



Cornell University
ILR School

Cornell University ILR School
DigitalCommons@ILR

Book Samples

ILR Press

2013

Global Unions, Local Power: The New Spirit of Transnational Labor Organizing

Jamie K. McCallum

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/books>

Thank you for downloading an article from DigitalCommons@ILR.

Support this valuable resource today!

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the ILR Press at DigitalCommons@ILR. It has been accepted for inclusion in Book Samples by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@ILR. For more information, please contact catherwood-dig@cornell.edu.

If you have a disability and are having trouble accessing information on this website or need materials in an alternate format, contact web-accessibility@cornell.edu for assistance.

Global Unions, Local Power: The New Spirit of Transnational Labor Organizing

Abstract

[Excerpt] This book is about two parallel stories. First, it relates the account of the most aggressive campaign ever waged by a global union federation (GUF), a years-long effort of private security guard unions to organize against Group4 Securicor (G4S), the world's largest private employer after Walmart. What began as an isolated battle in the United States blossomed into a worldwide struggle for global unionism impacting hundreds of thousands of workers from over twenty countries. But the global effort also gave rise to deep local struggles. Consequently, the narrative moves among different scales of action, from the global arena, to the national-level context, to the local union office. Throughout the campaign, workers in different places won wage increases, union recognition, benefits, an end to abusive workplace discrimination, and, most importantly, a greater degree of control over their employer's business model. In the United States, security guard union density (8 percent as of late 2012) is now slightly higher than the national private-sector average, and the campaign settlement provides the union with a clearer path to bring more workers into the fold. Rarely have global campaigns meant more than superficial changes in workers' lives—this struggle set a new standard.

The second story describes a transition to a new spirit of transnational labor activism. The word "spirit" implies a shifting idea about how labor should best confront the problems posed by global capital. In a context of rising corporate power and declining or unenforceable worker rights (publicly enforceable claims), many of labor's tried and true strategies have proven wholly ineffective. In response, since the early 1970s unions have engaged in what I call "governance struggles," a panoply of strategies to subordinate the rules-based logic of private companies to democratic oversight by workers and their unions. The significance of the fight against G4S is the complex and contradictory ways in which those gains at the global level were articulated onto the local context, enhancing worker mobilization and transforming local union movements.

Most global union campaigns seek to assert universal labor standards and core values within a given company. But the inability to transfer any gains to the local context has often meant that workers' lives remain unchanged. Rather than insist on the incompatibility of global and local levels of activism, the findings in this book suggest a paradox—effective global unionism requires reciprocity with local actors. The conclusions also permit cautious optimism about the prospects for authentic labor internationalism where others have asserted an overriding pessimism (see Burawoy 2010). The question therefore posed here is simple: How can global unions build local power?

Keywords

labor movement, organizing, unions, activism

Comments

The abstract, table of contents, and first twenty-five pages are published with permission from the Cornell University Press. For ordering information, please visit the [Cornell University Press](https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/books/89).

GLOBAL UNIONS, LOCAL POWER

*The New Spirit of Transnational
Labor Organizing*

JAMIE K. McCALLUM

ILR PRESS
AN IMPRINT OF
CORNELL UNIVERSITY PRESS
ITHACA AND LONDON

Copyright © 2013 by Cornell University

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotations in a review, this book, or parts thereof, must not be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher. For information, address Cornell University Press, Sage House, 512 East State Street, Ithaca, New York 14850.

First published 2013 by Cornell University Press

First printing, Cornell Paperbacks, 2013
Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

McCallum, Jamie K., 1977– author.

Global unions, local power : the new spirit of transnational labor organizing / Jamie K. McCallum.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8014-5193-5 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-0-8014-7862-8 (pbk. : alk. paper) 1. International labor activities. 2. Labor and globalization. 3. Labor movement—International cooperation. 4. Transnationalism. I. Title.

HD6475.A1M33 2013

331.88—dc23

2013002325

Cornell University Press strives to use environmentally responsible suppliers and materials to the fullest extent possible in the publishing of its books. Such materials include vegetable-based, low-VOC inks and acid-free papers that are recycled, totally chlorine-free, or partly composed of nonwood fibers. For further information, visit our website at www.cornellpress.cornell.edu.

Cloth printing	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Paperback printing	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

To my family, with gratitude

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ix
List of Abbreviations	xiii
Introduction	1
1. Forging the New Labor Transnationalism: Governance Struggles and Worker Power	19
2. The Globalization of the Organizing Model	48
3. The Campaign against G4S: Globalizing Governance Struggles	74
4. Transnationalism, Mobilization, and Renewal: The Battle with G4S in South Africa	99
5. Organizing the “Unorganized”: Varieties of Labor Transnationalism in India	122

Conclusion: Labor's Prospect	145
Appendix: Comparative Research at the Global Level	161
Notes	167
References	179
Index	205

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book owes its life to the unionists and workers who shared their time and stories with me throughout the years I conducted research. You are the ardent couriers of an old idea made new again. In particular, I must recognize Mr. Cheeks, whose singular wisdom, courage, and compassion were so important.

It is not a book about why David sometimes wins or a recipe for labor union success. Nor was it written to “give voice” to low-wage workers struggling for a better life. Rather, I undertook the project to make sense of a particular historical conjuncture for labor. Along the way—and it was quite a journey—I accrued many personal debts.

At the City University of New York I owe endless appreciation to Frances Fox Piven, Ruth Milkman, John Torpey, and Stanley Aronowitz for their mentorship and insights over many years. I benefited from the support of a research grant from the Graduate Center and a fellowship at the Center for Place, Culture, and Politics, where I had the insightful criticism of David Harvey, Peter Hitchcock, Ruthie Gilmore, Manny Ness, and others.

Blair Taylor was an astute editor and critic. Patrick Inglis helpfully challenged some of my assumptions, forcing a greater degree of clarity. All in all, the lumpen intelligentsia of New York City was an amazing resource, and I have drawn on many people within important institutions as this work has moved forward—my comrades at Left Forum, Brecht Forum, and Bluestockings deserve special mention.

Peter Evans and Dimitris Stevis lent their considerable talent and expertise to reviewing this manuscript. I am grateful to have had such politically engaged and intellectually rigorous scholars improve my work. The book changed considerably as a result of their insights.

Outside the United States I am grateful for the guidance, feedback, and friendship over the years of Ian Greer in London. At the Freie Universität, Mike Fichter roped me into a four-country study of global framework agreements, funded by the Hans-Böckler-Stiftung, that significantly influenced my views on governance. Eddie Webster offered me space to work and sage advice at the Sociology of Work Unit at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, as did Supriya RoyChowdhury at the Institute for Social and Economic Change in Bangalore. In Geneva, my work was aided by Dan Gallin at the Global Labour Institute and Konstantinos Papadakis at the International Labor Organization. Lisa Berntsen in Rotterdam provided important translation assistance.

On the first day of my research abroad I acquired swine flu (H1N1), foisting me into the epicenter of a global pandemic. This presaged a series of research trips fraught with minor calamities that nearly ended my fieldwork numerous times—a bus crash near the Nepal border, a near-drowning in the Bay of Bengal, and a violent attack in Soweto. All of this contributed to the alienation and sensory overload that major cities in the developing world are famous for bestowing on new arrivals. For their care and patience during these times I owe heaps of gratitude to Lotta Staffans, Jason Hopps, Rebecca Harrison, Gretchen Wilson, Sowmya and Sriraj Reddy, Auntie and Uncle Ramalinga Reddy, Harish N., Anushree Sahay, and Sunil Kumar. In South Africa I would have been useless without the expert advice of Crispen Chinguno.

Over the years my research was aided by a network of global trade unionists and political activists who were sympathetic to my project and became important stakeholders in my success. Though most of them remain nameless in the book, their imprint is on every page. I am grateful for

the help of several veteran organizers who took time to read versions of the manuscript, bluntly correcting me when I simply did not “get it.” In particular, I thank Audra Makuch, Muni Citrin, and Jane McAlevey for their careful insights into the world of labor. Jenna Latour-Nichols and Alan Sutton offered considerable help editing the manuscript as well as vital research assistance.

Some of this was written while I was actively engaged in labor union activity, on the margins of the proverbial trenches. The final stages took place while I contemplated various editing decisions from the comfort of an Adirondack chair overlooking the Green Mountains. I credit a handful of my students with reminding me that one’s perspective and vantage point matters and to be mindful of that when considering pronouncements on the fate and future of movements. My colleagues in sociology and anthropology at Middlebury also shared their wisdom and varied expertise as I set about making revisions.

Fran Benson challenged me to write this book the first day we met, and her guidance throughout the process gave me the confidence to make the big decisions necessary to finish the job. I thank her and the wide array of talented folks at Cornell ILR Press.

Finally, my family, to whom this book is dedicated, deserves their own special roped-off area of gratitude. For making Vermont feel like home (where the heart is), I thank Erin. Her support made my life full of laughter and love when it was most needed. Her take on the world—a committed bottom-up perspective—always challenged my well-worn ways of thinking. My brother, Fox, doubles as a best friend, and I am indebted to him for all that accrues from blood and comradeship. In addition, he deserves notable recognition for his good sense in bringing Jill, Oliver, and Eudora Lee into the family, all of whom have changed my life. My parents, my greatest mentors, inspired in me a curiosity for the world that made me who I am. Their unconditional support has never wavered, for which I will be ever grateful.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACFTU	All China Federation of Trade Unions
ACTU	Australian Council of Trade Unions
AFL	American Federation of Labor
AIFLD	American Institute for Free Labor Development
AITUC	All India Trade Union Congress
ANC	African National Congress
CIO	Congress of Industrial Organizations
CITU	Centre of Indian Trade Unions
COCOSA	Coordinating Committee of South Africa
COSATU	Congress of South African Trade Unions
CSR	corporate social responsibility
CTW	Change to Win
EWC	European Works Council
FOSATU	Federation of South African Trade Unions
G4S	Group 4 Securicor
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

GFA	global framework agreement
GMB	General Workers Union
GUF	global union federation
IAD	International Affairs Department
ICEM	International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine, and General Workers' Unions
ICFTU	International Confederation of Free Trade Unions
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IMF (Union)	International Metalworkers Federation
INTUC	Indian National Trade Union Congress
ISS	International Services
ISWOI	Indian Security Workers Organizing Initiative
ITF	International Transport Federation
ITS	International Trade Secretariat
IWW	Industrial Workers of the World
J4J	Justice for Janitors
LHMU	Liquor Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union
Mercosur	Southern Common Market
MSF	Manufacturing, Science, and Finance Union
NACTU	National Council of Trade Unions
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NGO	nongovernmental organization
NUM	National Union of Mineworkers
NUMSA	National Union of Mineworkers South Africa
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PSGU	Private Security Guards Union
RICO Act	Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act
SACTU	South African Congress of Trade Unions
SARHWU	South African Railway and Harbour Workers Union
SATAWU	South African Transport and Allied Workers Union
SEIU	Service Employees International Union
SIGTUR	Southern Initiative on Globalization and Trade Union Rights
SMU	Social Movement Unionism
TGWU	Transport and General Workers Union (UK)
TINA	There Is No Alternative

UAW	United Auto Workers
UNI	Union Network International
UNIDOC	Union Development and Organizing Centers
UNI PS	UNI Property Services
UNISON	Public Service Trade Union
UNITE	Union of Needle Trades, Industrial, and Textile Employees
WFTU	World Federation of Trade Unions
WTO	World Trade Organization

GLOBAL UNIONS, LOCAL POWER

INTRODUCTION

Just over a decade ago, the reigning doxa held that neoliberal globalization was a death sentence for labor standards and worker organizations. An inevitable race to the bottom hollowed out trade unions, undermined state protections, and placed national working classes in competition with one another for scarce jobs. Whereas capital had no country, workers, it seemed, were locked in place and left behind. As Piven and Cloward (2000: 413) summarized this belief, "Globalization in turn seems to puncture the century-old belief in worker power."

But the renaissance of global labor activism that began alongside an explosion of alter-globalization¹ movements in the late 1990s has inspired a new perspective on the relationship of workers to the global economy—and a variety of substantive studies on a new dimension of labor movement activity. As a challenge to the fatalistic conception that globalization² necessarily undermined the power of workers, scholars, and activists formed the skeletal framework of a counter-thesis, questioning the supposed fixity of labor within the national context and its inherent weakness in the face of

global capital (see Evans 2008, 2010; Herod 2001; Munck 2002). Animated by the prospect of a new “great transformation,” they asserted that unions are forging a new frontier within an old tradition—global unions for the global age.

However, in the scramble to understand the increasing tendency of labor politics to “go global,” scholars have overlooked many of the most critical details on the ground. This book redirects our attention to the manner in which transnational campaigns empower or inspire local movements, still the place it matters most. While some research has assessed the local *impacts* of transnational labor activism, the argument here is from the opposite direction, suggesting that local contexts determine the local strategy. Moreover, while important studies have argued that transnational labor advocacy has the tendency to undermine the autonomy and power of local movements (Seidman 2008), the campaigns examined here are inspired by global priorities and yet have empowered local struggles.

This book is about two parallel stories. First, it relates the account of the most aggressive campaign ever waged by a global union federation (GUF), a years-long effort of private security guard unions to organize against Group4 Securicor (G4S), the world’s largest private employer after Walmart. What began as an isolated battle in the United States blossomed into a worldwide struggle for global unionism impacting hundreds of thousands of workers from over twenty countries. But the global effort also gave rise to deep local struggles. Consequently, the narrative moves among different scales of action, from the global arena, to the national-level context, to the local union office. Throughout the campaign, workers in different places won wage increases, union recognition, benefits, an end to abusive workplace discrimination, and, most importantly, a greater degree of control over their employer’s business model. In the United States, security guard union density (8 percent as of late 2012) is now slightly higher than the national private-sector average, and the campaign settlement provides the union with a clearer path to bring more workers into the fold. Rarely have global campaigns meant more than superficial changes in workers’ lives—this struggle set a new standard.

The second story describes a transition to a new spirit of transnational labor activism. The word “spirit” implies a shifting idea about how labor should best confront the problems posed by global capital. In a context of rising corporate power and declining or unenforceable worker rights

(publicly enforceable claims), many of labor's tried and true strategies have proven wholly ineffective. In response, since the early 1970s unions have engaged in what I call "governance struggles," a panoply of strategies to subordinate the rules-based logic of private companies to democratic oversight by workers and their unions. The significance of the fight against G4S is the complex and contradictory ways in which those gains at the global level were articulated onto the local context, enhancing worker mobilization and transforming local union movements.

Most global union campaigns seek to assert universal labor standards and core values within a given company. But the inability to transfer any gains to the local context has often meant that workers' lives remain unchanged. Rather than insist on the incompatibility of global and local levels of activism, the findings in this book suggest a paradox—effective global unionism requires reciprocity with local actors. The conclusions also permit cautious optimism about the prospects for authentic labor internationalism where others have asserted an overriding pessimism (see Burawoy 2010). The question therefore posed here is simple: How can global unions build local power?

Backdrop

In 2008 I hosted two trade union organizers from India who coordinated global campaigns for Union Network International (UNI) Global Union, the largest of the global unions. They were on their way to a conference in Puerto Rico hosted by the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), a prominent and controversial North American union. Their job was to coordinate a campaign to raise the living and working standards of five million private security guards. They claimed to have built a coherent network of unionists sufficiently mobilized to take on the country's largest employer, a private security firm called G4S. Moreover, they were not alone. Others like them were coordinating the same campaign against the same employer in Africa, Eastern Europe, Latin America, and the United States.

As a former organizer myself, I was deeply cynical about the prospects for cross-border collaboration among unions. The obstacles always seemed insurmountable. Aside from a common employer, in some cases, what did the workers of the world truly share? It seemed wise to heed the cautionary tale of history, which suggested that hostility, in some form or another, was

a far more likely response to globalism than solidarity. The brief outpouring of internationalism around the dramatic 1999 World Trade Organization protests in Seattle had come and gone rather quickly, with labor retreating into national protectionism. Besides, it was hard enough winning campaigns in New York and New Jersey—forget about New Delhi.

Moreover, at that time the US labor movement was deeply embroiled in fratricide. For example, the Puerto Rico conference ended with the dramatic takeover of the local democratically elected teachers union by the SEIU (through its cooperation with corrupt local political elites).³ This was a disheartening finale to an event that was to ostensibly focus on building global solidarity. Given these circumstances—when leading unions were driving wedges into their own organizations, and when labor imperialism seemed to be making a surprising comeback—it seemed justifiably insane to suggest they should lead a global organizing agenda. Yet that is exactly what my houseguests were proposing.

Further inspection, however, inspired me to reconsider my position. Maritime seafarers across the globe had recently concluded one of their first rounds of global collective bargaining, realizing an unfulfilled dream of the automobile worker unions in the late 1960s (Lillie 2006). European workers seemed to be embracing the “works councils” that emerged from the post-Maastricht environment to coordinate efforts across borders (Waddington 2011). Campaigns by international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and watchdog groups had directed the corporate charters of some multinational garment producers toward fairer working conditions in export processing zones (Anner 2011). GUFs in Europe were winning framework agreements in an attempt to constrain management behavior so that workers could organize (Wills 2002). Overall, scholars began heralding the beginnings of an inchoate worldwide labor movement, a perspective that gained support with the 2008 merger of the American, Canadian, and British steelworker unions. Finally, the SEIU and a handful of other US unions were developing genuine cross-border coalitions with sister unions in Europe, Australia, and the United Kingdom. This upsurge in labor transnationalism inspired a scholarly interest in labor as a vital counterweight to unfettered global capitalism (Moody 1997; Gordon and Turner 2000; Bronfenbrenner 2007; Stevis and Boswell 2007a and b; Waterman and Wills 2002; Munck and Waterman 1999; Munck 2002; Webster, Lambert, and Beziudenhout 2008; Evans 2010).

Absent from these accounts, however, was the heart of unionism—campaigns by workers against bosses. Searching for cases of actually existing union transnationalism was stymied for multiple reasons. For starters, global unionism is not the product of where we would most expect it, the International Trade Union Confederation, the umbrella organization for the global labor movement. Rather, nearly all instances of labor transnationalism emerge from within individual GUFs, and many of those are driven by large national affiliates in the United States. Second, many campaigns that claimed to be “global” in scope were only one-way foreign aid efforts. And on the rare occasions when unions were able to extract promises of good behavior from employers at the global level, they had no ability to enforce the changes locally.

Most confusing of all was the seeming schizophrenia at the SEIU. Though the union seemed, on the one hand, committed to a more comprehensive and cooperative global union approach, its indefatigable leader at the time, Andrew Stern, had recently declared his intention to outsource strikes to low-wage countries. Such an interpretation of international solidarity would be comical if it did not recall the ugly history of US labor’s role in the American imperium. Consequently, the most paradoxical part of the story in this book is the leading role currently played by American trade unions in the global labor movement. Why should such enfeebled unions in the United States have any solidarity to offer the comparatively stronger traditions in Western Europe and in the leading countries of the South?

The emerging scholarly literature on global unionism was as intriguing as it was filled with generalizations and hyperbole. Some scholars’ accounts were wildly optimistic, full of exuberant comparisons to Marx’s First International. Other perspectives were from committed pessimists—but without the critical engagement to offer anything constructive. In either case it was heavy on speculation about a new global possibility but light on how it actually worked.

In the spring of 2009 I attended UNI’s global conference at SEIU’s downtown headquarters in New York City, hoping to gain a greater insight into actually existing labor transnationalism. Instead, the meeting showcased a variety of campaigns that reinforced my worst fears about global unionism—bureaucratic approaches to convince transnational companies to “do the right thing,” a vague and uninspiring platitude that evoked the common story of labor’s weakness more than its strength. Then the talk

turned toward the G4S campaign; against this backdrop, it seemed all the more incongruous.

G4S puts 650,000 security guards to work in 125 countries, keeping watch over everything from strip malls to nuclear weapons laboratories, from the tennis courts at Wimbledon to the battlefields of Iraq. It shepherds the rich and famous throughout the developing world, occasionally fighting pirate ships in the Indian Ocean.⁴ It has steadily grown richer and more powerful not *despite* the global economic crisis but *because* of it, having benefited from the perceived increased need for its services given public budgetary shortfalls, crime spikes, and heightened threats of terrorism and political violence. The mostly failed attempts to unionize within the company's US-based subsidiary, Wackenhut, were well known, making the achievements of the global effort all the more perplexing. Interested in unraveling the exceptional nature of this campaign, I decided to study an example of what was possible rather than what was predictable.

Organizing the Global Security Sector

The SEIU grew into the most dynamic union in the country during the 1990s, and its momentum continued in the early years of the new century, as it organized security guards at some of the same large retail office buildings where it had begun the pioneering Justice for Janitors campaigns (see chapter 2). The union set its sights on the \$34 billion security industry at just the moment when it became dominated by European companies. While some of those firms promoted high standards in their home countries, low wages, high turnover, and dangerous working conditions were endemic to the US market. Buoyed by significant early success at multiple security companies—it remains the largest labor campaign for African American workers since A. Philip Randolph organized the Pullman Car Porters in the 1920s—the decision to pursue unionization at G4S, the largest player in the market and also a European firm, made perfect sense. “I was guilty of suggesting it would be another easy win,” recalled one SEIU staffer. “But I can’t remember ever being so wrong.”⁵

In response to the company's ardent rebuke of union recognition in the United States, the SEIU looked beyond its national borders for allies—first in Europe, then in the Global South. As part of a corporate “southern strat-

egy,” G4S dropped its unionized European clients for higher profit margins and expanding markets in the Global South, and it soon became the largest employer on both the African continent and in India. The stage was then set for a dramatic confrontation in some of the world’s most anti-union climates. The campaign took on a global dimension almost immediately. As workers occupied corporate headquarters in Indonesia, struck in South Africa and Malawi, and crashed shareholder meetings in London, the SEIU and UNI worked to tarnish the company’s public profile and weaken its status with potential clients. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development determined that the company had violated fundamental worker rights in four countries, and an investor in G4S withdrew its financial support out of moral outrage.

In 2008, after five years of battle, the company finally submitted to a global framework agreement (GFA),⁶ a policy instrument guaranteeing new rules that allowed G4S employees to organize trade unions without management interference, including in some places where local law had formerly forbid unionization at all. When the threat of management reprisals was neutralized, workers went on the offensive, winning concrete economic gains in India, South Africa, Malawi, Mozambique, Indonesia, and Poland. New security guard unions emerged in Nepal, Congo, and Ghana. Security guards in the United States, who began the campaign years earlier, won a clear path to union recognition in nine major cities. This book sheds light on the South African and Indian cases because they tell different sides of the same story. In both places private security guards are poor workers in a precarious industry, though their struggles to improve conditions—wages, benefits, job security, employer misconduct—have nonetheless been very distinct.

South African guards fought to oust racist managers and build stronger workplace unions. The militancy and social movement character of trade unionism that all but disappeared in the post-apartheid era seemed reinvigorated through this campaign—a massive strike, workplace mobilization, transnational collaboration, and community involvement. In contrast, the Indian situation did not recall an old tradition; it reflected a new one. There is a growing tendency in India’s labor movement toward independent unionism outside the sphere of political party control. Embracing this new movement, the SEIU and UNI spent months touring the country in search of willing coalition partners to build a new multi-union organization to organize security guards on the basis of industry and class, not politics and

caste. In both places the commitment to a global strategy paid off locally, as workers won diverse gains and built stronger organizations. Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink (1998), who largely ignore labor struggles, have shown that social movements in poor countries can make use of a “boomerang strategy” by enlisting the support of rich country allies.⁷ That process is present here, though we also see how unions in the North were strengthened by recruiting solidarity from unions in the Global South, a “boomerang in reverse.”

This book also emphasizes a less visible dimension of the campaign—the transformations of foreign union movements under the influence of the SEIU and UNI. Call it “mimetic isomorphism” or “open-source organizing,”⁸ American unions are remaking some of their most powerful counterparts around the world. Critics often claim that after hiring the SEIU and submitting to an internal reorganization, unions in Europe, South Africa, and India will bear the unmistakable imprimatur of an SEIU local and continue the legacy of the AFL-CIO as a junior partner in a national effort to extend American hegemony. But so far the risk seems unfounded. The SEIU and other members of its breakaway federation, Change to Win, have found willing partners abroad who understand the benefits of learning from the US experience and translating some aspects of a new strategy. One German unionist recalled, “One day we woke up and realized we were in trouble and the next thing we know we’re doing whatever SEIU tells us to do. And I hate to admit it, but they have a point.”⁹

But the lessons for labor are by no means clear. Cultural friction and hostility broke out almost everywhere the SEIU went, creating discord between North American, European, and Southern union movements. The end result was a settlement that generated accolades for its scope and persistence but also doubts as to whether or not it was “worth it.” Of the 35,000 security guards the SEIU claims to represent today, only a thousand work for G4S, a surprisingly miniscule figure given the extent of the campaign. Consequently, there are those within the SEIU who interpret the campaign as “too long, too expensive, too destructive, too aggressive and didn’t get us what we wanted anyway.”¹⁰ To some extent, that position has won the day. Since concluding the G4S campaign the union has retreated from some of its prior commitments to global unionism.

Nonetheless, woven throughout this book is a story of the campaign largely portrayed as successful. Beyond the material gains won for workers,

compared to the resources spent winning them, the real feat of the campaign is the leverage it gives the national union over the industry as a whole—now that its largest player has submitted to union rules.

Globalization and the Sources of Worker Power

How were poor security guards and their unions able to force the hand of one of the world's largest corporations?

Recently there has been great interest in reading transnational labor struggles as if they were cast in a theatrical version of the *double movement*, Karl Polanyi's term for how nineteenth-century civil society instinctively and spontaneously "protected itself against the perils of the self-regulating market system" and re-embedded it in a variety of collectivist projects. Much the way capitalism might produce its own gravediggers, globalization is said to create the very conditions that allow workers a kind of "built-in" power to fight back.¹¹ In other words, the new international division of labor, the geographic dispersion of production, the vertical consolidation of corporate power, the emergence of global cities, and new labor process innovations such as just-in-time production models—in short, a new cartography of economic activity—actually make global capitalism more vulnerable to disruption (see Evans 2008, 2010; Herod 2001; Webster, Lambert, and Beziudenhout 2008).¹² These circumstances, it is said, suggest that "the hour of von Hayek is gone and the hour of Polanyi has arrived" (Munck 2002: 177–178).

One variation on this general theme argues that free-trade pacts, such as the North American Free Trade Agreement, typically the bane of labor movements, provide workers certain opportunities for transnational labor activism (Kay 2005, 2011). Another suggests that the immiserating conditions of neoliberalism paradoxically lay the foundations of social movement-inspired forms of unionism (Chun 2009). Labor activists make similar claims. Stephen Lerner, a former director of the SEIU's Property Services Division and a major player in the G4S campaign, argued that "the spread of multinational corporations and the increasing concentration of capital have created the conditions that can turn globalization on its head" (Lerner 2007: 17). There is no such happy irony in this book. This line of argument is seductive, but ultimately it provides the relationship between global capitalism

and worker power a coherence it does not possess. Situated awkwardly astride this optimistic theoretical outlook rests the daunting record of failed attempts to win meaningful gains through transnational activity. Power is not, as Piven (2008: 26) says, “there for the taking,” and we need to more seriously consider the conditions under which workers are able to exercise it.

Building on Erik Olin Wright’s (2000) terminology, Beverly Silver (2003) explains that workers utilize *structural power* when they occupy an advantageous position in a particular economic system, or *associational power*, which flows from their self-organization into unions, political parties, or other collective organizations.

The place-bound nature of service work might seem to lend security guards a degree of structural power because their work cannot be outsourced globally. Unlike auto manufacturing or garment factory work, there is no obvious point of conflict between janitors or security guards in New Jersey and New Delhi. This power is magnified when placed in the context of emerging global cities, the command and control hubs of global capitalism. Sassen (2001), whose analysis has directly inspired the SEIU’s strategy, argues that global cities require a conglomeration of low-skill, low-wage, service-sector jobs, such as security guards. And precisely because the process of making a global city global is so expensive, requiring high inputs of fixed capital (Goldman 2011), it is less simple than we think for business to simply up and leave. Therefore, Manuel Castells’s (2000: 506) assertion, “At its core, capital is global. As a rule, labor is local,” which is intended to derive labor’s weakness, is seen from this perspective as its saving grace.

The problem is that place-bound workers experience some of the same downward pressures as those whose jobs are more subject to a spatial fix by capital. Guards endure long hours of tedium, low pay, and, being a profession that requires relatively little skill, heavy competition. This is a perfect prescription for employers keen on depressing wages, given that labor is such a large factor of production. In the end, whatever power could theoretically be derived from the industrial setting is overshadowed by the negative effects of the reserve army of labor, myriad forms of subcontracting, labor brokering, and the disaggregation of trade union movements, all of which tend to militate against any kind of labor power built into the logic of globalization.

But Silver (2003: 123) says the conditions that have systematically undermined workers’ structural power have placed “a renewed premium on the

importance of associational power” and that we should see low-wage service workers such as security guards increasingly rely on their collective action to leverage gains. The catch is that the capacity to exercise associational power is embedded in state and legal frameworks guaranteeing trade union rights, freedom of association, and so on, all increasingly rare commodities (Silver 2003: 14). This raises a curious problem. On the one hand, associational power is premised on particular political opportunities. Yet the less one’s job and livelihood are protected by such frameworks, the more necessary—and unattainable—associational power would seem to be. The erosion of social welfare provisions everywhere and the increasing informalization of the global labor force can only mean that the growing percentage of workers who would count on exercising associational power is less and less likely to be able to do so. How then can associational power become *actionable*?

Frances Fox Piven suggests power moves from a potential to an actionable status when collective actors break the rules that structure a given social context (Piven 2008). In other words, exercising power entails disrupting the interdependent relationships in society that are normally bound by rules.¹³ In contrast, I use Piven’s concept here to connote *rulemaking*. More precisely, this means new terms of engagement between labor and capital that allow associational power to be made actionable. Modifying the normative framework of employment regulation and the cultural logic that proscribed workers as submissive—in effect, new rules governing the industrial context—was the central way otherwise powerless security guards were able to fight back.

Governance Struggles and Worker Power: The New Spirit of Labor Transnationalism

Recent shifts in power among states, corporations, and labor groups have encouraged unions to seek gains through new kinds of *governance struggles*, a strategy that enhances the potential for global unionism to empower workers locally. Governance struggles seek to exert a degree of discipline and control over the business practices of transnational corporations and free-trade pacts. In so doing, they alter the otherwise unilinear channels of decision making that impact workers’ ability to organize. Although the governance

concept usually implies a generalized political authority vested in nonstate actors and institutions, I use it here specifically to connote worker struggles that seek to enforce new “rules of engagement” with transnational corporations. Whereas traditional union strategies seek to exert pressure on management or the state to increase wages or benefits packages, or to respect a panoply of *rights*, governance struggles target the corporation at a level removed from the workplace in the hope of creating a new field of *rules* that will enable workers to exercise power. These rules include “neutrality agreements,” by which management concedes its right to actively oppose workplace organizing or any clause or conduct code that alters management’s relationship with its employees in a direction that is deemed favorable to unionization.¹⁴

Governance struggles, explored in depth in the next chapter, constitute the heart of labor transnationalism since the late 1960s but have only recently managed to translate global gains into local possibilities beyond a superficial level. The GUFs are the latest actors to modify this general repertoire through the implementation of GFAs. GFAs are policy instruments signed by transnational corporations and GUFs that seek to create an arena for global labor relations (Fichter et al. 2012). GFAs also link unions around the world in an effort to impact the behavior of companies throughout their supply chains. GFAs have been studied from myriad directions. Many scholars have sought to demonstrate the ways in which GFAs help unions win specific demands, a process that is present in this book, too. But my analysis suggests their greater utility is as part of a larger strategy to expand the bargaining power of national unions over entire industries by forcing major companies to play by union rules.

The labor movement is in fundamental crisis almost everywhere. Shrinking union densities, increasing casualization, flexible employment regimes, and disappearing labor legislation are only the most visible symptoms of widespread decline, a telltale sign that the opportunities for unions are increasingly limited by developments outside their national contexts and sphere of influence. Governance struggles, in various forms, have emerged as a structural response to mitigate the dilemmas posed by global capitalism. The idea is to reconstruct the rules-based power of transnational corporations to assert a degree of control for local actors.

Governance struggles have come to play such a large role in global labor activism as a direct outcome of three interrelated phenomena. First, the

analysis that placed transnational corporations as the motive force of the world economy, and largely outside the purview of national states, has convinced some parts of the labor movement that it cannot rely on government protections. Although it is intended to support the normative globalization thesis, Tilly's (1995: 21) maxim nonetheless captures a fundamental historic development: "As states decline, so do workers' rights." This is exactly why labor turned toward governance struggles—to fight about rules, not rights. The largest and most successful recent victories for unions have been won not through the power vested in them by the National Labor Relations Act, for example, but by circumventing it. The relatively recent failure of unions to successfully win the Employee Free Choice Act, despite massive resources spent trying, is even more of an indication that labor will be unable to depend on national legislation. Instead, the erosion of the right to organize, bargain, and win a contract has pushed some unions toward a strategy of creating new rules. This is even more crucial at the global level, where international labor rights barely exist or are unenforceable. Second, rapidly changing investment patterns and employment regimes, especially in the growing services sector, have emphasized the perceived need for labor to insert itself more firmly into the operating protocols of global business. For many unions, even those without the capacity, resources, or know-how to change, it is now clear that waging battles in one country (against a corporation in many countries) is a recipe for failure. Finally, the increasing consolidation of corporate ownership into fewer and fewer hands presents an opportunity for unions to reach more workers and apply more leverage to a sector as a whole with a single campaign.

Governance struggles are typically associated with processes of globalization because the strategy evolved from a need to regulate capital as it shifted production to places unable or unwilling to enforce labor standards. But they are not solely transnational efforts. The fight against G4S involved the hallmarks of what are now known as "corporate" or "comprehensive" campaigns, most of which happen within national borders, which I conceive of as a governance struggle as well. As the name suggests, corporate campaigns target specific companies with the intent of weakening their public image, economic stability, or political clout in order to extract concessions. A product of ideas born in the New Left of the late 1960s, corporate campaigns have become an exceptionally popular tactic in American unionism to constrain corporations, sometimes as corollaries to actual organizing

drives, though many times not (Manheim 2000). As described in chapter 2, the corporate campaign was a crucial first step in the G4S fight, and a major source of inspiration and transformation for unions around the world.

None of this is to say that governance struggles offer a panacea where other strategies have failed. However, the G4S campaign was successful because it neutralized the company while simultaneously creating the conditions for workers to organize, build new organizations, renew old traditions, and experiment with new strategies. That happened because unions and workers found a way to unleash their power—not because of capitalist globalization but in spite of it and not because they won new rights but because they made new rules.

A Theory of the New Labor Transnationalism

Scholars have produced a significant body of descriptive case studies of labor transnationalism, but the facts do not speak for themselves. The insights of Polanyi and Silver and others explored in this book notwithstanding, the field lacks a theoretical lens through which to understand the complexities of new modes of cross-border worker activity. This study endeavors to formulate such a theory—first through an analysis of governance struggles and second by finding a place for the G4S campaign in the past and present attempts of unions to reach across borders. Precisely because it is so multifaceted, this campaign can help us more confidently speculate on the potential of such activity to expand in the future.

Transnationalism is not so much a *tactic* as it is a revised *modus operandi*, given new political, economic, and sociocultural conditions. In the chapters that follow I argue that the bleak prognostications for labor's revitalization in the global era—the polemical context for this book—can be challenged if we expand our understanding to include new experiences of transnational labor collaboration, particularly those that link struggles in the global and local arenas. From this general argument I raise three inter-related propositions.

The first is that globalization is not the death knell of worker power, as is often stated on the Left and on the Right. Globalization performs a powerful ideological function as a component of its restructuring dynamism,

most famously voiced by Margaret Thatcher's triumphant TINA proclamation: There Is No Alternative.¹⁵ But the negative forecasts that associate union decline with neoliberal globalization, or foreclose other outcomes, cannot explain the growing number of cases in which unions have generated some form of power over global companies. The emerging counter-thesis, however, has generally overemphasized and oversimplified the structural opportunities for workers and underestimated the audacious strategies of transnational capitalists. My analysis extends beyond the limits of the counter-thesis and the focus on "structural power." Instead, evidence presented in this case shows that workers can find ways to exert "associational power" in the absence of almost any structural advantage whatsoever through governance struggles. It is worth remembering at this point that for all the structured inevitability purported by the Marxist paradigm, the most revolutionary element bequeathed to us in the *Communist Manifesto* was the conscious agency of workers.

Second, I show that transnational governance struggles are a viable means to empower workers locally. Common sense tells us that workers who have the support of a global campaign behind them are necessarily more powerful in facing down global corporations. But often the very strategies that appeal to the international community end up sidelining local labor rights by redirecting the grievance resolution to a different forum of governance (Seidman 2008). Moreover, governance struggles focus their energy on undermining corporate rules, not immediately on organizing workers. But the campaigns studied in this book have empowered local organizing and have also been strengthened by local campaigns. These strategic approaches are considered the basis for a "new labor transnationalism," a wholly different conception than the one advanced in the existing literature.

Last, successful labor transnationalism may depend on a good deal of restructuring of local union movements. In all the empirical chapters there is a focus on struggles within unions to overcome their own strategic deficits—revitalization from the inside out. But nowhere is the connection between internal revitalization and transnational collaboration more important to the story than in North America. I argue against the conception of the "new labor transnationalism" as a bottom-up phenomenon emerging predominantly from movements within the Global South. In fact, one of the most striking impressions from this book is the degree to which today's

global labor movement is led by unions in the United States and how much traction US strategies have around the world. By linking global labor campaigns and local union revitalization, it makes the case for rethinking the dynamics of transnational collaboration. It argues for a shift away from a top-down perspective, in which transnationalism is bound up in the institutions of the global labor movement, without surrendering to a totally bottom-up angle, which suggests that change must come from the global grassroots. If workers are going to succeed in forging transnational power, they need an approach that draws on diverse forms of governance and mobilization at the global and local levels (including information sharing, strikes, boycotts, solidarity campaigns, corporate campaigning, etc.), depending on particular constraints and opportunities.

But beyond the lessons derived from the contours of the case study, the larger story here is about new experiments in strategy and vision that are largely absent from most of the labor movement. The outcomes reveal both the horizons and the limits of such possibilities today. According to two experienced unionists and labor scholars, Bill Fletcher Jr. and Fernando Gapasin, "the future of the union movement lies in a combination of renewed internationalism and the ability of local union movements to transform themselves" (Fletcher and Gapasin 2008: 186). That is essentially the process described in this book.

Overview

This book's six chapters lay out a theoretical framework and an ethnographic narrative about a new spirit of labor transnationalism. The first chapter recasts the history of labor transnationalism from the standpoint of governance struggles. In so doing I theorize a transition to a new kind of global labor politics that appears alongside a new kind of capitalism. The complex issues surrounding global governance regimes have been at the heart of debates about globalization. Though most of this literature centers on the institutions of the global political economy, this chapter explains how unions have engaged in governance struggles "from below." In particular, I take up the strategies for codes of conduct, social clauses, and trade-labor linkages, and then I move on to address global framework agreements in detail.

The second chapter explores the antecedents of the G4S campaign through an analysis of the SEIU's global campaigns. I demonstrate that the union's internationalism emerges from both external and internal pressures, an inside out self-transformation that highlights the link between union revitalization and labor transnationalism. It further documents the wide influence that the SEIU has had on union movements across the world, and the various ways in which its strategies and its staff have come to play such a large role in the global labor movement. The SEIU's transformation into a global actor is seen here as a kind of historical preface to the campaign against G4S. This is especially true as it acts through UNI, its main GUF.

Chapter 3 begins the ethnographic narrative of the campaign to win a global framework agreement with G4S, starting with security guard organizing in 2001 in the United States. It goes on to describe the globalization of the campaign strategy into Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America, ending in December 2008. Furthering the story in the first chapter, it discusses the development of another kind of governance struggle integral to the campaign and so much transnational labor activity today, the corporate or comprehensive campaign. Chapters 4 and 5 transpose the global campaign onto different local contexts, Johannesburg and two Indian cities, Bangalore and Kolkata. Here we see the ways in which local dynamics shape the strategic choices and opportunities offered to the SEIU and UNI, and the ways in which governance struggles open up pathways for local union mobilization, revitalization, and social dialogue.

The conclusion suggests that workers of the world can in fact unite, if not around common demands then around common employers. I argue that scholars and unionists should more seriously consider the local dimension of global unionism in order to fully grasp the potential and limitations of labor transnationalism. Readers may be disappointed by the absence of a principled call for unions to "be more like movements" that seems to punctuate the conclusion of most books on labor. Instead, I discuss the crucial role played by union leadership in transnational campaigns. Finally, the book would be incomplete without some speculation on the future trajectory of global unionism, given the pace at which it has changed even since this fieldwork was completed.

Workers of the World . . .

The prospect of a unified workers movement that transcends national boundaries has been central to the radical imagination for almost two centuries. Today, the pragmatic position—global companies require global unions—often seems new, but this position is as old as the union idea itself. In 1897, Tom Mann, the veteran British trade union leader and communist, declared it “next to impossible to effectively organize nationally unless international effort be made concurrently” (Mann 1897: 9). And though the iterations of labor internationalism have fascinated writers since then, only recently have scholars built the semblance of a field—global labor studies—out of the disparate perspectives of geographers, economists, industrial relations experts, business writers, and the occasional sociologist.

When I began this research five years ago I was suspicious of arguments that insisted the potential for transnational unionism was living within the contradictions of global capitalism. I wanted to see the internal workings of a global campaign—how unions struggled to transcend the challenges posed not only by global political economy but also their own entrenched organizational inertia. Though I set out with a great deal of skepticism I am now convinced that in order for unions to become a force for social transformation they will need to answer the challenges posed by global capitalism—and their own institutional blinders—with the kinds of global labor organizations that can facilitate sustained cross-border collaboration. As will become clear in the pages that follow, those formations are now coming into existence for the first time.

Chapter 1

FORGING THE NEW LABOR TRANSNATIONALISM: GOVERNANCE STRUGGLES AND WORKER POWER

By now we can definitively point to growing tendencies toward transnationalism within some segments of labor movements around the world. Take any large and expanding industry with a global footprint—telecommunications, automobile production, property services, retail, transportation and logistics, food and agriculture, hotels and tourism—and there are active campaigns involving workers, unions, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and other civil society groups in dozens of countries. This activity has increased since the mid-1990s beyond regional cooperation to develop legitimate global structures that can carry out sustained campaigns against some of the world's largest and most union-resistant corporations. But the most successful transnational labor campaigns are not bubbling up from below, as many might hope. Nor are they mere instruments for self-interested developed-country unions. In both positions, prospects for labor transnationalism are evoked rather than investigated, and we are often left with an unhelpful choice between Pollyanna or pessimism (see

Burawoy 2010; Clawson 2010; Webster 2010). Rarely do we hear *how* those uncommon occasions of successful transnational collaboration happen. In other words, how is workers' power made actionable on the global stage?

Today global union federations (GUFs) play the most decisive role, but they are only the latest incarnation, clearly built on the successes and failures of past practice. The first task then is to theorize a transition to a new kind of global labor politics. Why has labor transnationalism moved, as I have suggested, from a proletarian internationalism toward global governance struggles? When one considers the earlier—and longer—period of transnational labor history, governance struggles are an unexpected development. For all of that time workers were becoming increasingly enmeshed with their respective national states and reliant on rights-based regimes for employment protection (Tilly 1995). International cooperation among national working classes even began to break down as nation-states assumed an ever-larger role in the everyday lives of workers and their organizations.

But over the last four decades there has been a perceptible shift in emphasis as unions recognize the inordinate role that multinational corporations have come to play in shaping the lives of working people. Corporate power is invested in making public policy, but increasingly its internal rules-based power is enough to structure employment relationships to its liking, even against governmental regulatory measures that stipulate the opposite. Consequently, unions feel less compelled to rely on rights and even actively avoid existing rights-based frameworks at times. Instead we see a decisive shift toward governance struggles, as unions have fought for new rules of engagement through neutrality clauses, codes of conduct, social clauses, and framework agreements. This shift is even clearer when we map it onto a historic example. Unions had, for most of their existence, lobbied for the International Labour Organization (ILO) to regulate labor standards by sanctioning the governments of member states. But more recent history shows a widespread preference for linking labor rights and trade policy through the supranational apparatus of the World Trade Organization (WTO) instead, a primary institution of world governance. How and why a labor-backed governance paradigm developed demands recourse to the historical record of labor transnationalism. As a preamble to that question, this chapter begins with a brief assessment of the changing global landscape for labor.

Labor Transnationalism in Transition

Early Internationalism

Labor has come a long way since *la belle époque* of Marx's International Workingmen's Association of 1864, or even before, in the 1830s, when unions in Northern Europe were motivated by a "vague idea of a common bond between laboring people" (Lorwin 1953: 3).

By the onset of the twentieth century, a broad swath of worker organizations had created several International Trade Secretariats (ITSs)¹ involving millions of workers that existed primarily as vehicles for information sharing on wage rates, working conditions, and union struggles (Windmuller 1981). Although the majority of international labor groups hailed from the UK or Germany, by the early 1900s, the anarcho-syndicalist Industrial Workers of the World were both an "authentically American" and "path-breaking internationalist" organization, with branches in Europe and Australia (Moberg 2005b). Munck (2002: 135) says this nascent labor movement was "instinctively internationalist" from its inception.

However, international labor solidarity has not been continuous. Rather, it was suddenly shattered with the outbreak of World War I and the Bolshevik Revolution, when workers abandoned a common international cause to defend a national flag and killed one another by the millions on the battlefields of Europe. Thus the "Great War" is often seen as a breaking point for international solidarity. However, when it was over, it was labor's support for the war that was the most compelling argument for an institution that would offer robust protections for workers in the wake of such devastation and tragedy. Thus, the ILO was established in 1919 by disparate groups of European socialists and Laborites, and the Gompers wing of the American Federation of Labor (AFL). The mission was, among other things, to create more robust universal labor standards. Then in early 1945, after a rift began over the US-backed Marshal Plan, a group of Communist-oriented unions came together under the banner of the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU)² (Carew, Dreyfus, Van Goethem, Gumbrell-McCormick, and Van der Linden 2000). As millions of workers found support through new organizations, it seemed, for a moment, labor internationalism was in full swing again.

Strangely, however, the *end* of the Second World War may have been as detrimental to transnationalism as the *onset* of the First World War. The

first divided national working classes, while the second strengthened their nationalism. Although strong states have been historically linked to strong national working classes, they are negatively correlated with instances of labor transnationalism. Since 1945, scholars have pointed to an inverse relationship between the capacity of workers to win strong gains from nation-states and their subsequent interest in transnational activity (Logue 1980). As unions found their respective states more accommodating to wage and benefits concessions, their will to internationalism was muted (Wills 1998). However, it would be incorrect to posit the complete disappearance of labor transnationalism after the war. Instead, the postwar configuration of states had a dramatic impact on the internationalist outlook of many unions.

Labor in the Age of Three Worlds: The Cold War and Trade Union Imperialism

At the end of the war the international trade union movement lined up behind their respective country interests to take sides for the “democratic” West or the “communist” East. Although there was an initial impetus within the WFTU to be nonpartisan, ideological battles quickly led to the secession of its non-communist European members, who would later form the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) in 1949.

But no unionists took up the Cold War cause with more pluck than the Americans, who became strident allies to the US government’s militant anti-communism. Before the Taft-Hartley Act (1947) introduced loyalty oaths to organized labor, the AFL deployed unionists to Western Europe to help establish noncommunist trade unions (Fichter 1982). Following its merger in 1955, the AFL-CIO began a more aggressive defense of “free trade unionism” through the ICFTU, which it eventually deemed insufficiently anticommunist. It preferred to pursue cold war unionism on its own terms, especially in Latin America through its own organization, the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD).

On the heels of Castro’s 1959 revolution in Cuba, AIFLD became closely aligned with Kennedy’s Alliance for Progress initiative and dedicated itself to the task of suppressing radical leftist forces within the international trade unions, but mostly in Latin America (Sims 1999: 56). The central figure in the Institute was the notorious Jay Lovestone, the once

Communist Party USA leader turned Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) spy. Ted Morgan's rich biography (1999) of Lovestone details both his international romantic encounters and his strident love affair with collective bargaining, which was central to his anti-communist espionage activities in foreign labor movements. His largest role was in Latin America, where, as director of the AFL's international activities, his covert campaigns were central to US foreign policy in the region (Buhle 1999). It also trained local leaders to promote workplace unionism over more political/social movement forms and spent considerable funds constructing schools, bridges, and other infrastructure to help promote the idea that "free trade unions can produce results, while Communists produce only slogans" (AIFLD 1964, cited in Herod 2009).

While the Cold War certainly divided the movement, some important instances of collaboration happened during this time as well. It was the increasing transnationalization of capital, not proletarianization, that provided the greatest rationale for cooperation and unity. It is at this point that we see the earliest incarnations of governance struggles. Beginning in the 1960s, the trade secretariats, the institutional successors to the GUFs, took significant strides toward countering the increasing globalization of capital. The idea was to mirror the structural configurations of transnational corporations, the vision of Charles Levinson, who got his start in trade union politics as the staff person for the CIO's Paris office in 1951 (Gallin 1997). Levinson went on to lead the International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine, and General Workers' Unions (ICEM) for two decades and was perhaps the first to recognize the deep challenges and potential for labor unions posed by globalization. He argued that transnational collective bargaining represented an inevitable approach if unions wanted to survive. This theory prompted the ICEM to establish multiple bodies similar to world company councils in major globalizing industries at the time. In many ways, Levinson may well be the progenitor of the governance struggle.³

In the end it was not Levinson's ICEM but the International Metalworkers Federation that began, within the auto industry, the most significant experiment with transnational unionism and the earliest approaches to labor governance. The beginning of the deindustrialization of motor manufacturing from high-wage to low-wage areas was witnessed, first within the United States and then outside of it. The United Auto Workers (UAW), operating in the classic Fordist paradigm, sought to constrain capital flight

by establishing worldwide union representation through company councils. As it turns out, the theory was more successful than the practice, and the company councils yielded very little in the way of gains for unions or workers (Bendiner 1977), but it remains an important step toward a new paradigm of labor transnationalism.

Labor, Development, and the End of the Cold War

Most historians agree that two world wars, and then a cold war, significantly undermined any basis for international solidarity. Nationalism, capitalism, anticommunism, Fascism, and Stalinism—the most powerful ideas of the twentieth century—all argued convincingly against working-class unity.

When the history of labor transnationalism has been written fully, by far the most bewildering part will be explaining how sincere and legitimate transnational cooperation actually happened *despite* decades of labor imperialism, Cold War divisions, the rise of economic and cultural nationalisms, and brutal colonial legacies. Since the Cold War, the crowning achievement of labor internationalism is the campaign against apartheid in South Africa. The campaign led by Richard Trumka's United Mine Workers of America and the National Union of Mineworkers in South Africa pressured Royal Dutch/Shell to close its South African operations as part of a global boycott against apartheid. The movement was backed by churches, international NGOs, and other unions, including crucial logistical support from seafarers in the International Transport Federation who helped expose secret trade deals between oil companies and the South African government (Bronfenbrenner 2007). Shell, unlike other oil suppliers, never left the country, choosing to trade the bad publicity for higher profits as it slowly became the primary oil supplier to the apartheid state. Nevertheless, Bronfenbrenner (2007) calls the campaign "perhaps the most comprehensive and most effective example of cross-border solidarity of labor and its allies in history." Munck (2002) claims the South African campaign rekindled "the spirit of the First International." And so we are back where we began. In many ways, the role of labor against South African apartheid represents an interregnum into new modes of transnational collaboration, and especially struggles for governance.

Recasting the New Labor Transnationalism: Labor and Global Governance Struggles

To the great surprise of the participants of the 2001 World Economic Forum in Switzerland, John Sweeney, then-president of the AFL-CIO, announced the “birth pangs of a new internationalism” at a time when many on the Left were committed to promoting the doom-and-gloom forecasts of the globalization thesis (Sweeney 2001). Sweeney declared, “This movement for a new internationalism is building from the bottom up, not the top down. . . . Its forum is the public square, not the boardroom.” (Munck, 2002)

Sweeney himself was building on an important *Foreign Affairs* article by Jay Mazur, chair of the AFL-CIO International Affairs Committee. Here, Mazur (2000) declared an end to Cold War unionism, labor imperialism, and narrow workplace-centered campaigning, instead suggesting that the unions had turned a corner in the international arena, inspired by the 1999 protests against the WTO in Seattle. He wrote:

For years governments ignored demands to include labor and environmental rights in trade agreements, confident that there was no political cost in doing so. This is now changing. Unions are forging new alliances with environmentalists, human rights groups, and religious and consumer activists. After Seattle, the demand for labor rights and other social standards can no longer be ignored. . . . A social movement of potentially tremendous force has begun to gather that can affect the bottom line and the laws of the land. (Mazur 2000: 81)

Sweeney’s remarks and Mazur’s sentiment succinctly summarize much of what is usually considered “new” about new labor transnationalism and, indeed, for a time it was. For the time between the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the WTO protests it seemed that alliances between US unions and radical social movements had provided labor with a new telescope through which to view the world of work outside its borders.⁴ Armbruster-Sandoval (2005) and Mark Anner (2011) show that numerous transnational campaigns arose at this time inside the Latin American maquiladora sector by unions making use of a “boomerang strategy” (Keck and Sikkink 1998) and other creative social movement