Part III

NEW LABOR INTERNATIONALISM

The Old and the New in the
New Labor Internationalism

Hermes Augusto Costa

In a bibliographic review of the new labor internationalism 150 years after
the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*, Peter Waterman (1998b: 349) is
skeptical about the possibility that we are on the brink of a second proletar-
ian internationalism, since "there was no first coming of this mythical
creature."[1] Marx's considerations in the statutes of the first international labor
organization, the International Working Men's Association, founded in 1864,
clearly reflected the aspirations contained in the *Communist Manifesto*, based
on class struggle, the emancipatory role of the proletariat, and "a world to
win" (Marx and Engels, 1982: 136): "the economic emancipation of the
working classes is, therefore, the great end to which every political movement
must be subordinated, as a means. [...] [A]ll the efforts leading towards this
great end have failed up to now due to a lack of solidarity between the
multiple divisions of labor in each country and the absence of a fraternal
bond connecting the working classes of different countries" (Marx, 1983:
14). These ambitions for emancipation and international worker solidarity
are still alive, particularly since it has been capital and not labor that has
managed to internationalize itself.

According to the International Labor Organization (ILO), in the year
2000, there were 160 million unemployed in the world, of whom 50 million
were in the developed countries. In addition, 500 million workers earned
less than a dollar a day (ILO, 2001). The cruelty of these numbers indicates
the battlefield upon which the new labor internationalism operates, chal-
lenging the labor struggles of the twenty-first century to gain an international
dimension. This challenge involves the reinvention of the labor movement,
either by means of the rehabilitation of its old goals or by the proposal of
new strategies for emancipatory struggle. However, it seems equally clear
that these numbers are less and less the exclusive "property" of the labor

movement. Hence it is pertinent to argue that there are now conditions for the revival of labor internationalism, especially if it is framed within a more general movement of solidarity.

In this introductory text to labor internationalism, designed to highlight the most important characteristics of the *new* labor internationalism, I will discuss what is "new" about it, as well as what it has preserved from the "old" labor internationalism." I will begin, however, by listing the main obstacles that labor internationalism and transnational labor cooperation in general face today. Having identified the obstacles, I will focus my analysis on trade unionism as the "old" protagonist of labor internationalism, and on the international organizational dimension that it has today. Then, I will review some of the theories and debates that have stimulated our reflection on the subject of transnational labor action.

OBSTACLES TO LABOR INTERNATIONALISM

A first step towards legitimizing the existence of a "new" labor internationalism is to identify the causes that hinder its success. As I understand it, the various forms of transnational labor cooperation currently face two sets of obstacles: the first has to do with the structural transformations that have taken place in labor itself in recent decades, as a result of the revolutions in information and communications. Although labor has become a global resource, we cannot speak of a global labor market, as labor markets are today more segmented than they ever were before. The second has to do with a diversity of factors, which range from the tension between the scales of national and transnational labor action and the type of objectives involved in transnational action, to the weak theoretical reflection on the issue. Let us now look at each of these in more detail.

The first set of obstacles leads us back to arguments that have been used to question the importance of labor: capitalist development, led by robotics and automation, is gradually moving towards a society of leisure, creating conditions under which people will be released from productive work; the cultural mechanisms orienting human action are less and less determined by human action and more by social practices situated outside the space of production. Interaction, instead of labor, is becoming the main reference of sociability; the space-time of production saw its importance diminish from the moment when the labor movement, trade unions and working-class parties surrendered, at the end of the sixties, to the capitalist logic, in exchange for wage increases, job security and other social benefits, thus transforming capital into the only possible horizon of social change (Santos, 1994: 265). Amongst the main impacts produced upon labor by the changes in world capitalism we can include, for example, the action of transnational companies (TNCs), which convert national economies into local ones and hamper

trade union mechanisms of regulation at the national level; the increase in structural unemployment, which generates processes of social exclusion; the displacement of productive processes and the predominance of financial markets over production markets; the growing segmentation of labor markets, which keeps the unskilled segments of the work force below the poverty level; the development of a mass culture based on a consumerist ideology and on credit for consumption; the increase in risks, while adequate insurance remains inaccessible to the great majority of workers, etc., etc. (Santos, 1995b: 134–135). These transformations in the nature of capitalism have led to a "commodification of human culture itself," sustaining the belief that "the great schism, in the new era, is between those whose lives are increasingly in cyberspace and those who will never have access to this new realm of human existence" (Rifkin, 2000). In the "information age" (Castells, 1996–98), in which capitalism has become "globalised, networked, and informatised," confirming a "new global capitalist disorder" (Waterman, 1998b: 350; 365–366; 2000b: 16–20; 2002: 33; 44), scenarios of capitalism without labor, of limited international mobility of workers, of global apartheid, of labor individualization, or of a society of plural activities composed of "permanent temporary workers," are only some of the possible futures for labor (Beck, 2000: 44–74).

In a generalized context of "global labour flexibility" (Standing, 1999) and of the "deconstruction of the world of labor"—manifest in the changes that have taken place in its internal organization, in the fabric of production, in the precarization of employment, etc. (Boultanski and Chiappello, 1999: 291 ff.), and leading, therefore, to profound changes both in the "regulatory regimes" (which define the rules governing "behaviour at work"), and in the "production regimes" (which define the mode of production of goods and services) (Waddington, 1999: 2; 14–24)—we can speak of a "Brazilianization" of the West, based on the "eruption of the precarious, discontinuous, imprecise and informal" (Beck, 2000: 9; 11; 102 ff.). All informal activities that function on the margin of normal economic circuits thus announce many other inequalities, which confirm the weight of the logic of social exclusion upon the fabric of production (Ferreira and Costa, 1998/99: 143). As Santos points out (1998: 23–24), the crisis of modern contractualization is characterized by the structural predominance of processes of exclusion over processes of inclusion. And despite the fact that the latter are actually operating in accordance with advanced forms that permit a virtuous compatibility with the values of modernity (freedom, equality, autonomy, subjectivity, justice, solidarity), what is clear is that such processes affect increasingly smaller groups, while forms of exclusion are imposed upon much larger groups. In face of the growing erosion of the right to work and of economic and social rights (Supiot, 1999), combined with the increase in structural unemployment, we are witnessing a shift

in the status of workers from "citizens" to "lumpen-citizens" (Santos, 1998: 28).

The second set of obstacles to labor internationalism has to do with the multiple interconnected factors inhibiting cooperation outside strictly national spaces, delimited by countries' borders. Indeed, a first factor to consider is precisely the presence of national stimuli that are given priority by workers' organizations. Due to the fact that wages, working conditions or legal regimes are established at the national level, differences between countries are frequently highlighted as regards both the ability to mobilize workers and the influence of political, ideological and cultural factors on trade union organization (Teague and Grahl, 1992: 79; Sagnes, 1994a: 14; Bean, 1994: 48; Jensen, Madsen, and Due, 1995: 9; Visser, 1995: 44–45; Gobin, 1998: 199–200; Turner, 1998: 211; Munck, 2000b: 99; Brunelle and Chaloult, 1999: 163; Ebbinghaus and Visser, 2000: 19; Gordon and Turner, 2000a: 22; 2000b: 256; Atleson, 2001: 20; Katz, 2001: 348; Bourdieu, 2001: 7). In this sense, it is inappropriate to speak of a denationalization of labor relations systems (Traxler and Schmitter, 1995; Streeck and Schmitter, 1998; Streeck, 1998).

A second factor that sets limits to labor internationalism results from the scarcity of theorization on the issue, which also reflects the scarcity of concrete actions of an international scope (Devin, 1990: 9; Jensen, Madsen and Due, 1995; Armbruster, 1998: 21; Waterman, 1998a: 43; Ramsay, 1999: 194; Waddington, 1999: 3; Wills, 2001: 188).

Third, obstacles of a material nature are those most frequently invoked by trade unionists everywhere, given the large financial resources necessary to support actions of international cooperation (Vigevani, 1998: 291). This is even the case within the context of Europe, where there are more possibilities for transnational labor cooperation than in any other region or part of the world (Visser, 1998: 234–236; Ramsay, 1999: 214; Jacobi, 2000: 12; 21; 23; Dølvik, 2000: 73–74; 2002: 109; 113; Hyman, 2000: 159; Caire, 2000: 25; Rehfeldt, 2000: 79; Hoffmann, 2002: 132); the largest trade union organization, the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC), does not have enough financial support from affiliated organizations, which is why it has become too dependent upon the support of the European Commission (Waddington, Hoffman and Lind, 1997: 485; Waddington, 1999: 14).

A fourth factor has to do with the possible incorporation of the logic of competition and conflict into the strategies of transnational labor action (Costa, 2000: 181). Given that the struggle for better wages in one country may signify the degradation of the wage relation or even the increase in unemployment in another, it is legitimate to think that discourses of international worker solidarity may generate difficulties and conflicts among different countries and sectors of the international labor movement (Ruzza, 1996: 125; Breitenfellner, 1997: 582; 596; Ruzza and Le Roux, 2000: 32–33;

Ramsay, 1997: 523; Mason, 2000: 74; Rehfedt, 2001: 351). In other words, even the questions that are supposed to generate a global labor consensus, such as the inclusion of labor standards in international trade agreements, give rise to opposing visions from trade unions according to the level of development of the countries concerned. This is because, besides the resistance of the TNCs, union organizations of peripheral and semiperipheral countries see in the minimum labor standards a form of protectionism that discriminates in favor of the richer countries (Santos, 1998: 50–51; 1999: 2–3; 2001: 75; Lee, 1997a: 177; Compa, 1998: 2; Gunderson, 1998; Nash, 1998b: 3; Castro, 1999: 195; Leisink, 1999: 23; Ewing, 2000: 41; 48; Caire, 2000: 28; Helmons, 2000: 73–74; Jacobi, 2000: 17–18; Trubek, 2000: 2).

Employer opposition or resistance constitutes a fifth obstacle to labor internationalism. Particularly at the level of the TNCs, employers, fearing that the leveling of wages and working conditions may lead to imbalances in costs of production, make use of "divide and rule" tactics (Hyman, 1999c: 108; 2000: 159; Ramsay, 1997: 524; 1999: 214; Castro, 2000: 122), frequently reinforcing mechanisms of exploitation of the working class (Estanque, 2000).

Finally, it is problematic to speak of the existence of a transnational union identity amongst workers (Waddington, Hoffman and Lind, 1997: 485); rather, in a generalized context of changing union identities (Hyman, 1996; 1999a; 1999b), the notion of diffuse labor identities would seem more accurate (Costa, 2000: 174).

FORMS OF ORGANIZATION OF LABOR INTERNATIONALISM

My aim in this section is to systematize the institutional basis that serves as a support for labor internationalism. In considering the main forms of organization adopted, I will focus on trade unionism as the most relevant social actor of labor internationalism,[2] as is clear by the amount of space dedicated to this issue by the different case studies in this book. While in recent decades the idea of a crisis in trade unionism has frequently been emphasized,[3] this does not mean that this "old" social protagonist is removed from the scene, nor that its role as a counter-power has been annulled, even though that role may be in question these days (Gobin, 2000). As a basic form of working-class organization (Munck, 1999: 15; 17; Munck and Waterman, 1999: ix; Gorz, 1999: 54) and a structure that empowers workers (Murray, Lévesque, Roby and Le Queux, 1999: 161), the trade union movement occupies a prominent (though less and less exclusive) place in the initiatives of social emancipation.

In defining the organizational contours of labor internationalism, we can point to various levels of transnational union intervention: worldwide, regional, sectorial and at the level of the company (Caire, 2000: 22–24). At the first level, we find essentially the large *world trade union confederations*. These

include: the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU), set up in 1945 and basically dominated by trade unions from the Communist countries, and which practically disappeared with the fall of the Eastern Bloc; the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), founded in 1949 in the climate of the Cold War and as a response to the Communist influence in the WFTU, and which grouped together most of the trade unions of the time that were not aligned with the Eastern Bloc, including both reformist trade unions of the socialist and social democratic types and forms of trade unionism associated with the American State Department and all its institutions (Sagnes, 1994b: 499)—this is today the only large world-wide trade union organization, with 231 affiliated organizations in 150 countries across the five continents, with a total of 158 million members (ICFTU, 2003: 1); and the World Confederation of Labor (WCL), which in 1968 replaced its predecessor, the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions (IFCTU), asserting itself as a kind of third way, located halfway between the WFTU and the ICFTU.

In the second place, at the regional level, are the *regional trade union organizations*. The most prominent is the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC), set up in 1973 as a corollary of the process of European construction. But we also have to consider the regional organizations of the world trade union confederations, such as the Inter-American Regional Workers Organization (ORIT),[4] the Latin American Workers' Confederation (CLAT), the African Regional Organization (AFRO), the Asian-Pacific Regional Organization (APRO), or the International Confederation of Arab Trade Unions (ICATU).

Third, at the sectorial level, are the International Trade Secretariats (ITSs), the most long-lasting form of union organization (Lee, 1997b: 6–7), established at the end of the nineteenth century (1889). These are sectorial union organizations that represent the workers of a particular sector worldwide. Although acting primarily on the international plane, these trade union federations—which after 2002 became known as Global Union Federations (GUFs)—also have representatives at the regional level, particularly the European Industry Federations (EIFs), affiliated with the ETUC.

The ITSs have played an important role in the fourth kind of international labor organization because of the attempts that they made some forty years ago to create the World Works Councils (WWCs) in the TNCs (Moody, 1997b: 234; Rehfeldt, 2000: 78; Wills, 2001: 184–187). These were designed to reinforce transnational union collaboration, although they were not oriented towards the achievement of international collective bargaining, at least not in the beginning (Stevis, 1998: 63; Gumbrell-McCormick, 2000b: 34). Because they became too bureaucratic and dependent on a unionized workforce, and due to the differences in working conditions between countries, the impact of the WWCs on labor relations at the TNC level was only

very limited (Stevis and Boswell, 2000: 155; Linden, 2000: 523; Wills, 2001: 186). In sum, the European Works Councils (EWCs), oriented towards the information and consultation of workers in TNCs, as well as some already existing experiences in World Works Councils are at present the most advanced expression of labor internationalism at the company level.

All of the levels of organization mentioned above, in which the protagonists of labor internationalism move, obviously include also local and national trade union organizations, since labor internationalism *in action* may derive simply from constant reciprocal actions of solidarity between trade union federations and unions of two or more countries, whether or not they belong to the same regional bloc. But we can also mention other kinds of labor internationalism: the organization of debates and joint actions involving the world union confederations aiming at enforcing compliance with the minimum labor standards established by the ILO; the participation of regional union organizations in institutional forums at the regional level; negotiations between TNCs and labor organizations of two or more countries, involving, for example, the information and consultation of workers; collective negotiations between TNCs and Global Union Federations, involving for example agreements about codes of conduct designed to respect labor rights; the organization of strikes and forms of public protest at the transnational level; regional and international union networks in defense of labor rights; the merging of trade unions as a way of making the international labor organization more cohesive, etc.

THEORIES AND DEBATES

Without claiming to be exhaustive, I propose to look at some of the theories and debates on the subject of labor internationalism. These are permeated by the question, for me central, of the continuities and ruptures between the past and the future of labor internationalism—that is, between the old and the new labor internationalism. This question is, besides, present in the very concept of internationalism. Given the variety and fragmentation of transnational labor connections, it would perhaps be better to speak of internationalisms, in the plural, as proposed by Waterman (1998a: 52). But the most accurate concept is perhaps that of cosmopolitanism, given that many transnational connections today combine traditional labor issues with other issues and involve diverse social movements.[5] For Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2001: 73–74; 2002: ch. 9), the concept of subaltern cosmopolitanism—indicating practices and discourses of resistance to unequal exchanges in the late-capitalist world system, and only possible on the margins of this system as a counter-hegemonic practice and discourse generated in progressive coalitions of subaltern classes or groups and their allies—although evoking Marx's belief in the universality of those who, under

capitalism, have only their chains to lose, should be distinguished from the universalism of the Marxist working class. This is because, in addition to Marx's working class, the dominated classes may currently be grouped into two further categories, none of which necessarily possesses a class basis:

> On the one hand, sectors of the working classes that are considerable or influential in core and even semiperipheral countries have today more to lose than chains, even though this "more" is not much more, or rather, is more symbolic than material. On the other hand, vast populations of the world do not even have chains, or rather, they are not useful or skilled enough to be directly exploited by capital, and, consequently, the eventual occurrence of such exploitation would taste like freedom. In all their variety, cosmopolitan coalitions struggle for the emancipation of dominated classes, whether these are dominated by mechanisms of oppression or of exploitation. Perhaps for this reason, contrary to the Marxist conception, cosmopolitanism does not imply uniformity and the collapse of differences, autonomies and local identities. Cosmopolitanism is nothing more than the interlocking of progressive local struggles with the goal of maximizing their emancipatory potential *in loco* through transnational/local connections. (Santos, 2001: 74)

Considering that little effort has been made to construct a theoretical basis for the analysis of transnational trade unionism, Ramsay (1999: 194–212) proposes that six distinct theoretical approaches be taken into account as a way of moving towards an "international union theory." In conjunction with multinational collective bargaining—which, according to Ramsay, "is widely regarded as the grail for the international labour movement" (1997: 520)—the quest for that theory aims not only at systematizing past debates but also at stimulating future reflections on labor internationalism. *Evolutionary optimism, managerial skepticism, left pessimism, left agnosticism, national alternativism,* and *contingency theories* are the designations of the six theoretical approaches. The contributions of the former secretary-general of the International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine and General Workers Unions (ICEM) are at the basis of *evolutionary optimism.* For Charles Levinson (1972; 1974), the growth of the power of multinational companies should be counterbalanced by the growth of a multinational collective bargaining capable of generating a democratic equilibrium. In this sense, Levinson predicted the development of international trade unionism through three phases: the first would involve the concession of international support (on the part of the International Trade Secretariat corresponding to the sector) to unions involved in local conflicts with TNCs; the second would consist of the emergence of multinational negotiation, even though limited to the best organized sectors of the TNCs; the third phase would involve centralized bargaining

with both the headquarters of the company and its various branches. To sum up, in the 1970s, Levinson believed that the enlargement of industrial democracy to an international scale was inevitable.

The *managerial skeptic* approach to international trade unionism contradicted Levinson's theses, holding that most of the obstacles to multinational collective bargaining lay mostly in the sphere of labor itself. This was characterized by the following aspects: lack of enthusiasm on the part of the unions; religious and ideological divisions; incompatibility of interests between the workers' movements of the developed and less developed countries; absence of uniform legal frameworks and of practices of collective bargaining between countries; and weak interest in international solidarity. The *left-wing pessimists,* on the other hand, also directly criticized Levinson's optimism and his pluralistic vision that the power of capital would be democratically counterbalanced by labor in the capitalist system. Although there are some similarities with the managerial skeptic school, the left-wing pessimists preferred to lament rather than to stress the weaknesses of labor. With their roots in the attempts to construct a new labor internationalism after the Second World War, the left-wing pessimists argued that the TNCs completely removed all room for maneuver from labor, since they set workers in different parts of the world against one another. As Fröbel, Heinrichs, and Kreye (1980) showed, a "new international division of labour" undermined the possibilities for solidarity between the workers of developed and less developed countries, which have lower production costs. Moreover, left-wing pessimists also emphasized, unlike Levinson, the politicization of trade union struggles as the only viable way of overcoming nationalist tendencies. But the left developed, according to Ramsay (1999: 203), a less pessimistic and oppressive version of labor internationalism, which he calls *left agnosticism,* oriented towards the combination of organizational ties, political mobilization and local participation. It is a theoretical approach that is more moderate and indeterminate because it calls attention to both the "pros" and "cons" of international trade unionism. Indeed, while the left-wing pessimists only described scenarios that were too negative for labor, the left-wing agnostics did not forget to mention achievements such as the establishment of the ETUC (1973), considered the most vigorous trade union structure with externally unified activities.

The fifth approach reviewed here, *national alternativism,* gives priority to factors of national union organization. It also acknowledges the existence of obstacles to multinational collective bargaining but considers the struggle with the capitalists and multinationals to be a priority on the domestic, local field, rather than on the international field. It also considers government support to be a priority, since it is more appropriate to union efforts and demands than international pressure on TNCs. Finally, *contingency theories* involve a series of contingency factors that vary from context to context, but

which seek to understand the implications of multinational collective bargaining on trade union organization by using non-monolithic criteria. Avoiding vague generalizations, contingency factors such as the type of structure of the company (whether or not it has a unified ownership and an integrated management structure), short- and long-term strategies, product lifecycle, organizational culture, predisposition for social dialogue, etc., all of these give trade unionism, from the point of view of international action, access to information about the strengths and weaknesses of TNCs, allowing it to choose the strategy considered most suitable.

Largely deriving from developments in the field of human resources management, the arguments held by these schools of thought are still applicable today, despite the fact that most of them were formulated decades ago. They reflect theoretically on the concrete problems and obstacles that labor internationalism currently faces and that have been described above. In the wake of the European Union (EU), recent decades have witnessed the emergence of regional blocs, such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) or MERCOSUR, and these also present theoretical challenges to transnational trade unionism, which is caught in the dilemma of having to choose between internationalism and regionalism. Although both of these options involve transnational labor unity, the simple fact that there is a dominant European "space of production" that produces more than 90 percent of what it consumes (Hoffmann and Hoffmann, 1997: 9; Hyman, 2001: 172; Dølvik, 2002: 87) could lead to tensions between the regional and national levels since the reinforcement of regional labor unity might happen at the expense of the disuniting of the international union movement (Gumbrell-McCormick, 2000a: 43). However, there is also the prospect of a scenario of complementarity, if the successful experiences within a particular regional space are transposed to the world space (Sachwald, 1997: 134; Chaloult and Almeida, 1999: 9).[6] In this case, it could be argued that trade union integration in regional spaces functions as the intermediary between national *roots* (concepts, structure and practices of national unions) and global *options* (international labor solidarity) (Costa, 2002: 71).[7]

The relationship between *globalization* and *labor* constitutes one of the most recurrent recent debates on the subject of the emancipatory possibilities of labor internationalism. Given the multiple de-structuring impacts of economic globalization on the sphere of labor—such as the destruction of the balance between production and the reproduction of the work force, the deregulation of labor markets, the increase in unemployment and job insecurity, the relocation of productive processes, the crisis in unionism and in the negotiating power of unions, etc. (Leisink, 1999: 3; Lambert, 1999: 213; Moody, 2000: 5; Le Roux, Fouquet and Rehfeldt, 2000: 213–214)—an increasing number of studies have focused on labor movement responses and resistance strategies.[8] It is certainly true, as Munck (1999: 20) claims, that the

"recognition of the processes and impact of globalisation does not lead automatically to a new labour internationalism." However, globalization permits emancipatory forces to have an overall vision of the world, to acquire an understanding of the connections between "civilization" and "barbarism," and to aspire to the construction of strategies oriented towards a civilization of the global society (Waterman, 2000a: 136). In highlighting the crisis of the labor movement, globalization "forces reconsideration of the questions of union identity and the terms of inclusion and exclusion" (DeMartino, 1999: 84) and, in face of the threat to union rights, supplies motives for attempting to do something, reacting collectively in an organized and responsible way (Ewing, 2000: 20; Mazur, 2000: 86).

Some authors have also used the questioning of the powers of the state to justify the contours of this relationship between labor and globalization. For Charles Tilly (1995: 4; 22) globalization is the main cause of the weakening of the powers of the state, as an entity responsible for guaranteeing the rights of workers. Thus, the decline in state power corresponds to a decline in labor rights. For Wallerstein (1995: 24), however, there is a double relationship between transnational capital (the TNCs) and the state. On the one hand, TNCs need states in order to ensure that their global attempts at monopoly and high profits are successful, as well as to limit workers' demands. On the other hand, TNCs oppose states when these act to protect "antiquated" interests and are too sensitive to pressure from workers. Following a similar line of reasoning, which sees states as tools of capitalist control, Hobsbawm believes that globalization has not yet found ways of replacing the state, since it "remains the central mechanism for redistributing the social income between classes and regions" (Hobsbawm, 1995: 43).[9]

A second debate, connected to this one, has emerged recently within the international trade union movement and is known as the *millennium debate*. This was the focus of attention at the Seventeenth World Congress of the ICFTU (April 2000), although both the ICFTU and ILO have been interested in it since 1999. The millennium debate aims at constructing an international trade union movement that is more unified, homogeneous, and efficient, endowed with a true power to negotiate with TNCs and international institutions (Demaret, 2000: 1). The theoretical challenge underlying this debate is the North–South trade union dialogue, reflected in the promotion of solidarity between the developed and underdeveloped countries and the construction of democratic and responsible institutions at the global and regional levels (ICFTU, 2000b: 1). It is, indeed, an essential step toward the future of labor internationalism. However, for Waterman (2000b: 11–14; 2002: 50), this debate has started to focus excessively on the organizations that are promoting it and has overlooked some truly important questions for labor internationalism, such as discussions around the notions of "international solidarity" or the meaning of the expression "internationalism" itself,

thus reinforcing a trade union discourse and practice in which the typical protagonists are from the "center": white, Anglo-Saxon and male.

The warning given by the former secretary-general of ORIT (the regional organization of ICFTU for the Americas) follows this line of thought. It is all the more important coming from an organization that, being affiliated organizationally with the "North" (that is, to the ICFTU, based in Brussels) and having known decades of instrumentalization on the part of North-American trade unionism led by the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) (Stevis, 1998: 14; Jakobsen, 1998: 307; Castro and Wachendorfer, 1998: 20), represents the workers of the "South" (essentially Latin America). For Luís Anderson, what is at stake when we think of the ICFTU is the recognition that "a trade union organization destined to be the voice of all the workers of the world, and whose members are primarily from the South of the planet, cannot be run exclusively, on a daily basis, by trade unionists from the countries of the North" (Anderson, 2000: 29).[10] Thus, the Brazilian union federation CUT, through the person who was its international relations secretary between 1994 and 2002, Kjeld Jakobsen, argued for the South to have more influence, and for reforms to take place within the bureaucratic structure of the ICFTU. The option of decentralization was reflected in the creation of the post of assistant secretary general within ORIT at its Fourteenth Continental Congress (1997). It was "the first international initiative to change the structure of traditional power, centralized in the figure of the Secretary General" (Jakobsen, 1998: 314). As such, this should be seen as a starting point for giving greater representation to Southern interests. In my view, the strengthening of a critical consciousness generated from within "Southern trade unionism" itself is an important condition for the reinvention of a new labor internationalism.

Discussions about *international labor standards* and their inclusion in international trade agreements constitute a third area in which labor internationalism is an intervening and interested party. It is an older debate than the previous ones,[11] but is closely connected to them. On the one hand, this debate has acquired a greater interest in recent years because the globalization of the economy has stimulated international competition and introduced a growing flexibility into production systems. In a context in which the revolution of communication systems gives even more public visibility to the practices of exploitation of labor, anxieties concerning labor and its loss are increasing not only within trade unions but also within non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (Lee, 1997a: 175–176; Gunderson and Riddell, 1995). The defense of a social clause is thus associated with a social dimension of globalization and represents a "turning point in the discussion about minimum labor standards at the global scale" (Ferreira, 2001: 285).

On the other hand, and as I mentioned above, international labor standards lead us, *grosso modo*, to a double, even polarized, vision of the world

(Trubek, 2000: 1–2),[12] which places face to face defenders and opposers of the "social clause" as a mechanism for the application of *core labor standards* (freedom of association, protection against anti-union discrimination and promotion of collective bargaining; abolition of forced labor; elimination of child labor; equal treatment and non-discrimination in the workplace, which coincide with the main conventions of the ILO). For the former, essentially the developed countries, it is possible to defend a connection between international labor standards and the liberalization of international trade. Thus, a violation of previously agreed international labor standards would constitute a pretext for the imposition of commercial sanctions upon prevaricators (Lee, 1997a: 176).[13] For the developing countries, the application of universal labor standards in the poorest countries would lead to the destruction of these countries' capacities to compete in world markets and would consequently raise unemployment, cause a fall in standards of living and halt development (Sibley, 2000: iii). This is what has given rise to the insistence of these countries on the need to decide for themselves the type of standards that best suit their level of development (Raynauld and Vidal, 1998: 3).

In this sense, the debate is strongly conditioned by the presence of states and by the patterns of development of the countries concerned. Despite the fact that the social clause obliges governments that sign multilateral agreements to respect the basic rights of workers by using the threat of sanctions (Chin, 1998: 17), we can see, for example, that the ratification of ILO conventions depends in the end upon the political will of the states. Many states do not even send the ILO their reports on the application of conventions (Ewing, 2000: 38), which clashes with the humanitarian concerns that originally underlay the expression "labor standards."[14] The establishment, in 1998, of an "ethical trading initiative" supported by the British government and involving companies, trade unions and NGOs, which aimed at the implementation of ethical trading policies with direct impacts upon the lives of producers, suppliers and workers in developing countries, is clearly a strategy by means of which states may play a role in this debate (Ewing, 2000: 42). However, in recent years, and despite the fact that this is not a new phenomenon, another question, which could be labeled as "extra-state," has gained weight in the debate on international labor standards: it concerns the adoption of "codes of conduct" on the part of TNCs, a "new option through private sector self-regulation using civil society vigilance" (Compa, 2001: 5).

According to the ICFTU, the codes of conduct reveal that "social responsibility" constitutes an important element of the marketing strategies of TNCs. In any case, there are various limitations to its implementation: there are too many codes of conduct drawn up by departments of public relations of TNCs, which in the end hide, rather than denounce, the reality of the working conditions in which many affiliated companies, producers and contractors find themselves (ICFTU, 2000a: 8; Jones, 1999: 9); also, in addition

to the voluntary nature of the codes, they are frequently adopted unilaterally in order to avoid trade union involvement (Gibbons, 2001: 3), and are thus outside legal jurisdiction (Veiga, 1999: 177); they adhere to standards that are extremely low, such as promises to tolerate local laws and customs, which involve, for example, the payment by contractors of a minimum compensation in accordance with those laws; however, the legal minimum payment in many countries is well below subsistence levels (Booth, 1997: 8). There have been few controls of the implementation of the codes drawn up by TNCs (Ewing, 2000: 44; Murray, 2001: 12), which is why the application of voluntary codes in practice, in order to bring them "down to earth," is a central issue of this debate (Yanz and Jeffcott, 2001: 8–10; Compa and Hinchliffe-Darricarrere, 1995).[15]

These obstacles may also suggest that social clauses should not be at the center of an international trade union strategy, since they reduce union action to trade agreements based on lobbies, which, in practice, ends up highlighting the anti-union actions of the TNCs and evading the real problems and needs of the workers (Cueva, 2000: 185). However, we cannot overlook the fundamental role played by workers' organizations in this debate, namely the development of international actions oriented towards the negotiation of "ethical trading agreements" (Ewing, 2000: 50; 54) with the TNCs on the application of ILO labor standards, and on possible sanctions to apply to the TNCs that do not comply with them and that are not, therefore, "socially responsible" (Jennings, 2001: iv). Faced with the constant failure of TNCs to respect labor rights, the challenge of constructing solidarity on the basis of "knowledge-as-emancipation"—which involves a trajectory from a state of ignorance (conceived as colonialism) to a state of knowing (conceived as solidarity) (Santos, 1995a: 25; 2000: 74)—is more than ever an imperative task for the agenda of contemporary labor internationalism.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE OLD AND THE NEW: CONTINUITIES AND RUPTURES

Up to now, I have selected some of the obstacles, forms of organization, contemporary theories, and debates associated with labor internationalism, without having identified the main characteristics that distinguish the "new labor internationalism" from the old forms of proletarian internationalism. Do the above-mentioned aspects, which are current topics of discussion, point to a new labor internationalism? What distinguishes the old from the new internationalism? What are the elements of continuity and of rupture between them? These are the questions to which I will turn my attention next.

In my opinion, it is crucial to adopt a balanced posture when comparing the old and the new labor internationalism, either because many of the

promises of traditional proletarian internationalism, such as international labor solidarity, have not yet been realized, or because the ambitions claimed by the new labor internationalism are themselves subject to obstacles, or even because the distinction between the old and the new internationalism is not uncontroversial. It thus becomes necessary to problematize the relationship between the old and the new labor internationalism. While it is clear that as the structuring and organization of the old labor paradigms dissolve, new forms are developing (Munck, 1999: 14), it is also true that the "old questions" are not irrelevant, and that the "old actors" are not incapable of changing (Adkin, 1999: 216). The proposal for a synthesis between continuity and transformation, to "look at the old labour movement in new ways" (Waterman, 1999: 248; 254), and to construct new projects of global solidarity in which "restitution" (the acceptance of the errors of the past or "solidarity with the past") is understood as one of the components of the future project of global solidarity (Waterman, 1998a: 231) are, therefore, three converging ideas that should be taken into account when considering the relationship between the old and new labor internationalism.

The old labor internationalism: between pasts lost and found

One of the ways in which labor internationalism has lost its past, that is to say, in which it has not been able to make its old aspirations work, lies in its theoretical presuppositions. According to Hyman (1999b: 95), the old labor internationalism was based on at least three premises: first, the idea that the proletariat would be the great protagonist of a human emancipation destined to free the working class from the loss of humanity to which it had been subjected in the context of bourgeois society; second, the belief that the advance of capitalism would be synonymous with the homogenization of the proletariat; and third, the idea that this homogenization would permit the creation of a community of interests organized as a "class" by agents of the collective struggle (the trade unions), while rejecting all forms of nationalism and nation-state rivalries. Originally, the labor movement was conceived as international in structure and as internationalist in objective (Waterman, 1998a: 17; Hobsbawm, 1988: 10). However, not only did the proletariat reveal itself incapable of releasing the working class from capitalist oppression, but neither did its homogenization occur, despite the confirmation of trade unionism as the principal organizing force of the working class. Furthermore, the ties of the traditional nineteenth-century union internationalism to national spaces (Waterman, 1998a: 20; 26; 51) also denied the internationalist ambition contained in the third premise. As I have already said, in addition to constituting today an obstacle to labor internationalism, this connection to national spaces is one of the main legacies of the old internationalism, confirmed in the twentieth century and felt until

today. In this way, it also constitutes a less than felicitous encounter with the past of labor internationalism.

The disappearance of the first organizational forms of labor internationalism—the Internationals—also leads to a lost past of labor internationalism. While the *First International* (1864) was riven by enormous internal divergences between Marxists, Proudhonists and Bakunists (Holthoon and Linden, 1988: vii), the *Second International* (1889) was dominated by a spirit of collective fervor, and the *Third* (1919) by party dogma (Nash, 1998a: 1).[16] The world trade union confederations that followed in the second half of the twentieth century, the WFTU, the ICFTU and the WCL, despite having different orientations and conceptions, also came to display common features: a distancing between leaders and union bases; the persistence of influences resulting from the Cold War context, a tendency to reproduce the structure and behavior of the nation-state and interstate agencies; an excessive dependence on the principles of a "North"-based trade unionism; inspiration in European and North American strategies and ideologies originating in the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth (social democracy, communism, social Christianity, and business unionism); reduction of the complex reality of the world working population to the model of the unionized male worker; etc. (Waterman, 1998a: 112–113; 2002: 34–40). While world trade union organizations have contributed to molding contemporary labor internationalism, their practices lead towards a series of errors from the past that it is important not to repeat. Not infrequently has the international labor movement preferred closed-door tactics and diplomacies instead of using the power of the working class; it has preferred negotiation with restricted and financially equipped trade union circles to the detriment of wide ranging debate with the union movement as a whole; it has preferred to hold discussions about important issues behind closed doors, instead of extending them to the different levels of the union structure (COSATU, 2001: 2; 3).

But while the new encounter with some outmoded aspects of the labor past may be undesirable and rather inauspicious, we cannot exclude the possibility that it could be a source of regeneration, as the ITSs have shown (today known as GUFs, as mentioned above). Many ITSs, such as those in the printing, mining and transportation sectors, were founded in the nineteenth century and have remained in action until today, performing actions of labor solidarity with unions and union federations at local, national and international levels, or negotiating agreements with the TNCs with a view to obliging them to respect labor rights, etc. The organizational growth of the ITSs in the last three decades (Stevis, 1998: 62–63; 73) may in this way be seen as a fortunate encounter with the past of labor internationalism.

The new paths of the new labor internationalism

Following what I have said above, the emergence of a new labor internationalism seems to be associated both with signs of crisis in the old labor internationalism (although the idea of crisis presents a challenge to be overcome and a pretext for the construction of a new model) and with the emergence of new conditions. These include greater limits to the autonomy, authority and legitimacy of the state; increasing transformations (and also contradictions) in the global space to the detriment of the national space; a growing concern with the values of diversity, peace and ecology; an insistence on the interrelationship between global utopias (in the sense of imagined global human communities) and the need to civilize the global capitalist order that threatens the human species (Waterman, 1998a: 2). Guided by the need to move "from an international of imagination to the imagination of an internationalism" (1998a: 42; 260), Waterman (1998a: 219–220; 1999: 260–261; 2000b: 8–9) proposes a "new social unionism" in which the connections between the issues of labor/trade union interest and the issues of other social groups are combined, therefore defending the interconnection between different actors of social emancipation. This would include struggles around wage labor, not only to demand better wages but also a greater control over production processes, investments, new technology, the relocation of production, subcontracting, and education and training policies; struggles against hierarchical, authoritarian and technocratic relations and working methods and in favor of socially and environmentally useful practices, the reduction of working hours or the sharing of domestic work; struggles for the continuing transformation of all social structures and relations; the promotion of different connections and forms of dialogue with other movements and non-unionized communities (church movements, women's movements, ecology, human rights, and peace movements, etc.); the promotion of basic democracy and the encouraging of direct horizontal relations among workers, and between workers and other democratic/popular social forces.

This type of proposal converges with others, such as that which Gay Seidman (1994) identified in a comparative study of Brazil and South Africa apropos the direct relationship between the late industrialization of those countries and the specific forms of labor mobilization that have occurred there. For Seidman (1994: 11), the specific patterns of industrialization molded labor strategies, conferring upon them a broader scope and a more diversified mobilization in terms of class. In a similar vein, Adler and Webster (1999) also analyze the contribution of "social movement unionism"—which occurs when the organizational characteristics of the unions merge with the capacity for mobilization of the social movements (Adler and Webster, 1999: 143)—to the theories and practices associated with the

process of democratic transition and consolidation in South Africa. In his turn, Boaventura de Sousa Santos, using Portuguese trade unionism as a reference, argues that the defense of "citizenship outside the space of production leads the trade union movement to join up with other progressive social movements, such as consumer movements, ecological, anti-racist and feminist movements," and this entails a shift of much of its combative energy onto the "articulation with these other movements" (1995b: 135). This appeal to a "democratic culture of active citizenship beyond the factory" (Santos, 1995b: 139) is also echoed by the strategies that have been followed by CUT in Brazil. For this union federation, the order of the day is the construction of a "union that is organic but also civic, that represents the workers and is a social movement, that faces the challenges of capitalism as a mode of production and as a process of civilization," thus leading to the "integration of a working-class consciousness with a consciousness of citizenship" (Nascimento, 1998: 83).

Although all these analyses draw attention to the need to expand trade union action to areas and activities situated outside the strictly union sphere (Offe, 1999: 63), what is now at stake is the generalization of the scale of this idea. It involves a social movement unionism of global scope, already proposed by Kim Moody (1997a; 1997b) when he speaks of an "international social movement unionism" and of emancipatory orientation.[17] Focusing on the pragmatic responses of Australian, Asian, and African unions to the globalization of the economy, Lambert and Chan (1999: 99–101) assert that a "global social movement unionism" is already under construction and that its main characteristics are the following: the establishment of regional ties between union organizations in countries where democratic labor rights are denied; a militant internationalism oriented towards the realization of boycotts and pressure actions aiming at opposing the excessive commercial dependence induced by the integration of economic processes; a genuinely global unionism capable of promoting a true internalization of an internationalist culture, i.e., a culture by means of which the leaders and members of union organizations demonstrate towards the struggles of the working classes of other countries the same sensitivity that they show towards workers' struggles in their own; and a new politics for the working class, that is, a politics capable of challenging the neoliberal model of globalization that many unions have adopted, either by redefining the meaning attributed to class interests in the globalization process, or by engaging in a politics of resistance to the logic of global lean production.

The emergence of this social movement unionism, which generally speaking expresses the option of democratic rather than authoritarian values (Lambert and Chan, 1999: 102; Lambert, 1999: 213), also leads towards a set of strategies of transnational labor organization, already in action in various countries where work is frequently undertaken in *maquiladoras*.[18] These

strategies, of a trans-class and trans-border nature, involve the constitution of networks of community-based activists and organizations oriented towards the establishment of forms of participatory democracy; the organization of transnational campaigns and alliances (involving religious, environmental, trade union, consumer, human rights and women's organizations) for the inclusion of codes of conduct in the TNCs; joint action by trade unions of developed countries and those of developing countries (which have fewer guarantees and union rights); petitions for human rights, etc. (Armbruster, 1995; 1998; 1999; Frundt, 1996; Williams, 1999).

Faced with the inevitable fact that workers' worlds are increasingly invaded/interconnected/interdependent (Waterman, 1998a: 239), as well as the recognition on the part of union leaders that the unions should be transformed "into a respected source of new ideas, not the neglected guardians of a glorious past" (Thorpe, 1999: 225), Waterman (1998a: 72–73; 2000b: 10–11) proposes a systematization of the new labor internationalism divided into thirteen propositions. Of these, it is worth highlighting the following: the stimulation of forms of face-to-face interaction, involving the working class at the grassroots and community level; the replacement of rigid, centralized and bureaucratic models with decentralized, horizontal, and flexible information models; the prioritizing of political activities and creative work instead of verbal declarations; the practice of an "international solidarity at home," combating the local causes and effects of international exploitation and repression; the generalization of an ethical solidarity by combating locally the multiple forms of discrimination against workers; dialogue with intellectuals, scientific communities, and experts, as well as with other "interests" beyond the union; the "opening-up of the map" of internationalism to trade union movements in the most far-flung parts of the globe.

In the same vein as these innovative proposals, we must not forget to mention the Internet as one of the most recent "resources" at the disposal of the new labor internationalism. According to Eric Lee (1997b), the Internet leads us, by way of a computer-mediated *global labornet*, towards a "New Labor International." Although in the *Communist Manifesto* (1848) Marx and Engels had already appealed to the maximization of the means of communication resulting from the industrialization of the nineteenth century, it is now a question of taking advantage of the potential inherent in the World Wide Web. For Lee, despite the persistence of obstacles to a truly global use of computer communication by the international labor movement, the Internet helps to solve some of the problems that the labor movement has faced for decades (Lee, 1997b: 2). The Internet permits cheap and easy access to new work with a democratic and socialist vision of the world, as well as to reprints of works that would otherwise have remained lost in the archives. The digitalization of thousands of books, magazines and pamphlets published by labor and social democratic movements throughout the last

century constitutes one of its most valuable contributions (Lee, 1999: 238–239). However, the functional effectiveness of these sites also depends upon the constant updating and transposition to cyberspace of denunciations of human rights and labor rights violations, as well as the ability to make available all kinds of information of interest to the international labor movement (Lee, 2000: 26; Cohen and Early, 2000: 174).

Thus, the idea that a "new world order" has given way to a "new internationalism" that transcends spatial (local and national), institutional and class boundaries is currently gaining strength (Lee, 1997a: 186; 1999: 243; Waterman, 1998a: 250). Inspired by Habermas (1989), Catalano (1999) suggests that the three dimensions of communicative action can be applied to the relationship between "top officials, workers and society": "The claims of rectitude, veracity and coherence require that the theoretical and practical reasons on which moral action lies be perfectly articulated" (Catalano, 1999: 38). The search for a discursive consensus around the new labor internationalism would thus result from a confrontation between points of view and opinions, moderate and radical arguments, optimism and pessimism, in order to contribute to the operationalization of the emancipatory project pursued by labor internationalism. The chapters that follow show some of the ways in which a new labor internationalism *in action* is being constructed. They are then critically analyzed and evaluated in Waterman's final chapter.

Abbreviations

AFL-CIO: American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations
AFRO: African Regional Organization
APRO: Asian-Pacific Regional Organization
CLAT: Confederación Latino Americana de Trabajadores (Latin American Workers Confederation)
COSATU: Congress of South African Trade Unions
CUT: Central Única de Trabalhadores (Workers Union Federation)
EIFs: European Industry Federations
ETUC: European Trade Union Confederation
EWCs: European Works Councils
GUFs: Global Union Federations (formerly ITSs)
ICATU: International Confederation of Arab Trade Unions
IFCTU: International Federation of Christian Trade Unions
ICFTU: International Confederation of Free Trade Unions
ILO: International Labor Organization
ITSs: International Trade Secretariats (at present, GUFs)
IWMA: International Working Men's Association

MERCOSUR: Common Market of the South
NAFTA: North American Free Trade Agreement
NGOs: Non-Governmental Organizations
TNCs: Transnational Corporations
WCCs: World Company Councils
WCL: World Confederation of Labor
WFTU: World Federation of Trade Unions
WWCs: World Works Councils

Notes

1 See also Waterman's chapter in this volume.
2 Trade union internationalism constituted the first kind of self-articulation of workers in the "national/industrial/colonial" capitalist era, and dominated labor internationalism throughout the twentieth century (Waterman, 2000b: 3).
3 The drop in the levels of trade union membership is the factor most invoked to justify that crisis, although the absence of solidarity between trade union militants, with the emergence of contemporary individualism, and the general debilitation of strategies and forms of union struggle are also factors to be taken into consideration.
4 In the context of Latin America, more specifically at the level of the Common Market of the South (MERCOSUR, set up in 1991), we should mention the existence, since 1986, of the Trade Union Federations Coordinator of the Southern Cone (CCSCS), which coordinates the actions of trade union organizations in the countries of the Southern Cone. It was set up with the support of ORIT, and comprises the union federations of the four MERCOSUR countries, plus Chile and Bolivia (associate members of MERCOSUR) (Castro, 1999: 211).
5 For a discussion of the notion of solidarity in labor internationalism, see Zoll (1996), Valkenburg (1996), Valkenburg and Beukeuma (1996), Lind (1996), Waterman (1998b: 362–364), Hyman, (1999b), Ruzza and Le Roux (2000), or Munck (2000a: 391–392). See also the "Global Solidarity Dialogue," coordinated by Peter Waterman and available at http://www.antenna.nl/~waterman/.
6 As happens, for example, with the creation of the World Works Councils, based on the more consolidated experience of the European Works Councils.
7 For a contemporary theoretical understanding of regional unionism and the industrial, political and ideological imperatives that confront it, see Abbott (1998: 624–625).
8 This is also the focus of the case studies presented here, as well as that of a number of recent books on the issue, such as those by Munck and

Waterman (1999), Waddington (1999), Leisink (1999), Fouquet, Rehfeldt and Le Roux (2000), and Gills (2000), among others.

9 For further considerations of this discussion, in which, on the one hand, the state is no longer viewed as a source of global governance (Ohmae, 1996) and, on the other, it is argued that the Nation-State is not a thing of the past and that the time of nations is not yet over (Boyer and Drache, 1996; Boyer, 1997), since recourse to the state remains as a source for the union movement (Delaunay, 2000: 122), see, amongst others, Ferner and Hyman (1998: xviii–xxii), Chaykowski and Gilles (1998: 18–20), and Waddington (1999: 11–14).

10 According to data provided at the Fifteenth Continental Congress of ORIT (Washington, DC, 23–26 April 2001), almost half the affiliates of ICFTU are from developing countries, as are most of the ninety organizations that joined between 1990 and 1999. However, this reality is not reflected in the directive bodies of the ICFTU, for "both ICFTU and all the ITSs are directed by representatives from the developed world, which not only lacks political and ethical justification," but also provides little motivation for new organizations from the developing world to join (ORIT, 2001: 56). For this reason, the challenge facing the ICFTU is to change its nature and style in order to create an "apparatus for struggle capable of leading the working class on the basis of a minimum platform of demands, designed to invert the marginalization of workers and of the poor" (COSATU, 2001: 2); see also COSATU (2001: 4; 5; 10) and CUT (2001: 19).

11 We should bear in mind that the ILO was established in 1919 and that its most important conventions (#87 and #98) are over 50 years old, although the first initiatives to articulate labor standards and trade derive from nineteenth-century bourgeois European philanthropists and intellectuals (Haworth and Huges, 1997: 181).

12 This polarization can still be seen in the worldwide trade union movement and has been revived by the millennium debate.

13 For a discussion of the positions of the ILO and the World Trade Organization (WTO) as regards the inclusion of a social clause based on sanction mechanisms, see Haworth and Hughes (1997: 189–193) and Ewing (2000: 39; 46–48). It should also be mentioned that the concession of preferences to imports from developing countries constitutes a resource adopted by developed countries like the United States of America, particularly by means of a Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), although this concession is conditioned by demands of a social order. This means that a "negative condition" may be imposed upon developing countries whenever they do not comply with ILO international labor standards. On this subject, see CUT/CFDT (1996), Frundt (1998) and Thorstensen (1999).

14 For a precise definition of the meaning of this expression, see Deakin and Wilkinson (1994: 290–292), Raynaud and Vidal (1998: 3–6), and Torres (2000: 79), among others.

15 An analysis of codes of conduct as an aspect of the debate on international labor standards can be found in the journal International Union Rights, vols. 7(2) (2000) and 8(3) (2001).

16 For an analysis of the history and contradictions of the Internationals, see Abendroth (1973), Kriegel (1974), Holthoon and Linden (Ed., 1988), Demaldent (1990), Piqueras (1995), Stevis (1998), and Linden (2000: 521–540), amongst others.

17 According to Scipes (2000: 6), in the late 1980s and early 1990s, "social movement unionism"—which suggests that workers' struggles are only one of many efforts to qualitatively change society—was the object of an international debate promoted by Eddie Webster, Rob Lambert, Peter Waterman, and Scipes himself on the new types of unionism emerging in Brazil, the Philippines, South Africa and South Korea.

18 American companies that were established in Mexico from 1965, producing mostly products manufactured for export with the aim of benefiting from tax exemptions. Having had no trade union presence for a long time, the maquiladoras now usually employ low-skilled young people, most of whom are women, and who are greatly discriminated against. The maquiladoras—which in 1997 already numbered 3,508, employing 900,000 workers (Klein, 2002: 229)—are closely related to the phenomenon of the sweatshops, that is, small factories that often make use of subcontracting, and where wage exploitation, the absence of conditions of hygiene and security, tax evasion, and other infringements of labor rights are dominant. On these issues, see among others, Armbruster (1998: 23), Bonacich (1998: 12–13), Williams (1999), Jakobsen (2000: 216), Treillet and Vega (2000), Bissel (2000: 26–27), Mazur (2000: 88–89) and Anner (2000).

Bibliography

Abbott, K. (1998). "The ETUC and its role in advancing the cause of European worker participation rights," Economic and Industrial Democracy 19(4): 605–631.

Abendroth, W. (1967). Histoire du mouvement ouvrier en Europe. Paris: F. Maspero.

Adkin, L. (1999). "Ecology and labour: Towards a new societal paradigm," in R. Munck and P. Waterman (eds.), Labour Worldwide in the Era of Globalization: Alternative Union Models in the New World Order. London: Macmillan, 199–217.

Adler, G., and E. Webster (1999). "The labour movement, radical reform

and the transition to democracy in South Africa," in R. Munck and P. Waterman (eds.), *Labour Worldwide in the Era of Globalization: Alternative Union Models in the New World Order.* London: Macmillan, 133–157.

Anderson, L. (2000). "El debate del milenio," *Nuevos Rumbos del Sindicalismo* (PDF version) 11: 28–29.

Anner, M. S. (2000). "Local and trans-national campaigns to end sweatshop practices," in M. E. Gordon and L. Turner (eds.), *Trans-national Cooperation Among Labor Unions.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 238–255.

Atleson, J. (2001). "Trans-national labour solidarity," *International Union Rights* 8(3): 19–20.

Armbruster, R. (1995). "Cross-National labor organizing strategies," *Critical Sociology* 21(2): 75–89.

— (1998). "Cross-Border labor organizing in the garment and automobile industries: The Phillips Van-Heusen and Ford Cuautitlan cases," *Journal of World-Systems Research* (http://csf.colorado.edu/wsystems/jwsr.html) 4(1): 20–51; accessed on 30 September 1999.

— (1999). "Globalization and cross-border labor organizing: The Guatemalan maquiladora industry and the Phillips Van Heusen workers' movement," *Latin American Perspectives* 26(2): 108–128.

Bean, R. (1994). *Comparative Industrial Relations: An Introduction to Cross-national Perspectives.* London: Routledge.

Beck, U., org. (2000). *Un nuevo mundo feliz. La precariedad del trabajo en la era de la globalización.* Barcelona: Paidós.

Bissel, T. (2000). "Unions against sweatshops," *International Union Rights* 7(4): 26–27.

Bonacich, E. (1998). "Organizing Immigrant Workers in the Los Angeles Apparel Industry," *Journal of World-Systems Reseach* (http://csf.colorado.edu/wsystems/jwsr.html) 4(1): 10–19.

Booth, P. (1997). "Nike code of conduct," *International Union Rights* 4(4): 8–9.

Boltanski, L., and È. Chiappello (1999). *Le Nouvel Esprit du Capitalisme.* Paris: Gallimard.

Bourdieu, Pierre (2001). *Contrafogos 2. Por um movimento social europeu.* Oeiras: Celta.

Boyer, R. (1997). "Les mots et les réalités," in S. Cordellier and F. Doutaut (eds.), *Mondialisation, au-delà des mythes.* Paris: La Découverte, 13–56.

Boyer, R., and D. Drache (1996). "Introduction," in R. Boyer and D. Drache (eds.), *States against Markets: The Limits of Globalization.* London: Routledge, 1–27.

Breitenfellner, A. (1997). "El sindicalismo mundial, un possible interlocutor," *Revista Internacional del Trabajo* 116(4): 575–603.

Brunelle, D., and Y. Chaloult (1999). "Transnacionalização das práticas sindicais: quadro teórico-analítico," in Y. Chaloult and P. R. Almeida (eds.),

Mercosul, Nafta e Alca: a dimensão social. São Paulo: Ltr, 149–169.

Caire, G. (2000). "Syndicalisme ouvrier et mondialisation," in A. Fouquet, U. Rehfeldt and S. Le Roux (eds.), *Le Syndicalisme dans la mondialisation.* Paris: L'Atelier, 21–30.

Catalano, A. M. (1999). "The crises of trade union representation: New forms of social integration and autonomy-construction," in R. Munck and P. Waterman (eds.), *Labour Worldwide in the Era of Globalization: Alternative Union Models in the New World Order.* London: Macmillan, 27–40.

Castells, M. (1996–1998). *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture.* 3 vols. Oxford: Blackwell.

Castro, M. S. P. (1999). "Negociações colectivas internacionais e Mercosul," in Y. Chaloult and P. R. Almeida (eds.), *Mercosul, Nafta e Alca: a dimensão social.* São Paulo: Ltr, 191–216.

— (2000). "Movimento Sindical no Mercosul: trajectória e perspectivas de acção," in J. Lorenzetti and O. L. Faccio (eds.), *O Sindicalismo na Europa, Mercosul e Nafta.* São Paulo: Ltr/Escola Sul da CUT, 103–135.

Castro, M. S. P., and A. Wachendorfer (1998). "El sindicalismo del MERCOSUR: Su trayectoria y sus perspectivas en un contexto de ampliación comercial hemisférica," in M. S. Castro and A. Wachendorfer (eds.), *Sindicalismo y globalización: la dolorosa inserción en un mundo incierto.* Caracas: Nueva Sociedad, 13–38.

Chaloult, Y., and P. R. Almeida (1999). "Apresentação," in Y. Chaloult and P. R. Almeida (eds.), *Mercosul, Nafta e Alca: a dimensão social.* São Paulo: Ltr, 7–14.

Chaloult, Y., and D. Brunelle (1999). "Transnacionalização das práticas sindicais: Quadro teórico-analítico," in Y. Chaloult and P. R. Almeida (eds.), *Mercosul, Nafta e Alca: a dimensão social.* São Paulo: Ltr, 149–169.

Chaykowski, R. P., and A. Gilles (1998). "La mondialisation, le travail et les relations industrielles," *Relations Industrielles—Industrial Relations* 53(1): 13–23.

Chin, D. (1998). *A Social Clause for Labour's Cause: Global Trade and Labour Standards—a Challenge for the New Millennium.* London: Institute of Employment Rights.

Cohen, L., and S. Early (2000). "Les solidarités transfrontalières: L'expérience du CWA," in A. Fouquet, U. Rehfeldt and S. Le Roux (eds.), *Le Syndicalisme dans la mondialisation.* Paris: L'Atelier, 165–176.

Compa, L. (1998). "Democratizing the trade debate," *Foreign Policy in Focus* 3(23): 1–4.

— (2001). "Trade unions, NGOs, and corporate codes of conduct," *International Union Rights* 8(3): 5–7.

Compa, L. and Hinchliffe-Darricarrere, T. (1995). "Enforcing international labor rights through corporate codes of conduct," *Columbia Journal of Trans-national Law* 33(3): 663–689.

Globalization: Alternative Union Models in the New World Order. London: Macmillan, 41–63.

Gumbrell-McCormik, R. (2000a). "Globalisme et regionalisme," in A. Fouquet, U. Rehfeldt and S. Le Roux (eds.), *Le Syndicalisme dans la mondialisation.* Paris: L'Atelier, 43–53.

— (2000b). "Globalisation and the dilemmas of international trade unionism," *Transfer—European Review of Labour and Research* 6(1): 29–42.

— (2000c). "Facing new challenges: The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (1972–1990s)," in A. Carew, M. Dreyfus, G. V. Goethem, R. Gumbrell-McCormick and M. v. d. Linden (eds.), *The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.* Bern: Peter Lang, 341–517.

Gunderson, M. (1998). "Harmonization of Labour Policies Under Trade Liberalization," *Relations Industrielles—Industrial Relations* 53(1): 24–52.

Gunderson, M., and W. C. Riddell (1995). "Jobs, labour standards and promoting competitive advantage: Canada's policy challenge," *Labour (IIRA)*: S125–S148.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The Theory of Communicative Action: Lifeworld and System. A Critique of Functionalist Reason.* Cambridge: Polity.

Haworth, N., and S Huges. (1997). "Trade and international labour standards: Issues and debates over a social clause," *Journal of Industrial Relations* 39(2): 177–195.

Helmonds, S. V. M. (2000). "The social dimension in the context of globalisation," in US Department of Labor, Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ed.), *The Social Dimension of Economic Integration: Papers Submitted for Discussion at the United Sates and European Union Seminar.* Washington, DC: US Department of Labor, 56–77.

Hobsbawm, E. J. (1988). "Working-class internationalism," in F. v. Holthoon and M. v. d. Linden (eds.), *Internationalism on the Labour Movement 1830–1940.* Vol. I. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 3–16.

— (1995). "Guessing about global change," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 47 (Spring): 38–44.

Hoffmann, J. (2002). "Beyond the myth: 'international solidarity' as a challenge to trade unions in the age of globalisation and europeanisation," in J. Hoffmann (ed.), *The Solidarity Dilemma: Globalisation, Europeanisation and the Trade Unions.* Brussels: European Trade Union Institute, 119–144.

Hoffmann, J., and R. Hoffmann (1997). "Globalization: Risks and opportunities for labor policy in Europe," *Discussion and Working Papers* 97.04.01. Brussels: ETUI, 1–32.

Holthoon, F. v., and M. v. d. Linden (1988). "Introduction," in F. v. Holthoon and M. v. d. Linden (eds.), *Internationalism in the Labour Movement 1830–1940.* Vol. I. Leiden: E.J. Brill, vii–xiii.

Holthoon, F. v., and M. v. d. Linden, eds (1988). *Internationalism in the Labour Movement 1830–1940.* 2 Vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Hyman, R. (1996). "Changing Union Identities in Europe," in P. Leisink, J. Van Leemput and J. Vilrokx (eds.), *The Challenges to Trade Unions in Europe: Innovation or Adaptation.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 53–73.

— (1999a). "Five alternative scenarios for west european unionism," in R. Munck and P. Waterman (eds.), *Labour Worldwide in the Era of Globalization: Alternative Union Models in the New World Order.* London: Macmillan, 121–130.

— (1999b). "Imagined solidarities: Can trade unions resist globalization?" in P. Leisink (ed.), *Globalization and Labour Relations.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 94–115.

— (1999c). "National industrial relations systems and trans-national challenges: an essay in review," *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 5(1): 89–110.

— (2000). "Syndicats européens et intégration trans-nationale," in A. Fouquet, U. Rehfeldt and S. Le Roux (eds.), *Le Syndicalisme dans la mondialisation.* Paris: L'Atelier, 149–161.

— (2001). "European integration and industrial relations: a case of variable geometry?" in P. Waterman and J. Wills (eds.), *Place, Space and the New Labour Internationalisms.* Oxford: Blackwell, 164–179.

ICFTU (2000a). "Making vision into reality: Priorities for the ICFTU in the 21st century" (http://www.icftu.org/displaydocument.asp?Index=991210102andLanguage=EN); accessed on 19 Jan. 2001.

— (2000b). "Launching the millennium review—The future of the international trade union movement" (http://www.icftu.or/displaydocument.asp?Index=991209294andLanguage=EN); accessed on 12 Oct. 2001.

— (2003). "ICFTU: what it is, what it does…" (http://www.icftu.org/displaydocument.asp?DocType=OverviewandIndex=990916422andLanguage=EN): 1–2 accessed on 25 June 2003.

ILO (2001). "World Employment Report 2001: life at work in the information economy" (www.Ilo.org/public/english/support/publ/wer/index2.htm); accessed on 5 Sept. 2001.

International Union Rights (2000). Special issue on "Workers' rights know no borders. Focus on labour codes" 7(2).

— (2001). Special issue on "Codes of conduct" 8(3).

Jacobi, O. (2000). "Trans-national trade union cooperation at global and European level—opportunities and obstacles," *Transfer—European Review of Labour and Research* 6(1): 12–28.

Jakobsen, K. (1998). "Nuevos rumbos en la ORIT?" in M. S. P. Castro and A. Wachendorfer (eds.), *Sindicalismo y Globalización: la dolorosa inserción en un mundo incierto.* Caracas: Nueva Sociedad, 307–318.

— (2000). "Movimento sindical no NAFTA," in J. Lorenzetti and O. L. Faccio (eds.), *O Sindicalismo na Europa, Mercosul e Nafta.* São Paulo:

Ltr/Escola Sul da CUT, 137–221.

Jennings, P. (2001). "La nouvelle dimension de l'action syndicale," *Le Monde Diplomatique (supplément ILO)*, September: iv.

Jensen, C. S., J. S. Madsen and J. Due (1995). "A role for pan-European trade union movement?—possibilities in European IR-regulations," *Industrial Relations Journal* 26(1): 4–18.

Jones, R. (1999). "Civilising the multinationals," *International Unions Rights* 6(2): 8–9, 11.

Katz, H. C. (2001). "Whither the American labor movement?" in L. Turner, H. C. Katz and R. W. Hurd (eds.), *Rekindling the Movement: Labor's Quest for Relevance in the Twenty-first Century*. Cornell: Cornell UP, 339–349.

Klein, N. (2002). *No logo: o poder das marcas*. Lisbon: Relógio D'Àgua.

Kriegel, A. (1974). *As Internacionais Operárias*. Amadora: Bertrand.

Lambert, R. (1999). "Australia's historic industrial relations transition," in P. Leisink (ed.), *Globalization and Labour Relations*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 213–248.

Lambert, R. and Chan, A. (1999). "Global dance: Factory regimes, Asian labour standards and corporate restructuring," in J. Waddington (ed.), *Globalization and Patterns of Labour Resistance*. London: Mansell, 72–104.

Le Roux, S., A. Fouquet and U. Rehfeldt (2000). "Conclusion," in A. Fouquet, U. Rehfeldt and S. Le Roux (eds.), *Le Syndicalisme dans la mondialisation*. Paris: L'Atelier, 213–218.

Lee, E. (1997a). "Globalization and labour standards: A review of issues," *International Labour Review* 136(2): 173–189.

— (1997b). *The Labour Movement and the Internet: The New Internationalism*. London: Pluto.

— (1999). "Trade unions, computer communications and the new world order," in R. Munck and P. Waterman (eds.), *Labour Worldwide in the Era of Globalization: Alternative Union Models in the New World Order*. London: Macmillan, 228–244.

Lee, E. (2000). "Unions using the internet," *International Union Rights* 7(2): 26–27.

Leisink, P. (1999). "Introduction," in P. Leisink (ed.), *Globalization and Labour Relations*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 1–35.

Leisink, P., ed. (1999). *Globalization and Labour Relations*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Levinson, C. (1972). *International Trade Unionism*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Levinson, C., ed. (1974). *Industry's Democratic Revolution*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Lind, J. (1996). "Trade unions: Social movements or welfare apparatus?" in P. Leisink, J. Van Leemput and J. Vilrokx (eds.), *The Challenges to Trade Unions in Europe: Innovation or Adaptation*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 105–120.

Linden, M. v. d. (2000). "Conclusion: The past and the future of international trade unionism," in A. Carew, M. Dreyfus, G. V. Goethem, R. Gumbrell-McCormick and M. v. d. Linden (eds.), *The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions*. Bern: Peter Lang, 519–540.

Marx, K. (1983). "Estatutos gerais da Associação Internacional de Trabalhadores," in J. Barata-Moura, E. Chitas, F. Melo and A. Pina (eds.), *Marx e Engels: Obras escolhidas em três tomos*. Vol. II. Lisbon: "Avante," 14–17.

Marx, K., and F. Engels (1982). "Manifesto do Partido Comunista," in J. Barata-Moura, E. Chitas, F. Melo and A. Pina (eds.), *Marx e Engels: Obras escolhidas em três tomos* (Vol. I). Lisbon: "Avante," 106–136.

Mason, J. G. (2000). "Le débat américan sur la mondialilsation," in A. Fouquet, U. Rehfeldt and S. Le Roux (eds.), *Le Syndicalisme dans la mondialisation*. Paris: L'Atelier, 65–75.

Mazur, J. (2000). "Labor's new internationalism," *Foreign Affairs* 79(1): 79–93.

Moody, K. (1997a). "Towards an international social-movement unionism," *New Left Review* 225: 52–72.

— (1997b). *Workers in a Lean World: Unions in the International Economy*. London: Verso.

— (2000). "Global capital and economic nationalism. Protectionism or solidarity?" in Global Solidarity Dialogue (http://www.igc.org/solidarity/atc/87Moody.html); accessed on 19 Jan. 2001.

Munck, R. (1999). "Labour dilemas and labour futures," in R. Munck and P. Waterman (eds.), *Labour Worldwide in the Era of Globalization: Alternative Union Models in the New World Order*. London: Macmillan, 3–23.

— (2000a). "Labour and globalisation: Results and propects," *Work, Employment and Society* 14(2): 385–393.

— (2000b). "Labour in the global: Challenges and prospects," in R. Cohen and S. M. Rai (eds.), *Global Social Movements*. London: Athlone, 83–100.

Munck, R., and P. Waterman (1999). "Preface," in R. Munck and P. Waterman (eds.), *Labour Worldwide in the Era of Globalization: Alternative Union Models in the New World Order*. London: Macmillan, ix–xiv.

Munck, R., and P. Waterman, eds (1999). *Labour Worldwide in the Era of Globalization: Alternative Union Models in the New World Order*. London: Macmillan.

Murray, G., C. Lévesque, N. Roby and S. Le Queux (1999). "Isolation or integration? The relationship between local and a national union in the context of globalization," in J. Waddington (ed.), *Globalization and Patterns of Labour Resistance*. London: Mansell, 160–191.

Murray, J. (2001). "The Sydney Olympic Games code of conduct," *International Union Rights* 8(3): 11–12.

Nascimento, C. (1998). "Sindicato cidadão e formação para a cidadania (questões actuais sobre sindicalismo e a qualificação profissional," in CUT, *Educação e Sindicalismo (caderno de apoio às actividades de formação do programa nacional de formação de formadores e capacitação de conselheiros— Caderno II)*. Florianópolis: CUT.

Nash, B. J. (1998a). "Globalizing solidarity: Praxis and the international labor movement," *Journal of World-Systems Research* (http://csf.colorado.edu/wsystems/jwsr.html) 4(1): 1–3; accessed on 30 Sept. 1999.

— (1998b). "Forum: Problems and Prospects for a Global Labor Movement," *Journal of World-Systems Reseach* (http://csf.colorado.edu/wsystems/jwsr.html) 4(1): 3–9; accessed on 30 Sept. 1999.

Offe, C. (1999). "Reforma do Estado e trabalho," in M. R. Nabuco and A. C. Neto (eds.), *Relações de trabalho contemporâneas*. Belo Horizonte: PUC Minas-IRT, 47–68.

Ohmae, K. (1996). *The End of the Nation State: The Rise of the Regional Economies*. London: HarperCollins.

ORIT (2001). "XV Congreso Continental. Documento Base" (http://www.orit-ciosl.org/debate/docbase_res.html); accessed on 28 Mar. 2001.

Piqueras, J. A. (1995). *O Movimento operário*. Porto: Campos das Letras.

Ramsay, H. (1997). "Solidarity at last? International trade unionism approaching the millennium," *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 18(4): 503–517.

— (1999). "In search of international union theory," in J. Waddington (ed.), *Globalisation Patterns of Labour Resistance*. London: Mansell, 192–219.

Raynauld, A., and J.-P Vidal. (1998). *Labour Standards and International Competitiveness: A Comparative Analysis of Developing and Industrialized Countries*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Rehfeldt, U. (2000). "Les stratégies syndicales européenes," in A. Fouquet, U. Rehfeldt and S. Le Roux (eds.), *Le Syndicalisme dans la mondialisation*. Paris: L'Atelier, 77–86.

— (2001). "European Works Councils and union bargaining strategies," in D. Foden, J. Hoffmann and R. Scott (eds.), *Globalisation and the Social Contract*. Brussels: European Trade Union Institute, 343–353.

Rifkin, J. (2000). "O novo capitalismo transforma a cultura em comércio," *Público* 22 Jan.

Ruzza, R. d. (1996). "L'Internationalisation de l'économie et la crise du syndicalisme," *L'Homme et la Société* 121/122: 117–130.

Ruzza, R. d., and S. Le Roux (2000). "L'internationalisme syndicale est-il praticable?" in A. Fouquet, U. Rehfeldt and S. Le Roux (eds.), *Le Syndicalisme dans la mondialisation*. Paris: L'Atelier, 31–42.

Sachwald, F. (1997). "La régionalisation contre la mondialisation?" in

S. Cordellier and F. Doutaut (eds.), *Mondialisation, au-delà des mythes*. Paris: La Découverte, 133–146.

Sagnes, J. (1994a). "Introduction générale," in J. Sagnes (ed.), *Histoire du syndicalisme dans le monde: des origines à nos jours*. Toulouse: Privat, 11–18.

— (1994b). "Rivalité des organisations syndicales internationales," in J. Sagnes (ed.), *Histoire du syndicalisme dans le monde: des origines à nos jours*. Toulouse: Privat, 495–507.

Santos, B. S. (1994). *Pela mão de Alice: O social e o político na pós-modernidade*. Porto: Afrontamento.

— (1995a). *Toward a New Common Sense: Law, Science and Politics in the Paradigmatic Transition*. London: Routledge.

— (1995b). "Teses para renovação do sindicalismo em Portugal, seguidas de um apelo," *Vértice* 68: 132–139.

— (1998). *Reinventar a democracia*. Lisbon: Gradiva.

— (1999). "The Welfare State in Portugal: Between conflicting globalizations," *Oficina do CES* 140: 1–35.

— (2000). *A crítica da razão indolente: contra o desperdício da experiência*. Porto: Afrontamento.

— (2001). "Os Processos da globalização," in B. S. Santos (ed.), *Globalização: fatalidade ou utopia?* Porto: Afrontamento, 31–106.

— (2002). *Towards a New Legal Common Sense*. London: Butterworths.

Scipes, K. (2000). "Social movement unionism: A call for theoretical clarification," *Labour Movements*, Research Committee (RC) 44 (December) of the International Sociological Association. Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 6.

Seidman, G. W. (1994). *Manufacturing Militance: Workers' Movements in Brazil and South Africa, 1970–1985*. Berkeley: U of California P.

Sibley, T. (2000). "The case of universal labour standards," in ICTUR, *Trade Union Rights for the Next Millennium* (draft discussion paper). London: ICTUR, i–ix.

Standing, G. (1999). *Global Labour Flexibility: Seeking Distributive Justice*. London: Macmillan.

Stevis, D. (1998). "International labor organizations, 1864–1997: The weight of history and the challenges of the present," *Journal of World-Systems Research* (http://csf.colorado.edu/wsystems/jwsr.html) 4: 52–75; accessed on 30 Sept. 1999.

Stevis, D., and T. Boswell (2000). "From national resistance to international labour politics," in B. K. Gills (ed.), *Globalization and the Politics of Resistance*. London, Macmillan, 150–170.

Streeck, W. (1998). "The internationalization of industrial relations in Europe: Prospects and problems," *Politics and Society* 26(4): 429–459.

Streeck, W., and P. C. Schmitter (1998). "From national corporatism to transnational pluralism: organised interests in the Single European Market,"

in E. Gabaglio and R. Hoffmann (eds.), *The ETUC in the mirror of industrial relations*. Brussels: European Trade Union Institute, 131–170.

Supiot, A., ed. (1999). *Au-delà de l'empoi: Transformations du travail et devenir du droit du travail en Europe (Rapport pour la Comission européenne)*. Paris: Flammarion.

Teague, P., and J. Grahl (1992). *Industrial Relations and European Integration*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Thorpe, V. (1999). "Global unionism: The challenge," in R. Munck and P. Waterman (eds.), *Labour Worldwide in the Era of Globalization: Alternative Union Models in the New World Order*. London: Macmillan, 218–228.

Thorstensen, V. (1999). "Os novos temas da Organização Mundial do Comércio: Implicações nas relações do Mercosul com a União Europeia e NAFTA," in Forum Euro-Latino Americano, *Regular e democratizar o sistema global—Uma parceria para o século XXI*. Cascais: Principia, 253–310.

Tilly, C. (1995). "Globalization Threatens Labor's Rights," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 47 (Spring): 1–23.

Torres, R. (2000). "Trade and labor standards: An economic perspective," in US Department of Labor, Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ed.), *The Social Dimension of Economic Integration: Papers Submitted for Discussion at the United Sates and European Union Seminar*. Washington, DC: US Department of Labor, 78–98.

Traxler, F., and P. C. Schmitter (1995). "The emerging euro-polity and organized interests," *European Journal of International Relations* 2(1): 191–218.

Treillet, S., and X. d. L. Vega (2000). "Vers des stratégies syndicales transnationales," in A. Fouquet, U. Rehfeldt and S. Le Roux (eds.), *Le Syndicalisme dans la mondialisation*. Paris: L'Atelier, 189–199.

Trubek, D. M. (2000). "Desperately seeking global labor standards: Can we get out of the box?" (http://www.WAGENET.org/Conferences/Papers/Intro_Overview_D2/trubeklab.html); accessed on 2 Mar. 2001.

Turner, L. (1998). "The Europeanization of labour: Structure before action," in E. Gabaglio and R. Hoffmann (eds.), *The ETUC in the Mirror of Industrial Relations*. Brussels: European Trade Union Institute, 207–230.

Valkenburg, B. (1996). "Individualization and solidarity: The challenge of modernization," in P. Leisink, J. Van Leemput and J. Vilrokx (eds.), *The challenges to trade unions in Europe: Innovation or adaptation*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 89–104.

Valkenburg, B., and L. Beukema (1996). "The organisation a flexibility. Atypical jobs as a challenge for the modernization of trade unions," *Transfer—European Review of Labour and Research* 2(4): 738–754.

Veiga, J. P. C. (1999). "Práticas sindicais e acordos preferenciais de comércio: Um novo caminho para o sindicalismo?" in Y. Chaloult and P. R. Almeida (eds.), *Mercosul, Nafta e Alca: a dimensão social*. São Paulo: Ltr, 170–189.

Vigevani, T. (1998). *Mercosul: Impactos para trabalhadores e sindicatos*. São Paulo: Ltr.

Visser, J. (1995). "Trade Unions from a comparative perspective," in J. Van Ruysseveldt, R. Huiskamp and J. van Hoof (eds.), *Comparative Industrial and Employment Relations*. London: Sage, 37–67.

—— (1998). "Learning to play: the europeanisation of trade unions," in P. Pasture and J. Verberckmoes (eds.), *Working-class Internationalism and the Appeal of National Identity: Historical Debates and Current Perspectives on Western Europe*. Oxford: Berg, 231–257.

Waddington, J. (1999). "Situating labour within globalization debate," in J. Waddington (ed.), *Globalization and Patterns of Labour Resistance*. London: Mansell, 1–28.

Waddington, J., ed. (1999). *Globalization and Patterns of Labour Resistance*. London: Mansell.

Waddington, J., R. Hoffmann and J. Lind (1997). "European trade unionism in transition? A review of issues," *Transfer—European Review of Labour and Research* 3(3): 464–497.

Wallerstein, I. (1995). "Response: Declining states, declining rights?" *International Labor and Working-Class History* 47 (Spring): 24–27.

Waterman, P. (1998a). *Globalization, Social Movements and the New Internationalisms*. London: Mansell.

—— (1998b). "The second coming of proletarian internationalism? A review a recent resources," *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 4(3): 349–377.

—— (1999). "The new social unionism: A new union model for a new world order," in R. Munck and P. Waterman (eds.), *Labour Worldwide in the Era of Globalization: Alternative Union Models in the New World Order*. London: Macmillan, 247–264.

—— (2000a). "Social movements, local places and globalized spaces: Implications for "globalization from below," in B. Gills (ed.), *Globalization and the Politics of Resistance*. London: Macmillan, 135–149.

—— (2000b). "Trade union internationalism in the age of Seattle," in Global Solidarity Dialogue (http://www.antenna.nl/~waterman/age-seattle.html#top); accessed on 17 Jan. 2001.

—— (2002). "Internacionalismo sindical na era de Seattle," *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais* 62: 33–68.

Williams, H. L. (1999). "Mobile capital and transborder labor rights mobilization," *Politics and Society* 27(1): 139–166.

Wills, J. (2001). "Uneven geographies of capital and labour: the lessons of European Works Councils," in P. Waterman and J. Wills (eds.), *Place, Space and the New Labour Internationalisms*. Oxford: Blackwell, 180–205.

Yanz, L., and B. Jeffcott (2001). "Bringing codes down to earth," *International Union Rights* 8(3): 8–10.

Zoll, R. (1996). "Modernization, trade Unions and solidarity," in P. Leisink, J. Van Leemput and J. Vilrokx (eds.), *The Challenges to Trade Unions in Europe: Innovation or Adaptation*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 77–87.