

LSE

THE LONDON SCHOOL
OF ECONOMICS AND
POLITICAL SCIENCE ■

LSE Research Online

[Richard Hyman](#)

What future for industrial relations in Europe?

**Article (Accepted version)
(Refereed)**

Original citation:

Hyman, Richard (2018) *What future for industrial relations in Europe?* [Employee Relations](#), 40 (4). pp. 569-579. ISSN 0142-5455
DOI: [10.1108/ER-02-2018-0056](https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-02-2018-0056)

© 2018 Emerald Publishing Limited

This version available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/89229/>
Available in LSE Research Online: July 2018

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

This document is the author's final accepted version of the journal article. There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

WHAT FUTURE FOR INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN EUROPE?

Richard Hyman

Abstract

The systems of industrial relations which were consolidated in most of western Europe after 1945 and constructed in the ex-dictatorships of southern Europe in the 1970s, are under attack on many fronts. Meanwhile, in most of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), where systems of organised industrial relations were at best only partially established after the collapse of the Soviet regime, the scope for unilateral dominance by (in particular foreign-owned) employers has been further enlarged. It is also clear that the European Union (EU), far from acting as a force for harmonisation of regulatory standards and a strengthening of the 'social dimension' of employment regulation, is encouraging the erosion of nationally based employment protections and provoking a growing divergence of outcomes. However, the trends are contradictory and uneven. In this contribution I discuss a number of key similarities and differences across the countries of Europe, and end by considering whether progressive alternatives still exist.

Keywords

austerity, collective bargaining, Europe, globalisation, industrial relations, neoliberalism, trade unions

Introduction

As is clear from the other contributions to this special issue, the systems of industrial relations consolidated in most of western Europe after 1945 and constructed in the ex-dictatorships of southern Europe in the 1970s, are under attack on many fronts. Meanwhile, in most of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), where systems of organised industrial relations were at best only partially established after the collapse of the Soviet regime, the scope for unilateral dominance by (in particular foreign-owned) employers has been further enlarged. It is also clear that the European Union (EU), far from acting as a force for harmonisation of regulatory standards and a strengthening of the 'social dimension' of employment regulation, is encouraging the erosion of nationally based employment protections and provoking a growing divergence of outcomes.

In the following discussion I first discuss the transformations within global capitalism which everywhere have threatened established systems of institutionalised industrial relations. I then turn to the nationally specific dynamics which have resulted in growing diversity across Europe: what Lehndorff (2015a) terms 'divisive integration'. I end by considering what progressive options remain.

The New 'Great Transformation'

Karl Polanyi (1944), writing three-quarters of a century ago, interpreted the development of capitalist economies as the outcome of a 'double movement'. The first, in the nineteenth century, involved the imposition of 'free' markets (though the whole idea of free markets is an oxymoron, since all markets are social and political constructs). The damaging social effects of this process, in particular those transforming labour into a 'fictitious commodity' to be hired and fired at will, provoked a counter-movement. Hence the struggles in the twentieth century for social, industrial and economic democracy represented a countervailing process to impose some constraint on the disruptive social consequences of market liberalism. Markets became 'embedded' in a systematic regulatory web.

Polanyi anticipated a parallel reaction to the excesses of market-making at the international level: renewed state regulation of the domestic economy linked to a retreat from 'capitalist internationalism'. What however occurred was a new form of international regime, involving a bounded liberalisation of external trade, but linked to Keynesian economic management and a partial decommodification of labour at national level. 'The principles of multilateralism and tariff reductions were affirmed, but so were safeguards, exemptions, exceptions, and restrictions – all designed to protect the balance of payments and a variety of domestic social policies' (Ruggie, 1982: 381).

The post-war social compromise was inherently ambiguous and unstable, for three main reasons. First, it reflected a specific, historically contingent balance of class forces, and one largely confined to 'advanced' economies. Second, it assumed different forms cross-nationally, but in all cases involved an accommodation between national labour movements, employers who were primarily national in terms of corporate ownership and production strategies, and governments which were to a large degree autonomous in social and economic policy: an outcome of the bounded character of economic internationalisation which Ruggie described. Third, the existence of an alternative socio-economic model to the East – however deformed and repressive – imposed a degree of self-restraint on capitalist aggression.

These three preconditions no longer apply. What has developed in recent decades has been analysed by McMurtry (1998) as the 'cancer stage of capitalism'. Polanyi (1944: 73) described labour, land and money as 'fictitious commodities' because while they were all subject to market forces, unlike real commodities they were not produced for sale on the market. 'To allow the market mechanism to be the sole director of the fate of human beings and their natural environment, indeed, even of the amount and use of their purchasing power, would result in the demolition of society.' Certainly the post-war compromises imposed firm limits on the commodification of labour, land and money; but Polanyi's analysis was remarkably prescient. What has now occurred is the systematic weakening and removal of the social constraints on the destructive dynamic of commodification: a 'carcinogenic mutation' which has released the pathological potential which capitalist economies always contained (McMurtry, 1998: 127-128).

The cancer stage of capitalism is linked as both cause and effect to the erosion of the three preconditions of post-war social compromises. First, globalisation – of which European economic integration is one important element – has removed the dominant capitalist agglomerations from national control. There are many ways of conceptualising the historical development of globalisation, including its technological foundations and its geographical scope. What we would highlight are the changes in its core dynamic. Its earliest forms involved international movements of commodities: raw materials, manufactured products but also labour (including slave and semi-slave labour, as Nelson Lichtenstein reminds us). The mid-twentieth century saw a qualitative shift to the dominant role of multinational corporations and the development of what may best be called global surplus value chains, in which corporate strategists subject actual producers to constant pressures to cut costs, creating new forms of insecurity. In the third, most recent phase, finance capital intensifies the dynamic of commodification.

Financialisation is the second key transformation. Liberalisation of financial markets has spawned an array of exotic fictitious commodities which Polanyi could never have imagined: derivatives, secondary markets, hedge funds, private equity, leveraged buy-outs, credit default swaps.... It is now possible, and indeed more effective, to generate a surplus without producing value: money can be expanded without the production of commodities as traditionally understood. Corporations have themselves been transformed into commodities, increasingly bought and sold, creating new modes of insecurity: for growing numbers of workers (and their unions), it is no longer even clear *who* is the employer (Standing, 2011: 35).

The third transformation involves the reconfiguration of the role of the state. The post-war compromises involved the state in multiple ways. Particularly but not exclusively in Europe, legislation created a web of individual employment rights, and also buttressed collective representation of worker interests through trade unions and works councils. Welfare regimes were central to Polanyi's 'double movement'. Macroeconomic regulation on Keynesian lines sustained near-full employment. Governments themselves became major employers, typically committed to supporting high labour standards. But in recent decades, neoliberal globalisation has provided an alibi for anti-social policies by governments that insist that there is no alternative to submission to international markets (Weiss, 1998). On the one hand, government policies have been aimed at 'rolling back the state', and restricting social protections to those that can be justified on grounds of productivity and competitiveness; on the other, new and repressive forms of intervention have been required to impose the sway of market forces. The European Union (EU), once often viewed as a defender of decommodification, has become one of the key drivers of this process: its 'new economic governance' increasingly targets social welfare and employment protection; while the austerity

packages imposed on the ‘programme’ countries by the Troika of European Commission, European Central Bank (ECB) and International Monetary Fund have coercively imposed escalating insecurity.

National economies and national labour markets are thus increasingly *disembedded* from effective social regulation; and the beneficiaries of financialised ‘shareholder value’ capitalism have little interest in maintaining historic compromises. Keynesian macroeconomic management, one of the key foundations of the postwar settlement, presupposed the economic governance capacity of the nation-state; macroeconomic demand management has now been subordinated to the assumed inevitability of national ‘competitiveness’. Where significant productive and infrastructural assets were in public hands, in most countries these have now been largely privatized.

Thus the balance of class forces has shifted radically. These trends can be understood, within Polanyi’s framework, as a *counter-counter-movement*, a *third* phase involving the deliberate unravelling of the regulatory web constructed in previous decades. The norm of insecurity, widely believed to have been overcome in the mid-twentieth century, is increasingly re-imposed. The crisis which began in 2007-08 brought a rapid increase in unemployment, which in many countries persists. For many, and in some countries most new labour market entrants the only available employment opportunities are precarious: short-term contracts, bogus self-employment, agency work zero hours contracts.... What was once considered ‘atypical’ employment is now increasingly typical.

The growth of a new ‘reserve army of labour’ combines with the longer-term trend to ‘post-Fordism’ – the shift from industry to services and, within manufacturing, the contracting out of functions and the subdivision of corporate structures – to bring a proliferation of smaller employing units. This fragmentation of occupational status and identity intensifies competition within the working class and presents major obstacles to collective solidarity. Hence it is no surprise that trade union membership, as a proportion of the labour force, is almost universally in decline, as able 1 indicates. This trend, as Peters (2011) shows, can be attributed to the impact of the global financialisation of capitalism. In most of western Europe, collective bargaining coverage remains stable – though this is certainly not true of Britain, nor indeed of Germany – but its content has often been hollowed out through diverse forms of decentralization and concession bargaining.

For the past two or three decades, the wage share in national income has everywhere declined, and inequality has increased, in some countries dramatically. Even before the recent (and current) crisis, government budgets had been squeezed, to an important extent through a competitive reduction in corporation tax in an attempt to avoid capital flight: in consequence, the welfare state has been cut back, transformed increasingly into a minimal safety net. Even this diminished level of social protection is under threat as part of the current austerity drive, given an explicitly coercive character by the neoliberal rulers of the EU and the majority of member states.

[Table 1 about here]

‘Divisive Integration’

It has long been customary to identify a limited number of industrial relations patterns in Western Europe: the Nordic countries with strong traditions of labour market regulation based primarily on exceptionally strong central organisations of unions and employers, buttressed by highly developed welfare states and an egalitarian ethos; a ‘central’ model comprising Germany, Austria and the Benelux countries, with strong but less encompassing collective institutions, a ‘southern’ model with less organisational capacity among the collective organisations of capital and labour, and far greater dependence on the state as a regulatory mechanism; and as an outlier, the Anglophone countries of Ireland and the UK with more weakly regulated labour markets (Gumbrell-McCormick and Hyman 2013). Since EU enlargement in 2004, the CEE countries are often seen as a fifth, ‘transitional’ model (but transitional to what?), with particularly weakly developed collective institutions among the labour market actors and with governments torn between the pursuit of deregulated labour markets to enhance national competitiveness and anxiety to maintain social protection to avoid social protest and support the electoral base of the governing parties. Bohle and Greskovits (2007) have also suggested that the diversity among CEE countries necessitates further differentiation among country types:

neoliberalism in the Baltic states, ‘embedded neoliberalism’ (marketisation to some extent constrained by state regulation and social protection) in most countries, neocorporatism in Slovenia.

In recent years, such differences have increased. ‘The cleavages between unions *within* the groups of countries are deepening.... The country clusters frequently used in comparative trade union analyses make less sense today’ (Lehndorff et al. 2017: 9, 24). This need not mean that the familiar groupings of European industrial relations systems have lost heuristic utility. However, any attempt to systematise the patterns of industrial relations across Europe has become increasingly complicated because of the uneven impact of the crisis and subsequent EU initiatives to discipline national governments. Certainly, the ‘southern’ countries have been particularly severely affected in this respect; but so have several (though by no means all) CEE countries. Ireland stands out– with its US-style housing bubble and deregulated financial sector – as the first victim of the Troika process; the cost of rescuing failed banks more than doubled government debt between 2008 and 2010. Yet in terms of actual labour market outcomes, as Table 2 indicates, in 2012 (the peak of the crisis for most countries) there were still significant similarities within country groups.

As Lehndorff (2015b) documents, the incremental shift of EU policy towards neoliberalism has created a ‘competition Union’; and any competition results in both winners and losers. This dynamic is intensified for members of the eurozone, since Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) complemented the single market with a single currency but without an architecture for transfers between countries (as between regions in national political economies) with unequal competitive capacity. With any capacity to revalue national currencies removed, governments facing trade imbalances were obliged to resort to ‘internal devaluation’: in other words, cutting the real value of wages and social benefits. While the centrifugal dynamic among member states was evident from the outset of EMU, it was greatly intensified by the combined effects of the financial crisis, which imposed immense costs on some governments but not others in order to bail out failed banks, and the deflationary impact of the ‘new European economic governance’ (NEEG), particularly severe in the case of those countries receiving bail-out packages. Austerity became ‘the hard core of EU crisis policy’ (Lehndorff 2015b: 13). The deflationary squeeze on already struggling economies intensified unemployment and reduced tax revenues, accentuating the debt problem and hence escalating the vicious spiral, resulting in ‘a continent drifting apart’ (Lehndorff 2015b: 19).

This variable geometry is evident from the national accounts presented in earlier contributions. These eight cases can be supplemented by a number of other recent multi-country studies. Lehndorff (2015a) surveys the uneven impact of imposed austerity across Europe, with specific analyses of Spain, Italy, Greece, Ireland, Germany, France, Austria, the UK, Hungary and Sweden. Van Gyes and Schulten (2015) explore how the NEEG has affected wage bargaining at national level, with comparative studies of Italy, Portugal and Spain, the four Nordic countries, Hungary, Slovenia and the Czech Republic, and a separate study of the UK. Collective bargaining in the context of austerity and the NEEG is also the focus of Koukiadi et al. (2016), with studies of the manufacturing sector in Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia and Spain. Lehndorff et al. (2017) examine the impact of the crisis on trade unions, covering France, Spain, Italy, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, the UK and Sweden. ‘Internal devaluation’ is the focus of the studies in Myant et al. (2016) examining the cases of Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, Germany, the UK and Poland. While all these works are multi-authored edited collections, one may also note the book of Baccaro and Howell (2017), who discuss different dynamics towards neoliberalism across western Europe, with specific accounts of the UK, France, Germany, Italy and Sweden. Among a range of journal articles, one may also note the comparison by Meardi (2013) of Germany, France, the UK, Italy, Spain and Poland, and his subsequent analysis (2014) of the last three of these; the more encompassing study by Visser (2016) of trends in the coverage and character of collective bargaining in 38 OECD and EU countries; and the attempt by Marginson (2016) to theorise different modes of institutional change under the impact of economic globalisation.

The challenges to established industrial relations processes involve an interaction between structural, to a large extent transnational forces, and the strategies of ‘institutional entrepreneurs’ (Crouch 2005) at national level. The relative importance of internal and external drivers of change, and the degree to which these threaten the regulatory capacity of traditional institutional arrangements, entail major cross-national variations in the experience of the crisis years. To

systematise this diversity, I identify four main patterns, though the boundaries between these are relatively imprecise.

At one extreme are countries subject to externally imposed austerity and more specific requirements to weaken employment protection legislation, liberalise precarious contracts, decentralise collective bargaining, remove the priority of higher-level over lower-level agreements, weaken or abolish extension mechanisms and reduce minimum wages. Of the eight countries discussed by previous authors, Spain most clearly fits this category, and to some degree Romania. However, the most radical cases of externally imposed demolition of worker protections are Greece and Portugal, both subject to the severe constraints of 'Memoranda of Understanding' with the Troika as conditions for debt relief. To some extent, developments in Romania and Slovenia can be interpreted in the same terms; in particular, the elimination of many of the 'corporatist' characteristics established after Slovenian independence. Ireland was also subject to analogous constraints from the Troika, though its already weakly institutionalised industrial relations mechanisms were less radically transformed.

This category merges into a second, where less coercive external pressures reinforced already strong domestic moves to liberalisation. Here, the UK is the exemplary case: the financial crisis, and the subsequent government bail-out of failed banks, indeed substantially increased public debt; but the radical austerity measures imposed after the 2010 election were largely the reflection of a domestic political agenda. Moreover, the new legislative attacks on trade unions were purely an exercise in political vindictiveness. The cases of Italy and France present some similarities. In the former case, the 'secret letter' sent by the European Central Bank in 2011, when a default on government debt seemed possible, demanded radical changes in labour law and collective bargaining practices. The resulting changes, as Meardi (2012: 75) comments in his comparison of Spain and Italy, 'would not have been thinkable without direct institutional intervention from the EU. In few months, the European Commission and the ECB achieved what Spanish and Italian employers and rightwing government had not even dared to ask. Labour resistance, which had previously had some success, is now in a weaker position when fighting a more elusive opponent, uninterested in local political exchange and unaffected by general strikes.' Nevertheless, liberalisation of employment protection and collective bargaining was strongly embraced by both the Monti and Renzi governments, with the 'Jobs Act' which the latter pressed though being presented as a means to remedy labour market failing deemed responsible for high youth unemployment. Likewise, Rehfeldt in his article attributes the El Khomri law of 2016 to the fact that France was at risk of EU sanctions for 'excessive debt' and was under pressure from the Commission to cut labour costs and facilitate company-level derogations from sectoral collective agreements. Yet at the same time, this agenda was enthusiastically embraced by 'modernisers' within the Hollande government, and became central to the electoral programme of Macron in 2017. One could also argue that in both Slovenia and Romania, though external pressure was also decisive, deregulation and austerity measures were facilitated by powerful domestic actors.

As a third category, the majority of CEE countries, not yet fully integrated into financialised global capitalism and hence less exposed to the financial crisis (the Baltic states were obvious exceptions), were less severely affected than were many economies in the west. As Mrozowicki and Czarzasty argue in their account of Polish developments, the 'embedded neoliberalism' of the Visegrád countries has involved, as Bohle and Greskovits (2012) put it, 'a 'permanent search for compromises between market transformation and social cohesion'. The collective industrial relations actors are in general weak, but statutory individual employment protection is relatively strong. Within this context, developments during the past decade have largely reflected domestic political dynamics, with often authoritarian governments anxious to sustain populist support and hence reluctant to threaten workers' material conditions.

The fourth group, the Nordic and 'central' countries, includes the main winners from the eurozone and the 'competition Union'. Here, there was relatively little external pressure to transform industrial relations during the crisis, and the pressures for weakening of employment protection and decentralisation of collective bargaining have been primarily domestic. In these countries, it is a matter of debate how far recent changes have undermined the postwar industrial relations architecture. Müller-Jentsch concludes his contribution by arguing that 'there has been no radical break with the main institutions and structures whose history can be traced back to the Weimar Republic. Collective bargaining autonomy and co-determination have proved to be stable yet flexible institutions at the

core of the system.’ Yet as he also notes, ‘pessimists’ suggest that incremental erosion may have reached a stage where disintegration may be difficult to avoid. In the Danish case, Knudsen and Lind note that the traditional ‘voluntarist’ model of Nordic employment regulation is challenged by growing competition within the EU and by the threat of social dumping (reinforced by CJEU rulings such as the Laval judgment), and by a more general shift in the balance of power towards employers; but they conclude by stressing the continuity of the system. Again, there are more pessimistic readings, in particular the account of Sweden by Baccaro and Howell (2017). In the case of this fourth group, stability and continuity must be read comparatively: as against the coercive destruction of regulatory institutions elsewhere in Europe, erosion is indeed limited. Whether vulnerability is increasing in these countries too remains a serious question.

What Is to Be Done?

Hence to differing degrees, the balance of class forces in Europe has shifted dramatically towards employers, and capital has increasingly escaped the constraints painfully constructed in previous decades, while the dominant approach of the EU is to reinforce rather than to regulate this trend. Is the juggernaut of capital now irresistible? The starting point for any sober assessment of alternative trajectories is that structural forces are powerful, but that agency is also important. To explore the tension between structure and agency we need to focus on social relations. These relations are in turn always uneven and contradictory, creating openness to historical contingency, since material contexts impose constraints but also create opportunities. The organisational capacities and strategic competence of the key actors shape the outcomes, perhaps producing the difference between success and failure.

The cross-national differences in the dynamics of institutional change and regulatory reconfiguration can be understood in terms of the concept of variable geometry. Any discussion of possibilities for resistance to attacks on workers’ conditions and the rights of collective organisation needs to address in particular three aspects of unevenness: the relationship between the global and the local; that between trade unions and other vectors of protest; and the challenge of crafting solidarity from diversity. To fight back against the odds requires strategic imagination, new alliances and transnational learning and solidarity.

Globalisation is by definition supranational; the modalities of resistance are predominantly national, or indeed sub-national. This variable geometry in part reflects national differences in opportunity structures, in part diverse historical traditions and repertoires of contention (Tilly, 2006). But while resistance to globalised insecurity occurs in nationally specific contexts, its focus must unavoidably be international. This is one of the central arguments developed in recent decades by the alter-globalisation movements. Trade unionisms have their own, more institutionalised international structures, but internationalism is far less embedded in everyday trade union action. And internationalism means little if it is purely a concern of ‘international experts’: it must be built into the routine discourse and practice of labour movements. In this respect, what Tarrow (2006) calls ‘the new transnational activism’, often orchestrated by what he terms ‘rooted cosmopolitans’ who are locally embedded but globally oriented and connected, may represent a more agile form of cross-national coordination. The fact that labour in some countries has (as yet) been little affected by the crisis, while the impact in others has been devastating, obviously intensifies the obstacles to transnational solidarity.

There is a long history of mutual suspicion between trade unions and more spontaneous, often activist-led social movements and NGOs; yet neither form of resistance can succeed alone. Almost everywhere, unions have lost power resources. Structural power is severely weakened by globalisation, and associational power has declined with falling membership density. In much of western Europe, institutional power remains superficially robust, which can induce complacency, as was long the case with German unions; but without other supports, institutional status can be fragile (Hassel, 2007). Unions are almost universally weak among the younger workers who, as shown earlier, have been particularly seriously affected by the erosion of labour market security. Many of the victims of insecurity see trade unions as part of the problem. Yet if protests against austerity, unemployment and precarious work have commonly been led by more radical social movements, their

very spontaneity obstructs sustained resistance; and in some cases they become captured by highly politicised ‘orchestrators’. Organisational divisions and rivalries can seriously weaken the capacity for effective action. Where these divisions are transcended, important synergies can be created between the different types of collective actor. As Ibsen and Tapia (2017) show, there is growing evidence of successful attempts by unions to build ‘coalitional power’ with other social movements.

Globalised ‘neo-entrepreneurial’ capitalism, as Jenkins and Leicht (1997: 379) term it, ‘produces a more fragmented labor market as it also shrinks the number of established places for members of the working class’. Different social and economic groups have been affected in significantly different ways by crisis and austerity, and these differences can create new divisions and antagonisms, not the supposed unity of the ‘99%’. A sense of mutuality, of a common fate and common interests, is not objectively given but is a task requiring a difficult struggle. Unity cannot be built by a linguistic sleight-of-hand – ‘the people united’ – but requires sustained dialogue and debate, otherwise the interests of the weakest are easily submerged beneath a spurious assumption of commonality.

The construction of solidarities at both national and international levels involves vital cognitive and discursive elements. In this context, della Porta (2012: 276) notes that ‘the proposals and practices of the *indignados* and occupying movement – as well as those spread in and by the Arab Spring – resonate in fact with (more traditional) participatory visions, but also with new deliberative conceptions that underline the importance of creating multiple public spaces, egalitarian but plural’. For Melucci (1989), the creation of a collective identity is a process of negotiation over time which contains three aspects: shaping a cognitive framework within which the environment is understood and goals and tactics are formulated; fostering social relationships among participants; and stimulating an emotional dynamic among those involved. Such processes are somewhat alien to most trade unionisms (or have been lost over time), but have been vital for many of the ‘new’ social movements. Hence developing synergies between the organisational capacity of the ‘old’ and the imaginative spontaneity of the ‘new’, drawing on the strengths of each, is an important means to build effective resistance to the re-commodification of labour.

It is necessary to address the systemic nature of the crisis, but in comprehensible terms. Movements of resistance must embrace the principle that ‘capitalism is the reality, but not our perspective’ (Urban, 2014: 41). To be effective, different modes of resistance must be mutually supportive, and above all must be informed by a vision of an alternative. The challenge, as always for those pursuing a different socio-economic order, is to formulate alternatives which are concrete, comprehensible and attractive. The issue is partly one of language, to simplify without trivialising; but it is also to provide concrete examples of economic solidarity outside the market. And indeed, a key element in a number of the protests in the worst affected countries – notably in Spain and in Greece – has been the collective provision and exchange of food, health care and other services, bypassing the money economy, and this has certainly helped enthuse and empower many of those worst affected by insecurity and austerity.

Those who drive neoliberal globalisation, the hegemony of finance capital and the politics of insecurity and austerity rely on the demoralisation of their victims. Resistance may well draw its inspiration from anger, but to be translated into constructive action it requires self-confidence in the capacity to initiate change. In dark times, to build hope is perhaps the most difficult challenge, and not only because hopes can so easily be disappointed. But fatalism and surrender should not be the only options. Another world – and another Europe – is possible.

References

- Baccaro, L and Howell, C (2017) *Trajectories of Neoliberal Transformation: European Industrial Relations since the 1970s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bohle, D and Greskovits, B (2007) ‘Neoliberalism, embedded neoliberalism and neocorporatism: Towards transnational capitalism in Central-Eastern Europe’, *West European Politics* 30(3): 443-466.
- Crouch, C. (2005) *Capitalist Diversity and Change: Recombinant Governance and Institutional Entrepreneurs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- della Porta, D (2012) 'Mobilizing against the Crisis, Mobilizing for "Another Democracy": Comparing Two Global Waves of Protest', *Interface* 4(1): 274-277.
- Gumbrell-McCormick, R and Hyman, R (2013) *Trade Unions in Western Europe: Hard Times, Hard Choices*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Hassel, A. (2007) 'The Curse of Institutional Security: The Erosion of German Trade Unionism', *Industrielle Beziehungen* 14(2): 176-91.
- Ibsen, CL and Tapia, M (2017) 'Trade union revitalisation: Where are we now? Where to next?', *Journal of Industrial Relations* 59(2): 170-191.
- Jenkins, JC and Leicht, K (1997) 'Class Analysis and Social Movements: A Critique and Reformulation' in JR Hall (ed.) *Reworking Class*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, pp. 369-397.
- Koukiadaki, VA, Távora, I and Martínez Lucio, M, eds (2016) *Joint regulation and labour market policy in Europe during the crisis*. Brussels: ETUI.
- Lehndorff, S, ed. (2015a) *Divisive integration: The triumph of failed ideas in Europe – revisited*. Brussels: ETUI.
- Lehndorff, S (2015b) 'Europe's Divisive Integration: An Overview' in S Lehndorff, ed., *Divisive integration: The triumph of failed ideas in Europe – revisited*. Brussels: ETUI, 7-37.
- Lehndorff, S, Dribbusch, H and Schulten, T, eds (2017) *Rough waters: European trade unions in a time of crises*. Brussels: ETUI.
- McMurtry, J (1998) *The Cancer Stage of Capitalism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Marginson, P (2016) 'Governing Work and Employment Relations in an Internationalized Economy: The Institutional Challenge', *ILR Review* 69(5): 1033-1055.4
- Meardi, G (2012) "'Mediterranean Capitalism" under EU Pressure: Labour Market Reforms in Spain and Italy, 2010–2012', *Warsaw Forum of Economic Sociology* 3(1): 51-81.
- Meardi, G (2013) 'Les relations professionnelles européennes sous pression internationale. Une comparaison de six pays', *La Revue de l'Ires* 74: 35-60.
- Meardi, G (2014) 'Peripheral Convergence in the Crisis? Southern and Eastern European Labour Markets and Industrial Relations', *Warsaw Forum of Economic Sociology* 5(1): 7-27.
- Melucci, A (1989) *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. Philadelphia: Temple UP.
- Myant, M, Theodoropoulou, S and Piasna, A, eds (2016) *Unemployment, internal devaluation and labour market deregulation in Europe*. Brussels: ETUI.
- Peters, J (2011) 'The Rise of Finance and the Decline of Organised Labour in the Advanced Capitalist Countries', *New Political Economy* 16(1): 73-99.
- Polanyi P (1944) *The Great Transformation*. New York: Rinehart.
- Ruggie, J.G. (1982) 'International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order', *International Organization* 36(2): 379-415.
- Standing, G (2011). *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Tarrow, S (2006) *The New Transnational Activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Tilly, C (2006) *Regimes and Repertoires*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Urban, H-J (2014) 'Zwischen Defensive und Revitalisierung', *Sozialismus* 11/2014: 35-41.
- Van Gyes, G and Schulten, T, eds (2015) *Wage bargaining under the new European Economic Governance: Alternative strategies for inclusive growth*. Brussels: ETUI.
- Visser, J (2015) ICTWSS database. <http://www.uva-aias.net/208>
- Visser, J (2016) 'What happened to collective bargaining during the great recession?', *IZA Journal of Labor Policy* (2016) 5(9): 1-25.

Biographical note

Richard Hyman is Emeritus Professor of Industrial Relations at the London School of Economics, UK and editor of the *European Journal of Industrial Relations*. He has written widely on industrial relations in general and trade unions and conflict in particular. While concerned with comparative analysis in general his primary expertise is with experience in Europe.

Table 1. Trade Union Density and Collective Bargaining Coverage

	Union Density				Bargaining Coverage			
	1980	1990	2000	2014 ^a	1980	1990	2000	2014 ^a
FI	69	73	75	69	77	81	86	93
DK	79	75	74	67	72	69	80	84
SE	78	82	80	67	85	88	91	89
BE	54	54	49	55	97	96	96	96
NO	58	59	54	52	70	70	72	67
IT	48	39	35	37	85	83	80	80
IE	64	57	40	34	64	60	55	41
AT	57	47	37	27	95	99	99	98
UK	51	39	30	26	70	54	36	30
SI		69	42	21		100	100	65
EL		39	34	22		65	65	42
RO	100	80	40	20				35
BG	98	81	28	18			40	29
DE	35	31	25	18	78	72	64	58
NL	35	24	23	18	79	82	86	85
PT	55	28	22	19	70	99	92	73
ES	19	13	17	17	76	82	83	78
CH	28	28	23	16	48	44	42	49
CZ			27	13			41	47
SK			32	13			51	25
LV			26	13			18	15
PL	65	37	17	13			25	15
HU	94	83	22	11			47	23
LT			17	9			15	10
FR	18	10	8	8	85	92	95	98
EE		94	15	7			29	23

^a For some countries, 2013

Source: ICTWSS database, based on national sources (Visser 2015)

Table 2. Labour Market Indicators, 2012, by country groups

	Population (million)	Employment rate 15-64 (%)		Unemployment (%)		Fixed-term (%)		Part-time (%)	
		All	Female	All	15-24	All	15-24	All	Female
DK	5.5	73	70	8	14	9	21	25	36
FI	5.3	69	68	8	19	16	41	14	19
NO	4.8	76	74	3	9	8	24	27	42
SE	9.3	74	72	8	24	16	57	25	39
AT	8.4	73	67	4	9	9	36	25	44
BE	11.1	62	57	8	20	8	31	25	44
CH	7.7	79	74	4	8	13	53	35	60
DE	82.0	73	68	6	8	14	53 ^a	26	45
NL	16.5	75	70	5	10	20	51	49 ^b	77 ^a
EL	11.2	51	42	24	35	10	26	8	12
ES	46.2	55	51	25	53	24	65	15	24
FR	62.5	64	60	10	24	15	57	18	30
IT	60.0	57	47	11	35	14	53	17	31
PT	10.6	62	59	16	38	21	56	11	14
IE	4.5	59	55	15	30	10	35	24	35
UK	62.0	70	65	8	21	6	15	26	42
EE	1.3	67	65	10	21	4	13	9	13
LT	2.2	62	62	13	26	3	9	9	11
LV	3.2	63	62	15	28	5	10	9	11
BG	7.5	59	56	12	28	5	7	2	3
RO	20.4	60	53	7	23	2	6	9	10
CZ	10.4	67	58	7	20	9	27	5	9
HU	10.0	57	52	11	28	9	22	7	9
PL	38.1	60	53	10	27	27	66	7	11
SK	5.4	60	53	14	34	7	19	4	6
SI	2.0	64	61	9	21	17	72	9	12

^a Note that in DE, this figure is inflated by the high proportion of apprentices who are categorised as fixed-term.

^b In NL, part-time status is defined as working under 35 hours a week; elsewhere, it is based on employees' self-definition

Source: eurostat