
UNION RENEWAL ADMID THE GLOBAL RESTRUCTURING OF WORK RELATIONSHIPS

Larry Haiven
Associate Professor,
Saint Mary's University, Halifax,
Canada

Christian Lévesque
Professor,
École des Hautes Études
Commerciales,
Montreal, Canada *and*

Stéphane Le Queux
Senior Lecturer,
Griffith University,
Brisbane, Australia

Gregor Murray
Professor,
Université de Montréal,
Montréal, Canada

Few in the world of work can escape the current challenges of global economic and political restructuring. Be it in terms of flexibility in the organization of work, concessions in wages and benefits, reduced job security and greater risk of the movement of jobs from public to private, or from North to South or even from South to South (as in the case of the movement of jobs from Mexico to China and most recently from China to India), workers are facing a restructuring of their work relationships in ways that raise important questions about the capacity and renewal of union organizations. This special issue of *Just Labour* features a selection of papers in which each seeks to shed some light on our understanding of union renewal and union capacity to deal with the restructuring of work relationships.

It is customary to evoke an idyllic union past characterized by continuous growth of industrial and public sector unions and the improvement of wages, working conditions and public services in most of the highly industrialized economies during the long wave of economic expansion in the decades following the Second World War. Of course, many may rightly challenge this narrative as the past is never quite as unproblematic as such a one-dimensional account would have us believe – be it for women as opposed to men, or outlying regions as opposed to urban centres or the unemployed and/or poor as opposed to those in steady and rewarding work. Nonetheless, it is probably fair to say that post-war industrial relations regimes in many advanced capitalist economies, which were in fact the institutional expression of brokered compromises between

contending forces in the world of work in particular nation states, contributed greatly to the stability and sustainability of this long period of growth (Aidt and Tzannatos 2003).

The post-war regimes in most of the highly industrialized economies were underwritten by at least four key planks. First, Keynesian-inspired macro-economic policy sought to alleviate, if not eliminate, the fluctuations of national business cycles for both workers and their employers by tilting fiscal and other economic policy towards continuous expansion (Shutt 2005). Second, in this macro-economic context, minimum workplace standards for all workers, such as hours of work, minimum wage and health and safety protections, provided a floor from which collective worker organizations could mobilize to attain yet higher standards. Third, social welfare programs for those unable (temporarily or permanently) to earn market income socialized risk and reduced the threat of unemployment – be it through layoffs in the troughs of the business cycle or termination of employment in more catastrophic incidences of restructuring. Finally, laws and regulations promoting collective bargaining by trade unions ensured a continuing access for workers to mechanisms to improve wages and working conditions and to have some say about the way that their work is organized. Vary as they did from one country to another, all four planks were important for ensuring some degree of union power in the national economy and the national polity.

The restructuring of national and international systems of labour regulation over the past couple of decades has greatly affected all four of these planks, with huge consequences for the ability of union organizations to protect wages and working conditions.

First, national systems of macro-economic demand management had to contend with an ideological onslaught from a neo-liberalism. In this vision, monetary and fiscal policies were the problem, not the solution. Moreover economic growth could only be attained by reducing the role of the state, dismantling trade barriers and deregulating labour markets. Not all parts of this vision were universally adopted. But they certainly held considerable sway in the less regulated labour markets of some Anglo-Saxon countries (notably the U.S., the U.K., Australia and New Zealand) as well as in a number of the emerging and newly capitalist economies of Eastern Europe.

Second, the advance of workplace standards either slowed or retreated in many countries. Greater capital mobility and the dismantling of trade barriers allows the shifting of business activities to low cost production regimes and they stimulate the development of ever more sophisticated global logistical systems. These developments induce workers to offer concessions of all sorts in an attempt to secure jobs. And the threat by firms move to more compliant locations can also prompt governments to diminish labour regulation. Moreover, declining rates of unionization made it all that more difficult for collective

bargaining to use these often eroding standards as a basis for improving minimum standards. One of the most palpable examples can be seen in the erosion of traditional internal labour markets guaranteeing lifetime employment and defined benefit pension schemes to core workers in so many core industries (Stone 2004).

Third, spurred by fears of deficits and debt, governments diminished social spending. In some cases, as in the United Kingdom of the 1980s, it was a not even thinly disguised attempt to reinforce market discipline; in others, it was the result of new mechanisms to reduce state spending and public sector debt. Moreover, it is in this context that states have sought to introduce new forms of market discipline to public sector employment. Contending forces have sought to redefine the boundaries between public and private: sometimes for ideological zeal; sometimes in a simple effort to offload cost; sometimes in order to bring new capital into previously uniquely state activities without increasing public sector debt loads, but at the cost of granting future monopoly rents offered to private sector entrepreneurs who are seeking a high long term rate of return on capital investment. These initiatives range from outright privatization to public-private partnerships to the subcontracting of selected activities.

Finally we move to the fourth plank, collective bargaining law. Over the past few decades it has been weakened or has not proved up to meeting the employer onslaught. This development was especially significant. At exactly the time that the shift in focus from goods to services militated in favour of regulatory adaptation to facilitate collective representation, the rules governing collective representation came under challenge. At worst, as in the many faces of neo-liberal attacks on collective representation, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon expressions in the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand, the traditional mechanisms available to unions to organize new members were drastically changed and union density dropped accordingly. In Canada, the state has intervened more and more often to remove the right to strike and even replace collective bargaining with unilaterally-imposed terms (Haiven and Haiven 2002, Panitch and Swartz 2003, Fudge and Brewin 2005). Even seemingly small changes in union organizing laws, as for example the move from a card-count to a voting regime for union certification as in Ontario and British Columbia, had a serious impact on certification attempts and win rates (Yates 2000, Riddell 2001, Slinn 2003). At best, even where collective bargaining laws were not changed, benign neglect could often yield similar results since unions were often ill equipped to make gains for new groups of workers and in new areas of the economy that were traditionally little organized (Yates 2000)

It is hardly surprising, then, that the weakening of national institutions of labour regulation and the restructuring of the organization of production and services- both public and private - have raised formidable challenges for union

organizations. There is an absolute imperative to understand the processes at work, to understand the variety of responses and to scrutinize all forms of experimentation and innovation in the attempt to bring justice and dignity to people at work.

THE CRIMT INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ON UNION RENEWAL

With these challenges in mind and to try to build bridges between the most current academic research on labour and employment issues and the ongoing experiences of union activists and staff, the Inter-University Research Centre on Globalization and Work¹ convened an International Colloquium on Union Renewal in Montreal in November 2004.² The organizers felt the need to reinforce the links between different research communities, across national boundaries, between linguistic communities in Canada and especially between practitioners and the research community's analysts of union renewal. Moreover, many labour organizations endorsed these objectives with enthusiasm evidenced by the tangible material support provided for the event by the Canadian Labour Congress (CLC), the *Fédérations des travailleuses et travailleurs du Québec* (FTQ), the *Confédération des syndicats nationaux* (CSN), the Global Union Research Network (GURN) of the ILO-ACTRAV, to name just a few of the worker organizations that partnered the Colloquium.

By all measures, the gathering was a great success. In response to specific invitations and an international call for papers and union renewal experiences, two hundred and fifty people from fifteen different countries participated, academics as well as trade unionists and other community partners (such as governmental and "social economy" organizations). Some ninety presentations were delivered, from position papers and capsules and vignettes fresh from the field to full-blown research reports and academic studies. The objective was to cover a wide range of themes: union renewal in general, the challenge of economic restructuring, unions and political action, organizing into the union and organizing the union, transforming the internal life of the union, and building alliances and coalitions both nationally and internationally. Many of these contributions are available on the website of CRIMT (<http://www.crimt.org/>) and a dedicated interactive site on union renewal (<http://www.crimt.org/Unionrenewal.html>) developed by our colleague Nicolas Roby. This dedicated site is meant to provide ready access to a wide variety of views on union renewal and revitalization with a particular focus on the exchange of relevant experiences and academic outreach to interested communities.

Articles from the colloquium will also appear in five labour and industrial relations journals across the world as well as in the forthcoming collection of studies on union renewal in Canada, *Paths to Union Renewal*:

Canadian Experiences, edited by Pradeep Kumar and Christopher Schenk (2005).³ Of course, the objectives of the CRIMT Colloquium and those of the Centre for Work and Society's *Just Labour* are so compatible that it was a natural fit to find a place for the expression of some of the most interesting research results in this special issue of the Centre's online journal. The editors of this special issue especially wish to thank the Centre, the *Just Labour* editors and Jason Aprile for their interest in both sharing the results of the six very interesting studies featured in this special issue and in expanding the circle of texts to include contributions in both English and French. We also wish to thank the circle of outside reviewers for their timely comments that have helped to improve the quality of the papers.

We are particularly fortunate to have a collection of six refereed papers that ranges across countries, languages and levels of analysis (from the micro-analysis of single workplaces to networks linking unionists across the globe). These papers are meant to contribute to the ongoing debate on union renewal. Over the last decade, pathways to union renewal have begun to be more widely discussed and studied (see, for example, Turner, Katz and Hurd 2001; Fairbrother and Yates 2003; Milkman and Voss 2004; Frege and Kelly 2005, to name just a few). These pathways range from internal and external organizing, organizational restructuring and union management partnerships to community coalition-building and international alliances. Each of the articles in this special issue addresses directly or indirectly these different pathways to union renewal but perhaps, most interestingly, each explores some of the dynamic tensions within union renewal processes in a context of the re-regulation of work. Four points of tension stand out: tensions between collectivization and individualization, tensions between local democracy and broader solidarity, tensions between resistance and cooperation, and tensions between homogenization and isolation.

COLLECTIVIZATION AND INDIVIDUALIZATION

Trade unions are the quintessential collectivity in the workplace. Yet in workplaces and in the labour market, globalization is promoting de-collectivization and individualization. The processes of de-collectivization and individualization are not passive. While certain economic and political conditions provide context, there are ongoing efforts to organize and *disorganize* others. Union renewal has of course much to do with building communities of interest and consciousness of the power of solidarities, just as union decline is heavily influenced by competing efforts to disorganize collectivities and weaken broader understandings of solidarity.

Several articles in this issue of *Just Labour* address these processes. The study by David Peetz and Georgina Murray, entitled "Individualization and

Resistance at the Coal Face”, offers compelling insights into these processes. They focus on a fight to the finish between management and labour in an Australian mine. Radical and ongoing changes in Australia, since the current Conservative/Liberal coalition was first elected in 1996, provide a stark example of the desire to alter the playing field in ways that recast power relations in favour of international capital. Peetz and Murray describe the process through which a multinational corporation has taken advantage of the new legal framework to activate blatant union busting in order to impose a new individualistic order.

The authors provide an account of the strategy of one of the largest Australian coal mining companies in introducing Australian Workplace Agreements (AWAs) in order to individualize the workplace. AWAs are individual contracts of employment that take the employer concerned out of the ambit of a collective agreement covering all employees. One of the objectives of this strategy was to get rid of union activists. Drawing on Peetz’s (2002) innovative framework that distinguishes between ‘exclusivist’ and ‘inclusivist’ individualizing practices, which recognizes that these are not mutually exclusive and can coincide, the authors first focus on employment practices. The exclusivist practices identified range from redundancies to black listing and direct discrimination. Inclusivist practices mainly relate to the use of AWAs (the ‘if you sign, you’re in’ mentality) and to performance appraisal systems as a tool to reinforce the blacklisting of trade unionists. Peetz and Murray then turn to relational methods, including the refusal to engage in meaningful collective negotiations in an attempt to make AWAs more attractive and organizing large meetings where activists are singled out. They finally discuss information methods, including discrete threats and employer propaganda or “doublespeak”. Drawing directly on miners’ comments and on court evidence, the text is rich in both detail and colour.

Although there has been worker resistance, justice only came in the end through arbitration and that was too late for many of the workers. Now even this avenue is being closed off as the same Australian Government appears aligned with business interests in a new legislative initiative to slaughter collectivism. It would appear that this new legislation will leave unions with no other option than to stand on their own, through workplace organizing and tapping into broader union solidarities and resources, in what is otherwise likely to be a very bleak future.

BROADER SOLIDARITY AND LOCAL DEMOCRACY

A fundamental paradox and dilemma for trade unions is the need to enlarge the basis of solidarity and the need for local union democracy. Globalization and the increased capacity of multinational corporation to move

out of a country and to use coercive comparison puts pressure on the capacity of unions to deliver both broader solidarity and local union democracy. As campaigning organizations, facing an often intrepid adversary in the employer, unions need organizational cohesion and unity of purpose to win their struggles. Dissent within a union or between unions is often an impediment that allows employers to 'divide and conquer.'

Michel Catlla's article, entitled "French Trade Unions Caught in the Swirl of Collective Bargaining," is a telling illustration of this trend. It details the process through which the German manufacturer Bosch used the threat of plant closure in one of its factories in France in order to secure the consent of French workers to increase their working time. What makes this case so striking is that it took place in the context of a broader policy initiative by the French state to introduce a 35 hour working week. Moreover, the increase in hours examined by Catlla was agreed to without any extra compensation for the workers concerned. While France seemed to be one of the only countries resisting the more general trend to deregulation of labour standards, this tale may show that France is the exception that proves the rule.

The paper first introduces the reader to the current state of implementation of the "Aubry" law on the reduction of working time and discusses employers' fierce opposition to it. Indeed, employers questioned the very legitimacy of the concept of working time, claiming individuals' right to 'work more' if the so desired. Yet, Catlla provides qualitative and quantitative evidence that, even under attack, the working time policy has been overwhelmingly applied. The case of Bosch thus stands as a counter-example, or perhaps it is better to say it is a specific example of an employer's willingness and capacity to obtain concessions.

In a context of multi-unionism in the workplace, where the two major union centres in France were represented, the paper explores these unions' differing responses, exemplifying in practice the ideological divide within French unionism: one trying to reach an agreement to save jobs, the other radically opposing any kind of concession regarding what is considered as a social *acquis*, in other words as a matter of principle about acquired rights. However, as in the Australian mining case, Bosch ultimately opted to bypass the union, asking every worker, individually, to sign on to the new agreement or leave in what was a brutal ultimatum about job security. Although most of the workers signed on, the author questions the legitimacy of such an 'agreement' (signed under duress) and points to both the limits of a single factory in this context and the importance of broadening the debate to involve local stakeholders.

RESISTANCE AND COOPERATION WITH MANAGEMENT

In spite of, or perhaps because of the threats to employment security, employers have attempted to promote “organizational citizenship” wherein employees, stripped of the motivation provided by lifetime employment would still maintain their commitment to their employers (Stone 2004). One method of binding employees thus has been the move toward “high performance workplaces,” one of whose main features is employee input into decision-making. Many employers are attempting to increase value-added by tapping into the ideas and cooperative instincts of their workers. Sometimes the opportunity arises for a union to participate in such joint activity. Management either voluntarily invites the union or the union is in a position to impose its will to support or scuttle such an initiative. Is the degree of reciprocity in workplace regulation the same as the degree of identification with management goals? This is a question that has prompted fierce debate among trade unionists. The separate contributions to this special issue by Corliss Olson and Patrice Jalette consider this tension between cooperative efforts to secure workplace futures through the improvement of work processes and outputs and commitment to management’s organizational goals.

Olson’s article “Can Joint Training Increase Union Knowledge and Power?” looks at a traditional labour-management relationship in the United States, in a country where such relationships are becoming increasingly scarce. She explores a case where worker participation and joint union-management regulation were just beginning to be explored. The industry was facing increased international competition. Advances in technology had resulted in much higher throughput with far fewer workers. In the particular plant studied here, there were also technological changes, but with older equipment. The threats to employment security and the technological problems reduced worker morale and commitment. This particular employer realized that productivity could be enhanced only if worker knowledge and participation were maximized. The union was strong enough and the union-management relationship mature enough that union involvement was a sensible option. As with the case above, involvement of the union may be an exception to the national norm, but all the more informative because of exception to the rule.

The company and the union, with the help of the University of Wisconsin’s School for Workers, embarked upon a joint training exercise which yielded positive results for both sides. Olson concludes that it did so because Haddad’s (2004) elements for successful labour-management jointness: “an independent union agenda, good labor relations, an active joint committee with mutually agreed goals, union commitment, a good track record of success, and (good prospects for) financial stability.” Olson concludes also that the union gained in knowledge and power from the exercise. Ironically, cooperation with

management can deliver power resources to the union if it is equipped to make use of them.

Jalette who is a Université de Montréal and CRIMT researcher, has worked extensively with union organizations in Quebec to get a better handle on the dynamics of subcontracting and its implications for unions. The interest in this issue in Quebec is hardly surprising. After the Charest Government was elected in 2003 in Quebec, its first legislative initiative was to “flexibilize” the provisions of the Quebec Labour Code on subcontracting, reducing successor rights and making the definition of the terms and conditions of employment for outsourced workers a subject for new negotiations, if and when they continued to benefit from union representation. This context has lead Jalette to engage in a research partnership, first with the FTQ (a major Quebec labour central) and then with a range of union organizations, in order to gauge the range of subcontracting and the possible union stances with regard to the practice.

A first important conclusion in his research is that unionized workers are distributed right across the chain of production and are as likely to be doing subcontracts as to be “threatened” by them. In other words, there is scope for much investigation and nuance in thinking about the boundaries of the firm. A second conclusion, following logically from the first, is that the actual stance of a union is likely to vary considerably according to its circumstances and that the same local union can vary from one circumstance to another. Drawing on the literature on union positions relative to both work reorganization and subcontracting, he finds that the four generic positions identified in previous research offer apt descriptions of the range of union practice observed. These are: outright opposition; a defensive effort to protect existing employment and working conditions; not taking a position or abstention with regard to a subcontracting project; and a proactive position in which the local union becomes involved and seeks to put forward its own vision of the reorganization of production as regards its members and their employing organization. A final conclusion stemming from his study concerns the role of power resources in allowing unions to adopt more proactive union positions.

Drawing on work done by other CRIMT researchers, notably that of Christian Lévesque and Gregor Murray (2002), as well as growing range of international literature focusing on the sources of union power, Jalette finds that local unions that have a global vision of their situation and their firm, that are able to mobilize their members and that develop links of solidarity with outside groups are more likely to demonstrate greater capacity to deal with subcontracting. These conclusions point to very practical avenues for enhancing union capacity to deal with the restructuring of production systems and to promote decent working conditions for their members.

HOMOGENIZATION VERSUS ISOLATION

Globalization, by definition, has a levelling effect as it seeks to impose sameness or homogeneity on workplaces across the world with similar production systems, similar work standards, interchangeability of production facilities. One purpose is to reduce the identity of national institutions and the impact of trade unions on workplace regulation and force workers in one location to compete against production benchmarks set in another. If this sounds familiar, perhaps it is because the advent of Taylorism in the early years of the 20th century had similar intents and results. The standardization of work and the degradation of skill reduced the power of craft unions and the identity of workers as craftspeople. But it increased atomized competition only so far.

The homogenization of labour inherent in Taylorism also soon revealed its downside to employers. Stripped of their occupational identities, workers came to see their commonality, not with those of their particular craft, but with a much wider group – all of the workers in their workplace and, to some extent (especially where promoted by active labour and communist parties), with all other workers in their country. At the very least such reformulated identity led to the rise of industrial unions and to the industrial relations system we have known for the better part of the last 70 years.

Worker organizations are typically embedded in the “local”. This anchoring in the community is of course a continuing source of strength, but it can also be source of weakness if it translates into isolation. A key challenge therefore is how to overcome that isolation. This is central to one of the predominant themes running through this special issue, namely the need for workers and their unions to develop new power resources in order to contend with restructuring. The many faces of workplace restructuring in the context of globalization, including those featured in this issue of *Just Labour*, highlight the need for union organizations to be proactive but it is difficult to be proactive without adequate access to information and expertise. Information and expertise at the local level require forms of connectedness.

Both Verena Schmidt and Ann-Marie J. Lorde ask the question: “How can unions reach out across national boundaries to connect with their counterparts in other countries?” They identify opportunities but also challenges.

The article “The Global Union Research Network: A Potential for Incremental Innovation?” by Verena Schmidt reports an exciting initiative to found a global network that seeks to respond to at least part of this challenge. The International Labour Organization (ILO) is the only tripartite agency of the United Nations’ system of international organizations. Its purpose is to promote social dialogue on work between unions, employers and governments in all of the ILO’s member states. The Bureau for Workers’ Activities (ACTRAV) is the main link between the International Labour Office, which is the executive

secretariat of the ILO in Geneva, and workers and their organizations. Its mandate is “to strengthen representative, independent and democratic trade unions in all countries, to enable them to play their role effectively in protecting workers' rights and interests and in providing effective services to their members at national and international levels, and to promote the ratification and implementation of ILO Conventions” (<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/dialogue/actrav/>). But it has been increasingly clear that in a neo-liberal context and declining union membership in so many countries, there is a need to facilitate exchange between unions and to enable them to draw on a broader range of resources than is available to them locally. This was also one of the key conclusions of the “millennium” review exercise conducted by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), leading to a joint initiative in 2004 between ACTRAV, the ICFTU and a number of other organizations to develop a mechanism to facilitate exchange between union organizations and with a broader research community interested in labour issues. This led ACTRAV (where Verena Schmidt works), in collaboration with some of the major international union organizations, to establish a global network for union research or the GURN (Global Union Research Network www.gurn.info). ILO ACTRAV is particularly well positioned to do this because of its long experience in worker education in both the North and the South.

Readers can gain valuable information from Schmidt’s presentation of the origins, role and challenges of this new network. In addition to providing information on the characteristics of this initiative, Schmidt offers important insights into both what makes an innovation stick and why some networks work and others do not. Her article is therefore very valuable both for the practical information provided to readers who may want to participate in this network and for the many insights into the dynamics and challenges for unions and the broader labour research community to construct global solidarity. The argument is, of course, that this is an essential aspect of enhancing worker capacity to obtain decent working conditions and dignity at work in both the North and the South.

Finally, Ann-Marie J. Lorde’s article, entitled “Can Caribbean Public Sector Unions Build Capacity to Withstand Economic Changes in their Region?”, tackles core issues for public sector union renewal, which are all the more compelling in the public sectors of the Global South. Lorde is an official with the National Union of Public Workers in Barbados and she brings a trade unionist’s pragmatic eye to the question. Lorde begins by offering necessary historical context of colonial exploitation and emerging trade unionism in the British West Indies. As in many colonies that emerged to nationhood after World War II, the pre-independence labour struggle produced national leaders, like Cheddi Jagan of Guyana, Michael Manley of Jamaica and Eric Williams of Trinidad and

Tobago. But, Lorde asks, are the Caribbean unions up to the new challenges before them?

She sees several problems, some of them familiar to unions in the Global North, others specific to those in the South. The erosion of national labour regulation will be familiar to those in the North, as is the weakening of public enterprises threatened by full or partial privatization. But developing countries still trying to find economic footholds in a competitive world economy are even more vulnerable. Many are saddled with debt and are especially captive of international trade-liberalization bodies like the WTO and to regional free-trade initiatives like the Free Trade Area of the Americas and the Caribbean Single Market and Economy (CSME).

Another problem especially acute in her region is the dearth of technology and training which would allow communication with other unions. Lorde is especially thankful for the links with the Global Union Federations (GUFs) that have helped build the capacity of Caribbean trade unions. Lorde concludes with an appeal to her union brothers and sisters to reform a movement that has stagnated. She calls for greater professionalism, improved solidarity, reaching out to younger workers and an end to discrimination against women in unions. Research and education of union members, she insists, are a key to moving forward.

These six articles highlight the complexity of union renewal processes within an increasingly globalized world in which work is being restructured at so many different levels and in so many different ways. If globalization is rightly associated with greater constraints for unions, it also creates new space for union action and practices. However, as we have sought to highlight in this introductory overview and as is so well illustrated by each of the contributions that follow, union renewal is a dynamic process in which a variety of tensions are at work. As the reregulation of work continues apace, unions in all countries certainly have to cope with destabilization and uncertainty but they also have the opportunity to learn from the many different and varied experiences in play. Certainly the most compelling conclusions emerging from these six studies are the need to develop new organizational capacity to deal with the daunting challenges at hand and, most importantly, the evidence that it is possible to do so. We hope that these six articles will provide readers with an enhanced understanding of some of the pathways being explored to renew organizational capacity and revitalize union power in a variety of industry and national contexts.

NOTES

¹ CRIMT is the French language acronym for the Centre de recherche interuniversitaire sur la mondialisation et le travail.

-
- ² This initiative was part of a Major Collaborative Research Initiative project, initiated by CRIMT and funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, entitled "Rethinking Institutions for Work and Employment". The editors of this special issue have been responsible for the coordination of the collective representation theme within this larger project.
- ³ In addition to this special issue of *Just Labour*, see forthcoming issues of *Transfer* (2005), *Labor Studies Journal* (2006), *La Revue de l'IRES* (2006) and *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations* (2006). *Paths to Union Renewal* will be launched at the November 2005 convention of the Ontario Federation of Labour and is available from Broadview Press.

REFERENCES

- Aidt, Toke and Zafiris Tzannatos. 2003. "Unions and Collective Bargaining: Economic Effects in a Global Environment." (Washington, The World Bank)
- Fairbrother, Peter and Charlotte Yates (eds.). 2003. *Trade Unions in Renewal: A Comparative Study*. (London, Continuum).
- Frege, Carola M. and John Kelly (eds.). 2005. *Varieties of Unionism: Strategies for Union Revitalization in a Globalizing Economy*. (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
- Fudge, Derek and John Brewin. 2005. *Collective Bargaining in Canada - Human Right or Canadian Illusion?* (Ottawa, National Union of Public and General Employees, United Food and Commercial Workers Canada)
- Haddad, Carol. 2004. "Labor Participation in Plant Modernization: Findings from a Demonstration Project in the Small and Medium-Size Firm Sector." *Labor Studies Journal* 29(2): 55-81.
- Haiven, Larry and Judy Haiven. 2002. *The Right to Strike and the Provision of Emergency Services in Canadian Health Care*. (Ottawa, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives)
- Kumar, Pradeep and Chris Schenk (eds.). 2005. *Paths to Union Renewal: Canadian Experience* (Calgary, Broadview Press)
- Lévesque, Christian and Gregor Murray. 2002. "Local Versus Global: Activating Local Union Power in the Global Economy." *Labor Studies Journal* 27 (3): 39-65.
- Milkman, Ruth and Kim Voss (eds.). 2004. *Rebuilding Labor: Organizing and Organizers in the New Union Movement*. (Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press).
- Panitch, Leo and Don Swartz. 2003. *From Consent to Coercion: The Assault on Trade Union Freedoms, (3rd ed)* (Toronto, Garamond)
- Peetz, David. 2002. "Decollectivist Strategies in Oceania." *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations* 57 (2:): 252-281.
- Riddell, Chris. 2003. "Union Certification Success under Voting versus Card-Check Procedures: Evidence from British Columbia, 1978-1998." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*. 57(4):493-517.

- Shutt, Harry. 2005. *The Decline of Capitalism: Can a Self-Regulated Profits System Survive?* (London, Zed Books)
- Slinn, Sara. 2003. "The Effect of Compulsory Certification Votes on Certification Applications in Ontario: An Empirical Analysis," *Canadian Labour and Employment Law Journal* 10(3):399-429.
- Stone, Katherine V.W. 2004. *From Widgets to Digits: Employment Regulation for the Changing Workplace.* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press)
- Turner, Lowell, Harry C. Katz and Richard W. Hurd (eds.). (2001). *Rekindling the Movement: Labor's Quest for Relevance in the 21st Century.* (Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press).
- Yates Charlotte. 2000. "Staying the Decline in Union Membership: Union Organizing in Ontario, 1985-99." *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations* 55 (2): 640-674.