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INTRODUCTION: NEO-LIBERAL GLOBALISATION AND INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES ON LABOUR AND COLLECTIVE ACTION

Maurizio Atzeni

WHY THIS BOOK?

The effects of the current world economic crisis on employment and working conditions have put to the fore, once again, the role of workers in resisting, coping with or finding alternatives to a changed, unfavourable context. In the field of industrial relations and the sociology of work, after decades in which non-confictual visions of work associated with Human Resource Management seemed to be the dominant pattern of work relations, researchers’ attention is now shifting back to workers and labour. Studies of migrant workers, of exploitative working conditions in the developing world, of gender discrimination, of work relations in the growing service sector, of emotional
labour, are all important recent additions to the field in which the role of workers is pivotal. While these new studies aim to spread more light on issues that have more powerfully emerged in a context dominated by post-Fordism and globalisation, there has also been a revitalisation of more traditional workplace studies concerned with issues of workers’ organisation, collective action, trade unionism, the labour process and workers’ self-management. In other overlapping disciplines, such as social anthropology, labour geography, social history and political economy, a focus on labour has been central to explain patterns of exploitation in the informal sector and of illegal immigrants in the global cities; to envisage strategies of resistance across space and societies; to link labour unrest to historical patterns of capitalist development; to re-open the crucial debate about gendered, unpaid work and social reproduction; and, overall, to redefine the concepts of work and of the working class.

In a nutshell, what all these streams of research emphasise is a commitment to a more socially compromised research, one in which the activities of people at work, the struggles they engage in and the organisational and political strategies they produce assume a central status, according to the position workers have in capitalism. In the current academic and social context, labour has thus regained centrality in explaining contemporary processes and issues, becoming a subject of study in itself.

Considering the renewed importance of labour and workers studies, the aim of this book is relatively straightforward: to provide a comprehensive set of theories, themes and issues coming from different disciplines that can help reflect upon the centrality of labour within the contemporary process of globalisation. Changes in the international division of labour and technological innovations have altered previously established patterns of work and labour relations, have put into question accepted dichotomies such as that between formal and informal work or between productive and unproductive work, and have consistently changed the social framework within which working classes have historically formed. How have these changes, that marking a new era in the structure of work, been addressed within the literature? Are these changes fundamentally calling for a new conceptualisation and understanding of labour and the working class within capitalism? Does workers’ resistance within capitalism remain the central category, the building block for social change? What forms can resistance take? More generally, can we make/provide a theoretical framework for the importance of workers’ resistance within global capitalism?

These questions are the threads linking and cutting across all the chapters of this book. Within its pages the latter question is divided into three main parts. The first explains the continued centrality of labour within capitalism,
focusing on aspects related to class, social reproduction and work organisation as mediated by different geographical and historical contexts. The second focuses on labour as an actor for social change and aims to explain strategies, forms and processes of workers’ resistance to work within capitalism, both in terms of formal organisation by trade unions and workers’ own activity. The third considers how globalisation has, on the one hand, made more precarious the conditions of work for the majority of the world’s population, across the North/South and the formal/informal divide but, on the other hand, how forms of workers’ resistance and self-organisation have appeared from different groups of workers in different sectors of the economy.

In the first part of this Introduction the aim is to give an overview of the structural changes imposed by the process of neo-liberal globalisation and what these have meant in terms of typology and quality of work. The second part will consider how these changes have been addressed, particularly within the sociology of work literature, pointing to the limitations of the discipline in the conceptualisation of workers’ collective action. The final part will give an overview of the chapters included in the book, how they are linked to each other and how they contribute to the overall aims of the book.

NEO-LIBERALISM AND GLOBALISATION

The changes in the world of work that have occurred over the last three decades on a global scale cannot be understood just in terms of societal responses and adaptations to massive technological innovations and developments, particularly in the transport and communication systems, that have changed production, exchange and distribution in the world market. While the introduction of new technology has speeded up, supported and made real certain processes, as with flexibility and de-localisation, these have not been ‘natural’ consequences of the way in which the market economy evolves and adapts itself to change. Rather, what we call today globalisation can be seen as directly linked to the imposition, by political and economic elites, of neo-liberalism as the new political economic model for the world order. In this sense globalisation has been the result of a project, starting in the 1970s, which in the shadows of a discourse that viewed market reforms as common sense, aimed to re-establish conditions for capital accumulation and restoration of class power (Harvey 2005).

The post-second world war social compact of the industrialised capitalist centres, based on the so-called Fordist model of production, has been put into question. This model, promoting mass labour, mass production and
consumption, had guaranteed, in many parts of the industrialised world, relatively higher standards of living, consistently reduced for many years the level of unemployment, and provided the basis for the development of the welfare state. But it had also strengthened the associational and institutional power of trade unions, giving them a fundamental role in collective bargaining and working conditions negotiation, overall contributing to effectively raise the interests of workers vis-a-vis the interests of capital. This empowerment of labour together with the centrality of the State in the management of the economy was evident also in the South of the world, even though here the application of the Fordist system had been less homogeneous compared to the developed countries. However, when promoted by ‘developmentalist’ regimes, as for instance in Argentina and Brazil, the industrialisation process based on the Fordist system had been able to produce consistent improvements for workers, either through expanding their consumption capacity or raising standards of living and education and promoting the enlargement of the middle classes (Amin 2008).

The imposition of neo-liberalism, with its discourse on the thaumaturgy of the market in getting efficient and quality-based production and distribution, has been in reality, since the beginning, targeted to break the redistributive model that dominated in the post-war period and thus to reduce workers’ power in society. This was obtained not just by cutting rights and curbing trade unions’ power, but also by reducing the role of citizenship in determining the political and economic model of the state and opening up previously regulated spheres of the economy to the market (with the correspondent loss of national economic sovereignty and increasing power of transnational financial capitals and institutions).

Analyses of the changes imposed by neo-liberalism vary greatly between countries. Neo-liberal reforms have been introduced at different historical moments, under different political regimes, in geographically diverse economic contexts, and have also been accepted or opposed by workers and societies in different forms and degrees, even between countries with similar history, culture and patterns of economic development (Atzeni et al. 2011). This diversity, makes it even more important to underline the political, economic and class-based character of the neo-liberal project (something which is missing, for instance, from a variety of capitalism literature, see Hall and Soskice 2001, and from global value chain approaches; for a Marxist critique of this see Starosta 2010). The diversity invites us to find out how similar processes induced by neo-liberalism (for instance, labour flexibility, outsourcing, subcontracting, privatisation of public services and reforms of the welfare state) are linked and connected across the world.
One of these linkages is clearly represented by the parallel process of de-industrialisation/de-localisation and its consequences on working conditions and workers’ quality of life. The disappearance of industrial districts and factories in large areas of the industrialised world has destroyed once homogeneous class communities, has atomised and dispersed workers in the ever increasing service sector, has led to a decrease in unionisation and an overall individualisation of employment. Meanwhile, within the new international division of labour, processes of de-localisation and outsourcing of services and manufacturing in emerging economies and production based on global chains have completely transformed the world of work across the North/South divide. This has almost reverted previous assumptions about the formal and the informal, about protected and precarious work, and about the standard of work between the developing and developed world. The mobility of capital and the availability of new information technologies is creating new spaces of work in which differences are blurring. The structure of work and employment has changed so dramatically in recent years that it makes sense to talk about the emergence of a new class of workers: the precariat (Standing 2011). While the extent to which this is really a new class is highly debatable, partly because of the heterogeneity of work relations that have existed historically within capitalism (see Chapter 3), today, however, precariousness seems to be the unifying keyword. Unpaid stages and internships, indefinite renewal of temporary contracts, traditional wage relations camouflaged by consultancy projects to avoid the payment of social security obligations, self-employment, and a myriad of so-called ‘atypical’ forms of work co-exist today. In many parts of the world and in both the public and private sector, they exist alongside more traditional, regular forms of employment. Thus, while in the past precariousness was associated with the informality of the developing world urban labour markets, neo-liberal globalisation has transformed it into the key feature of capital accumulation in the urban economy of the world cities (Sassen 2001, Beck 2000). In this context and in addition to this ‘informality within the formal economy’, the use of illegal migrants and their discrimination in terms of wages and labour conditions has also been used to reduce overall labour standards and thus increase precariousness (Wills et al. 2010, Chapter 10 in this book).

While it is then possible to argue for a transnational and a transversal precariousness (across regions, sectors of the economy and typologies of employment), the extent to which neo-liberal globalisation has also produced an increase of people working directly within the informal economy should not be underestimated. While in certain realities the lack of extended industrialisation and the absence of more dynamic labour markets has always explained
the existence of high level of informality, the liberalisation of the economy, processes of privatisation, the shrinking of state employment and other measures adopted by developing countries as part of the structural adjustment programmes promoted by international financial institutions, have increased the number of people in the informal sector. This can be noticed not just for countries in which informality has always been very high, like in the majority of the African world (Lindell 2010). In Argentina, where, on the contrary, formal employment has for decades been very high, the adoption of neo-liberal reforms during the 1990s has produced a major fracture between protected and unprotected workers which has remained, the recent economic expansion notwithstanding.

The overall increase of precarious/informal work at world level cannot, however, be understood just as the effect of states’ free market oriented employment and income generation policies. While these policies, increasing unemployment and degrading work, have contributed to making a large and cheap labour force available for capital at local levels, other factors have also contributed to this. The emergence of China and South East Asia as the manufacturing hub of the world and the opening to the market of virtually all former socialist states has made available to capitalist expansion new masses of workers, expanding the labour market at a global level. This has, on the one hand, increased competition for capital investment among workers in different world regions and, on the other hand, by cheapening the cost of manufactured commodities, it has reduced salaries for workers in the industrialised world. These geo-political changes, the technological developments associated with globalisation and the interconnections of the world’s economic activities have generated new cycles of growth and capital accumulation. This, however, has been relatively low, has been built since the beginning of neo-liberalism on financial speculation rather than on cycles of production and has thus been centred, according to Harvey (2010), on the renewal and acceleration of processes of primitive accumulation, making this a permanent rather than a historically transitory phenomenon. Various processes of what Harvey calls ‘accumulation by dispossession’ can be seen at play within the current capitalist dynamics. The destruction and exploitation of the environment to provide infrastructures and new opportunities for private capital expansion, the appropriation of new lands or the privatisation of previously common lands, while destroying the means through which entire communities had been used to guarantee their subsistence and survival, further increasing the ‘reserve army’ needed by capital in its endless expansion, has subsumed the lives of more and more people into market relations. Similarly, the privatisation of services that were previously guaranteed by the welfare
state, such as health, education and social security, has re-commodified these services and made more costly the reproduction of workers. Finally, the financialisation of the economy, that has made people responsible for crisis, as the subprime mortgage crisis demonstrated, can be seen as another powerful vehicle to allow capital accumulation by dispossession.

Many of the dispossessions that Harvey identifies as permanent features of the current process of capitalist accumulation affect directly the possibility of workers’ social reproduction. The reproduction of human beings, the satisfaction of their material as well as social needs, is a fundamental condition that allows the selling of labour power in the market. But despite its importance, this work has always remained invisible, not just to the political economy but also to the whole of society and this despite the feminist revolutions of the 1960s and 1970s (Picchio 1992). Women have historically borne the cost of social reproduction either by working for free at home for the well-being of the family or, with the full insertion of more women into the labour market, delegating domestic activities to other women. In both cases, however, the theoretical and practical invisibility of reproductive work has left untouched the gendered division of labour in society. Against a scenario of informality, precariousness, crisis and capital’s continued processes of capital primitive accumulation, women have been, as Silvia Federici reminds us in Chapter 4, ‘the shock absorbers of economic globalization, having had to compensate with their work for the deteriorating economic conditions produced by the liberalisation of the world economy and the states’ increasing dis-investment in the reproduction of the workforce.’

In this brief overview of the changes imposed by neo-liberal globalisation on the world of work, a number of issues, which will be dealt in details in the following chapters, have been mentioned. The first concerns the transformations associated with the process of de-industrialisation/de-localisation. This process changes completely the landscape of work in both the de-industrialised and the newly industrialised realities, creating new jobs, new skills, new urban geographies, a diversification of wages and employment relations and, overall, shaping new working classes. This implies, in turn, the need to think about what this working class is, what kind of workers are composing it and to reflect upon what Silver calls in her chapter ‘the making, unmaking and remaking’ of the working classes in the history of capitalist dynamics (Chapter 2). The second concerns the issues of precariousness and informality. While this is emerging as the current trend in terms of type of employment at the global level there is still not enough information about what informal work is, what are workers’ perceptions about it and the interaction between work and formal/informal social spaces, an argument that will be considered
later by Mollona in Chapter 8. The third and last issue discussed refers to the need to insert social reproduction as a category in the understanding of work. This is today especially relevant not just because reproduction continues to fall on the shoulders of women and remains essential for the existence of wage workers. But also because reproduction itself is becoming a contested terrain of struggle, as the many movements fighting for the preservation of the environment, customary rights and common lands are showing.

RENEWING THE FIELD OF STUDY

The changes on the world of work produced by globalisation have been widespread and have completely revolutionised the traditional framework of analysis within the field of the sociology of work and labour relations, imposing a reflection on the validity of existing theoretical paradigms about work, centred fundamentally on studies of the social relations and regulation of work in the waged, protected and male dominated industrial factory. Research on work in the service sector (Korczynski and MacDonald 2009), on creative labour (Smith and McKinlay 2009), on migrants working conditions (Wills et al. 2010), on call centres (Taylor and Bain 2005), on the retail sector (Grugulis and Bozkurt 2011), on the variable forms of the so-called atypical work (De la Garza Toledo 2011) and studies of work organisation and workers’ subjective experiences of work in the labour process tradition (Bolton and Houlihan 2009) are just a few examples of recent research streams adding to the field of employment relations. Other studies, particularly by social anthropologists have highlighted the interaction between work and formal/informal social spaces in urban contexts (Mollona 2009, Lazar 2012), have reflected on debates on the nature and origin of the informal sector of the economies (Fernandez-Kelly and Shefner 2006), have proposed interdisciplinary approaches to community-based workers’ organisation (Mcbride and Greenwood 2009) and have focused on the relation between precariousness and citizenship (Barchiesi 2011). Finally, from a labour geography perspective, the relational concepts of space and mobility have been used to assess different levels of workers’ militancy (Rainnie et al. 2010).

Within the renewal of the sociology of work, Miriam Glucksmann has recently questioned the validity and relevance of the concept of the division of labour (Glucksmann 2009). In her view, the original concept, which emphasised technical matters as an excuse to divert attention from managerial and class power, needs to be enlarged not just to give proper recognition to the gender discrimination implicit in what feminists called the ‘peopled’ division
of labour, but also to include the multiple forms of work often co-existing in
the same time/space dimension, arguing that work varies depending on the
existence of different modes of socio-economic provisions (for instance, mar-
ket/ non-market, public/private) and of work activity developed differently
through the different phases of a whole economic cycle (production, distribu-
tion, exchange and consumption). For Glucksmann, the insertion of women
in the labour market, the privatisation of services such as childcare and the
increasing precariousness of workers are among the reasons why individuals
are daily experiencing variations in their work: from paid to unpaid, from
formal to informal, from voluntary to market-imposed. Thus the concept of
the Total Social Organisation of Labour could be used to give sense to these
interconnections of work. Similarly, though at a different level, the concept of
Instituted Economic Processes of Labour is proposed to highlight the connec-
tions existing between the work done in the spheres of production, exchange,
distribution and consumption, spheres that are seen as constituting a unity
within the economy. The increasing inclusion of the consumer and thus of
consumers’ work as an integral part in the production process (assembly of
furniture, home banking, call centres, etc.) justifies this new concept. Finally,
the interconnections and interplay between the technical division of labour,
work performed across different socio-economic modes and sphere of eco-
nomic activity, would allow configuring the overall socio-economic formation
of labour.

Glucksmann’s framework is very sophisticated and certainly useful for
studying empirical variations of work, particularly in a world that is increas-
ingly interconnected and in which individuals can play simultaneously at
different levels. However, on the one hand it downplays the role that profitabil-
ity has in shaping the division of labour along gender or ethnic lines and, on
the other hand, it seems to relegate the role of the increasing commodification
and re-commodification of life imposed by the capitalist system through
the renewal of processes of primitive accumulation. The private/public and
market/non-market modes identified by Glucksmann, expressions of what she
calls a ‘multi modal capitalism’ (Glucksmann 2009, p. 887), remain inserted
within a capitalist logic and this needs to be explained at the outset. In this
sense, the privatisation of public services, the retreat of the welfare state and,
more generally, the cut in workers’ economic and social rights introduced with
neo-liberalism, has had a considerable effect on work, not just producing new
articulations between different spheres and modes of work but also, by putting
the logic of the market back into important spheres of life, conditioning the
way in which work has to be performed; not any longer to provide a social
service but, instead, to provide a market product.
While the developments in the field mentioned above and Glucksmann’s work seem to suggest that previous paradigms have been updated to include recent changes in the structure of work, once we direct the focus of our attention specifically to the literature on the organisation and representation of workers, we have to notice that there is still a tendency to concentrate on institutions, formal regulations and strategies for inclusion, almost replicating the ‘old’ scheme of union representation and collective bargaining which was so centred on the post-war development of the industrialised countries, and this, paradoxically, even when the object of analysis is precarious/informal sector workers (Schurman and Eaton 2012). More generally, progressive research about workers, either when discussing organisational strategy (Simms, Holgate and Heery 2012), social movement unionism and renewal (Fairbrother 2008), labour internationalism (Bieler, Lindberg and Pillay 2008) or mobilisation theory (Kelly 1998), at least in the Anglo-Saxon world, it is rarely disconnected from the presence or reference to a union actor. Overall this tendency to concentrate on institutions (unions, but to the same extent also NGOs or advocacy groups) has, on the one hand, set apart the study of workers’ self-activity in collective organising and, on the other hand, has often reduced the subject of study to work relations in formal employment contexts.

Particularly for those interested to explain workers’ resistance and organisation, workers matter in explaining the social processes conducive to collective action only as far as they are represented by a trade union that engages in a formal struggle with a formal employer in an environment regulated by legislation (Atzeni 2010). While research on the role of these institutions and their organising strategies remains fundamental in perspective to improve the daily reality of workers, especially in the informal/precarious sector of the economy, where almost by definition workers are unorganised and need to build from scratch, workers’ self-activity rather than institutions matters in building their resistance and mobilisation, generating alternative forms of organisation and representation of workers’ interests and/or renewing the class- and movement-based side of trade unionism (see the chapters by Cohen and Darlington in Part 2).

Workers’ self-activity is, however, conditioned by the combination of multiple structural factors. The type of labour process can foster co-operation and enlarge the scope for the establishment of solidarity among workers or, on the contrary, can increase their level of atomisation; the strategic location of the economic activity can give workers more chances to make their complaints visible and legitimise their organisation or, on the contrary, make any forms of organisation risky; the kind of remuneration workers receive and the employer
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