UNIVERSITY
of
GREENWICH

The Business School

Cosmopolitanism and international trade unionism: Managerial and mobilising forms

Dr Charles Umney, Work and Employment Research Unit
C.umney@greenwich.ac.uk

Working Paper

Abstract — This conceptual article argues that the well-established sociological concept of cosmopolitanism has been inadequately applied to organised labour, and specifically to international activities of trade unions. Taking a Marxian perspective, it sets these subjects side-by-side, considering firstly what the experience of international trade unionism can reveal about cosmopolitanism, and secondly theorising the forms cosmopolitanism may take in international trade union activity. In answer to the first question, it seeks to show how the development of cosmopolitanism assumes radically different forms among union members and managerial elites. In answer to the second question, it typologises international trade unionism using two categories termed 'managerial' and 'mobilising' internationalisms. These categories have material determinants, and in each the interaction between material interest representation and cosmopolitan normativity assumes different forms.

Keywords: Trade unions, Cosmopolitanism, Marxism

Introduction

Through the concept of 'cosmopolitanism' (Beck, 2002; Beck and Sznaider, 2006; Delanty, 2011, 2012) sociological literature has explored how actors orient towards new identifications that transcend national boundaries. One of the most pressing questions in this, now widely-discussed, terrain has been the interconnection between cosmopolitanism and international economic integration (Skrbis and Woodward, 2007; Szerszynski and Urry, 2002). The links between the two are somewhat unclear. Does greater economic interdependence further the development of cosmopolitan identities? Among which actors, and under what circumstances, is cosmopolitanism more likely to emerge? Some have sought to redress the depiction of cosmopolitanism as an inherently elite activity by emphasising how people can be thrown into 'cosmopolitan' states in the course of working life under global capitalism (Kennedy, 2004; Werbner, 1999). Given this, it is striking that there has been so little cross-fertilisation between literatures on cosmopolitanism and organised labour. Certainly, increasing interest in topics such as immigration within industrial relations (IR) scholarship has highlighted tensions surrounding the complex identities of migrant labourers (Greer et al., 2012). However, given the impact of multinational capital's enhanced spatial reach on national labour movements, there has been surprisingly little attempt to theorise how trade unionists interact beyond their own borders.

This conceptual article places ideas surrounding cosmopolitanism alongside recent developments in IR scholarship, focusing particularly on Europe. There are two objectives: to consider what the study of international trade unionism reveals about cosmopolitanism, and to integrate the notion of cosmopolitanism into a tentative theorisation of international trade unionism. Approaching these subjects from a Marxian perspective, the article argues that despite the empirical heterogeneity of international trade unionism, two main forms can be distinguished, referred to as 'managerial' and 'mobilising' internationalisms. These orientations have material determinants; managerial internationalism is rooted in labour market 'normality' and mobilising internationalism is sparked by labour market 'tension'. In each case, there is a different type of interaction between cosmopolitan norms and material interest. In 'managerial' forms, the normative priorities of union officials are argued to be the dominant force in developing (or disrupting) cosmopolitanism. In 'mobilising' forms, by contrast, international solidarity is likely to develop in a disjointed manner, constrained temporally and spatially by the same material conditions which give rise to it. Thus, the article seeks to contribute to the understanding of cosmopolitanism by showing how conflicting perceptions of globalisation as simultaneously opportunity and threat clash and resolve for trade unionists in reaction to specific material circumstances, and within specific constraints.

The structure of the article is intended to reflect the Marxian spirit of 'rubbing conceptual blocks together to make a fire' (Mulhern, 2011:237). In its first half, it juxtaposes sociological literature on cosmopolitanism with Marxian materialist thought, highlighting a productive tension between the inherently 'cosmopolitan' concept of class consciousness and the material impediments that obstruct solidarity. The resulting theoretical framework is then applied to a review of empirical literature on international trade unionism. The article considers the determinants of 'managerial' and 'mobilising' modes of international activity, and the extent to which they enable cosmopolitan trade union orientations.

Cosmopolitanism and the Marxian tradition

There are obvious differences between the sociological literature on cosmopolitanism and Marxian thought. Most broadly, cosmopolitanism denotes 'the primacy of world citizenship over all national, religious, cultural, ethnic and other parochial affiliations' (Beck and Sznaider, 2006:6). Certainly, the idea of 'world citizenship' resonates with Marx and Engels's vision of the countryless proletarian as depicted in the *Communist Manifesto*. However, whereas the latter was seen as the product of material forces- the dialectical antithesis of capitalist expansion- sociologists have often interpreted cosmopolitanism in terms of ethical or cultural norms. To be 'cosmopolitan' may signify an intellectual or cultural openness (Delanty, 2011; Roudometof, 2005; Skrbis and Woodward, 2007) or a belief in the legitimacy of global governance (Mau et al, 2008). As Delanty (2012:333) observes, the study of cosmopolitanism therefore concerns 'major transformations in the moral and political horizons of contemporary society'. A rigid Marxism that views normativity as mere reflection of class antagonisms clashes with these ideas. Nonetheless, this article will argue that Marxian perspectives can interact constructively with the concept of cosmopolitanism, leading to a useful theoretical framework through which to study international trade unionism. First, key terms must be clarified.

Here, 'cosmopolitanism' is understood as the de-emphasis of local reference points and a corresponding belief that social action should be global in scope- expressed more abstractly, as a 'universal' rather than a 'particular' outlook (Cheah, 2006; Ferrara, 2007). 'Cosmopolitanism' might therefore be seen as the end of a continuum ranging from total absorption in one's immediate surroundings to complete disregard for borders and local particularities. These two extremes are of course ideal types, with myriad in-between points. In addition, this article also suggests that cosmopolitanism should imply a sustained commitment to these orientations, rather than sporadic engagement. Accordingly, cosmopolitanism must not be confused with 'transnationalism', denoting the objective extent to which actors are intertwined in cross-border economic

interconnections (Roudometof, 2005).[1] One might suppose that where transnationalism is greater, cosmopolitanism is more likely to emerge (Mau et al., 2008), but others have shown that cosmopolitanism is a 'fragile commitment' which can easily be disrupted by the more threatening elements of globalisation (Skrbis and Woodward, 2007). Beck and Sznaider (2006) put the question to social scientists: under what conditions does objective transnationalism produce normative cosmopolitanism?

Expressed this way, the question concerns the interaction between material structures and human consciousness, about which Marxism has much to say. Marxian thought is underpinned by the idea of class as a social relation of production. Their view of ever-expanding class conflict- destroying illusory national boundaries and sentimental cultural ties as capitalist social relations reproduce themselves- renders Marx and Engels the consummate 'cosmopolites' (Lowy, 1984). Class is a universal category, to which all forms of local particularity are secondary- and hence the ultimate driver of cosmopolitanism. This assessment has been attacked empirically and theoretically (e.g. Beck, 2002; Hyman, 2005; Logue, 1980). In particular, the supposedly universal character of class has been questioned, notably by post-Marxists (e.g. Gorz, 1982). The latter have suggested that cosmopolitan identifications emerge through the construction of 'equivalencies' between discrete local conflicts centred on individual experiences of factors like ethnicity, gender, or culture (Laclau, 1996). Following this, post-Marxist thought has emphasised pluralistic social movements, pursuing identity or ethical concerns rather than economic self-interest (Offe and Wiesenthal, 1980), as the primary agents for contesting globalisation. This is opposed to an international workers' movement predicated on the universal importance of the employment relation, as advocated in classical Marxism.

Nonetheless, despite critical reflection on the predictions made in the *Communist Manifesto*, a class dimension to cosmopolitanism can be productively highlighted. Perhaps, however, this dimension is only revealed after 'turning the Marxian argument on its head' (Beck, 2002). Rather than cosmopolitanism being understood as the destiny of a global working class, it may be more easily labelled as solely the preserve of elites. Beck (2002:33) summarises this idea: it is 'the activists of capital, who have made globalisation their profession, (that) have no nation, while the workers and workers' movements… call on "their" state for help, to protect them from the adventures of globalisation'. Binnie and Skeggs (2004) highlight a commonly-made association between cosmopolitanism and 'sophistication', reflecting this depiction of

1 Where the article refers to 'international trade unionism' it is in the broadest sense, encompassing the most limited cross-border interactions to sustained global collaboration. Thus, 'mobilising' and 'managerial' models both fall under the broader category of 'international trade unionism'.

cosmopolitanism as an inherently elite attribute. This characterisation has been heavily contested. Scholars have attacked the notion that cosmopolitanism can be reduced to a privileged choice, observing how statelessness can be forced upon workers themselves through economic processes (Kennedy, 2005:172-197). Social histories of class formation emphasise how class movements 'make themselves', highlighting emergent cosmopolitan norms in the process. Linebaugh and Rediker (2000:352) record how the connections developed between expropriated and highly mobile proletarians in the late 18th century evolved into 'egalitarian, multi-ethnic conceptions of humanity'. Similarly, Thompson (1963) identified internationalism as central to the early working class movement in England, particularly following the French Revolution. Werbner (1999) highlights more recent instances of 'working class cosmopolitans' among migrant workforces, showing that the latter are equally capable of 'opening up to the world' as elites.

Despite the truth in these arguments, there is also value in Beck's statement. Analysis of international trade unionism must recognise the potential for solidarity to develop through the efforts of workers, but should also understand why workers face stronger structural barriers to cosmopolitanism than managerial elites. Later, the article discusses empirical illustration of this argument. The next section considers theoretically why this might be the case.

Towards a theoretical framework

Marxian theory is concerned with contradictions in capitalist development, and so is well-placed to consider why increasing 'transnationalism' can, far from furthering cosmopolitanism, have the opposite effect. Harvey (2006) argues that capital is impelled, on one hand, to 'annihilate space' as it conquers new markets. On the other, it simultaneously creates new boundaries. As new economic geographies emerge in the search for greater profitability existing cultural, political and infrastructural environments are undermined. Thus, for Harvey (2006:419-420), class conflict is distorted by territorial fragmentation. 'Encrusted traditions' and 'local prejudices' become blurred with economic claims workers demand of governments and local employers. Consequently, two opposing conceptions of space are juxtaposed. At critical junctures where capital reshapes economic space to find more profitable configurations, the universalising force of capitalist class power is brought into sharp relief. The empirical consequences, however, are immediate pressures to preserve existing arrangements upon which living standards depend. Hence, the local and the cosmopolitan are sharply polarised at points of 'tension'- where capital's reconfiguration of space threatens the material well-being of particular groups at particular times.

For Haworth and Ramsay (1986), workers' responses to these 'tensions' cannot be understood without recognising that labour and capital have qualitatively different 'starting points'. The latter is likely to view workplace relations in 'abstract' terms; as

'calculated, objectified, impersonal aggregates' (Haworth and Ramsay, 1986:60). By contrast, workers typically experience these relations 'concretely'; as a network of social relationships within which solidarities develop. Lefebvre (1991) distinguished between abstract 'space' and concrete 'place'. 'Space' is a *tabula rasa* of material calculation, expanding and destroying geographic difference in the interests of 'rational' economic decision-making (Brenner and Elden, 2009). 'Place' is subordinate; subsumed by the 'rootless, fluid reality of material flows… which can be transferred and shifted across the globe' (Merrifield, 1993:521). For Haworth and Ramsay (1986), labour's concrete rather than abstract experience of workplace relations confers a *reactive* character on union action. Capital is impelled to transcend existing arrangements in pursuit of greater profitability, and workers must respond.

Haworth and Ramsay (1986) do not view this 'reactive' character as inevitable. They suggest that proactive construction of *political* consciousness among workers- rather than reacting to material threats- could seize the initiative from multinational capital. However, rather than sharply dividing between material and political rationales, they suggest that the development of political norms shapes how material interest is interpreted and pursued. The two are interrelated, and analysis can seek to untangle them. With this in mind, the issue of normativity, and the distinction between the 'particular' and the 'universal' made in the above definition of cosmopolitanism, can be revisited. This dichotomy has clear resonances in Marxian thought. Kamenka (1962) suggests that individuals' ethical choices can be divided between the 'evil' of elevating the particular and the 'good' of attempting to transcend it. For Marković (1974), visions of the world in particular or universalist terms are dialectical opposites, taking precedence according to underlying material factors. These broad distinctions mask myriad empirical permutations. Nonetheless, when treated carefully they are of some value.

The theoretical framework elaborated here synthesises the notion of spatial contradiction under capitalism with an understanding of the generally reactive character of union action. As Harvey (2006) argues, capital is impelled to seek new spatial configurations. As Haworth and Ramsay (1986) suggest, workers are impelled to react to these reconfigurations. Given the contradictory spatial horizons involved in this process- between the abstract 'space' of multinational capital and the concrete threat to 'place'- it follows that at moments of 'tension', there is indeed a heightened polarisation between 'local' and 'cosmopolitan' responses. This polarisation may be manifested in a sharply-posed choice between challenging the scope of capital through expansion of solidarity, or efforts to preserve local conditions. The ambivalence which is so integral to the idea of cosmopolitanism- between opportunity for new solidarities and hostility to potential threats (Skrbis and Woodward, 2007)- comes to a head in these moments of tension.

Of course, in practice union responses assume an array of forms which cannot be satisfactorily encapsulated in this bipolar way. However, as Hyman (1975) argues, unions perpetually list between 'exclusive' and 'inclusive' tendencies, and empirical diversity reflects the different actions these logics produce in different circumstances. The argument here is that moments of 'tension' become points of decision between the particular logic of 'place' preservation and the universal cosmopolitan logic of class solidarity. As argued in the following section, cases of 'mobilising internationalism' are the disjointed and constrained empirical syntheses of these two things.

This framework recalls Marxism's dialectical emphasis on the quantitative and qualitative dynamics of social change. Qualitative changes in empirical life should be interpreted by considering changes in the underlying dynamics of existing factors, rather than first seeking new variables. For this article's purposes, the dynamic in question is the balance of power between employer and employee. Developments that enhance capital's ability to utilise wider spatial resources, such as the liberalisation of new labour markets, alter this balance of power. From the perspective of union members such changes may be abstract, but if and when they are manifested as concrete threat to employment security, then workers must make qualitative decisions about their reaction. These decisions are made against the backdrop of the abovementioned polarisation of spatial logics. Expressed most abstractly, this means that changes in the nature of trade union solidarity emerge disjointedly, through responses to particular tensions which become visible as the balance of class power shifts.

This conceptualisation has important precedents in Marxian thought, which can help elaborate the notions of mobilising 'tension' and managerial 'normality' as discussed above. Luxemburg highlighted the power of particular struggles- the mass strike- as a means of expanding class solidarity in preference to the more ahistorical Leninist concept of the vanguard party. For Luxemburg, in periods of 'normality' economic struggles are disaggregated and localised, while political struggles are deferred upwards to representatives. In periods of conflict, economic grievances can be converted into expanded class militancy. For Mandel, because unions generally engage in struggle only episodically and reactively, there is an inherent discontinuity in which the origins of labour bureaucracy can be located. The distinction between 'normality' and 'tension' is thus a dynamic one. The former encompasses widely shifting power dynamics which may remain abstract or unperceived, only exploding in finite and specific moments of 'tension'- for example where particular employers pursue outsourcing or 'coercive comparisons' (Meardi, 2012) in particular workplaces.

Because tensions are manifestations of underlying material dynamics, the latter's parameters shape the terms under which the former are experienced, and correspondingly the likely reactions to them. Poulantzas's (1973) concept of a 'double articulation'

suggests that, at any point in time, political and normative factors have substantial autonomy in catalysing class formation. However, they do so under anterior conditions; 'the necessary starting point for new generations of practice' (Hall, 1985:95). Thompson (1978, cited Bieler, 2006:35) writes that actors 'identify points of antagonistic interest, they commence to struggle around these issues and in the process of struggling they discover themselves as classes'. It is in response to such points- or 'tensions'- that cosmopolitan and local logics clash, and through which international solidarity can emerge. Whether a genuine cosmopolitanism can be the outcome of these clashes will be discussed further below.

The preceding discussion considered the relationship between cosmopolitanism and transnationalism, developing a Marxian theoretical framework applicable to international trade unionism. The notion of a cosmopolitan class identity was juxtaposed with the localising pressures exerted by capitalist reconfiguration of economic space, and it was argued that this distinction becomes sharply polarised at particular points of 'tension'. Through union responses to these tensions, a 'mobilising' internationalism may emerge, but one which is constrained by the terms which give rise to it. In times of 'normality', a 'managerial' model of internationalism is likely to prevail, more reflective of the normative priorities of union elites. The next section elaborates this argument through a review of empirical literature.

Review of empirical literature on international trade unionism

International trade unionism as the interaction of cosmopolitan norms and material interest

As noted previously, social histories (Linebaugh and Rediker, 2000; Thompson, 1963) highlight cosmopolitan norms among insurgent proletariats in the labour movement's early, 'defining' period before the mid-19th century (Van der Linden, 2008). Similarly, Hobsbawm (1962) highlights the countryless existence of radical émigrés during his 'age of revolution'. While cosmopolitan currents among politically-engaged working class activists are therefore historically evident, identifying such a tradition among unions themselves is considerably harder. As bargaining actors, unions make demands of the institutions capable of meeting these claims- frequently the state. Consequently, the same movements are likely to 'make peace with the nation' (Linebaugh and Rediker, 2000:352) when those claims are recognised (see also Harrod, 1972:48). Thus, unions are typically bound into national arrangements, even if they frequently adopt the universalist language of class solidarity (Hyman, 2001). Accordingly, Logue (1980:51) confines the most striking instances of international workers' activity, for example the movement for the eight hour day, to 'the period of initial organisation'.

Consequently, industrial relations throughout the Twentieth Century and beyond has typically remained dominated by national actors, with the international environment-from the perspective of union members- a somewhat remote extra layer (Gumbrell-McCormick, 2008). Leading early-Twentieth Century trade unionists such as Edo Fimmen had sought to avoid this. Fearing that confederations of national centres would remain little more than forums for negotiating particular national interests with all the rivalries that entailed- as evidenced by the breakdown of international solidarity during the 1914-1918 war- Fimmen directed his energy towards the sectorally-organised International Trade Secretariats (ITSs- today renamed GUFs). Because these were able to directly mirror MNC structures, Fimmen felt ITSs could better incubate a cosmopolitan proletarian consciousness (Reinalda, 1997). Later, Levinson (1972) described the ITSs as a means towards directly coordinated multinational collective bargaining. This 'evolutionary optimism' (Ramsay, 1999) ties transnationalism and cosmopolitanism together, anticipating that the increasing interlinking of workers through MNCs will normalise global solidarity as a response to economic necessity.

While Levinson's vision of coordinated multinational bargaining has not been fulfilled, some ITSs/GUFs have achieved striking examples of solidarity. For example, the International Transport Workers' Federation's (ITF) 'Flag of Convenience' (FOC) campaign establishes internationally-recognised wages on ships which 'flag out' to less-regulated countries. These conditions can be enforced through international union action-where dockers in multiple countries may refuse to unload ships violating international agreements. The ITF has sought to counter conflicts of interest between capital and labour supply countries by emphasising the normative value of a universal minimum wage for seafarers (Koch-Baumgarten, 1998; Lillie, 2004). Thus, while the FOC campaign is ostensibly about improving economic conditions, it also depends on the militant ideology of dock workers. While dockers have 'no consistent structural interest' (Lillie, 2004:58-59) in the FOC campaign, they are threatened by wider deregulation of sea transport. Normativity and material interest are intertwined. In this sense the FOC campaign, much like, this article argues, international trade unionism more generally, can be best understood by considering the interaction between cosmopolitan norms of solidarity and material interest.

This perspective undoubtedly challenges more pessimistic visions of international trade unionism. Logue's (1980:10) theorisation suggests the very purpose of unions- to 'pursue the *short-term* economic interests of their members' (emphasis added)- deters international solidarity. Cosmopolitan norms are, in Logue's account, merely 'ideological residues', and international activity remains the preserve of elites with little relevance to membership. Certainly, complex and contradictory short term economic interests have beset the history of international union organisations (Carew et al., 2000), and consequently some writers (e.g. Gumbrell-McCormick, 2008) posit a relatively clear

distinction between 'economic' and 'political' rationales for international activity. For Logue, the latter is the weaker force by some distance, but the former provides little reliable motivation for international solidarity. However, making this distinction does not provide solid conclusions- an economic rationale can be invoked to justify both Levinson's optimism and Logue's pessimism. More constructive in explaining cases such as the FOC campaign is Van der Linden's (2008) typology of rationales, which ranges from short-term interest to normative support, with two categories in between: longer term interests, and indirect interests (where those involved believe that improving others' working conditions will help preserve their own). Thus, normative orientations, rather than being separate from material motivations, are manifested in different ways of interpreting interest. The idea of cosmopolitanism as a continuum might therefore be converted into the following diagram, which shows increasingly 'cosmopolitan' ways of pursuing interest (adapted from Van der Linden, 2008).

Figure 1

As argued previously, constant tension between 'exclusive' and 'inclusive' orientations underpins the historical development of trade unionism (Hyman, 1975), and the prevalence of different orientations in response to specific material tensions pushes union strategies in different directions along figure one. Various historical accounts of craft unionism during the early decades of industrialisation exemplify this antagonism. British unions expanded organisation, but simultaneously sought to define boundaries within which solidarity could operate through restrictions on trade entry (Engels, 1967; Foster, 1967). Similarly, the early American workers' movement, while espousing ostensibly internationalist platforms, sought to limit migration and the advancement of ethnic minority workers in an effort to define constituencies for solidarity (Aronowitz, 1992; Pizzolato, 2004). A historical overview is beyond the scope of this article. Nonetheless, a contradictory dynamic can be observed. The need to respond to the expanded reproduction of capitalist social relations both generates and seals off collective constituencies, simultaneously pushing unions towards expanded cooperation and

presenting obstacles to more cosmopolitan forms of solidarity. This process is explored in the following section.

'Tension' and mobilising internationalism

By examining contemporary empirical scholarship on international trade unionism, this section argues that cases of international mobilisation tend to be reactions to specific material 'tensions'. The 'mobilising' model of trade unionism, based around militant industrial activity, has gained traction in recent decades, particularly following the breakdown of Keynesian national compacts (Van der Linden, 2008). For the purposes of this article, 'mobilising internationalism' means internationally-coordinated grassroots activity (primarily strikes or other industrial action) targeted at policymaking elites- as in Turnbull's (2006) case study- or, more commonly, shared multinational employers. Erne's (2008) *European Unions* voices this ambition more widely, arguing for a more democratic (i.e. grassroots-led) pan-European union engagement. This section agrees that such mobilisations are indeed possible, but will also suggest that their reactive character confers temporal and spatial limitations on 'mobilising internationalism', generally limiting it to the second stage in figure one.

Turnbull (2006:311-312) highlights the reactive nature of recent international mobilisations in the European docks sector, tracing the development of pan-European solidarity against liberalising legislation (which, in itself, is clearly somewhat different from 'cosmopolitanism'; a point explored further below) to the ITF's decision to 'mobilise big actions *against specific issues*' (emphasis added). In Erne's case, critics (see Phelan et al., 2009) have pursued similar lines of argument. Phelan suggests that mobilisations are sporadic interruptions of the more normal 'technocratic' character of international trade unionism. Hancké characterises mobilisations as 'defensive coalitions' rather than proactive efforts to build a cosmopolitan labour identity. Hancké (Phelan et al., 2009:203) acknowledges the possibility for solidaristic norms, arguing that these norms 'work best when infused with a healthy dose of self-interest'. This is a more nuanced position than an earlier study (Hancké, 2000), in which he finds unions seduced by the short term logic of job retention over the longer term logic of inter-union coordination of demands, but he retains a view of international union activity as primarily defensive reaction. So interpreted, mobilising internationalism is not about whether unions follow economic or political rationales, but the spatial and temporal horizons of their reactions to 'tension'. In other words, whether they pursue reactive self-interest through short term 'place' preservation or expanded cooperation through coordinated international mobilisations over particular grievances.

Meardi (2012) and Greer and Hauptmeier's (2008) depictions of intra-European trade union cooperation resonate with this notion of 'tensions'. Meardi (2012:104) argues that disinterest in international solidarity may reflect a lack of scope for 'coercive

comparisons'- i.e. direct labour market competition- between workers in different countries. Where coercive comparisons do exist, international solidarity is 'needed, but uneasy': a rationale for solidarity coexists with a material basis for rivalry. Finally, Meardi suggests that where capital successfully stabilises new international divisions of labour, the contradictory rationale for solidarity again weakens. 'Tension' has been followed by release. Greer and Hauptmeier (2008) argue that where employers pursue coercive comparisons, and where a lack of access to 'co-management resources' impedes the ability of union elites to influence employers, the key actor is likely to be the 'political entrepreneur'- activists or leaders that inject principles of solidarity to frame particular tensions as necessitating international, rather than local, collective action. In their study, such mobilisations - as opposed to elite bargaining- were confined to the European level; a fact which will be examined further below.

What Greer and Hauptmeier term 'political entrepreneurship' is an integral component of mobilisation among industrial relations actors. Kelly's (1998:29) application of mobilisation theory to trade unionism highlights the importance of normative framing in industrial relations disputes. He points towards the use of 'emotionally loaded categories'- such as exploitation or class solidarity- in defining expanded constituencies for collective action. Johns (1998) shows how a political emphasis on class solidarity can convert local job preservation into a search for shared interests between unions undergoing coercive comparisons. Carew et al's (2000:526) history repeatedly illustrates the need for international solidarity to be 'achieved time and time again' by looking beyond immediate short term interest in response to economic challenges. Therefore, mobilisation progresses through the 'framing' of spatially and temporally expanded models of solidarity However, as Kelly's (1998) influential account of mobilisation theory shows, a necessary condition for this process is *specific* grievances which can be reacted against and reframed. Inherently 'cosmopolitan' concepts such as class solidarity can be used to frame specific disputes and push mobilising responses into the second stage shown in figure one. In this way, the 'moral and political' notion of cosmopolitanism (Delanty, 2012) can be situated within a material analysis of an expanding global capitalism. Where there are exceptional pockets of militant ideology, as among docker participants in the FOC campaign, the third stage- 'indirect interest'- may be reached. The 'anterior conditions' of these tensions, however, push back in the other direction. These constraining conditions take two forms.

The first constraint is spatial. Because mobilising constituencies form in reaction to specific grievances, they generally encompass only those workers who are directly threatened by these tensions. Moreover, it was previously theorised that tensions reflect capital's search for more profitable arrangements. This process must also have actual or *potential* 'beneficiaries'- those whose material wellbeing is invested in prospective new 'place' configurations- and the existence of these 'beneficiaries' imposes limits to the

scope of solidarity. Even an exceptional case of solidarity reflecting high degrees of normative commitment such as the FOC campaign reveals interest antagonisms between unions from 'labour supply' (i.e. developing) and 'capital supply' (i.e. developed) countries embodied in tensions over FOC minimum rates (Koch-Baumgarten, 1998; Lillie, 2004).

These barriers, however, are clearest within Europe. Fetzer (2008:295) has shown how European unions' decisions to expand solidarity in response to Europe-wide restructuring initiatives also depended on a 'shared European vulnerability' relative to the rest of the world. In other words, expanded mobilisation between European unions against shared employers was catalysed by the existence of potential beneficiaries of new spatial configurations beyond Europe. Indeed, the continuing development of international union institutions within Europe may enhance the sense of the non-European world as a threat (Ghighliani, 2005). More broadly, other writers observe barriers to solidarity between workers whose existing 'places' are undermined and workers whose 'places' are in creation (Arrighi and Silver, 2000; Eder, 2002; Silver, 2003). In these contexts, mobilising internationalism may be an attempt to define a larger conception of 'place' and to expand the constituencies mobilising in its defence. Thus, the potential use of cosmopolitan class categories to mobilise nonetheless falls short of cosmopolitanism itself. As in the above discussion of US and UK labour history, mobilising solidarities expand disjointedly within the contours of capitalist uneven development, simultaneously creating and limiting constituencies for collective action.

Moreover, because of its reactive nature, mobilising internationalism is also constrained temporally. As Meardi (2012) observes, where tensions produced by coercive comparisons are eventually diminished, the rationale for solidarity weakens. Hyman (2005) identifies an historical 'agitator' internationalism- a 'bottom-up' response to employer internationalisation- which is inherently reactive, enduring while particular mobilising struggles continue unresolved. Ferus-Comelo (2008) distinguishes between 'top-down' methods- including advocacy over international trading standards and labour rights- and 'bottom-up' solidarity- targeting MNCs through industrial coordination. The former takes place at supra-national level within forums such as the International Labour Organisation, and hence aligns with the 'managerial' model sketched out below. Thus, there are overlapping temporal structures at work: the multinational firms which form material levers for solidaristic reactions to specific disputes, and the ongoing relationships developed through elite contact within supranational institutions.

In these senses, the reactive character of mobilising internationalism means it is unlikely to be fully 'cosmopolitan' insofar as, in practice, any embrace of universalist principles cannot be separated from the disruptive pressures of interest representation. Because it reacts to specific threats to material security in specific places, instances of mobilisation

are inherently finite. Additionally, because expanded solidarities formed in response to capital's reconfiguration of economic space are catalysed by the 'shared vulnerability' (Fetzer, 2008) of a particular constituency, they are liable to exclude the 'beneficiaries' of new spatial arrangements. The framing of particular tensions can use 'emotionally loaded categories' (Kelly, 1998:29) such as class solidarity to catalyse expanded mobilisations rather than place preservation, but this cosmopolitan thrust collides with the abovementioned limits, giving mobilising internationalism a disjointed character.

'Normality' and managerial internationalism

The term 'managerial internationalism' may pejoratively suggest an elitist model (Martinez-Lucio, 2010), with some writers associating the conservatism of bureaucracy with labour parochialism (Moody, 1997; Waterman, 2001). For Logue (1980), the international activity of full-time officials is often parasitical and irrelevant to members' interests. While acknowledging the potentially conservative role of bureaucracy, this section suggests an ambivalent portrayal of managerial internationalism. It suggests the normative activity of officials is the most likely route to a sustained cosmopolitanism within unions, albeit at the expense of grassroots agency. In particular, it emphasises how the development of international interpersonal contacts at elite level facilitates sustained normative commitment to international activity among international union officials.

As Hyman (2005) and Harrod (1972) have argued, while mobilisations disrupt the bureaucratic division of labour, the *status quo* of international trade unionism is usually the deferral of international affairs 'upwards' to union elites. This may be because the agency of managerial elites is less constrained by specific structural configurations than that of workers. Logue (1980) argues that, where officials undertake international activity, they do so liberated from imperatives of interest representation. Where unions express political commitments to internationalism, this may primarily reflect the normative positions of union officials (Gumbrell-McCormick, 2008). Accordingly, the more optimistic accounts of union cooperation through institutions such as EWCs emphasise personal agency and developing interconnections between union officials at elite level. Such interconnections stabilise the 'inner life' of institutions (Banyuls et al., 2008), and catalyse an 'evolution in the attitude' of key actors (Da Costa and Rehfeldt, 2007:315). *Contra* reactive mobilisations, these developing interpersonal solidarities may provide more scope for a sustained cosmopolitan commitment to grow more steadily. As Waddington (2006) argues, key 'office holders' within EWCs are most likely to de-emphasise local reference points in their activities, leading to more developed communication and information sharing rather than coordinated mobilisations.

Despite its elitism, this organisational dynamic may also be more adapted to international 'social movement' campaigning. This assertion appears counter-intuitive, given associations between 'social movement unionism' and grassroots initiative (Moody, 1997;

Waterman, 2001). More nuance therefore needs to be added to the central distinction. Managerial and mobilising internationalisms should be understood not as rigid empirical categories, but rather as 'directions'. Mobilising internationalism sees active agency transferred 'downwards', as unions stimulate expanded solidarity between members in reaction to tensions. Managerial internationalism sees agency transferred 'upwards' to full-time officials. This does not mean that the issues it addresses are necessarily irrelevant to members. For example, members may express normative commitment towards causes such as human rights campaigning, which become part of a cosmopolitan 'rights'-oriented unionism; for example, supporting campaigns over human and labour rights in Latin America (Novelli, 2007) or South Africa (Southall and Bezuidenhout, 2004). It is these types of campaigns that have most effectively enabled solidarity between workers in the post-industrial world and the industrialising one. However, while such campaigns may indeed reflect cosmopolitan norms shared at grassroots level, their driving agency is likely to gravitate away from member mobilisation and towards managerial coordination. Frank's (2003) historical study infers a 'hierarchical dynamic' to 'social movement' campaigning. Because normativity rather than material interest is prominent, union activity increasingly prioritises influencing the consumer or voting choices of the public at large- inevitably weakening the primacy of member self-representation (Ross, 2008). Therefore the notion of 'managerial internationalism' as discussed here cannot simply be characterised as conservative bureaucracy, and may also be evident in innovative forms of union activity such as social movement unionism.

If managerial internationalism catalyses ongoing international interpersonal contact and is more dependent on the normative orientations of key officials, it may also be less confined by the temporal and spatial barriers inherent in the mobilising model. Managerial internationalism is the 'normality' of international trade unionism, sporadically disrupted by the eruption of underlying material antagonisms into visible 'tensions'. This accords with Marxian analyses such as Luxemburg's, in which insurgent class movements usurp bureaucratic elites only in periods of particular mobilising grievances. The latter, by definition, are disjointed and finite. Hence, even accounts of celebrated instances of international solidarity, like the 1990s Liverpool dock lockouts, suggest that following initial surges in solidarity the pre-eminent actors in maintaining and coordinating communications on a day-to-day basis were increasingly officials (Kennedy and Lavalette, 2004). Even in sustained international campaigns which emphasise militant industrial solidarity, mobilisations tend to be reactive, with full-time officials tasked with fostering contacts between tensions (Umney, 2012). Thus, different unions are not divided into 'mobilising' or 'managerial' brackets. Instead, wherever it occurs, the former temporarily disrupts the latter. The argument here therefore differs from that of Erne (2008)- who identifies a choice between 'democratic' and 'technocratic' strategies shaped by the prior experiences and traditions of trade unionists- instead

suggesting an oscillation between 'directions' within unions depending on material circumstances.

A new dimension to Beck's (2002) suggestion that cosmopolitanism emerges more readily among managerial elites can be advanced. While it is inaccurate to suggest that cosmopolitanism has no place among union rank-and-file, its development assumes radically different forms at different levels. In mobilising forms, it is disjointed, and continually runs up against countervailing forces. In managerial forms, it is often somewhat isolated from grassroots concerns and thus able to develop more independently. Following Haworth and Ramsay (1986); like the capitalist, full-time union officials have different 'starting points' from their members. In their relative removal from workplace pressures, they can consider the role of the union in more abstract terms. Thus, their action can more easily extend beyond reacting to threats to 'place', loosening the constraints of anterior material conditions that obstruct progress along figure one. One might also hypothesise that, because by definition cosmopolitan norms are aspatial and atemporal, they may even legitimate a managerial division of labour within unions. If mobilisations are inherently 'particular', then they cannot be used to further a sustained normative cosmopolitanism. Therefore the two types identified here may, in fact, be complementary. The contacts forged by officialdom in times of 'normality' may be invaluable tools to draw on in times of 'tension', comparable to the idea of a 'ratchet' in Levinson's (1972) work (Ramsay, 1999). This is not to suggest managerial internationalism is inherently cosmopolitan. Rather, the normativity of official agency has greater autonomy in managerial models. Thus, 'cosmopolitan' officials are critical conditions for international solidarity, and parochial officials are an insurmountable barrier. Where officials do assume 'cosmopolitan' outlooks, in order to translate into international mobilisation this must interact with, and in the process give a new meaning to, existing expectations about interest representation. The alternative is a polarisation between elitism on the one hand and parochialism on the other.

Conclusion

This article has sought to bring together the hitherto distant bodies of literature on cosmopolitanism and transnational IR. In doing so, it has suggested two points for consideration in the ongoing debate over cosmopolitanism. Firstly, it has sought to show how cosmopolitanism develops according to different dynamics at elite and grassroots levels within unions. Secondly, it has suggested that the ambivalence which is integral to the notion of cosmopolitanism- as highlighted by writers such as Skrbis and Woodward (2007)- is heightened for workers at points of 'tension', at which these competing logics clash and find new form.

The article has also sought to build the notion of cosmopolitanism into a theorisation of international trade unionism. It has pointed towards contradictions in the spatial dynamics

of capitalism, reflecting the juxtaposition between a universalising class antagonism and the material pressures to preserve 'place'. These contradictions both produce and constrain instances of 'mobilising internationalism', which can most abstractly be described as qualitative manifestations of underlying power shifts between labour and capital. The kernel of truth in the suggestion that cosmopolitanism is confined to managerial elites lies in the fact that 'managerial internationalism' does not face the temporal and spatial constraints exerted on mobilising internationalism to the same degree, if at all.

Of course, the concrete empirical forms taken by international trade unionism will remain heterogeneous. Nonetheless, despite this practical diversity, this article argues that the core of these two different 'directions' will always be discernible. International trade unionism's 'normality' is likely to remain dominated by full-time international officials, and increasingly cosmopolitan union orientations are possible depending on their own preferences. At times of 'tension' the potential exists for the limited expansion of solidarity to create a constrained and disjointed mobilising model. It is mistaken to look for an undiluted normative cosmopolitanism as the driving force behind working class opposition to globalisation. Rather, focus should be on the ways in which inherently cosmopolitan concepts such as class solidarity catalyse the expansion of the scope of material conflicts between employer and employee.

Bibliography

Aronowitz, S. 1992 *False Promises: The Shaping of American Working Class Consciousness*, Durham and London: Duke University Press

Arrighi, G. and Silver, B. 2000 'Workers North and South', in Panitch, L. and Leys, C. (eds.) *Socialist Register 2001: Working Classes, Global Realities*, London: Merlin

Banyuls, J., Haipeter, T. and Neumann, L. 2008 'European Works Councils at General Motors Europe: Bargaining Efficiency in Regime Competition?', *Industrial Relations Journal* 39(6): 532-47

Beck, U. 2002 'The Cosmopolitan Society and its Enemies', *Theory, Culture & Society* 19(1-2): 17-44

Beck, U. and Sznaider, N. 2006 'Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda', *British Journal of Sociology* 57(1): 1-22

Bieler, A. 2006 *The Struggle for a Social Europe: Trade Unions and EMU in Times of Global Restructuring*, Manchester: Manchester University Press

Binnie, J. and Skeggs, B. 2004 'Cosmopolitan Knowledge and the Production and Consumption of Sexualised Space: Manchester's Gay Village', *The Sociological Review* 52(1): 39-61

Brenner, N. and Elden, S. 2009 'Henri Lefebvre on Space, State, Territory', *International Political Sociology* 3(4): 353-77

Carew, A., Dreyfus, M., Van Goethem, G., Gumbrell-McCormick, R. and Van der Linden, M. 2000 *The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions*, Bern: Peter Lang

Cheah, P. 2006 'Cosmopolitanism', *Theory, Culture & Society* 23(2-3): 486-96

Da Costa, I. and Rehfeldt, U. 2007 'European Works Councils and Transnational Bargaining about Restructuring in the Auto Industry', *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research* 13(2): 313-6

Delanty, G. 2011 'Cultural Diversity, Democracy and the Prospects of Cosmopolitanism: A Theory of Cultural Encounters', *British Journal of Sociology* 62(4): 636-56

Delanty, G. 2012 'A Cosopolitan Approach to the Explanation of Social Change: Social Mechanisms, Processes, Modernity', *The Sociological Review* 60(2): 333-354

Eder, M. 2002 'The Constraints on Labour Internationalism: Contradictions and Prospects' in Harrod, A. and O'Brien, R. (eds.) *Global Unions: Theories and Strategies of Organised Labour in the Global Political Economy*", London: Routledge

Engels, F. 1967 'The Condition of the Working Class in England' in Henderson, W. (ed.) *Engels: Selected Writings*, London: Penguin

Erne, R. 2008 *European Unions: Labour's Quest for a Transnational Democracy*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press

Ferrara, A. 2007 '"Political" Cosmopolitanism and Judgement', *European Journal of Social Theory* 10(1): 53-66

Ferus-Comelo, A. 2008 'Mission Impossible? Raising Labor Standards in the ICT Sector', *Labor Studies Journal* 33(2): 141-62

Fetzer, T. 2008 'European Works Councils as Risk Communities: The Case of General Motors', *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 14(3): 289-308

Foster, J. 1976 'British Imperialism and the Labour Aristocracy' in Skelley, J. (ed.) *The General Strike, 1926*, London: Lawrence and Wishart

Frank, D. 2003 'Where are the Workers in Consumer-Worker Alliances? Class Dynamics and the History of Consumer-Labor Campaigns', *Politics & Society* 31(3): 363-379

Ghigliani, P. 2005 'International Trade Unionism in a Globalizing World: A Case Study of New Labour Internationalism', *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 26(3): 359-382

Gorz, A. 1982 *Farewell to the Working Class*: *An Essay on Post-Industrial Socialism* London: Pluto Press

Greer, I., Ciupijus, Z. and Lillie, N. 2012 'The European Migrant Workers' Union: Union Organizing Through Labour Transnationalism', *European Journal of Industrial Relations* (forthcoming)

Greer, I. and Hauptmeier, M. 2008 'Political Entrepreneurs and Co-Managers: Labour Transnationalism at Four Multinational Auto Companies', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 46(1): 76-97

Hall, S. 1985 'Significance, Representation, Ideology: Althusser and the Post-Structuralist Debates', *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 2(2): 91-114

Hancké, B. 2000 'European Works Councils and Industrial Restructuring in the European Motor Industry', *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 6(1): 35-59

Harrod, J. 1972 *Trade Union Foreign Policy: A Study of British and American Trade Union Activities in Jamaica*, London: MacMillan

Harvey, D. 2006 *The Limits to Capital*, London: Verso

Haworth, N. and Ramsay, H. 1986 'Matching the Multinationals: Obstacles to International Trade Unionism', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 6(2): 55-82

Hobsbawm, E. 1962 *Age of Revolution, 1789-1848*, New York: New American Library

Hyman, R. 1975 *Industrial Relations: A Marxist Introduction*, London: MacMillan

Hyman, R. 2001 *Understanding European Trade Unionism: Between Market, Class and Society*, London: Sage Publications

Hyman, R. 2005 'Shifting Dynamics in International Trade Unionism: Agitation, Organisation, Bureacuracy, Diplomacy', *Labor History* 46(2): 137-54

Johns, R. 1998 'Bridging the Gap Between Class and Space: US Worker Solidarity with Guatemala', *Economic Geography* 74(3): 252-272

Kamenka, E. 1962 *The Ethical Foundations of Marxism*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Kelly, J. 1998 *Rethinking Industrial Relations: Mobilisation, Collectivism and Long Waves*, London: Routledge

Kennedy, P. 2004 'Joining, Constructing and Benefiting from the Global Workplace: Transnational Professionals in the Building Design Industry', *The Sociological Review* 53(1): 172-197

Kennedy, J. and Lavalette, M. 2004 'Globalisation, Trade Unionism and Solidarity: Further Reflections on the Liverpool Dock Lockout', in Munck, R. (ed.) *Labour and Globalisation: Results and Prospects* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press

Koch-Baumgarten, S. 1998 'Trade Union Regime Formation Under the Conditions of Globalization in the Transport Sector: Attempts at Transnational Trade Union Regulation of Flag-of-Convenience Shipping', *International Review of Social History* 43(3): 369-402

Laclau, E. 1996 *Emancipation(s)*, London: Verso

Lefebvre, H. 1991 *The Production of Space*, London: Wiley-Blackwell

Levinson, C. 1972 *International Trade Unionism*, London: George Allen & Unwin

Lillie, N. 2004 'Global Collective Bargaining on Flag of Convenience Shipping' *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 42(1): 47-67

Linebaugh, P. and Rediker, M. 2000 *The Many-Headed Hydra: The Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*, London: Verso

Logue, J. 1980 *Toward a Theory of Trade Union Internationalism*, Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg

Lowy, M. 1984 'Marx and Engels: Cosmopolites: The Future of Nations Under Communism (1845-1848)', *Critiques: Journal of Socialist Theory* 14(1): 5-12

Marković, M. 1974 The Contemporary Marx: Essays on Humanist Communism, Nottingham: Spokesman Books

Martinez-Lucio, M. 2010 'Dimensions of Internationalism and the Politics of the Labour Movement: Understanding the Political and Organisational Aspects of Labour Networking and Coordination', Employee Relations 32(6): 538-556

Mau, S., Mewes, J. and Zimmermann, A. 2006 'Cosmopolitan Attitudes Through Transnational Social Practices?', *Global Networks* 8(1): 1-24

Meardi, G. 2012 'Union Immobility? Trade Unions and the Freedoms of Movement in the Enlarged EU', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 50(1): 99-120

Moody, K. 1997 'Towards an International Social Movement Unionism', *New Left Review* 225: 52-75

Mulhern, F. 2011 *Lives on the Left: A Group Portrait* London: Verso

Novelli, M. 2007 'Sintraemcali and Social Movement Unionism: Trade Union Resistance to Neo-Liberal Globalisation in Colombia', in Gamble, A. Ludlam, S., Taylor, A. and Wood, S. (eds.) *Labour, the State, Social Movements, and the Challenge of Neoliberal Globalisation*, Manchester: Manchester University Press

Offe, C. and Wiesenthal, H. 1980 'Two Logics of Collective Action', in Offe, C. (ed.) *Disorganised Capitalism*, Oxford: Polity Press

Phelan, C., Martin, A., *Hancké, B., Baccaro, L. and Erne, R. 2009 'Labour History Symposium on European Unions: Labour's Quest for a Transnational Democracy', Labor Histoy 50(2): 187-216*

Pizzolato, N. 2004 'Workers and Revolutionaries at the Twilight of Fordism: The Breakdown of Industrial Relations in the Automobile Plants of Detroit and Turing, 1967-1973', *Labor History* 45(4): 419-43

Poulantzas, N. 1973 *Political Power and Social Classes*, London: New Left Books

Ramsay, H. 1999 'In Search of International Union Theory', in Waddington, J. (ed.) *Globalization and Patterns of Labour Resistance*, London: Mansell

Reinalda, B. 1997 *The International Transportworkers Federation 1914-1945*, Amsterdam: Stichting beheer IISG

Ross, A. 2008 'The Quandaries of Consumer-Based Activism: A Low Wage Case Study', *Cultural Studies* 22(5): 770-787

Roudometof, V. 2005 'Transnationalism, Cosmopolitanism and Glocalization', *Current Sociology* 53(1): 113-135

Silver, B. 2003 *Forces of Labor: Workers' Movements and Globalization Since 1870*, New York: Cambridge University Press

Skrbis, Z. and Woodward, I. 2007 'The Ambivalence of Ordinary Cosmopolitanism: Investigating the Limits of Cosmopolitan Openness', *The Sociological Review* 55(4): 730-747

Southall, R. and Bezuidenhout, A. 2004 'International Solidarity and Labour in South Africa', in Munck, R. (ed.) *Labour and Globalisation: Results and Prospects* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press

Szerszynski, B. and Urry, J. 2002 'Cultures of Cosmopolitanism', *The Sociological Review* 50(4): 461-481

Thompson, E. 1963 *The Making of the English Working Class*, Southampton: The Camelot Press

Thompson, E. 1978 'Eighteenth-Century English Society: Class Struggle Without Class?', *Social History* 3(2): 133-65

Turnbull, P. 2006 'The War on Europe's Waterfront: Repertoires of Power in the Port Transport Industry', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 44(2): 305-326

Umney, C. 2012 'Managerial and Mobilizing Internationalism in the British Docks and Seafaring Sector', *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 18(1): 71-87

Van der Linden, M. 2008 *Workers of the World: Essays Toward a Global Labor History*, Leiden: Brill

Waddington, J. 2006 'The Performance of European Works Councils in Engineering: Perspectives of the Employee Representatives', *Industrial Relations* 45(4): 681-708

Waterman, P. 2001 'Trade Union Internationalism in the Age of Seattle', *Antipode* 33(3): 312-36

Werbner, P. 1999 'Global Pathways: Working Class Cosmopolitans and the Creation of Transnational Ethnic Worlds', *Social Anthropology* 7(1): 17-35