



## 'Labour and new social movements in a globalising world system': the future of the past

Peter Waterman

To cite this article: Peter Waterman (2005) 'Labour and new social movements in a globalising world system': the future of the past, *Labor History*, 46:2, 195-207, DOI: [10.1080/00236560500080873](https://doi.org/10.1080/00236560500080873)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00236560500080873>



Published online: 23 Jan 2007.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 113



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 6 View citing articles [↗](#)

## LABOR HISTORY SYMPOSIUM

# ‘Labour and New Social Movements in a Globalising World System’: The Future of the Past

Peter Waterman

*A new set of questions [is] being created by a changing present. Questions about who constitutes the working class, about how fragmented and divided groups of workers have organised, issues about workplace and community and the democratisation of unions and state policies are assuming centre stage. As the contours of the present shift, it is becoming possible to look back from new perspectives.<sup>1</sup>*

### Introduction: The Old and the New in an International Labour History Conference

The main title above is that of the 39th session of the International Conference of Labour and Social History (ITH in German), Linz, Austria, 11–14 September 2003 (see Appendix). The subtitle is, of course, my own. The conference title might suggest continuity, a new alliance, a flow from the past into the future. Yet I am more inclined to identify a turning point in international labour studies and labour internationalism.

The end of one period of labour history was actually suggested by a *previous* such Linz ITH Conference, the 35th, in 1999, which was on

The Labour Movement: A Failed Project of Modernity?

Now, it occurred to me, on reading *that* book, that *that* conference might just as well have been called

Modernity: A Failed Project of the Labour Movement!

---

Correspondence to: Peter Waterman, Jacob v.d. Doesstr. 28, 2518xn Den Haag, The Netherlands.  
Email: p.waterman@inter.nl.net

Whatever. But as I read the report on that 35th conference,<sup>2</sup> on my way home, it did seem to me that it provided a prefigurative critique of the 2003 one.

My feeling is that with a globalised networked capitalism, the history of labour/labour history has to start again. But this time labour has to be understood as one crucial but equal part of what is calling itself the 'global justice and solidarity movement' (GJ&SM). This movement is beginning to put in question both the capitalist system *and* the labour movement—the major subaltern social movement of national-industrial-colonial (and a major one of anti-colonial) capitalism.

In many ways, the new movement echoes the labour movement in its emancipatory moments or moods. But where the labour movement was, and sometimes still is, considered by its activists and analysts to be either the centre or the vanguard of social protest and internationalism, the GJ&SM reveals that this task is a multi-faceted one, with no central point or privileged force. Where, moreover, the labour movement has become lost in modernity, thus also losing both its original emancipatory and its early internationalist vocation, the GJ&SM sees a globalised modernity, at least implicitly, less as a solution, more as a problem.

### **The 39th Linz Conference 2002: Between the Old and the New**

Now, in addressing myself to the 2003 Conference, I am conscious of having incomplete notes and of lacking a complete set of papers. Moreover, I have to say, the conference seemed to me somewhat disjointed and disorienting. Maybe it was simply a matter of what Marcel van der Linden said in Linz of this moment in the history of labour internationalism—that we are in a period of transition.<sup>3</sup>

There was, for example, an awkward division between the mostly elderly Austrian participants (from Linz? From the pre-war Austrian labour movement?) and the middle-aged to young foreign ones. No attempt was made to bridge this gap, though the organisers are well aware of the acute shortage of youthful participants.

There was also something of a breach between the first day of the conference, largely dominated by political-economic presentations (abstracts ending with a three-line gesture in the direction of the labour movement), and a 'movementist' second day—if one moving between the institutionalised labour movement and the newest social ones.

Then there was a certain language problem, despite the amazing cabin translations, between those who were fluent in 'Old European' (English/French/German) and those who spoke English and/or Spanish. This problem takes visible shape in the annual conference proceedings, since, at least in the report on the 1999 event, half of them are in German and French, and *none* is accompanied by translated abstracts. This makes these thought-provoking materials largely inaccessible in the two major international languages *of the South*, English and Spanish. (Despite my advanced age, and knowledge of Dutch, Spanish and French, I found myself struggling to understand Hobsbawm in German.)

Given such disorientations, which may have been solely mine, what follows had better be seen as a series of initial reflections (or provocations). I leave a more rounded evaluation to a later moment and another person.

The 2003 Linz Conference was, like the 1999 one, a rather forward-looking event for such a venerable institution and 200-year-old subject. The presentations were, however, marked by tensions between various 'olds' and various 'news' ('news' also in terms of what was coming down the virtual pipeline, during the conference, from the Second World Trade Fiasco in Cancún, Mexico).

One of the tensions was, as suggested, that between a political-economic approach to labour, as a creature of industrialisation and the nation-state (system), and a multi-determined and even multi-directional approach, both focused on and drawing from the 'newest social movements.'

Overlapping this tension was one between a structuralist approach to history and society (in which 'protest' appears something like toothpaste extruded from a tube under the pressure of theory) and a 'movementist' one that begins with protest and then seeks an explanatory theory for, and often from, such. (The structuralist approach, admittedly, allows for a possibly reciprocal effect of labour movement toothpaste on capitalist teeth.)

There was also, to a considerable extent, an overlapping tension between those focusing on the *formalised and existent* (particularly union institutions) and those focusing on the *novel and imminent* (particularly the un-institutionalised movements).

Overlapping, again, with these was a tension between (1) a globalisation-as-myth school, ignoring informatisation and insisting on the primacy of capital, state-nation, class and (sometimes) imperialism, and (2) a globalisation-as-contradictory-reality one, insisting on the Big G as a revolution within (and possibly beyond) capitalism.

There was, finally, I think, another overlapping tension between a generally reflective/academic approach toward labour and social movements and an engaged one in which findings and proposals are at least intended to be fed back, in dialogical manner, to the new movements themselves.<sup>4</sup>

Whereas my initial presentation of the event might suggest I have a binary-oppositional or even Manichean view, or worldview (since I could be rightly assumed to be identified with the second complex of positions), I do not wish to be understood as suggesting that the first represents Ideology, the second Science. Rather, I think, an emancipatory knowledge and strategy come out of a dialogue within and across schools.

### The 35th Linz Conference 1999: A Prefigurative Critique?

I have already suggested that a key to the above-mentioned tensions could be found in that 35th Conference in 1999. With contributions from such labour/social history celebs as Eric Hobsbawm and Sheila Rowbotham (see introductory quotation), and others highly regarded within the profession, and/or area studies, it also introduced

such new (to me) names as that of Jie-Hyun Lim.<sup>5</sup> His is a path-breaking insight into the particularities/peculiarities of Marxism as it migrated to first the European periphery, then to further peripheries of the old imperialist world order. His title, 'From Labour Emancipation to Labour Mobilisation,' suggests a more general trajectory for the labour movement, labour theory and socialist strategy as they were shaped, or shaped themselves, to a capitalist modernity they had originally entered as not merely an *oppositional* but an *emancipatory* force.

But the contribution to *that* conference most relevant, I thought, to *this* one was that of Daniel James.<sup>6</sup> Quoting Charles Tilly, James suggests that labour history can be seen as focused on twin stars in a condition of tension: the development of national labour organisations, and the connections between the organisation of production, class formation and worker action. Around these stars can be found the 'cosmic debris' at the 'chaotic periphery'—local, regional and national studies, working class differentiation (by sex, race and nationality), daily life, the family, culture. James is more concerned to apply this metaphor to Latin American labour studies than to critique Tilly. But I note how Tilly's model focuses on the national, marginalises other determinants/contradictions—and quite ignores the international. And I was wondering about the extent to which the 1984 Tilly spectre was not haunting our 2003 conference...

But James throws more light on 2003. This is in his critique of Latin American labour history written within the tradition of world-systems theory (WST). What James said then, of one historian, seemed to me valid for not simply the WST tendency at the 2003 Conference, but for the political-economic determinists more generally:

Labour is constantly invoked but largely as an abstract analytical category ready to be mobilised, to be incorporated, occasionally to resist... [L]abour... has little agency or autonomy... Despite the imposing marshaling of historical fact and detail the analysis lacks complexity, motivation and a real notion of causality. Their analysis is based on a rigorous determination by the political[-economic?] process. Yet theirs is a notion of politics devoid of ideology, political language, political symbols and beliefs.<sup>7</sup>

I now feel under a certain obligation to address myself to at least one actual 2003 conference paper. I will therefore take that of Marcel van der Linden,<sup>8</sup> in so far as he seems to me an outstanding representative of traditional international labour history,<sup>9</sup> now standing on the cusp of the new.<sup>10</sup> Van der Linden is not only a historian of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, but a leading figure within the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam—the Mecca of international labour and social history. His paper was entitled 'The ICFTU at the Crossroads,' but actually represented an attempt to consider a past and suggest a future, within which the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) occupies only a certain moment. He argues that

The international trade-union movement in general, and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) in particular, is currently facing an

enormous challenge. The world working class is changing and expanding dramatically, and many of the old organisational structures and policies are in danger of losing their effectiveness. Will the movement be able to adapt itself? Will it succeed in conquering the minds and hearts of millions of new workers in Asia, Africa and Latin America? Or will it remain what it is, i.e. a North-Atlantic organization with some minor support in other continents?

This is strong language, or at least a disturbing question, raised by someone whose previous reflections on the ICFTU have been rather more cautious.<sup>11</sup> Van der Linden's paper sets up a periodisation of labour internationalism, which runs like this:

First stage: The labour movement defines itself (pre-1848).

Second stage: Subnational internationalism (1848–70s).

Third stage: Transition (1870s–90s).

Fourth stage: National internationalism (1890s–1960s).

Fifth stage: A new transition (since the 1960s).

I will not go into the documentation behind this periodisation. But I do have some comments on it.

The first is that, in the epoch of globalisation, the model still seems a little fixated on the *national*. For me, the first period might rather refer to the radical-democratic internationalism, or cosmopolitanism, of which Tom Paine and Flora Tristán were leading figures (the second evidently as a transitional one). The second period I would characterise as one of a craft or corporate internationalism (something that continues to this day). 'National internationalism' is a term I have myself used,<sup>12</sup> while pointing out that it was common, also, to unions on the capitalist periphery during this period. I would also, however, be inclined to stress the continuing hegemony of national internationalism.

The second comment is that, to the extent that the present period might be seen as one of transition, it is possible to give this a name, especially since this name is even creeping into the discourse of the hegemonic institutionalised unions. This is 'global solidarity unionism,' or 'global social movement unionism,' notions that not only surpass that of *internationalism* but simultaneously imply holism, and which therefore relate new forms of labour internationalism to the global solidarity and justice movement.

The third comment has to do simply with the relevant literature—historical and sociological. I have referred to much of this in a number of recent papers.<sup>13</sup> The point is, simply, that some of this literature uses concepts or raises issues concerning the past, present and future of what we had better call labour *and* internationalism. And this literature requires incorporation, discussion or confrontation. Much of this literature has implications, precisely, for the relationship between labour and the newest social movements.<sup>14</sup> While van der Linden asks questions about the possible or necessary transformation of union internationalism, there are here already some answers, or at least arguments.

**Back to Reality: Virtual or Not, It's Coming**

I earlier mentioned Cancún. This global drama, which was occurring as our rather amiable conference unfolded, revealed the differences between two periods and/or types of international labour-and-social movements. The differences at Cancún were expressed in two internet emanations, one being email messages to Cancún protesters by the Zapatistas, the other being the extensive Cancún webpages of the ICFTU. The activities of the ICFTU, and the related Global Unions, were almost exclusively concerned with unions, relations between unions and union-WTO (World Trade Organisation) relations. The collapse of the talks was greeted thus by the ICFTU:

[T]his is more than a crisis of the trading system; it is a crisis of global governance, unions said. 'We call on world leaders to reflect on the social vacuum at the heart of the multilateral system. This requires a discussion at the highest political level. The United Nations must show leadership in this,' Ryder [ICFTU General Secretary] concluded.<sup>15</sup>

The ICFTU was here appealing to, and revealing dependence on, states and inter-state organisations (elsewhere including the WTO), in the hope that they might *reform themselves*. The ICFTU speaks here as a body present *within* or *on the periphery* of the WTO. The mode of expression is diplomatic, since the ICFTU/Global Unions are apparently still trying to 'get a table at the WTO restaurant,'<sup>16</sup> or at least to fill a 'social vacuum.' What the ICFTU has to say on this website could also have been said by any liberal academic, at least of the pre-neo kind. While a finer or comparative analysis might indicate movement within the international trade union movement, in directions suggested by the GJ&SM, the apparent absence of unions from the protest activities at Cancún suggests a greater distance from the new movements than might have been suggested by increasing union presence at the World Social Forums.

Now for the Zapatistas:

Throughout the world, two projects of globalisation are in dispute: The one from above that globalises conformity, cynicism, stupidity, war, destruction, death, and amnesia. And the one from below, that globalises rebellion, hope, creativity, intelligence, imagination, life, memory, building a world where many worlds fit. A world of Democracy! Liberty! Justice!<sup>17</sup>

Here Sub-Comandante Marcos is addressing and appealing to the protest movement taking place in Cancún (neither 'protest' nor 'demonstration' finds mention on the dozens of ICFTU/Global Unions webpages). The mode of expression is obviously rhetorical. But this rhetoric does not simply remind us of the earlier, emancipatory, phase of the international labour movement. It includes radically modern values and aspirations. Although his is a polarising language, which would implicitly condemn, or at least criticise, the ICFTU for its dependence on 'globalisation from above,' the values and aspirations expressed actually cut across any such binary opposition, appealing to traditional modernist/labourist values as well as to hypothetically post-capitalist ones.

More intriguing, revealing and suggestive, however, is the message from Comandante Esther of the Zapatistas:

Indigenous and campesino women sisters, we want to tell you to organise to fight against the neoliberalism that humiliates us, that exploits us, and that wants us to disappear as indigenous women, as peasant women, and as women . . . [W]e say clearly that when women demand respect, we demand it not only from the neoliberals, but also from those who struggle against neoliberalism and say they are revolutionaries but in the home are like Bush . . . Also we want to tell all women in the city to get organised and fight together, because you also suffer the same situation—the humiliation and the exploitation. Because the women who work in the factories, as workers, employees, teachers, and secretaries have a boss, male or female, because rich women also humiliate us and devalue us. And what they earn is not enough to tend to their children's needs for health, education, and food. And also they have to comply with the schedule given them and if they do not, they get fired but they are not paid a fair salary.<sup>18</sup>

To me this suggests a movement leader who not only reaches out beyond her constituency (indigenous, campesino, female) to recognise and appeal to other women, in an (old) socialist and (new) feminist spirit, but who understands the necessity of a 'movement within the movement.'<sup>19</sup> And who makes an intellectual/emotional appeal to *women workers* that would be difficult to find on any international *union* site.<sup>20</sup>

More reality, this time definitely virtual. I began to write this note in the airport of Vienna, on my way home from Linz. And I was writing it on my Palm M130 PDA (Personal Digital Assistant . . . I think), which has a foldout keyboard. And I was wondering whether my Palm might not also have the possibility of plugging into some device in the airport which would transmit my unfinished thoughts to my fellow participants, and at least one interested website, in forty winks. The relationship between this 'real virtuality'<sup>21</sup> and that, slow, ageing, crisis-confronted movement (and somewhat disoriented or disjointed conference?) presents itself as an irony of left history that Isaac Deutscher was not required to address.<sup>22</sup> I am, of course, perfectly well aware of the distance between the bulk of the world proletariat—and the even greater bulk of the world's working people—and my Palm. But I am equally aware of the epochal revolution this device symbolises for work, for workers, for a renewed or reinvented labour internationalism and for an international labour studies reinvented in the light of globalisation.<sup>23</sup> Informatisation, like mechanisation, electrification and automation earlier, is integral to the present revolution within capitalism—both as process and product. Yet, while even the participant from Calcutta (aka Kolkata) had email, and the conference was electronically coordinated, 'informatisation' was hardly mentioned at this event. Though I did make it one of my 'ten theses' below.

### Ten Theses, and Not on Feurbach

It was a privilege to be invited to introduce the final discussion at the Linz Conference. I was just recovering from a keynote presentation at another



conference—at which an admittedly still sleepy audience refused, with remarkable accord, to laugh at my keynote jokes. In fact, as I informed one of the Linz Conference organisers, I had more or less prepared my propositions before the event. This was possible, in part, because I had the programme, some abstracts and one paper (the one that wasn't presented). It was also because Linz was the third of three international labour conferences I spoke at in 2003 (the fourth and last one was more of a consultation). Addressed to the future of international labour studies, the propositions went (or go now, following the ensuing discussion) something like this:<sup>24</sup>

1. *Work*. We need to recognise the multiple forms of 'work for capitalism,' as well as the manner in which 'atypical' labour is expanding at the expense of 'typical' waged labour. We need to remember that there were two early slogans of the labour movement, a liberal one that called for 'a fair day's wage for a fair day's work,' and a revolutionary socialist one, calling for the 'abolition of wage slavery.' We need to spell out the slogan suggested by Andre Gorz, 'The Liberation of Time from Work,' and concern ourselves with the increasing experiments in 'solidarity economics' (a major theme at the World Social Forums).
2. *Workers*. We have to surpass the narrow understanding of 'working class,' either by expanding it to all the kinds of 'atypical' labourers, or by using some such term as 'working people.' In either case we have to surpass the privileging of the traditional wage worker.
3. *Form*. We need to surpass a fixation on the traditional form of worker representation in the trade union organisation/collective-bargaining institution. The pyramidal—and nominally representative-democratic<sup>25</sup>—organisation (national to global) has to be understood in terms of networking and communication. It is in these terms that the new movements of 'labour's others' are increasingly articulated, locally, nationally, internationally. And these forms are likely to suggest themselves spontaneously to the new information workers (from computer operators to software designers).
4. *Social movements*. We have to place studies of unions and labour relations *back* within the framework of social movements. But this implies putting them *forward* also, now within the spectrum of historical and social movement theories developing alongside the newest social movements.
5. *Democracy*. We have to remember that unions once were—and still are under authoritarian regimes of the right or left—citizenship movements. This means considering the relationship between trade unions and new forms and understandings of democracy and citizenship arising under the neoliberal condition of Democracy Lite. Here understandings of citizenship coming out of the women's, migrant, indigenous and global justice movements are essential.
6. *History/geography*. All history is written backwards. Theoretically critical and socially committed understandings of globalisation/informatisation can provide new ways of understanding the *past* of labour movements. The growing area of

labour geography, within the general school of radical social geography, not only helps us surpass political-economic determinism, but requires us to reflect upon spatial difference and determination in relation to labour identity and protest, again from the local to the global. It could also surpass the increasingly empty oppositions of global to national, or global to local, in international labour studies.<sup>26</sup>

7. *Cyberspace*. Cyberspace is only a 'virtual reality' in the way that cinema once was. But whereas it was possible for state and capital to wipe out the worker cinema movement of the 1920s–30s, the infinite area of cyberspace cannot be fully occupied by either, nor can the 'gift economy' that cyberspace allows be fully incorporated by the capitalist economy it largely represents. Cyberspace must be understood not simply as a tool (for doing something better, faster and on a wider scale), but also as a community (a place of shared interests, identities, meanings and struggles) and as utopia (see below). The short history of international labour's engagements with cyberspace—and earlier ones with cultural internationalism—requires more intensive study than it has so far received.
8. *Ethnography/anthropology*. Most history of labour internationalism reveals little or nothing about *worker* experience, understandings and valuing of internationalism. Like much of what passes for labour internationalism, it is about the international relations of institutions and their officers. It may be difficult but should not be impossible to use ethnographic methods (or insights) to research past worker internationalism.
9. *Solidarity*. Solidarity is another crucial but under-theorised concept in the history and histories of international labour and labour internationalism. It needs to be deconstructed into such constituent elements as identity, substitution, complementarity, reciprocity, affinity and restitution. It needs to be measured according to axis, direction, reach, depth, impact, meaning, etc.
10. *Utopia*. 'Utopia' means both 'nowhere' and 'good place,' in other words a good place that does not yet exist. It refers, however, not simply to a condition but also to a process of achieving such. International labour history (and popular history before and since this) is replete with utopian references, at least in emancipatory moments. If contemporary labour aspirations are not to be condemned to dystopia, or to become conservative utopianisms (gradualist or insurrectionary), they need to be informed by the history and nature of labour and other social movement utopianism (particularly the utopianism of the anti-utopian Marxists?).

### Conclusion: The Future of the Past

Despite my critique of the ITH Conference, 2003, I am cautiously optimistic about the extent to which it can, and hopefully will, contribute to 'labour and social movements in a globalising world system.' The new GJ&SM does not reveal much

awareness of the past. And we all know what happens to those who ignore history. Even the title of the Linz Conferences, linking labour and social history, allows for such a development. And a number of the papers, to which I have not referred in this note, revealed a similar family relationship to that of the determinists I have criticised. It is a problem, moreover, not simply of GJ&SM disinterest in the past, but also of a cavalier dismissal of the 'old labour movement,' which is, in many ways, the Mother of All Modern Social Movements. And no one should ever forget mother.

## Notes

- [1] Rowbotham, 'New Entry Points,' 68.
- [2] Groppo et al., *Die Arbeiterbewegung*.
- [3] Van der Linden, 'The ICFTU at the Crossroads.'
- [4] That labour studies might be so committed does not mean that they are by this token emancipatory in intention or effect. The point is revealed in two such recent studies of *national* union movements, that of Robert Taylor ('Social Democratic Trade Unionism') on the UK and that of Dan Clawson (*The Next Upsurge: Labour and the New Social Movements*) on the US. These actually illustrate the difference between an explicitly 'social democratic' and 'social movement' approach—both phrases appearing in the titles. Taylor's is an original attempt to revive, under conditions of neoliberal globalisation, the historical social-democratic project. Clawson's is an argument to the effect that unionism can only revive to the extent that it 'fuses' itself with the new social movements—including the internationalist ones.
- [5] Jie-Hyun Lim, 'From the Labour Emancipation to the Labour Mobilisation.'
- [6] James, 'Latin American Labour History.'
- [7] *Ibid.*, 162. At the other pole to the political-economic determinists would seem to be the work of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri. In a brief exposition ('Marx's Mole Is Dead!') of their yet-to-be-published book, they make a convincing case for starting social analysis from social resistance or protest and treating hegemonic political-economic strategies as responses. While guilty of inventing two of the new century's most problematic left concepts—empire and multitude—these authors deal with the impact of informatisation/globalisation on the working class, the generalisation of proletarianisation, the increasing spread and depth of capitalist contradictions, and the way the old labour *internationalism* is being transformed into something much more potent.
- [8] Van der Linden, 'The ICFTU at the Crossroads.'
- [9] Van Holthoon and van der Linden, *Internationalism in the Labour Movement*; van der Linden, *The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions*.
- [10] I could and possibly should have included (also) the paper of Ilse Lenz ('Globalisation, Gender and Work'), in so far as this was the strongest conference presentation of what we might have to call the 'newest international labour studies.' By way of feeble excuses for not having included her, I will merely say: (1) I am awaiting the completion of the paper she actually presented, and (2) that despite the 15–20 years since we last met or communicated with each other, we have anyway been following parallel or converging tracks, and (3) I am hoping to recommence the dialogue when she eventually addresses herself to her women's international labour protest cases.
- [11] Waterman, 'Problematic Past and Uncertain Future.'
- [12] Waterman, *Globalisation, Social Movements and the New Internationalisms*, 26, 103.
- [13] Waterman, 'Adventures of Emancipatory Labour Strategy,' 'International Labour Studies 2000+,' 'Whatever Is the Global Justice Movement Doing?'

- [14] E.g. the positions of Richard Hyman as summarised in Waterman, 'International Labour Studies 2000+.'
- [15] <<http://www.icftu.org/default.asp?Language=EN>>.
- [16] Waghorne, 'Getting a Seat.'
- [17] <<http://www.foodfirst.org/wto/reports/ezln3eng.php>>.
- [18] <<http://www.foodfirst.org/wto/reports/ezln1eng.php>>.
- [19] For those too young to remember this—and they are increasing—I am here playing, but seriously, with 'revolution in the revolution' (Debray, *Revolution in the Revolution*).
- [20] She also throws a certain amount of doubt on the argument of a political-economic-determinist conference participant who declared that rural petty-commodity production gives rise to chiliastic movements.
- [21] Castells, *The Information Age*, 373.
- [22] Deutscher, *Ironies of History*.
- [23] Waterman, 'Adventures of Emancipatory Labour Strategy.'
- [24] For more extensive argument around these propositions, see the various references to Waterman. These references also reveal sources for many of the propositions. And the papers themselves mostly have extensive bibliographies.
- [25] 'Nominally democratic' in so far as many unions suffer from the low participation affecting liberal democracies more generally. The further the organisation gets from the shopfloor, moreover, the more nominal becomes the democracy. So, while the ICFTU might claim that it 'represents' 150 million workers in x number of countries, it is doubtful whether more than a small percentage know it represents them, even in Brussels where it is situated.
- [26] Given the extent to which locales are globalised, and to which the hegemonic global is particularised (by transnationals, by the West, by (inter-)state bodies, by Rich White Men with Diner's Club Cards), many questions arise about how, for example, 'localisation' or 'globalisation' might be understood by waged and other workers within or around a Coca Cola plant in Kerala, India.

## References

- Castells, Manuel. *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture: Vol. I: The Rise of the Network Society*. Malden, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
- Clawson, Dan. *The Next Upsurge: Labour and the New Social Movements*. Ithaca N.Y.: ILR Press, 2003.
- Debray, Régis. *Revolution in the Revolution*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967.
- Deutscher, Isaac. *Ironies of History: Essays on Contemporary Communism*. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Gropp, Bruno, Winfried Garscha and Christine Schindler, eds. *Die Arbeiterbewegung—Ein gescheitertes Projekt der Moderne?* [The labour movement—a failed project of modernity?]. Leipzig: Akademische Verlaganstalt, 2000.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 'Marx's Mole is Dead!' 2003 <<http://www.ukzn.ac.za/ccs/default.asp?3,28,10,1197>>.
- James, Daniel. 'Latin American Labour History: An Assessment of the State of the Field in the 1990s.' In *Die Arbeiterbewegung—Ein gescheitertes Projekt der Moderne?* [The labour movement—a failed project of modernity?], edited by Bruno Gropp, Winfried Garscha and Christine Schindler, Leipzig: Akademische Verlaganstalt, 2000.
- Jie-Hyun Lim. 'From the Labour Emancipation to the Labor Mobilisation.' In *Die Arbeiterbewegung—Ein gescheitertes Projekt der Moderne?* [The labour movement—a failed project of modernity?], edited by Bruno Gropp, Winfried Garscha and Christine Schindler, Leipzig: Akademische Verlaganstalt, 2000.

- Lenz, Ilse. 'Globalisation, Gender and Work: New Divisions, New Convergences. Gender, Work and Globalisation.' Paper presented to the Conference on Labour and New Social Movements in a Globalising World System, Linz, 11–14 September 2003.
- Rowbotham, Sheila. 'New Entry Points from US Women's Labour History.' In *Die Arbeiterbewegung—Ein gescheiteres Projekt der Moderne?* [The labour movement—a failed project of modernity?], edited by Bruno Groppo, Winfried Garscha and Christine Schindler, Leipzig: Akademische Verlaganstalt, 2000.
- Taylor, Robert. 'Social Democratic Trade Unionism: An Agenda for Action.' Catalyst Working Paper, Catalyst, London, 2003.
- Van Holthoon, Frits, and Marcel van der Linden, eds. *Internationalism in the Labour Movement, 1830–1940*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- Van der Linden, Marcel. 'The ICFTU at the Crossroads: An Historical Interpretation.' Paper presented to the Conference on Labour and New Social Movements in a Globalising World System, Linz, 11–14 September 2003.
- , ed. *The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions*. Berne: Peter Lang, 2000.
- Waghorne, Mike. 'Getting a Seat in the WTO Restaurant.' *Transnational Associations* (Brussels) 4 (2000): 163–72.
- Waterman, Peter. 'Adventures of Emancipatory Labour Strategy as the New Global Movement Challenges International Unionism.' 2003. <<http://jwsr.ucr.edu/archive/vol10/number1/pdf/jwsr-v10n1-waterman.pdf>>.
- . *Globalisation, Social Movements and the New Internationalisms*. London: Mansell/Continuum, 1998.
- . 'International Labour Studies 2000+: The International Labour Movement Between Geneva, Brussels, Seattle/Porto Alegre and Utopia.' 2003. <<http://www.commoner.org.uk/watermanlabstud.htm>>.
- . 'The Problematic Past and Uncertain Future of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.' *International Labor and Working Class History* 59 (2001): 125–32.
- . 'Whatever Is the Global Justice Movement Doing to the New International Social Movement Unionism?' *Journal of World-Systems Research* (forthcoming).

## Appendix

[This item should be taken as approximate. For a book based on the 2003 conference, see [http://www.ith.or.at/konf\\_e/39\\_tagungsband\\_ankuend\\_e.htm](http://www.ith.or.at/konf_e/39_tagungsband_ankuend_e.htm). PW]

## International Conference of Labour and Social History/ Kammer für Arbeiter und Angestellte Oberösterreichs

### Labour and New Social Movements in a Globalising World System Linz, Austria, 11–14 September 2003

#### *Historical Phases of the Relation of Labour and Globalisation*

Beverly Silver (Baltimore), 'Labor, Globalisation and World Politics: Contemporary Dynamics in World-Historical Perspectives.'

Ilse Lenz (Bochum), 'Veränderungen der Geschlechterverhältnisse in der Globalisierung der Wirtschaft' (Changes in Gender Relations under Economic Globalisation).

Ronaldo Munck (Liverpool), 'Labour, Globalisation and the "Polanyi Problem."'

*New and Old Forms of Labour in the Newly Industrialised Countries*

Ricardo Aronskind (Buenos Aires), 'The Impact of Global Trends and Local Changes on Latin American Workers.'

Christof Parnreiter (Vienna), 'Folgen der wirtschaftlichen Umstrukturierungen im Zuge der "Globalisierung" in Mexiko' (Effects of Economic Restructuring following 'Globalisation' in Mexico).

Minje Zhang (Hangzhou), 'Labour Migration and Social Development in China.'

*'New Social Movements,' NGOs: New Forms of Representation of 'Labour' on a Worldwide Scale?*

Peter Newell (Brighton), 'Managing Multinationals: Lessons from the Environmental Movement.'

Leo Gabriel (Vienna), 'Die andere Globalisierung: Strategien der sozialen Bewegungen in Lateinamerika' (The Other Globalisation: Strategies of Social Movements in Latin America).

*'Old' Forms of Labour Representation: Can Unions Act Globally?*

Andy Herod (Athens, Ga.), 'Impacts of the Transition on Unions in Eastern Europe.'

Jeffrey Harrod (Amsterdam), 'Can Unions Act Globally? Examples and Perspectives of Labour Representatives in the Global Economy.'

Willy Buschak (Dublin), 'Diskurs über "Globalisierung" in der internationalen Gewerkschaftsbewegung in den 1930er Jahren' (Discourse on 'Globalisation' in the International Trade Union Movement of the 1930s).

Marcel van der Linden (Amsterdam), 'The ICFTU at the Crossroads: An Historical Interpretation.'

John French (Durham, N.C.), 'International Trade Unionism and the Fight to Reshape the World that Trade Built: The Fight for International Workers Rights in a Globalising World, 1959–1999.'

*Final Discussion*

Commentary: Peter Waterman (The Hague)