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1. INTRODUCTION: WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE OLD NEW INTERNATIONAL LABOUR STUDIES?

The three works under review belong to our new times. This era has seen the final triumph of a complex, informatised, neo-liberal and globalised capitalism over all rivals. There is a continuing low-intensity war on work, working people and trade unions globally. We also see the crisis of the traditional popular alternatives to capitalism. Not only have we witnessed the implosion of Communism and Thirdworldism, however, but also the hollowing-out of Social Democracy, whether in its traditional Swedish, British, Australian, or in its recent East European, Brazilian or South African emanations.

What are the implications of the current global crisis for labour studies? Or at least for those tendencies that have traditionally identified themselves with labour? What is happening with these as they try to address themselves to institutionalised labour internationally (generally, comparatively) or to institutionalised international labour (transnationally, globally)? This question arises quite personally for someone heavily engaged with a tendency of the 1970s-80s which called itself the ‘new international labour studies’ (Cohen 1980, 1991). Between 1978 and 1990 I edited and self-published a tiny, more-or-less quarterly, Newsletter of International Labour Studies. NILS came out of Third World labour studies but was critical of both development and dependency theories. It was also critical of the institutionalised socialist traditions of Communism and Social Democracy. If it concentrated on Third World labour studies, with special issues devoted to Brazil, Tanzania, India or Indonesia, it also ran such on Poland, Western Europe and the USA. But NILS also gave particular attention to international labour issues (particularly women workers) and, of course, labour internationalism in general and trade-union internationalism in particular. Some of the books linked to or touched by the newsletter were more Third
World oriented (Arriola and Waterman 1992, Munck 1988, Southall 1988). Others were not (Bayat 1991, Cohen 1987, 1991, Waterman 1984, 1986, 1988). We were highly critical of the dominant international labour organisations, though not without nuance, and threw some light on this distant and secretive sphere. Sympathetic to most new labour movements and organisations, we tried to preserve some critical distance from them also.

We described ourselves as providing a service to movement-oriented intellectuals and research-oriented activists. Our purpose was to provide information on information (though, of course, we were just as interested in providing analyses of analyses). We had a strong interest in both information, including documentation and databases, and the means of communication, including audiovisuals and computers. But there was also some implicit political project within NILS. Born with, or transformed by ‘1968’, which I lived through in Prague, we foresaw the end of the Cold War, the resurrection of democratic and militant unionism, the growth of a grassroots internationalism, the rebirth of some kind of ‘liberation socialism’. The newsletter was inspired by and contributed to the new service-oriented labour NGOs, such as the Asia Monitor Resource Centre in Hongkong, the Pakistan Institute of Labour Education and Research in Karachi and the International Labour Research and Information Group in Cape Town. It had contacts with Third World and international labour researchers in Scandinavia, in India, France, Poland, and in one or two countries of Latin America.

Theoretically, NILS prefigured the new global social movements, new global solidarities and critical globalisation theories of the 1990s. Politically, it suggested a way forward from a democratic workerism to a broader democratic and pluralist vision of the forces for social transformation. We were, perhaps, most popular in South Africa, with its innovatory labour movement, labour-oriented left intellectuals, with its isolation from, and consequent thirst for, foreign and international information and ideas. The newsletter acted as some kind of link in an entirely informal network. One could not ‘join’ or ‘follow’ NILS, only subscribe to it, contribute to it, use it, refer to it. We met at international academic conferences, many of them in the Canada of the 1970s-80s. Or in the shopsteward-level consultations of the Transnationalisation International Exchange in Amsterdam, or on the pages of International Labour Reports, a labour-oriented illustrated magazine, in the UK. Both NILS (the newsletter) and NILS (the tendency) were modest in scale and pretension, customarily dependent on personal or academic (rather than state or union) patronage or funding. The tendency did, however, give rise to a number of books, some of them self-published (Waterman 1984, 1986, 1988) many of them published in a Zed Press Labour Series edited at one time by Robin Cohen (e.g. Bayat 1991, Cohen 1991a, Munck 1988, Southall 1988).

The collapse of NILS (the newsletter) was due to personal burn-out consequent on producing it on a self-funded basis and as an increasingly personal effort. But the decline of NILS (the tendency) also had something to do with the general disappointment, disorientation and dislocation of the left internationally following ‘Berlin, Baghdad, Rio’ (Lipietz 1992). More recent left work on labour internationally seems, as we will see, to be either more oriented to the academy, more state-dependent, or more compromised with the (remaining) dominant international labour organisations - primarily those of the generally social-reformist or specifically Social-Democratic tradition. Echoes of the NILS tradition, and of my personal contributions to such - sometimes friendly, sometimes not - can be found
in some of the works under review. These books suggest that the moment of NILS has passed. Yet the limitations of these new works, in the face of a renewed world labour order that is simultaneously reproductive of capitalism but revolutionary within this, destructive of old terrains of struggle yet creative of new ones (Gottfried 1995), suggests to me the necessity of some new emancipatory vision and strategy for labour internationally. The question is: from where, from what, is there to come a kind of labour studies that is fit for the new world labour order? I will return to this in my Conclusion.
2. TRADE UNIONS IN THE THIRD WORLD: AN OLD-WORLD-VIEW

Hope for the future: somewhat hopeless

The book edited by Henk Thomas comes out of an extensive Dutch state-funded evaluation of its trade-union development-aid projects. It begins with an editorial Introduction on the crisis of unionism in the Third World and the question of whether unions here will survive into the next century (ix). There follow Parts on Asia, Latin America and Africa, each with a general introduction, each with two national case studies. Only in the African section is the general introduction done by the authors of the case studies. In the Asian section the introduction is by four authors, none of whom are responsible for the following cases. The same is true for Latin America, although here the introductory team is reduced to three. In a conventional review one is expected to describe and respond to the contents before launching into critique. But this is an unconventional - even eccentric - book, with its authorial ‘cast of hundreds’ and its absence of any common logic or even subjects. As the editor himself states:

In the case of Asia, for example, issues of ethnicity, militarism and feminisation of industrialisation are addressed as separate themes. For Latin America, the changing roles of trade unions and the state...have received special focus, while in the case of Africa, the major disturbances in labour markets, as reflected in migratory patterns and growth of informal-sector activities, have been singled out for special attention. (22)

It may be that other reviewers will be able to impose a more than empirical or empiricist sense on this. I cannot. I feel therefore obliged to address, rather, the sense suggested by editor’s remarks, and the major issues raised for labour-oriented labour studies by the book as a whole.

The editor himself ends with four ‘issues and challenges’ (240-246): 1) that union studies need to pay closer attention to local, national and regional labour markets; 2) that unions need to address informal-sector work as a key policy concern; 3) that they need to recognise women’s work and women’s autonomy, to dialogue and cooperate with women’s movements; 4) that they need - in collaboration with networks of NGOs - to address themselves to the creation of productive employment and decent income. The conclusion, finally, expresses the ‘somewhat ambitious’ (244) hope that this might be the beginning of a new approach towards economic democracy. This is a necessary but insufficient and somewhat eclectic list of recommendations. It is not clear to me how it would lead to economic democracy, what this actually means - and why it should not lead also to the political and social kind. Attention to informal-sector work, does not here mean attention to informal-sector workers, far less their autonomy, nor their increasingly powerful and often democratic self-activity - which extends way beyond employment and income (Seddon and Walton 1994, Candia 1996). Indeed, only the third recommendation seems to address itself to a named and self-active human social category. We will see, in my Conclusion, that the implications of taking these seriously are much more radical than Thomas’ tokenism could possibly permit.
Approach: the lack of a global vision

Now there is no question about the crisis of work and unionism in the Third World. But there is, surely, much more in crisis hereabouts. To start with there is the profound crisis of work and unionism in the First World (Gorz 1989). In the Netherlands the major union federation is trying, pathetically but predictably, to meet its local difficulties by issuing membership cards with the combined form and function of my plastic Traveller’s Aid and Shopper’s Advantage cards. This is unionism as individualised insurance protection and private consumption stimulation (c.f., for the US, DeMartino 1995, Tasini 1995). What is at question today, however, is the whole question of trade-union representativity, and the necessity for a new basis for, and logic of, worker self-organisation (Catalano 1993). Secondly there is the crisis of development. Serious researchers and significant social movements, particularly those addressed to the Third World, today place this word within distancing quotes (Escobar 1992, Schuurman 1993). This is because they recognise ‘development’ as a manipulative discourse of Westernising elites. They consider it necessary to interrogate ‘development’, ‘modernity’, ‘westernisation’ and related terms. Thirdly there is the more general crisis of capitalist civilisation and social theory. According to some this is the end of history (i.e. of a belief in political transformation), to others the death of metatheories (i.e. of human rationality, universalism or social emancipation). Yet others, neither blinded nor paralysed by the final triumph of liberal capitalism over its rivals, consider it urgently necessary to find a new, emancipatory, social and theoretical paradigm (Sousa Santos 1995).

The problem is not that this book fails to address these more general crises: it operates on a more limited geographical and social field. The problem is that it shows no awareness of them and is thus unable to place the one it does address within a wider theoretical/social framework. If it had made use of its own main title it might have provided itself with a world view (or even a worldview) relevant to its more modest subject matter. ‘Globalisation’, here, however, seems to be aimed more at the putative purchaser than the published product, since it does not even have an index reference in the book itself! Indeed, even though the book is market-fixed, it recommends unions to focus on the ‘local, national and regional’ (240) ones, as if these were not themselves related to a global one. Or as if the global causes of the crisis of labour and unionism in the Third World were elemental, beyond human intervention - or even understanding.3 We are therefore left, in practice, with the descriptive sub-title, which lacks all the social breadth, theoretical potential and ethical implications of at least ‘critical and committed’ globalisation theory (Sousa Santos 1995: Ch. 6, Waterman Forthcoming). Such metatheoretical gaps or shortcomings are not necessarily fatal to a study. They can be compensated for by analytical rigour or policy relevance.

Analysis: good in parts

Analytical rigour, however, is not immediately apparent in this work. The discussion of the general literature (17-22) is, more modestly, described as a ‘record’. I record here, however, as many significant misses as hits.4 The function of this section is to clear the decks for a market-oriented study, and for a policy of human resource development (16). The former is called ‘economics’ by the editor, and must be surely distinguished in his mind, though not on his pages, from ‘political-economy’. ‘Human resource development’ is a
managerial doctrine, treating human beings as instruments or objects, rather than as at least potentially autonomous definers or self-active agents, of development. Thus, even the belated gesture toward feminist labour analyses and strategies is confined to the conclusion and reduced to a token.5 ‘Autonomy’ here, moreover, is a tacit for working women, not a new principle relevant to democratisation and human emancipation more generally (c.f. Held 1995). We are therefore left with the development manager’s question of the role labour can be asked to ‘play in the development process’ (22).

Even more problematic is the mentioned absence of any integrating logic. As is admitted (21), the overviews share no common theme. They are also of markedly different quality. The Latin American one seems to me strong, clear and useful, but neither its quality nor its structure have infected the others. The overviews, moreover, seem to neither orient nor be informed by the relevant case studies. The choice of countries appears arbitrary, missing the largest or most-dynamic (Chile is a small but dynamic exception). The larger/dynamic ones may also be those in which the labour movement is not only more significant (though no less problematic) but more regionally influential, at least in potential: Brazil and Mexico, South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan (Asia Labour Monitor 1988, Ogle 1990, Seidman 1994, Webster et al. 1994). There might be a case for taking the chosen countries (more typical? more problematic? less studied?) but that offered is eclectic and unconvincing (21). It does not, for example, seem to note that two neighbouring and English-speaking Southern African cases, Zambia and Zimbabwe, have to stand for a continent stretching (as at least colonial railbuilders were aware) from Cape Town to Cairo. It is quite difficult to imagine, for example, that anyone would consider the Netherlands and Belgium to in any way represent labour in the European Community, far less Europe. Much of the work reads, indeed, as if it were written in haste, against a deadline. The continental/country structure of the work cries out for a comparative framework or a justification for not using such. Thomas favours an approach [that] avoids the pitfalls of narrow descriptive studies of labour issues that become biased through a national focus; on the other hand, it does not reach out towards all-encompassing global concepts that derive from ideological preferences and biases rather than rigorous research. (20)

There are clearly problems involved in theoretically-driven labour research (Cohen 1991b) or the comparative kind (see Locke and Thelen 1995 for industrialised countries, Seidman 1994:9-10 for the Third World). There is, however, a greater cost in leaving your preferences and biases inexplicit, unreflected or undefended - or presented simply as ‘rigorous research’. What the latter customarily means is the acceptance of an instrumental rationality which does not question dominant social science paradigms. Nor even, as in this case, the massacre of nature, labour and people brought about by World Monetary Fundamentalism. ‘Rigorous’, finally, is not the word I would have used in generalising about either the continental overviews or country case studies.

**Policy: ignoring the global warning**

But is the work at least policy relevant? And if so, relevant to whose policies? There is something a puzzle here. In so far as the work was commissioned and subsidised by the Social-Democratic Dutch Minister of Development Cooperation, one might expect it to
be functional to Dutch development aid and finance policy. In so far as it is concerned with the equally social-democratic (lower-case) Dutch trade-union contribution toward the former, one might expect it to be at least partially relevant to the latter. Given, indeed, the extensive incorporation of Dutch unions into Dutch capitalism - or at least the predictably comfortable relationship between the funding ministry and funded unions⁶ - one might expect it to serve both simultaneously. But here, it seems to me, the book is more part of the problem it is considering than the solution it is seeking. This is not an inevitable fate for commissioned labour research. Unions of the social-reformist tradition are proving themselves capable of producing documents that are both globalisation- and gender-sensitive (see the Conclusion below). The problem with the Thomas work seems to be that it is still inhabiting a lowland utopia, protected from the rising tide of globalisation by Keynesian dykes built in the earlier period of nation-state-dependent capitalism. This concrete utopia (I am thinking of Holland’s visible motorways and invisible pigsties) has evidently not yet disappeared. But globalisation tends to undermine or dissolve national frontiers, as well as those of political and socio-economic blocs and their accompanying discourses (is Taiwan more Third World than Portugal? Which parts of the US and UK are First World?). Ignoring globalisation today is, like ignoring global warming, something even lowlands with dykes can hardly afford to do.

**Alternatives: buried or disguised**

There are other theoretical/political directions in which work sympathetic to Third World labour can or could look. One is that of Inga Brandell (1991), which, whilst possibly limited by its political-economy Marxism, is theoretically coherent, methodologically rigorous and therefore intellectually and politically challenging. Another is buried within the book itself. Buried in more than a figurative sense, since the ‘new international labour studies’ approach and the ‘social movement unionism’ (SMU) related to it are either dismissed, footnoted or disguised. Thomas considers that the NILS approach rose and fell with the ‘New International Division of Labour’ (NIDL) school (of Froebel, Heinrichs and Kreye 1981). He states ‘somewhat cynically’ that the NILS tendency led only to an interesting collection of cases, concepts and hypotheses for future research. He characterises NILS and SMU, disapprovingly, of going ‘far beyond production relations into the political realm’ (23-24:fn 19), and then dismisses them for their modest presence or impact. The spectres of NILS and SMU, however, return to haunt this book. Mihyo and Schiphorst refer to South African union strategies and debates, particularly the movement from SMU to ‘strategic unionism’. They then endorse the latter in the following terms:

> [T]he interests of groups of working people outside the formal, waged sector are coming increasingly into the orbit of the trade unions: women workers, informal-sector workers, the self-employed, rural workers and smallholders.

Strategies which recognise this differentiation of interests and constituencies will include the building of alliances with other groupings in civic society that articulate these concerns, including consumer, human rights, student and women’s groups. They will also involve strategic alliances with training and research institutions that can provide the necessary depth of analysis to build viable and above all sustainable bridges. Such a multiple strategic approach
would seem to make it possible for a new form of trade unionism to regain a meaningful position for working men and women. (197-8)

Both positions require commentary. The major problem with Thomas’ argument here is not that it is ‘somewhat cynical’: it is a reasonable, if superficial, point of view.7 The problem is that it is somewhat economistic, suggesting - in the face of daily worker or union experience and major social theory - that production relations are not ‘political’ (i.e. have nothing to do with either hegemonic or subaltern struggles for power). A minor problem is his belief that the NILS school rose and fell with NIDL, whereas it was a critical response to this (Cohen 1991a:Ch.8) and more inspired, I recall, by new democratic and social movement action and theory in all three world areas.8 The major problem with the argument of Mihyo and Schiphorst is that its trajectory closely reproduces my own, and that what they are favouring looks much more like my understanding of social movement unionism than South African ones of strategic unionism.9

The contractor/contractee relation in academic labour research

Much of the above criticism might seem irrelevant to the constraints under which the research for the Thomas book was carried out: use concepts, make analyses, proffer policies unfamiliar or unwelcome to the contractor and you are unlikely to be paid to do so again. This can be as true of ‘democratic’ NGOs and unions as of ‘hierarchical’ corporations and states.10 I see the contractor/contractee relationship here, however, as no inevitable constraint. What is needed, simply, is establishment of a professional code under which the evaluation is carried out within the contractor’s parameters (though these could also be bargained over), but in which researchers are free to develop later their research according to their own criteria (with the usual credits and disclaimers). The negotiation should take place in the relevant public sphere (perestroika requires glasnost). Such a code would serve the same function as those of solicitors or pharmacists: to ensure professional standards of service and prevent their undercutting and undermining by the unscrupulous or unqualified. This procedure would be to the advantage of at least the more intelligent and more democratically-minded contractors, since the subsequent work would be less likely to mirror their current self-image or public relations, or to pander to their immediate requirements.11

This book at least does us the fairly unique service of translating part of the customarily confidential evaluation into a publicly available book - thus provoking and allowing these reflections. But publication of the Thomas book was apparently also subsidised by the contractor (x-xi). Did this mean that it was under no requirement to go through a process of open academic debate or peer evaluation (which can, as I know from frequent experience, be even more painful than it is salutary)? We have here, in any case, a research project - lasting five years or more, involving 50 countries and 17 monographs (ix), at least 15-20 researchers and unknown tens of thousands of dollars - resulting in a book which does little credit to its producers, is of limited benefit to its funder, and of obscure use to the trade unions or workers concerned. Academic procedures are not themselves innocent of funders’ preferences nor unconstrained by predominant paradigms. But they can - and surely should - provide criteria alternative to those of capital or state, as well as intellectual stimuli or challenges and minimum professional standards. Otherwise one may be confronted with a self-reassuring corporatist circle in which capital, state, ruling parties, unions and academics play an apparently pluralistic game whilst actually excluding dissonance. (One
thinks here of the circulating elite of ‘self-managing’ Yugoslavia). Had full recourse been made to critical labour specialists or wider academic expertise, I cannot imagine that this would not have been a much better book.

**The return of the ethical**

A last word on ethics. The book seems to have an ambiguous attitude toward democratic and humanitarian values, sometimes adopting the value-free posture of US social science in the 1950s (era of the Cold War, McCarthyism, coerced consensus), occasionally lapsing into a terminology of empowerment, democracy, autonomy and gender equality (of the participatory 1970s and civil 1980s). Now the 1990s appear to be an era of increasingly extreme ambiguity. On the one hand there is the managerial imperative concealed/revealed in the hypocritical language employed by those manipulating or destroying people’s livelihoods, on either the macro-, mezo- or micro-scale - ‘structural adjustment’, ‘human resource development’, ‘downsizing’, ‘letting go’ (see endnote 23 below). On the other hand there is a distinct sharpening of the blurry-eyed utopianism of the 1970s. The increasing spread and depth of increasingly global problems is also leading to a return of the ethical - as in a heightened ecological awareness and environmental/consumer movement (ignored in Thomas’ discussion of increased employment). This is even invading the social-reformist unions mentioned earlier, and is leading to the development of explicitly value-driven thinking on labour in the era of globalisation (Brecher and Costello 1994, Brecher and Hunter 1995, Collier 1992, Hunter 1995, Mies 1993). This is no longer a traditional, ready-made, hand-me-down, ethic to be deduced from Judaeo-Christian morality, from Marxist political-economy, or the possessive individualism of the world-consuming West. It is something to be jointly constructed by an egalitarian dialogue, between, for example, labour movements in West and East, North and South. In an increasingly globalised world of labour it also requires a new kind of global solidarity. The Thomas book only notes the disappearance of the old kind. And offers, in endorsement of one of his contributors:

> a silver lining; the international labour movement may have to take on the heavy responsibility of co-designing new strategies and even participating in their implementation (237).

For ‘international labour movement’ read ‘state-dependent Western union development projects’. For ‘heavy responsibility’, read ‘white man’s burden’.
3. JAPANESE TRADE-UNION FOREIGN POLICY: BACK TO THE FUTURE

Riding the wave of capitalist globalisation

This book takes us back to the future in two senses.

One has to do with the subject of the book, the other its implicit framework. What the Japanese unions are apparently attempting to do is, in many ways, what the Americans and British were trying to do as long as 30 or more years ago. Yet they are doing it now, in the post-colonial, post-Communist and post-Cold War era. There must be something beyond or beneath imperialism and anti-communism that links such strategies with those of Japanese unions now. What it is, of course, is a traditional labour sense of, and faith in, national cross-class identity, rather than an increasingly necessary cross-national class or even human one.

The framework within which this book is placed takes us, likewise, back a quarter century, to the classical study of ‘trade-union foreign policy’ by Jeffrey Harrod (1972). This pioneered on the role of NGOs in foreign policy more generally. Williamson’s book, unlike that of Harrod (of which it is unaware), is atheoretical. But like that one it places its subject matter not so much within the framework of the labour movement or labour history as within those of an inevitably state-framed and state-oriented discourse of foreign policy and international relations. This is an odd place for someone of the left to place himself in the 1990s, when so many others are focusing on ‘cosmopolitan democracy’ or ‘global civil society’ (Held 1995, Waterman 1996). It cannot, moreover, move us toward any alternative international union strategy.

Williamson provides us with a lengthy, serious and highly informative account of the international relations of a major national union movement. Japan has come to prominence in the era of globalisation. Indeed, it has been a major source of globalisation, simultaneously innovating in products, production methods, labour relations - and in their worldwide export. Its unions have been riding the wave of Japanese capitalist economic development and are now following it in its internationalisation strategies. The work contains unexpected bonuses, such as the comparison of Japanese union development cooperation strategies and financing with those of the Americans, the Europeans and the international unions. It also has important appendices, including that on finances, and numerous names and addresses. This work will thus provide information to unions (what to expect as Japanese TNCs, Japanese supervisors and Japanese unions arrive), to international relations specialists (on this new actor in Japanese foreign policy), and to labour specialists (insights into the history of Japanese unions as well as Japan’s new/old union internationalism).

After a brief but crucial historical background, we get a chapter on the varied international policies of the postwar union centres - left, right and industrial - and then one on those of the contemporary confederations. We get chapters on the rather different international activities of the private and public-sector unions, interspersed with one on the impact of (and response to) Japanese TNCs in some Asian countries. There are then four chapters on the background to and development of the Japan International Labour Federation
Union corporatism on a world scale: from Gringo to Rengo

I am, reluctantly, going to have to concentrate on the later chapters, particularly on Japan’s independent activities in Asia. I cannot, however, ignore the one place in which Williamson talks about workers as well as unions, and uses the phrase ‘international solidarity’ (120).

Chapter 5 deals with the response of workers and unions to Japanese transnationals in three Asian countries. Here Williamson reveals either the failure of Japanese unions, particularly at the higher levels, to support militant workers and unions in Asia, or their opposition to and even sabotage of independent Japanese solidarity efforts. One case involved the closedown of a Japanese subsidiary in South Korea and the determined struggle of its women workers. They brought their case to Japan, were energetically supported by the now-customary solidarity groups (labour, community, church) and eventually won massive compensation - and the grudging recognition of the Japanese confederations. It becomes clear, however, that even in this case, the lesson the national-level unions drew was not of how they could or should act in solidarity but of ‘how unions could assist in solving TNC disputes’ (127) - in other words, of how they could act as intermediaries between foreign workers and Japanese corporations. Whilst Williamson here concludes that the attitudes of Japanese unions are ‘not static’ (142), he does not indicate how the ‘dynamism and change’ (143) he apparently favours could be brought about. Nor does he convince me that what the national unions and Rengo are doing has anything to do with ‘international solidarity’.

Now for the national-level institutions themselves. The consolidation of the Japanese trade unions under the new rightwing confederation, Rengo (1989), has been accompanied by the creation of JILAF (also 1989) as a body intended to coordinate union ‘development cooperation’ efforts, but which also has more general international interests and effects. JILAF’s governing structures, and its dependence on state funding, make clear that it is intended to express the corporate interests of the national union leadership, multinational capital and the state. The coincidence here of the Japanese process with that of the US is remarkable, though, I think, unremarked - or at least uncriticised - by Williamson. In the case of the USA, we had the post-1945 consolidation of the progressive CIO and conservative AFL in an AFL-CIO dominated by the conservatives. Alongside this went the business and/or state funding to a series of AFL-CIO-controlled bodies, operating in Europe, Latin America, Africa and Asia. The Japanese unions, like the Japanese auto industry, have apparently both reproduced the US model and improved on it. They have also echoed the state-nationalism and cultural arrogance that goes along with size, wealth and relative isolation from the rest of the international labour movement. They have, finally, copied the US strategy of operating both within the politically-experienced but financially feeble social-democratic internationals (particularly in their own regional backyard) and independently as corporatist-nationalist unions. The rise, finally, of union international activities, in both core capitalist super-powers, has taken place within union bodies with low levels of democracy and a largely uninformed, uninvolved membership - and at time in which, as Williamson reveals for Japan, that membership base is under increasing threat (281).
Now, the role of the USA’s gringo ‘trade-union imperialism’ (more on this term in Part 4) has been accompanied by waves of critical leftwing books and pamphlets. Williamson, however, refuses to play this role with respect to what could be reasonably dubbed Rengo trade-union imperialism:

No attempt is made here to rekindle the wider debate on union-government relations in international labour affairs, although it is hoped that the discussion will add substance to this debate, which often rests more on ideological differences than on substantive evidence’. (254)

Actually, this prolonged debate has also been about the relations of Northern unions with capital as well as state. And whilst it has been diversely ideological (i.e. Marxist, Thirdworldist, Radical-Democratic) and unbelievably repetitive, it has customarily been well-researched, well-argued, and strategically-oriented (for such work on Latin America, see Cantor and Schor 1987, Sims 1992, Spalding 1989, Welch 1995; for Asia, Spooner 1989; for Russia, Buketov 1995). Williamson himself provides plentiful evidence that the Japanese unions are as much oriented to the interests of Japanese capital and state as to those of Japanese and foreign workers. Thus, ‘in the context of...the re-establishment of business and governmental links’ (72), Japanese unions broke a union boycott by the reformist internationals to send an official delegation to China in 1992. And their ‘modest and belated’ (73) support to the South African struggles after 1990 could be reasonably interpreted as aimed rather at courting its future government (it was welcomed by future-President Mandela) than supporting the South African working class.

Non-white men also have burdens

Chapter 8, on JILAF, reveals the extent to which the Japanese now feel they must emulate Euro-American paternalism with respect to unions elsewhere. There is a lot of talk in this chapter about ‘international cooperation at the grassroots level’ (182), with the word ‘grassroots’ frequently recurring. Yet I found here neither grass nor roots. JILAF, whilst carrying out training programmes in Asia, has been concentrating on its invitation programme for foreign union leaders. The nature of the programmes offered makes it clear that these are exercises in statist propaganda and personal corruption. It is difficult to understand them otherwise. (There may be a ‘non-ideological’ way of stating this but it doesn’t occur to me). Visits are made to Rengo, to the Ministry of Labour, to the ‘participant’s embassy’ (190). (Workers have their own embassies? Turn in your grave, Karl Marx!). Talks are provided on Japanese labour history and labour relations. Guided tours are arranged. Visitor initiative is limited to a presentation ‘of the labour situation in the participants’ countries’ and the filling in of JILAF evaluation questionnaires. Different groups of participants are apparently isolated from each other and have difficulty seeing the smaller-scale enterprises that employ the majority of Japanese workers. JILAF provides its visitors with business-class return flights, expensive hotels, first-class rail travel on the famous Bullet Train (appropriate travel for labour ambassadors). Williamson himself calculates, for one case (191), that the expenses granted were, at $720, equivalent to two-thirds of the participant’s gross monthly pay.

The general pattern here is that earlier laid down by the US unions or, for that matter, by the World Federation of Trade Unions and the Czechs when I was running union courses
in Prague in the mid-1960s. The Communist model, however, offered hostel accommodation, modest per diems, tourist-class air-tickets, and internal travel by rattling bus. (Could this be why the Communists lost the trade-union Cold War?) Yet, after quoting a Japanese union official who also mentions the ‘weak and negative sides’ of Japanese labour relations, Williamson declares that this ‘challenges the view that JILAF’s programmes amount to little more than a blunt propaganda exercise’ (221). Are they then sharp propaganda exercises? They come over to me as naive, or gross, and as more expressive of well-publicised Japanese business sleaze than any meaningful solidarity ethic.  

Chapter 10, on ‘trade union development cooperation’ is, again, full of useful information, particularly in comparing the Japanese effort to its Euro-American forebears - or should this be competitors? Williamson’s exposition here, however, is surely arsy-versy. He begins with the needs of unions in the South, then their approach to their counterparts in the North, and only then deals with Northern union dependence on state Overseas Development Assistance (ODA). Yet, as those familiar with the Development Gospel know, In the Beginning Was the ODA. Seeing these state subsidies being handed around to development NGOs, unions began to believe that they should have a tranche of the funding (since they also believed in ‘development’), and that they could get a tranche (since they did not threaten the foreign interests of national capital or nation state). Western-based unions, national and international, have thus converted themselves, in large part, into non-governmental development funding agencies. This the Japanese government-and-unions have been emulating as evidence of national maturity and global responsibility.

Absence of structure and loss of direction

In terms of style and structure this is a seriously uneven book. Its breadth of coverage, general scholarship, its originality, its extensive historical background, suggest the makings of a Ph.D. But the book also reflects Williamson’s background in labour journalism and the Asia Monitor Resource Centre, reproducing a style more appropriate to the AMRC’s slim books for a broader public (e.g. Spooner 1989), with illustrative boxes, names and addresses in the text. As with the Thomas work, the shaping hand of an editor appears to be absent. Absent in this case, moreover, is the necessary hand of the designer: the boxes intrude on rather than lightening the text. Where, in Chapter 9, Williams makes an attempt to go beyond literature and interviews, both academic and journalistic techniques break down. Here we have the use of questionnaires. They come from two different exercises, one apparently arranged by the author for research purposes, one administered by the inviting Japanese organisation for its own political ones. After initially attempting to justify his methods (203), Williamson eventually hands responsibility for evaluation back to the reader (218). The absence of any initial theoretical or political position, any discussion of the general literature on union internationalism, or any exposition of methodology, actually requires readers to make sense of a book in which the author repeatedly fails or refuses to take a position.

Hugh Williamson apologises, in his Introduction, for neither having lived in Japan nor knowing the language. No apology appears necessary. He has written an original and highly informative book on Japan’s unions and their international relations. It is appreciated, in the now-customary readers’ blurbs, by both international and Japanese unionists, by academics
and by one veteran Japanese thinker/activist. Where apology, or at least explanation, is due is for the repeated refusal to take a critical position - in either the political or the academic sense.

The most convincing explanation I can offer for this is the collapse of the hope in some kind of shopfloor-based revival of union movements nationally and internationally. Neo-liberalism has also led to a crisis within the national welfare states in the North, and with the international expression of these in ODA. Within the extensive network of international labour support groups (from Amsterdam to Hongkong and Moscow to South Africa), this has meant difficulties in funding, and a possible loss of direction. These tiny, often isolated, always underfunded, groups have thus often found it necessary to provide services to, or seek funding from, the national and international unions they previously criticised or scorned. And the latter have found in such groups the low-cost, local or specialist knowledge and technical expertise (e.g. in computer-mediated communication) they need. This present book, for example, was apparently funded by the Olof Palme International Centre in Sweden. More classically and centrally Social-Democratic than this it is difficult to get. But, as earlier suggested, Social-Democracy has also been disoriented by the new world disorder.

Williamson gives but 11 of his 300 or more pages to the kind of Japanese international solidarity groups, committees and alliances that the AMRC has customarily allied itself with. These are bodies that often do address themselves to some kind of grassroots, and are certainly more concerned with international solidarity than international relations. He quotes a staff member of one of these Japanese groups/bulletins, Rodo Joho, to the effect that it deals with

shop floor disputes, privatisation, organising the unorganised, feminism, immigrant workers, the peace movement, environmental issues and Asian workers’ solidarity. (266)

However marginal such groups might be, this orientation surely points a way forward offered neither by the dominant reformist national nor the international unions. The marginalisation of this tendency within the book is even stranger when one compares it with the author’s own sympathetic report on a number of such international groups (Williamson 1993).

One would like to hope that Williamson might have the opportunity to update and rewrite this book, in more critical spirit, on a later occasion. He certainly has both the ability and the energy. In the meantime, of course, there is nothing to prevent readers picking out the many nuggets from this particular goldmine and combining them with others taken from the experience and thinking of the unorganised, of feminism, of the peace, environmental and international worker solidarity movements.
4. INTERNATIONAL SOLIDARITY AND SOUTH AFRICAN LABOUR: A FORGOTTEN PAST, A POSSIBLE FUTURE

Documenting and arguing the new labour solidarity

Roger Southall's book is a substantial piece of historical work. It is researched and documented with admirable breadth and rigour. It is well-structured and accessible. It also deals with an international relationship that has been quite central to Northern union internationalism over the last 30 years. It presents a cool and balanced account, allowing the reader to develop his/her own interpretation. It provides a model for other such studies. It represents, finally, an argument for a general transformation of union internationalism from 'imperialism' to 'solidarity'. Before dealing with this most challenging element, however, let me mention other aspects of this work.

To start with, it is, at some 400 pages, a long book. It is also long on narrative, this inevitably implying a plethora of organisational detail and initials. I found it an exhausting as well as a fascinating read. It fills in gaps in my own knowledge and it reminds me of forgotten episodes. It also provides us with much more detail on the byzantine - or machiavellian - workings of the traditional trade union internationals than we have previously had. But I wonder who else is going to plough through its 400 pages, rather than concentrating on its scene-setting and conceptual introductory chapters and its policy-oriented conclusions? Fortunately, the layout of the work is as much thematic as chronological, with chapters on, for example, the role of the African National Congress' South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU), the financial face of Western aid, and on grassroots solidarity activities. This means readers can well read the book selectively for their own purposes.

Secondly, this book is something more than either title or subtitle suggest. A more accurate title might be 'South African Unionism and its International Relations'. There are, thus, extensive chapters devoted to South African union history, some of them being, as the author himself indicates, largely dependent on the writings of others. Whilst this local background may have been necessary for orienting the author, and be valuable for non-South African readers, it is at the expense of greater breadth on international labour and labour internationalism. One misses, again, a full discussion of the diverse and extensive literature on labour internationalism of the 1980s (van Holthoon and van der Linden 1988), and the debates on the same, which sometimes related directly to South Africa (Newsletter of International Labour Studies passim, Waterman 1984).

Thirdly, this is again an institutional study, devoted largely to the internal, external and international relations of organisations. Fortunately, these are not only union organisations, since they include, notably, the various Anti-Apartheid movements internationally, and some socialist solidarity movements or factions. But an excess of politics must be at the expense of political economy (the changing nature of capitalism), sociology (the changing structure, behaviour and values of workers and their allies), or culture (international communication, media, banners, flags, posters and songs). Perhaps this would not matter if Southall was not talking about the present and future of internationalism as well as its past. But, in so far as his story is one of how an institutionalised internationalism was - and is - being undermined and transformed, then these other fields of social practice (or disciplinary perspectives) become important.
From worker gifts to union finance

If there is not much economics in the work, there is plenty of money. The dollar rolls around in text and table throughout. But Chapter Seven, entitled ‘The Content of Solidarity’ is devoted entirely to finance, its flow, its impact and its donors. Whilst Southall elsewhere deals at length with other forms of solidarity - boycotts, sympathy strikes, visits and exchanges - he does not compare or contrast these with the commodity form. He is critical of the sources, handling and effects of financial aid, but he does not contextualise what was probably the most important form of aid, both for the international donors and for the South African recipients. Southall himself points out that the total annual amount of union (actually, largely state-provided) financial aid never exceeded what a British football club might pay for the purchase of a single player (179). An odd but striking comparison. A more appropriate one might be with what British or Danish workers gave to Australian or Swedish strikers in the heyday of union internationalism before World War I. I have those figures: it is clear that that money represented a large proportion of the donors’ weekly subsistence income. But such donations differed from contemporary Western union aid also in other important particulars: 1) it came directly out of their own pockets, 2) it came out of a sense of identity, 3) it created a sense of community, 4) it was often reciprocated. Should we call this ‘the worker gift’ in order to distinguish it from ‘trade-union aid’? One other point needs to be made about money, and I think this is quite crucial to an understanding of the present limitations of institutionalised internationalism. The traditional basis for membership fees of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) is one percent of the income of those member organisations that are willing and able to pay. We may contrast this with Amnesty International, which receives from its Dutch affiliate over thirty percent of the latter’s national income (enough, surely, for several football players). I think this is the difference between an international confederation of national and nationalist organisations and a movement-oriented internationalist organisation. It is, of course, this miserable financial commitment that has required the ICFTU to convert itself, for almost half of its income and activity, into a state-funded development-funding agency.

Nationalist, communist and Trotskyist internationalism

The analyses of the role of local and foreign Communists, of SACTU, the Anti-Apartheid Movements, and of the South African Trotskyist groups in the UK, provide models of judicious presentation and judgment. It would have been easy to condemn these for their errors, inconsistencies, or self-subordination to non-union forces. These sometimes led to policies directly opposed to the development of the new South African unionism of the 1970s. A supporter of the new unionism in the 1970s stated to me, without bitterness, that for the ANC and Anti-Apartheid movement, ‘the only good South African is a dead, imprisoned or exiled one’. Southall permits us to see how these bodies nonetheless responded to, or even stimulated, the growth of grassroots, locality and shopfloor solidarity.

It would be nice (and easy) if the new internationalisms were created solely by new people with new understandings and new strategies. But new social movements are often created or influenced by old political people - people excluded or self-excluded from the dominant or traditional opposition organisations, this giving them the possibility or necessity of mobilising beyond or beneath. On the other hand, we need to recognise the limitations of the mobilising internationalisms. These are demonstrated by what happened to the Anti-
Apartheid movements (at least in the Netherlands and UK) after the end of apartheid, when they converted themselves largely into research, information and development-aid bodies, identified with the new regime, and with only a few rhetorical gestures in the direction of South African civil society or the self-organisation of the poor and powerless. For the continuation or revival of a solidarity oriented toward the latter, a new and broader understanding of international solidarity is certainly necessary.

**A missing chapter in the solidarity story**

It occurs to me that we could do with one extra chapter here, and probably in other studies of labour solidarity. That would be a critical appraisal of the role of what might be called ‘intellectual solidarity’. This is not quite the same as the solidarity of intellectuals, since many of these were active in the South African and international unions, in solidarity committees and political parties, as well as in semi-clandestine and socialist cliques that kept their middle-class vanguardist agendas well under their democratic workerist bushels. I am here thinking particularly of the contacts between the white pro-labour academics in South Africa and their counterparts abroad (amongst other places, at a conference organised by Roger Southall in Toronto, 1984). These contacts gave the South Africans immediate access to independent (non-institutional) information and ideas concerning the union internationals and labour internationalism.

This relationship reveals itself again in the pages of the *South African Labour Bulletin*, which gave South African labour leaders and organisers quite unique international information. It prepared them, both psychologically and intellectually, for the arrival and behaviour of both the Quiet Europeans and the Noisy Americans. Indeed, the more general role of SALB is ignored in this book, with but three index references. Yet SALB was both a product and source of international solidarity. It was a product in two senses. Firstly, it was in receipt of a considerable amount of foreign financial aid, mostly from non-union sources. Secondly, SALB gave high and varied coverage to foreign and international labour, with this rising to some 20 percent as the end of Apartheid approached. Whereas, in the 1970s it seemed to concentrate on analyses of labour in Southern Africa, it later moved to discussion of socialism, of labour internationalism and of the Brazilian labour movement experience (as well as relations with Brazilian unions). SALB still provides a unique space for debate on labour internationalism, and reflects or creates new discourses (i.e. subjects, approaches, styles) on the matter. Unlike most of the other foreign-funded publications in South Africa, it also seems to be surviving the transition (Waterman 1995b).

**Limitations of a polemical opposition**

Back to Southall’s ‘imperialism or solidarity’. This is a polemical title, of a kind much found in the traditional left pamphlet literature on the subject. It sets up another of those binary oppositions that have dominated South African union debates, with vice concentrated at the one pole and virtue at the other. Since Southall’s analysis is actually much more nuanced - is, indeed, concerned to subvert such manichean oppositions - does the title have any more than an eye-catching function or effect? Possibly no such intended function. But the effect may be to keep discussion of labour internationalism at an ideological, strategical or even moral level (good union internationalism and bad union
internationalism). It also tends to limit it to the North-South axis: 'labour imperialism' implies this.

'Trade union imperialism' is a potent slogan, marking those thus branded as conscious and deliberate agents of capitalist (occasionally state or state-socialist) empires. Certain international union actors, such as the USA's AFL-CIO and Japan's Rengo, seem to have gone out of the way to cast themselves in this role. This is amply documented for the USA by Southall. But, as a central organising concept, 'labour imperialism' does not in any way help us to understand why Mexican unions and unionists have been so self-isolated for 40-50 years. Nor why Poland's Solidarnosc - object of as much international solidarity as South Africa's unions? - was itself lacking in internationalism. Labour internationalism has, over the last half-century or more, been as problematic on the West-West and South-South axis as on the North-South one. The death, consequently, of trade-union imperialism does not necessarily imply the birth, or rebirth, of trade-union solidarity.

And what is 'international labour solidarity' anyway, in either historical or theoretical terms? Historically it has been a complex and contradictory discourse and practice, requiring, for its comprehension, reference to at least the development of capitalism and the nation-state, to the composition (including its re- and de-) of working classes and their cultures. The absence of any significant international solidarity activity by Mexican unions, or by Solidarnosc, can be understood largely in terms of labour self-identification with a nation or nation-state. Given that we are now passing from a stage of nation-state-dependent industrial capitalism to a globalised information capitalism, a new kind of internationalism - or global solidarity - is increasingly both possible and necessary. But it is in no sense inevitable. There is, thus, no political-economic guarantee that South African labour won't go the same way - particularly if it believes that it is or was primarily labour imperialism that obstructed labour solidarity.

From social-democratic to social-movement internationalism

Now to Southall's critique of my own understanding of a new labour internationalism (47-8, 361-3). Suffice it here to say that mine represents an attempt at a radical-democratic alternative to the old institutionalised internationalisms. Southall appreciates the argument and makes use of it. His qualification runs as follows:

In particular, [Waterman's] anti-statist and anti-organisational thrust puts him in danger of throwing the baby out with the bathwater. For instance, if we acknowledge the inherent inequality between even the strongest Internationals and transnational capital, it is difficult to envisage the former unions not requiring the level of professional sophistication ...required if TNCs are to be thrown on the defensive and opened up to worker pressures for participation and control. (47)

Southall has grounds for his criticism. However (and it is a long however): 1) Southall himself shows the extent to which it was the grassroots-oriented movements, alliances and coalitions (nationally and internationally) that dynamised the campaign and created innovatory forms of solidarity; 2) he recognises the extent to which international labour solidarity with South Africa was interwoven with democratic, anti-racist and human-rights solidarities; 3)
the latest phase in capitalist development puts into serious question all those movements, ideologies and institutions - such as the nation-state-oriented industrial trade union - developed in response to the previous phase.

For Southall, 'social-democratic' appears to be not simply a descriptive, or analytical category, but loaded with positive value. He repeats a left-social-democratic tendency (Wedin 1986) to set up the Americans at one pole and what I call the Scanadanders (Nordics + Canadians + Dutch) at the other.14 There are problems here. One is that this procedure leaves the problematic, but surely social-democratic, British and German unions out in the mid-Atlantic (between the North Pole of imperialism and the South Pole of solidarity?). Secondly it excludes full consideration of either radical transformation of existing international trade-union practices or alternatives to them. Yet even the best Northern union solidarity efforts have reproduced many of the features of the worst. These progressive unions exist, after all, largely on the same model nationally, within the same structures internationally. Yet they have always played the game according to some implicit social-democratic ground rules. Notably, they have failed to bring out in public, before their own members, or national and international civil society, the differences they had with the ICFTU majority and the AFL-CIO. Southall recognises all this. But he goes further than favouring the Scanadaland Connection. He puts in a powerful plea for the ICFTU itself:

Whatever may have happened in the past, the ICFTU has now become a broad-based and pluralist organisation which, whilst containing diverse political currents, has provided the major framework whereby Northern unions have provided material and moral solidarity to fraternal organisations in the South (and East)...The point is, as Dan Gallin has put, there is no other show in town. (363).

Ironically, the same Gallin, General Secretary of the International Trade Secretariat (ITS) of food and allied workers, is now saying that since the end of the Cold War, the ICFTU has become a 'directionless giant' (Gallin 1994). Vic Thorpe, General Secretary of the ITS of chemical workers is hitting the same critical note (Thorpe 1994). Both of these international union leaders are now arguing for new, revived and consolidated ITSs as the cutting edge of a new international labour solidarity. This is yet another position within the social-democratic spectrum.

But both South African experience and much of Southall’s argument suggest to me the necessity to go beyond this tradition: that the international trade-union movement needs to go to school with the new cross-class, democratic and pluralistic internationalisms (peace, human-rights, ecology, women’s, indigenous peoples). These not only have a higher public profile and approval than the almost invisible labour internationals, they are also booking the kind of success that labour internationalism won around the beginning of the century. Some parts of this 'new' movement actually pre-date the labour one, or were historically intertwined with it in the 19th century. Indeed, it could be argued that even classical labour internationalism had most social impact when it was least 'proletarian' (taking up democratic issues of slavery, national oppression, fascism, human rights or militarism). The international union Anti-Apartheid movement was successful because labour came to understand this, at least implicitly. International solidarity with South African labour thus reminds us of a regrettably forgotten past and points toward an alternative possible future.
5. CONCLUSION: A NEW INTERNATIONAL LABOUR STUDIES TRADITION

Beyond the practices and discourses of capitalist modernity

There are, of course, many areas and types of international labour studies not covered here. We have not considered those on labour and unionism across Europe or the West (e.g. Ferner and Hyman 1992, Hyman and Ferner 1994). Nor the growing number on the ex-Communist world (e.g. Burawoy and Krotov 1995). Nor the wave of writing on union internationalism during the Cold War (Carew 1987, MacShane 1992a, Weiler 1988). Nor comparative work on particular aspects of labour, or particular union strategies (Kester and Pinaud 1996). A random list of fairly recent writing, some possibly mentioned earlier, may suggest the range (Adam and Moodley 1993:Ch.4,8, Castaneda 1993:Chs.3,14, Drainville Forthcoming, MacShane 1992b,c, 1994, Spyropoulos 1991, Unger 1995, Zapata 1993).

But I do not think that we have, even here, an international labour studies fit for the new world labour order. To be fit, as I may have suggested, studies of labour and unions internationally are going to have to go beyond labour, unionism and the international. They have to go beyond labour at least as this has been generally understood, in terms of wages, industry, large-scale production, or as the privileged identity for the poor, the basis of le mouvement social, of human self-emancipation, of international solidarity. They have to go beyond unionism, because the new informatised service capitalism is undermining this form of labour self-organisation in the same way that the capitalism of industrial production undermined the craft guild. They have to go beyond the international, because this is - both etymologically and politically - a relationship between territorially-defined and state-oriented nations, nationalities or nationalisms. Let me expand on this last point. What we are today faced with is globalisation, global problems, the need for global solutions, and the consequent necessity of global identities. What is required is a new kind of 'imagined community' (Anderson 1983) beyond class, ethnicity, state or, indeed, modernity - at least in its capitalist, Western, national, industrial and statist emanations.

Both the possibility and the problems of such a development are revealed by the impact of feminism on labour and labour studies, nationally and internationally. The evidence may be limited, narrow, partial, even anecdotal. But these are hard times for the increasing numbers of the relatively or absolutely poor, for democracy, for emancipation. This kind of evidence may be the best we have. It can, as we will see, certainly stimulate both relevant thought and action.

Feminist international labour studies

The work of Chhachhi and Pittin (1996a), Mitter and Rowbotham (1996), Rowbotham and Mitter (1994), Truong (1996) is but part of a much wider stream. It deserves detailed review. I will have to here limit myself to some impressions and generalisations. Even at this level, however, I think that the contrast with the reviewed work will become evident.

Theoretical innovation: Perhaps the most striking feature is the extent to which these writings are theoretically informed, theoretically explicit and theoretically innovative. Their critique of mainstream studies in this area is not simply that these are gender-blind or
patriarchal but also that they are Westocentric, developmentalist, liberal, or traditionally socialist. The authors and editors draw on an extensive stock of feminist theorising about reproductive labour, concealed or invisible labour (including homeworking and sexual services), the feminisation (or not) of wage labour, the multiple roles and identities of women labourers, their complex and contradictory relationships with the new technologies, the employers, the state, the unions, and with each other - locally, nationally, internationally. Not only are these works theoretically explicit, they are also theoretically self-conscious, reflecting, for example, on the present world crisis as a crisis also of discourses, or on different forms of knowledge about, and the self-knowledge of, women workers.

Labour forces as social and political forces: In function of such recognitions or understandings comes an insistence on labouring women as active agents in industrialisation processes, including in their options between forms of employment, and within such different forms. From, for example, the recognition of ‘multiple identities’ comes the strategic idea of ‘coalescing strategies’ - a reversal of the traditional assumption that women’s multiple roles undermine their capacity for effective defence and assertion. Examples are provided of the variety of forms of self-organisation, and on the multiplicity of forms within a particular labour relationship.

Internationalism as networking: The internationalism revealed in these studies is of informal and shifting networks or alliances, customarily at a low level, frequently involving local-level organisers or the workers themselves, usually in equally informal relationship with academics and NGOs. In at least one case, such internationalism involves linking up with, and learning from the Third World.

Putting the body back into politics: The notion of ‘body politics’ is not one much present in international labour studies, whether old, new, red or blue. In these feminist works we are made aware of body politics in at least two senses. One is that of its subjects, particularly of the women who are forced, inveigled or feel obliged to become involved in the increasingly global market for reproductive labour - including domestic work, prostitution and long-distance marriage. The other is in the self-consciousness and self-reflexivity of the authors, such as one involved in 20 years of writing and organising around women and technology, who found herself both forced into or opting for individualised self-employment and then suffering from the kind of repetitive strain injury she had identified and condemned in her writings.18

Political impact: One must, finally, note the extent to which the general theoretical orientation and political strategy offered here overlaps with certain union policy positions mentioned below. This is neither accidental nor incidental. It may be in part due to personal and organisational interaction between specific academics and organisers, or writer-activists, in the Netherlands or Western Europe more widely. But it is also a feature of a shared left-, socialist-, or democratic-feminist tradition. These books both argue for and demonstrate (by their numerous activist contributors) the necessary dialectic - at least for an emancipatory movement - between reflection and action, the academy and the movement.

It is clear that marginality has its privileges. From the concealed edges of the ‘labour force’, the ‘working class’, the ‘labour movement’, things can be seen that are invisible from the centre. From the intellectual periphery of ‘the academy’, of ‘social science’, of
‘knowledge’, it is possible to develop ways of knowing denied the core. These things are possible, but not necessary. Privilege of position does not guarantee breadth of vision, nor is privilege necessarily the same as truth, priority or leadership. An understanding of globalisation, or a strategy of global solidarity, can be hidden from herstory as well as from history. This is the case with these works, which hardly theorise the global except in terms of political economy, and which give examples of international solidarity without theorising these - and with little analytical effort either.

It would be difficult to argue that the limitations of Thomas, Williamson and Southall are a function of the invisibility within them of women. But it does seem evident that it is by 1) explicitly addressing the half of the world’s labour force which does two-thirds of its work, and 2) theorising this, that it becomes at least possible to develop new visions and perspectives on labour - and therefore on human emancipation more generally.

**Feminist visions and perspectives for trade unions internationally**

In 1995 the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions in Brussels produced a pamphlet entitled *The Trade Union Vision Document: Changing the World Through Equality* (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions 1995). This is not, as it might initially seem, a general ICFTU declaration. It is a women’s one - even one influenced by feminism. It appears to have come out of some conference of, or on, women workers, although this is nowhere indicated. The document, however, is not addressed only to ‘the woman question’. It is indeed about changing the world through equality - with that principle extended from gender relations (my phrase, not theirs) to racial, national and social ones. ‘Sexism’, ‘exploitation’, ‘oppression’, ‘transformed global community’ - these are not terms one is accustomed to hearing, particularly in potent combination, from the mouths of Brussels bureaucrats.

Something similar seems to have happened within the Dutch trade unions. Their *New Trade Union Perspectives* document, however, is of explicitly female origin (Women and Development Project 1994a,b). The main title is again misleading because this project is, as its subtitle suggests, only (only?) about Third-World women workers in agriculture, export-processing and the informal sector. The report (1994a) and summary discussion document (1994b) come out of the increasing recognition that the working class is also female, particularly in the named sectors. This document is actually the result of a research project, involving Dutch feminists - or socialist feminists - from the two major Dutch union federations, as well as others from a major Dutch development-funding NGO and from the universities. In this case, the G-word (gender) is used quite explicitly. There are so many new ideas here - the role of reproductive labour, multiple identities, the value of autonomous self-organisation, alliances, coalitions, the role of research, relations with NGOs - as to at least suggest a radically new concept of trade unionism. These are reinforced by the conclusion to the discussion paper (1994b:36) which echoes the conclusion to the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848 (not itself particularly gender-sensitive):
A world to be won

Trade unions have much to gain when increasing numbers of women join their ranks: more bargaining power, new policies, new female leadership, the mainstreaming of reproductive needs, and a general revitalisation.

In concluding, we would like to stress that the issues discussed here are not isolated problems...International solidarity and mutual support is needed to strengthen women’s bargaining power and to contribute to the development of guarantees for human dignity and security for all, women and men.

It is difficult to know whether one should mourn or rejoice when the world’s longest-existing unions, national and international, become dependent, for both perspectives and visions, on feminists. Perhaps one should be at least grateful that the vacuum left by Social Democracy is being - at least temporarily - filled - at least partially - by feminism. The void could, after all, have been filled by neo-liberalism, or neo-realism - with, of course, the customary human face.²³

Remembering the dead: reminding the living

Back to the Introduction.

It provides me, firstly, with a certain sense of satisfaction to note that the Newsletter of International Labour Studies has not simply joined the Great International Labour Bulletin Archive in the Sky. In the spirit of the Italian ‘biodegradable organisation’, it seems to be being recycled, in evidently original and radical form, by the feminists. I must, secondly, admit to a certain amount of envy at the political impact of feminism on the trade unions compared with the barely visible (and certainly unrecognised) impact of NILS as both newsletter and tendency. Here I think we have to recognise that women, feminism and the women’s movement simply have an energy and resilience not provided by the male working class, by socialism and by independent worker movements. There remains, thirdly and finally, however, a conviction that the old new international labour studies has, in its energetic efforts to theorise and strategise around a new kind of internationalism, things to say to not only the newest (social-reformist, gender-blind) international labour studies, but even possibly to its feminist alternative.

Watch this space.
ENDNOTES

1. More than the conventional appreciation must be expressed to commentators on earlier drafts, or parts, of this paper, which consequently now has a quite different content and orientation. They include Ken Post, Roger Southall and a reader for the ISS Publications Committee. It is a privilege to receive trenchant criticism that is constructively intended, and a pleasure to respond to such.

2. A number of the European-based NILS network were invited to South Africa, particularly in the 1980s. And many South African labour scholars visited us in Europe or met us in North America in the 1970s-80s.

3. Contrast this with the reach and tone of someone in the tradition of Marxist political economy, in another cross-national study:

   Unions stand at a crossroad where Fordism gives way to neo-Fordism, perhaps making old forms of organisation obsolete or less able to meet new challenges. Today unions encounter workers with a diverse set of needs, many of whom have had little prior contact with unions...Organising atypical employees who work at their homes or in scattered workplaces...will prove difficult for unions...Industrial unionism, a child of Fordism, may need to cede to more flexible organisational forms of unionism. [...]Increasing internationalisation of the economy may pose insurmountable problems due to the national character of existing modes of regulation. Political struggles enacted on both the national and international stages will ultimately resolve the contradiction between international economic developments and national modes of regulation (Gottfried 1995:38-9)


5. There is only one woman, Amrita Chhachhi, amongst either the named co-authors, or the listed contributors to the project from which it sprung. And although her significant contribution to feminist theorising on strategies for working women (Chhachhi and Pittin 1996b) is mentioned at the end of the Thomas book (242-3), it is difficult to find it even in the chapter for which she was co-responsible. For more on her work see my Conclusion below.

6. ‘Comfortable’ here does not mean without difference. These are revealed in the public Ministerial response to the project underpinning this book (Meerburg 1995). The bureaucrat actually prioritises democracy and labour rights in the Third World and highlights international solidarity. All of these are absent from the academic’s four priorities. Meerburg’s statement, however, also suggests that any ministerial
differences with the unions are contained within a common discourse of Westernisation, growth, and human resource development.

7. I was provoked by the Thomas dismissal to re-examine Munck (1988). It has a thought-provoking introduction by Robin Cohen, on the relation between academics and activists, directly relevant to the Thomas project. There are chapters on the new international labour studies, labour in the world system, employment patterns, the labour process, the working classes, trade unions, labour relations, industrial democracy, labour and the state, the international dimension, and results and prospects. The book is, of course, from before ‘Berlin, Baghdad and Rio’, and nearly 10 years old. It marks a moment of transition between Marxism and Movementism. It carries its age well. An updated and widened revision (chapters on the West and the East) would be a service to the world labour and democratic movements.

8. I thought it best here to check my memory against the data. The first major mention of NIDL in NILS was a critical one, from a feminist and internationalist perspective, by Institute of Social Studies student, Debbie Monas (1981), immediately on the appearance of the relevant book.

10. Curiously, I find in their first paragraph echoes of my ‘workerist’ phase, in a 15-year-old article on ‘Workers, Peasants, Artisans and Mothers’ (Waterman 1981a,b), and in the second paragraph, that of my ‘social movement’ phase (Waterman 1993a). In a recent popularised version of the latter argument, I state in part, that what I am now calling the ‘new social unionism’ means one that is

Intimately related to other non- or multi-class democratic movements (base movements of churches, women’s, residents’, ecological, human-rights and peace movements, etc) in the effort to create a powerful and diverse civil society;


One of the purposes of this article was to criticise the populist South-African understanding of SMU, and to argue for a concept of that highlights an understanding of and an alliance with the new social issues and movements.

10. I was myself once invited, by the Norwegian Ministry of Development Cooperation, to do just such an evaluation as this one, only to be blackballed by the union concerned, which considered I was hostile to both the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (which then combined a crusading freeworldism and a paternalistic developmentalism), and to one of its Third-World partner unions (a thoroughly incorporated one, against which workers had been energetically rebelling). I then said to the Man from the Ministry, ‘Oh, if they want a whitewash job done, I suggest you get in touch with X in the UK’. They did - and he did.
11. The costs to contractor and contractee in not recognising the value of independent research has been publicly demonstrated in the case of the Dutch development-funding organisation, NOVIB, and one of its star Third World projects, AWARE, in India (for a NOVIB/AWARE view of the latter, see Theunis 1992). Some 10 years ago, NOVIB commissioned a well-qualified feminist South Asia specialist to evaluate AWARE (which had the required pro-woman pretensions). She produced a critical report, which was then bottom-drawer’d, and she was not asked to repeat the exercise. Later NOVIB commissioned an academic evaluation, on a much larger scale, which largely confirmed the self-image jointly projected by NOVIB and AWARE. In 1994, a public scandal developed around AWARE in both India and the Netherlands. NOVIB, apparently, is still paying the price for not having listened to the critical and independent researcher.

12. The combination of grossness and naivety in this kind of internationalism is demonstrated by two stories, one personally experienced, the other possibly apocryphal (but no less suggestive). It was possible, in the 1960s, to trace the route of East German union visitors to Africa by noting which of the left-populist national union centres had passed a resolution supporting ‘the peaceful solution of the German question’ (one of later them begged a colleague of mine to get them off this hook). It was said, around the same time, that press revelations of CIA funding for US union activities in Africa led to even greater expectations and demands for funding by rightwing unions there.

13. See the classified bibliography in Waterman (1995b:56). This incorporates references from the bibliography in Roger Southall’s book but attempts to broaden it to new areas as well as to update it.

14. In Southall’s case, Canada is actually ignored, a curious omission given his longtime residence there and his acknowledgement of the assistance of two officers of the International Department of the Canadian Labour Congress. I have long been sceptical of the self-congratulatory ‘humane internationalism’ of the Scanadlanders (c.f. Berg 1992). So have some Canadians been of Canadian trade union foreign policies - including one of Southall’s informants. At that time these policies often looked very much like those of what we used to call the AFL-CIO-CIA (Gandall 1986, This Magazine 1986).

15. The Kester and Pinaud work came to my attention after completion of this article: it would have made an appropriate fourth item for review. Although the title refers only to Europe (customarily understood as Western Europe), it actually includes not only Eastern Europe but Africa and - at least in sketch - Latin America and Asia. And although one could consider worker participation an aspect, a strategy, the editors clearly consider participation a central democratic value, and worker participation the labour movement ‘scenario for the 21st century’ (53-8). The book is rather comprehensive and covers a wide range of themes, including - extensively - union-university collaboration. What, I think, it shares with the works reviewed is its modern-industrial worldview (nation-state, industrialisation, fordism/taylorism, economic growth, classes, parties, unions, majoritarian democracy) and its social-reformist strategies (redistribution of power and wealth - from growth?), brought
about by union-government-management negotiation, enlightened by university-based intellectuals). Not confronted - sometimes not even mentioned - are: women and feminism, ecology and environmentalism, globalisation and the new global solidarities, multiple and shifting identities and values within and across classes, the changing nature and place of work in society. If meaningful participation at work is as much valued by workers universally, as Kester argues (36), then it will surely need to be rethought in relation to the above-mentioned features of radical- or high-capitalist modernity. Kester argues (37) that:

The challenge today is to launch participation once again as an ideology in its own right and to disassociate it from all major political systems, or better still, place it fairly and squarely in all political systems.

This comes over as a reformist-utopianism, making an interesting contrast with Bayat’s (1991) comparative work on self-management, which stands in the libertarian or utopian-socialist tradition. Regretably, Bayat is also not confronted by Kester and Pinaud. In so far as Kester himself suggests the crisis of existing political systems, would it not make more sense to see his project as part of an alternative to all such, once again related to other challenges coming out of contemporary capitalism? That this can be done, from within the social-democratic tradition is demonstrated by Mathews (1989). It should, however, be noted that the latter deals not only with democratisation of industry, capital or the economy, but also of the armed forces, social programmes, technology and social relations more generally. The Kester and Pinaud book, it should be stressed, is systematic, well-edited and has an extensive bibliography. Why, in the days of computerised editing, it has no index, is a puzzle and an irritation. It makes it, for example, difficult to check whether Carol Pateman and Juergen Habermas, both mentioned in the bibliography, are mentioned, referred to or discussed in the body of the text.

16. By ‘the social movement’ was meant none other than the labour movement. It is also the name of a venerable French journal of labour studies.

17. Anderson’s concept, which was applied to nationalism, has been much used and adapted, in some cases to ridicule the possibility of international community. But one of the most interesting elements in his book is the revelation of how recent an identity nationalism is, and of its predecessors, the religious community and the dynastic realm. The increasing necessity of global identities requires us to imagine democratic, pluralistic and sustainable ones. This in turn requires us to go back not only to the imagined community of early labour internationalism, but also to before capitalism. It seems to me we have to draw on the humane and emancipatory elements within universalistic religions if we are not to be condemned to globalised high-modern versions of the dynastic realm.

18. I must here specify, because the sobering piece by Ursula Huws (1996) has much more to tell us about labour-oriented labour studies, about labour-oriented labour specialists, about the rise and crisis of the emancipatory labour-support groups of the 1970s-80s. This paper should be required reading for anyone concerned with labour
and emancipation. Amongst the other revelations is that the author found support and inspiration at the international level when this was being wiped out by Thatcherism nationally. Global space seems to have always been a privileged one for feminists (Waterman 1993b). Huws’ work, and her testimony, also show how radical labour studies can be carried out despite the disappearance of earlier illusions and under extremely adverse conditions.

19. Hidden from History is actually the title of a pathbreaking book by one of the authors/editors here discussed, Sheila Rowbotham (1973). ‘Hidden from Herstory’ is the title of an article of my own about women, feminism and global solidarity 20 years later (Waterman 1993b).

20. I quote from Points 17 and 18 of the document:

We envisage a world which is not divided by sexism, racism and xenophobia: these are divisions which undermine our capacity to work together for a better future. We will only realise our human potential when we create conditions of freedom and mutual respect that end domination and exploitation. We see a society where women and men, young and old, enjoy an equal share of power and rights, of work and family responsibilities - in their communities and nations, North and South, East and West.

Our vision will not be realised overnight, or even perhaps in our lifetime. It means rebuilding our economic, social and political institutions...And, finally, our vision demands a firm and genuine commitment by all of us - women and men - to create a transformed global community where economic and social solidarity will prevail over human degradation, exploitation and repression.

21. This path was actually broken, a decade or more ago, by a group of Indian feminists (Rohini, Gothoskar, Chaturvedi 1983). To point this out is not to deny that the Dutch may be reinforcing or broadening the path. It is to situate their contribution both historically and socio-geographically. The Indian document was, in any case, certainly influenced by earlier European socialist-feminist thought. This is how internationalist strategy can and must develop in the age of globalisation.

22. The Conclusions and Recommendations to the report include the following heads and sub-heads:

Can women’s concerns be translated into trade union policies?

Multiple identity of workers...

The lives of women and men go far beyond their experiences in the workplace and are also determined by their social
identity and roles...Any redefinition of trade-union policies aimed at increasing membership must be based on recognition of the multiple, gender-specific identity of workers - men as well as women.

How should women be organised?

Networking and coalitions between trade unions and women’s organisations

Women’s organisations have developed a great diversity of strategies and organisational forms to address women’s needs and priorities in the reproductive sphere...such as communal kitchens...cooperative stores, housewives' committees...women’s centres, places of refuge...self-help organisations...

Trade unions should not try to take over these initiatives. But by forming alliances they can contribute to increased bargaining power of both women’s organisations and the trade unions...Networking, cooperation or coalitions between these organisations could empower both.

Trade unions should also take more advantage of the results of women’s studies in defining new policies and issues...Mutual strengthening between trade unions and these groups and NGOs could be promoted by an exchange of ideas, networking and cooperation. (Women and Development Project 1994a:149-162)

23. This is neither a sneer nor a smear. One of the pro-feminist Dutch unions is capable of producing, in its international bulletin, an article by an officer, which seeks to explain or justify its international affiliations and campaigns in terms of the latest capitalist and managerial ideology:

As you know, modern times do not leave the FNV unaffected. Thus, a few years ago, the FNV had to slim down (‘become lean’), limit its tasks (‘back to core business’) and now we are going to work in a ‘client-oriented’ way. And I find this very good, because we naturally have to be more conscious of whom we work for, of better goods delivery, of the reactions of those who consume our ‘products’, etc. And in this area we can certainly learn something from employers and their tactics.

The author continues, somewhat surprisingly, that

I want to defend the proposition that children in the Third World are clearly also our clients.
The reasoning here is complex— not to say bizarre. The notion seems to be that the product of this union company is ‘a modest scale of social redistribution’, and that the clients for this product are workers, or union members. The author then switches from the discourse of business (methods) to that of ethics (purposes), given that this

...little factory is set up because we consider unfair distribution in conflict with basic human principles, or unchristian, or simply irrational or ugly. And naturally because we were and are often ourselves the victims of unfair distribution, that we came and come to resist it.

And whoever thinks like this naturally finds that a fair distribution should not exclude outsiders.

He ends on a similarly high ethical note, indeed a spiritual one:

And if we should not believe any more in this, then we will have taken over from the employers more than simply some useful managerial strategies. Then we will have sold them our souls. (IZ Bulletin 1995. My translation - PW)

‘Disoriented’ would seem to me the kindest word one could use about the combination here of the discourses of the 21st century Japanese manager and the 19th century Dutch missionary, in function of international trade-union solidarity - which apparently has no discourse it can call its own.
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