weakening or prevention of this organising potential if only by assuming labour market coercion or a "union-free" environment; sociology and history would indicate that this is but wishful thinking. Models of labour in production dominate contemporary discussions in the construction of an integrated Europe (Emerson, 1988), they continue to be promoted at the international level where structural adjustment policies, with their implied weakening

of organised labour through labour market flexibility, (Harrod, 1992) will now contradict the union-based tripartitism inherent in trade-related labour standards. The importance of labour relations in the global economy is assuming strategic and prominent importance (Caporaso, 1987; Gordon, 1988; Harrod, 1995). Yet the question for the 21st century is not whether or not there will be worker, employee or producer organisations but more what will their form or functions be within a new model of labour and production.

The use of organised labour to illustrate the importance of the discussion of new models, paradigms and approaches applies equally to any other element in the system of labour and production, particularly to management practices, industrial structure, labour law and labour productivity. While the debate may continue to be centred on the currently competing models, it is unlikely that any one of the models will prevail without adaptation. To raise questions concerning the basis from which such creation and adaptation is undertaken begins with illuminating the existence of hegemonic models and their origins and assumptions as has been attempted in this article.

REFERENCES

- Albert, M. (1991) Capitalism contre Capitalism
- Amsden, A.(1989) Asia's Next Giant: South Korea and Late Industrialisation New York: Oxford University Press.
- Best, M.(1990) The New Competition:Institutions of Industrial Restructuring Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Caporaso, J. A., (1987) "Labor in the Global Political Economy" in Caporaso, J. (ed). (1987) A Changing International Division of Labor London: Frances Pinter.
- S. Chiu and D. A. Levin (1993) "Labour Under Industrial Restructuring in Hong Kong: A Comparision of Textiles and Garments" Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies - revised version in Frenkel and Harrod (1994).
- Cox, R. W. (1977) "Labor and Hegemony" International Organisation, 31 no.3 385-424
- Cox, R. W.(1987) Production, Power and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dertouzos, Michael L., Richard K. Lester, Robert M. Solow and the MIT Commission on Industrial Productivity (1989) Made in America. Regaining the Productive Edge Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Deyo, F.C. (1987-1) "State and Labour: Modes of political exclusion in East Asian development", in F.C. Deyo (ed.) The Political Economy of the New Asian Industrialism 182-202. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Deyo, F.C. (1987-2) "Coalitions, Institutions, and Linking Sequences-Towards a Strategic Capacity Model of East Asian Development" in F.C. Deyo (ed.) The Political Economy of the New Asian Industrialism 227-247. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Deyo, F. C. (1989) Beneath the Miracle: Labor Subordination in the New Asian Industrialism (Berkeley: University of California Press)
- Doray, B. (1981) Le Taylorism, une folie rationnelle? Paris:Bordas; translated 1988 as From Fordism to Taylorism: A Rational Madness London: Free Association Books.
- Dunlop, J. (1958) Industrial Relations Systems New York, Holt.
- Dutt, A. K. (1992) "The Origins of Uneven Development: The Rise of the West and the Lag of the Rest" American Economic Review 82 (2): 146-150

Ellison, Christopher and Gereffi, Gary, "Explaining Strategies and Patterns of Industrial Development" in Gereffi and Wyman, 1990:368-399.

Emerson, Michael with André Dramais (1988) What Model for Europe? Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Evensky, Jerry (1991) "The Neoclassical Model Enriched by the Structure of Control: A Labor Market Illustration", American Journal of Economics and Sociology 50(2): 207-222.

Frenkel, S. (1989) "Productivity Growth: Towards a Sociological Synthesis" Labour and Industry 2(1):5-31.

Frenkel, S. and Harrod, J. (eds) (1995) Industrialization and Labor Relations: Contemporary Research in Seven Countries (ILR Press, New York, forthcoming 1995)

Frenkel, S and Harrod, J. "Labor, Management, and Industrial Relations: Themes and Issues in International Perspective" in Frenkel and Harrod (eds) (1995)

Gordon, D. M. (1988) "Global Transformation or Decay?: Alternative Perspectives on Recent Changes in the World Economy" in Magnum, G. L. and Philips, P. (eds) (1988) The World of Labor Economics New York: Sharp:308-347

Gereffi, G. (1990) "Paths of Industrialisation:An Overview" in Gereffi and Wyman (1990).

Gereffi, Gary and Donald L. Wyman (eds.) (1990) Manufacturing Miracles: Paths of Industrialization in Latin America and East Asia Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Hart, Jeffrey (1992) Rival Capitalists: International Competitiveness in USA, Japan and Western Europe

Harrod, Jeffrey (1972) Trade Union Foreign Policy London: Macmillan.

Harrod, Jeffrey (1987 -1) Power Production and the Unprotected Worker New York: Columbia University Press.

Harrod, Jeffrey (1987 -2) "Social Relations of Production, Systems of Labour Control and Third World Unions" in Southall, Roger (ed) Trade Unions and the New Industrialisation of the Third World Ontario: University of Ottawa Press:35-55.

Harrod, Jeffrey (1989) "Industrialisation, Productivity, and Multiple Power Relations: Lech, Lula, and Kwon", Industrialisation Seminar paper, The Hague: Institute of Social Studies.

Harrod, Jeffrey (1992) Labour and Third World Debt Brussels: ICEF.

- Harrod, Jeffrey (1995-forthcoming) "Problems of the Anglo-Saxon Real Economy: Labour Relations and World Order". The Hague, Institute of Social Studies.
- Hashim, Y. (1994) The State and Trade Unions in Africa: A study in Macro-Corporatism Ph.D thesis, The Hague, Institute Social Studies.
- Hiramoto, A (1995) "Overseas Japanese Plants under Global Strategies: TV Transplants in Asia" in Frenkel and Harrod, (1995)
- Jacobs, Michael. (1991) Short-term America: The Causes and Cures of our Business Myopia Cambrige: Havard Business School Press.
- Katz, H. C. "Review Symposium of Kaufman, B. E., The Origins and the Evolution of the Field of Industrial Relations" in Industrial Relations and Labor Review Vol. 46, No. 2 pp.395-406
- Lieberman, Sima (1986) Labor Movements and Labor Thought: Spain, France, Germany and the United States New York: Praeger.
- Murphy,G and Tooze, R (eds) 1991, The New International Political Economy Boulder: CO. (
- Nau, Henry (1990) The Myth of America's Decline. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Perulli, P. (1993) "Towards a Regionalisation of Industrial Relations", International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 17(1):98-113.
- Olson, Mancur (1982) The Rise and Decline of Nations. Economic Growth, Stagflation and Social Rigidities New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Pollert, Anna (ed) (1991) Farewell to Flexibility? London: Blackwell.
- Porter, M. (1990) The Competitive Advantage of Nations Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Rapkin, D. C. (ed) (1990) World Leadership and Hegemony Boulder: C).
- Reich, R. B. The Work of Nations: Preparing Ourselves for the 21st Century Capitalism London: Simon and Schuster.
- Rostow, W. W. (1960) The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non Communist Manifesto Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Romer, Paul M. (1986) "Increasing Returns and Long-Run Growth" in Journal of Political Economy 94(5): 1002-1037.
- Szirmai, Adam and Dirk Plat (1990) "Comparisons of Purchasing Power, Real Output and Labour Productivity in Manufacturing in Japan, South Korea and the U.S.A.,

1975-85" Review of Income and Wealth 36(1): 1-31.

Thurow, Lester (1992). Head to Head: The Coming Economic Battle among Japan, Europe and America. New York: William Morrow.

Thomas, H. (1991) "Labour and Work in Small-Scale Enterprises" in Thomas et al (1991).

Thomas, H., Uribe-Echevarria F., and Romijn, H. (1991) Small-Scale Production: Strategies for Industrial Restructuring Washington: IT Publications.

Womak, J.P., D.T. Jones, D. Roos (1990) The Machine that Changed the World New York: MIT Press.