

INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (ISA)

LABOUR MOVEMENTS Research Committee (RC) 44

November 2000

Secretary's Notes

Inside

	Page
Contact Information	2
Article	3
The Research Agenda: The impact of European Integration <i>Richard Hyman</i>	
Participation, Gender and Ethnicity in decision making in former Yugoslavia <i>Vera Vratusa Zunjic</i>	4
Journal—Call for papers Top Ten Books	5
Social Movement Unionism— A call for theoretical clarification Kim Scipes	6
Profile of a research Unit Portugal	7
Update Challenges for Finnish Trade Unions	8
Call for Papers Conference on Finland	9
Preview ISA World Congress, Brisbane 2002	11

In this edition of the Newsletter we focus on trade unions in Europe. The internationalisation of the economy, the liberalisation of capital markets, the development of new forms of production and information technology, are transforming the European labour market, placing emphasis on international competitiveness and skill development.

In the face of these changes in the global economy trade unions face a number of challenges. Firstly, they need to find a way of combining the development of international policies and activities with the growing stress on the decentralisation of bargaining. Secondly, they need to recruit and develop new forms of representation appropriate to the new groups of flexi-workers emerging in the labour market. Thirdly, there is growing pressure on unions to merge. Finally the workplace is growing in importance as an arena for union organisation and activity.

Significantly social pacts have re-emerged as a central issue in European industrial relations. But unlike the agreements of the sixties and seventies, social pacts in the nineties involve wage restraint, increased labour market flexibility and social security adjustments.

However as is argued in a recent book on Social Pacts in Europe, investment rates are falling despite wage restraint. Furthermore profits are rising and these profits are not being reinvested. This, they argue, has destroyed the shared diagnosis that underlies pacting and has led to tension between trade unions as to what is the appropriate pay nor in a context of economic globalisation and of unemployment, atypical employment, exclusion from the labour market and regional disparities' (Giuseppe Fajertag and Philippe Pochet, *Social Pacts in Europe*, 2000, European Trade Union Institute, p24-25).

We hope this edition of the Newsletter encourages our members in Europe to respond to the issues raised in this edition and suggest possible themes for our conference in Brisbane

Mission

To encourage international research on Labour Movements, with a focus on their role both in industrial relations and in the political arena. Membership is open to any person engaged in research into Labour Movements or in Labour Movement Activities

Newsletter Editor

Edward Webster
Phone: 27 11 717 4426
Fax: 27 11 717 4469
E-mail: 029edw@muse.wits.ac.za

Newsletter Distribution and Membership

Anthea Metcalfe: antheam@yebo.co.za

Please e-mail/fax all copy and requests for information for this newsletter to the Editor
Membership queries can be directed to Anthea

LABOUR MOVEMENTS**Research Committee (RC) 44****President - Richard Hyman**

London School of Economics
London
UNITED KINGDOM
Phone: 44-1203-523840
Fax: 44-1203-524656
E-mail: r.hyman@lse.ac.uk

Vice-president - Claire Williams

Dept of Sociology, Flinders University
GPOB 2100, Adelaide, SA 5001
AUSTRALIA
Phone: 61-8-82012628
Fax: 61-8-82013521
E-mail: claire.williams@flinders.edu.au

Secretary - Edward Webster

Sociology of Work Unit (SWOP)
University of the Witwatersrand
Private Bag 3, Wits, 2050
SOUTH AFRICA
Phone: 27 11 717 4426
Fax: 27 11 717 4469
E-mail: 029edw@muse.wits.ac.za

Board members**Varkey Jose**

International Institute for Labour Studies
Geneva
E-mail: jose@ilo.org

Rob Lambert

Dept of Organisation and Labour Studies,
University of Western Australia, Perth
AUSTRALIA
E-mail: rlambert@ecel.uwa.edu.au

Carla Lipsig-Mumme

CRWS, University of York,
CANADA
Email: carlalm@yorku.ca

Regina Morel

Dept of Sociology, Federal University
of Rio de Janeiro, BRAZIL
E-mail: moreRLM@aol.com

Pamela Roby

Department of Sociology,
University of California, Santa Cruz,
USA
E-mail: roby@cats.ucsc.edu

International Sociology Association (ISA),

Facultad CC. Políticas Y Sociología, Universidad Complutense 28223 Madrid, Spain

Phone: 34 - 913 527 650
E-mail: isa@sis.ucm.es

Fax: 34 - 913 524 945
<http://www.ucm.es/info/isa>

The Research Agenda: The Impact of European Integration

by Richard Hyman

In 1957 the Treaty of Rome established the European Economic Community (popularly known as the 'common market'); in the 1980s the title European Union was informally adopted; since the Maastricht Treaty of 1992 the name European Union (EU) has become the official designation. The EU is a curious formation: unlike most other free trade areas it is not simply a market, but it is far from constituting a supranational state. Among political scientists the analysis of the nature of the beast has become a significant growth industry. But what are the implications for sociologists of labour movements?

A cynic might say that the EU has provided new avenues of research funding when national budgets have in most cases become constrained. In a sense this is true, but most EU funding is for narrowly defined policy-oriented projects which have limited appeal to students of labour movements. We may note however that the EU largely funds the European Trade Union Institute (the research arm of the European Trade Union Confederation), which cultivates wide-ranging contacts with sympathetic academics and also publishes a valuable quarterly journal, *Transfer*. Also worth mentioning is the European Foundation in Dublin, one of the organs of the EU, which sponsors considerable comparative research on working life and industrial relations, and also collates current information on developments in all 15 member states of the EU (see its web site, <http://www.eurofound.ie>).

Certainly the existence of the EU has had a marked impact on the content of the research agenda. I have space just to highlight what I see as **five key themes**.

First, 'globalisation' – a topic of global debate and often mystification – has distinctive European dimensions. The consolidation of the 'single market' a decade ago encouraged rapid corporate restructuring, introduced (in some countries for the first time) the phenomenon of hostile take-overs, and created novel enthusiasm for the principle of 'shareholder value'. In the same period, currency union has been linked to deflationary budgetary disciplines, while labour market flexibility has become central to public policy at both national and EU level. There has been much debate and analysis on how far these trends threaten to destroy the European 'social model' based on recognised trade union status, entrenched labour standards and a developed welfare state.

Second, there is much debate on the possibility of a meaningful 'social dimension' to accompany and humanise the market-driven processes of economic integration. In this context, a crucial question is how far European labour constitutes an actually or potentially coherent actor. Is there an effective perception of common interests and a will to mobilise resources cross-nationally, or are unions – whatever their public rhetoric – primarily concerned in defending their own narrowly defined national interests? The weight of scholarship on both these related questions is fairly pessimistic, though there are indeed optimists to be found.

Whatever the limitations of the 'social dimension' in general, social regulation at EU level has registered some important advances. Perhaps the most notable is in the field of women's rights and equal opportunities. Not only has substantial progress been made in EU legislation (though the limitations can of course be criticised), but the position of women in employment and the labour market has been above all the field where radical research and scholarship have benefited from EU funding. One could almost say that, thanks to the EU, labour-related gender studies have become mainstreamed.

A fourth theme of some importance is the nature and impact of the European Works Councils (EWCs), established on the basis of a 1996 EU directive. In formal terms these are little more than token information committees; but despite their lack of formal powers, are EWCs potentially a framework within which workers' representatives within multinational companies can develop common understandings and eventually construct a common strategic agenda? This has become a major area of research.

Finally, current negotiations over the enlargement of the EU to the east have obvious implications for labour and for labour researchers. Is enlargement a threat of undermining established standards in western Europe, or an opportunity to improve conditions in the east – or perhaps both? Such questions can be answered only on the basis of a grounded understanding of the nature of the emerging industrial relations regimes in eastern Europe. Here most sociological literature a few years back was little more than formal institutional description; today there is a much richer corpus of research.

More generally, one can say that for at least a decade, labour has been on the defensive in most of Europe. But there is an air of change and innovation to be found today, and many committed scholars are doing their best to understand and to help shape what is positive in current developments.

Richard Hyman
London School of Economics, UK

Participation, Gender and Ethnicity in decision-making in former Yugoslavia

By Vera Vratusa Zunjic

This is a brief presentation of published research (Economic Analysis, Vol.2, No.1 1999, 57-68) and includes hypotheses of ongoing research on factors that influence people's assessment of their level of participation in decision-making at work and their desire to increase this in the former Socialist Federate Republic of Yugoslavia. Former, and even present Yugoslavia. Within their borders are affiliates of all south Slavic and numerous other ethnic groups originating from countries with different religions and cultures, who live in historically inherited regions that reproduced unequal levels of economic development and (variegating dominant legitimization ideologies.???) This present(ed) the opportunity for comparative research on participation in the workplace.

This research does not have only historical value as the evidence of the past epoch but the theme of participation in decision making at the work place remains on the agenda of all those interested in the self-managing strategy of social development. in the dramatic moments of the ongoing antagonistic social transformation process of social and state property into private property by specific domestic and international social actors. These investigations were, and are still done on the basis of the secondary analysis of data gathered in 1989/90 from 14438 respondents by the Consortium of Yugoslav Social Sciences' Institute, "Quality of life" Survey just before the termination of the institutional existence of self-management and the war that tore this complex country apart. The data is drawn from stratified samples of all adult citizens in six former Yugoslav Republics and two provinces.

The question of whether there existed gender specific differences with respect to the levels of participation, and was anything being done to improve it, was the first to be examined. Male and female responses to, "How great is your participation in decision making in your work organization?" were compared. It offered five answer modalities describing small, medium and large levels of participation, with or without desire to increase the first two. The research confirmed the hypothesis that males dominate the decision-making process. Women respondents realistically evaluated their participation as "small" one third more often than men, and as "large" three times less often. This can be explained by the over-representation of women in the unskilled worker category, that is by definition associated with small real decision making power, and their under-representation in the categories of managers and politicians, which is associated with large participation in decision making. On the basis of the finding that almost three out of four highly educated male respondents occupied the position of manager at work and politician simultaneously, while only less then one out of three highly educated female respondents occupied the ruling work position, it is ascertained that education as important channel of social mobility is not valued equally for males and females.

The second research hypothesis that considerable intra-gender differences are caused by respondents' class specific characteristics (skill levels, job qualifications, occupations) is corroborated by the finding that four fifths of both male and female respondents assessed their participation level as small, indicating the existence of an oligarchic power structure. A related finding that the desire to increase their low level of participation was the most widespread among respondents of both gender, suggests that these responses were affected by their common class interest to at least influence decision making, if not even to control it, in order to improve their precarious social and economic work place position.

From the initial research findings, questions were formulated for further qualitative research:

1. Why female low paid unskilled workers tend to express less often the desire to increase their participation level than their male colleagues?
2. Why do unqualified women workers more often perceive their level of participation as medium, and even larger than their male colleagues?
3. Why do female specialists more often accept lower participation levels than men, and less often express the desire to increase their medium participation levels than their male counterparts?
4. Why are a high percentage of both male and female managers and politicians satisfied with their middle level of participation? Does this tendency point to insufficient decision-making and therefore also responsibility taking motivation of former Yugoslav ruling personnel, that presents to the actual moment important recruiting pool for the new-old domestic political and economic elite????
5. How much was the self-management system of decision-making in former Yugoslavia turned by directors and experts into "their" instrument used to formally obtain legal "cover" for the decisions already made not even by themselves alone, but more often by local and republican politicians? How can this decision making in informal power centres, that reduces general level of motivation of all employed to increase their participation level, be prevented in the future?
6. Do ethnically specific differences exist in their self-assessment of participation at the work place and in their desire to increase participation levels in former Yugoslavia?

The ongoing research is focused mostly the last question. It is hypothesized that the explanation of already identified ethnic-specific differences should be examined not only for the cultural specificity of different ethnic and confessional groups, but also for the geographic concentration of these groups in regions with unequal levels of economic development and dominant political cultures, since different socio-historical conditions tend to generate different participation experiences and motivation.

Vera Vratusa-Zunjic
Vvratusa@dekart.f.bg.ac.yu

RC44 Survey - Top 10 most influential books

1	D Harvey, The Condition of Postmodernity	J R Commons et al, History of Labour in the United States	
2	E P Thompson, The Making of the English Working	J D Edelstein & M Warner, Comparative Union Democracy	
3	E J Hobsbawn, Worlds of Labour	W Form, Segmented Labour, Fractured Politics	
4	G S Jones, Languages of Class	A Gouldner, Wildcat Strike	
5	G Friedman, Le travail en miettes	J D Greenstone, Labour in American Politics	
6	H Braverman, Labour and Monopoly Capital	S M Lipset et al, Union Democracy	
7	H Beynon, Working for Ford	R Michels, Political Parties	
8	J B Lopes, A Sociedade Industrial no Brasil (The Industrial Society in Brazil)	C W Mills, The New Men of Power	
9	L Rodrigues, Conflito Industrial e Sindicalismo no Brasil (Industrial Conflict and the Trade Unions in Brazil)	S Perlman, A Theory of the Labour Movement	
10	P Rosanvallon, La question Syndicale	H Wilensky, Intellectuals in Labour Unions	

Social Movement Unionism: A call for theoretical clarification

By Kim Scipes

The article in the recent RC44 Newsletter by Steve Lopez on “social movement unionism” in the United States brings up an issue that I feel needs to be addressed theoretically - and that is the very concept of “social movement unionism.” The term has reached most of its present popularity (especially) in the US as a result of Gay Seidman’s 1994 book on the emergence of new unions in Brazil and South Africa, Manufacturing Militance: Workers’ Movements in Brazil and South Africa (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press). In this book, Seidman used the term “social movement unionism” to characterize the new unions gathered together in CUT and COSATU. The term has since been picked up and then transferred to the US context, particularly by Kim Moody in his 1997 book, Workers in a Lean World: Unions in the International Economy (New York: Verso). Since then, a number of writers on labor in the US have used this term.

However, there are two problems with the term as it now stands. First, it has not been adequately theorized in my opinion: it is a term that really tells us little more about the practice of unionism other than mobilizing community support to help union’s win labor struggles, albeit for the good of the entire working class instead of just union members (Seidman, p. 2). The other problem—somewhat related—is that these authors did not know that there had been an international debate on this issue that included Eddie Webster, Rob Lambert, Peter Waterman and myself that had taken place in the late 1980s-early 1990s. This debate was based on efforts to understand the new type of unionism that had arisen in the 1970s-80s in Brazil (CUT), Philippines (KMU), South Africa (COSATU), and South Korea (KTUC).*

Perhaps most useful would be for me to share my definitions of different types of trade unionism that emerged out of the debate, so others can try to further develop them:

Economic unionism is “unionism which accommodates itself to, and is absorbed by, the industrial relations system of its particular country; that engages in political activities within the dominant political system for the well-being of its members and its institutional self but generally limits itself to immediate interests; and that can and sometimes does engage in international labor activities which are largely but not totally designed to help maintain the well-being of its country’s current economic system, ostensibly for the well-being of its members, and these international activities are usually opposed to any type of system-challenging trade unionism” (*Kasarinlan*: 126).

Political unionism is “unionism which is dominated by or subordinated to a political party or state, to which the leaders give primary loyalty—this includes both the Leninist and “radical nationalist” versions. This results in generally but not totally neglecting workplace issues for ‘larger’ political issues. These unions can and sometimes engage in international labor operations which are designed to support unions affiliated with political parties/states which are allied with their party/state” (*Kasarinlan*: 127).

And *Social movement unionism* is a type of trade unionism that differs from the traditional forms of both economic and political unionism. Social movement unionism specifically rejects the artificial separation between politics and economics that is accepted by the other types of trade unionism. Social movement unionism sees workers’ struggles as merely one of many efforts to qualitatively change society, and not either the only site for political struggle and social change or even the primary site. Therefore, social movement unionism seeks alliances with other social movements on an equal basis, and tries to join them in practice when possible, both within the country and internationally.

“Social movement unionism is trade unionism based in the workplace and is democratically controlled by the membership and not by any external organization, and recognizes that the struggle for control over workers’ daily work life, pay and conditions, is intimately connected with and cannot be separated from the national social-political-economic situation. This requires that struggles to improve the situation of workers confront the national situation—combining struggles against exploitation and oppression in the workplace with those confronting domination both external from and internal to the larger society—as well as any dominating relations within the unions themselves. Therefore, social movement unionism is autonomous from capital, the state, and political parties, setting its own agenda from its own particular perspective, yet willing to consider modifying its perspective on the basis of negotiations with the social movements with which it is allied with and which it has equal relations” (*Kasarinlan*: 133).

Since then, there have been a number of changes. Perhaps most importantly have been the changes in South Africa, and the relations between COSATU and the ANC. Do these changes invalidate any of the above definitions? Accordingly, there are a number of questions that we need to address. Are these theoretical formulations adequate or, if not, how can they be improved/replaced? Can they explain developments since 1991, in South Africa and elsewhere? Do we need to add more nuance to the typologies, especially considering whether there are positive or negative versions of SMU? Is this three-part category sufficient, or do we need to add another? Until we come to some agreement on types of trade unionism, it seems unsatisfactory to pass-off un- or under-theorized terms.

Published papers for this debate:

Lambert and Webster in William Cobbet and Robin Cohen (eds) 1988, Popular Struggles in South Africa.

Ronaldo Munck, 1988, The New International Labour Studies: An Introduction.

Peter Waterman, 1991 Working Paper for the International Institute for Research and Education (Amsterdam),

Peter Waterman, 1991, Working Paper for the Institute of Social Studies (The Hague).

Kim Scipes, 1992, *Kasarinlan*, Vol. 7, Nos. 2-3, 4th Qtr. 1991-1st Qtr. 1992: 121-162 (a journal published by the Third World Studies Center of the University of the Philippines),

Kim Scipes, 1992, *Critical Sociology*, Vol. 19, No. 2: 81-101.]

These were joined by unpublished papers by Eddie Webster (1987), Peter Waterman (1988 and 1993), and Rob Lambert (1989).

Kim Scipes
PhD Candidate in Sociology
University of Illinois, Chicago
E-mail: sscipe1@icarus.cc.uic.edu

(Australian People for Health, Education and Development Abroad) Apheda—Union Aid Abroad

APHEDA -Union Aid Abroad was established in 1984 by the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) as a means for Australian workers, through their unions, to directly assist international development by supporting projects for workers in developing countries. Our international program has developed from a rights based approach supporting education, health and capacity building programs in many areas including support of liberation struggles such as the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa. APHEDA has developed projects and partners in many countries in South East Asia, the Pacific, Middle East, Southern Africa and the Caribbean. Our international program places emphasis on training those who will be able to train others, including teachers, nurses, union organisers and community health workers, agricultural workers, and people suffering discrimination including women, indigenous people, refugees and people with disabilities.

Union Aid Abroad - APHEDA is union based, with support from individual trade union members throughout Australia, the ACTU, unions and workplaces involved in supporting projects. APHEDA expresses the Australian union movement's commitment to social justice and international solidarity for human rights and development. Union Aid Abroad - APHEDA is a signatory to the ACFOA (Australian Council for Overseas Aid) code of conduct and is fully accredited with the Australian government aid agency, AusAID.

International Study Tours 2001 Thailand, Cambodia & Indonesia

The APHEDA Study Tours are part of our global education program and provide a unique opportunity for trade unionists, APHEDA members and supporters to experience countries, cultures and development projects hosted by APHEDA project partners. APHEDA has taken over 100 unionists on 16 study tours over the last 7 years to Southeast Asia, the Middle East and the Pacific. This is a invitation to unique opportunity for activists - come with us on an APHEDA - Union Aid Abroad study tour. You will come back with a greater understanding of the issues confronting workers and their families in the countries visited, and a renewed commitment to global justice and solidarity is guaranteed !! Visit these countries in a sensitive, learning way, visit major tourist sites, get a direct update on trade union, economic, cultural and social changes through tours hosted by APHEDA's project partners in these countries.

Tour 1 Burma Human rights (Thai-Burma border, Bangkok, Chiang Mai)

4th - 11th January 2001, Approx price - \$2,300

Tour 2 Cambodia (Angkor Wat Temples, education and health)

12th - 19th January 2001 Approx price - \$ 2,625

Tour 3 Burma human rights & Cambodia combined

4th - 19th January 2001 Approx price - \$ 3,600

Tour 4 Indonesia (May Day in Indonesia looking at workers rights and labour education)

30 April - May 6 2001 Approx price - \$2,050

Possible Tour 5 Middle East (Palestine, Jordan, Lebanon, Israel) Health, tourist sites human rights May 2001.

Only if enough interest. Approximate price \$4,500

Price includes all travel, accommodation, interpreters, customary gifts, departure taxes and some meals - great value !! Approximate costs may vary slightly depending on numbers in groups. Min 7 persons max. 12 per group.

Further information about campaigns and current appeals can be found on our website

www.apheda.org.au

email: apheda@labor.net.au

mail: Box 3 Trades Hall, 4 Goulburn St, Sydney NSW 2000 Australia

Globalization of Finnish business activity and money-markets, economic depression and joining the European Union have been phenomena which have changed industrial relations in Finland. However, the very high unemployment rate dominates debate on Finnish working life. At its highest it was about 18% in 1994. Since then it has decreased, but is still a bit over 8%. This and changes in labour markets have forced trade unions to face new challenges. Like elsewhere, flexibility and readiness for changes have become the key concepts in the development of new strategies by employers in order not only to improve the efficiency and profitability of work organizations, but also in order to weaken the formerly relative strong position of trade unions.

Partly because of these new ideas, the role of the Finnish trade union movement during and just after the depression, has been subject to great criticism. It has been branded as a watchman of old structures and practices. According to research report of EVA (Centre for Finnish Business and Policy Studies) 43% of Finnish people agreed with the statement that *The trade union movement is the drag of development (slowing development??)*. However, it was mainly the economic elite that supported this, with 83% of managers agreeing with the statement. In the light of the EVA study, it seems that generally managers have a very pessimistic idea of the role of trade unions (1997). They view it as one of the main factors that hinder the further development of enterprises.

However, not all managers share the same views about employee activity. Although, they may have a lukewarm attitude towards trade unions, they are in favour of increasing workers' participation opportunities and influence in decision-making at the company level. EVA's study indicates that managers are ready to give more voice to employees in enterprises' internal matters providing that the well established centralized bargaining rounds can be skipped. And indeed, since the beginning of the 1990s, local bargaining practices have increased in the Finnish industrial relations, (but not at the cost of centralized bargaining that is attempted bring about even in this year????)

Reasons for the tough continuity of centralized bargaining have been at least twofold. Firstly, Finland has bound its currency to EMU, which means that it must monitor the inflation rate that has been increasing since the end of the 1990s. This implies that the Finnish economy can not afford high wage increases. Because it is well known that union and even company based negotiations in Finland (especially in the pulp and paper industry that was earlier the main pillar of Finnish economy) will lead to higher wage increases than in the case of centralized bargaining, even employer organizations have been in a favor of centralized negotiations.

Secondly, also the three federations of Finnish trade union have most of their affiliates in favour of centralized bargaining. The reason for this is partly the same as indicated before. The weaker unions have understandably preferred centralized negotiations, if they want to set a minimum level for their demands which is used as a bench mark for local bargaining. In the name of solidar incomes policy????, even strong unions have joined this strategy until the last year. Then unions did reach consensus around income increase demands. Therefore, each union carried out individual negotiations and this may become the case even in this year, although, for time being, there seems to exist nominal consensus about demands. It is also unlikely that Finnish trade unions will be able to act in concert in the future because the differences in profitability will increase between different sectors of the Finnish economy.

Consequently, income differences are about to rise among waged workers as the latest statistics already show. The main winners are the male-dominated export industries, while the main losers are workers in the home (domestic???) market and public service sectors that have a strong female majority.

This will increase tensions between respective unions. Although centralized bargaining will continue in Finland, it is evident that negotiations on a local level will be more common and cover more topics than before. This would mean that both trade unions and employers must somehow be able to strengthen their precontractual practices at the company level. Therefore, trust has become very hot topic in the Finnish industrial relations as shown in a few recent studies (1998 & 2000) conducted by myself and colleagues.

From an effectivity??? point of view, there has been a common culture of distrust in Finnish industry. It seems that it will be a great challenge for both the employers and the employees to change their ways of thinking and former strategies in this respect. According to our studies (1998), shop stewards seem to strategic in bringing about this change. Their status at the work place level, however, has been questioned by the employers. They want to undermine this status, because they know how important shop stewards are for the effective functioning of the union and because of they also know that willingness to become a shopsteward among unionists is decreasing due to the increasing responsibilities it involves. It is only the shop stewards who usually must take care of local bargaining.

Distrust, however, is not only problem that is emerging while local bargaining is increasing. For the time being, also the coverage???? of centralized bargaining has been disputed. Employer organizations have claimed that at least 50% of the branch of industry must be unionized before results of negotiations can be extended to non-members. This is not a case in some white collar jobs and, for example, in a construction and transport industries. These branches are, however, exceptions. (The share of organized labour in Finland, is approximately 80%). Still the question has become a hot topic in the Finnish industrial relations.

There exists both external and internal threats that the Finnish trade unions have to deal with. Naturally, there are also long term problems that they have to face. I will name here only two. Firstly, Finnish companies are both merging at a increasing rate with Nordic or other international enterprises and replacing their functions abroad. For instance, Finland lost (close???) during the deepest recession (1989-1994) over 200 000 industrial work places which is about 10% of the entire Finnish work force. At the same time Finnish industries established the same amount of work places abroad. And this trend continues. This has weakened some unions significantly and demanded that others internationalize their activities, but up to now it has taken place very slowly.

Secondly, trade unions are about to erode from within. According to my and my colleagues' studies, an individualization is emerging in traditional industrial unions (2000), particularly among younger male union members in metal industries. They have very individualized attitudes and consider their unions merely as as some sort of safety nets. If this trend will be generalized, it implies that very varying and even contradictory expectations concerning union policies will emerge. How to combine them and plan solvent strategies in order to tackle external pressures will be one of most difficult challenges that Finnish trade union movements will face in a long run.

Kaj Ilmonen
Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences
University of Jyväskylä, Finland
Email: ilmonen@dodo.jyu.fi

**THE "DISASTER AND SOCIAL CRISIS RESEARCH NETWORK"
5TH ESA CONFERENCE**

1. Disasters and Social Crises: Visions and Divisions in American and European Approaches

This session will focus on theories in European disaster and social crisis studies. Among the questions to be addressed are: How theoretical is contemporary European disaster and social crisis research? How theoretical? Are the theoretical approaches of European sociologists different from those of their American counterparts? How theoretically homogeneous are European disaster studies? that is, are there national differences in theoretical orientation? Is there skewing in theory use as a result of differing events and differing threats in different European countries? Are there East-West European differences?; North-South differences? To what extent do document studies reflect recent trends in sociological theory? To what extent are they grounded in the "classics"? Are different theories being used to explain disasters versus other types of crises? Are European sociologists more concerned with special theories of disaster or with theories of social life that also incorporate disasters?

Coordinators: Wolf Dombrowski, Disaster Research Unit, University of Kiel, Germany.

E-mail: wdombro@soziologie.uni-kiel.de

Robert A. Stallings, School of Policy, Planning, and Development, University of Southern California, USA,

E-mail: rstallin@usc.edu

2. Deconstructing Disaster Management: Beyond the Command and Control Model

This session will address the role and efficacy of the dominant model of disaster management known as 'command and control'. Secondly it will explore alternatives, such as the emergent human resources model. Papers will examine the following questions: Is the highly centralised, militaristic command and control model, widely used around the world, the most effective or appropriate? How successful is it in meeting the needs of highly culturally diverse urban communities? Is it sensitive to the needs of different social groups such as women, ethnic minorities, disabled persons, children, the elderly? Is it more appropriate at some stages of the disaster process than others? What is the actual and potential role of emergent groups in disasters and disaster planning and to what extent is their inclusion compatible with the command and control model? What alternative models exist? What examples are there of alternative models in practice (as opposed to purely theoretical models) ?

Coordinator: Maureen Fordham, Anglia Polytechnic University, United Kingdom.

E-mail: m.h.fordham@anglia.ac.uk

3. The Contributions of Sociology to Disaster Research and Vice Versa

Sociological theories and models have contributed to disaster research. Ideas from collective behavior, complex organizations and symbolic interactionism have been used. But since this was last systematically documented 15 years ago, updated versions will be obtained. This session will also identify sociological theories, models, bodies of empirical research and major hypotheses not yet systematically applied in disaster studies. Finally, special attention will be paid to how and where disaster research has and/or could feedback into sociology.

Coordinators: EL (Henry) Quarantelli, Disaster Research Center, University of Delaware USA. E-mail: elqdr@udel.edu

Bruna de Marchi,, ISIG Institute of International Sociology of Gorizia. E-mail: bruna.de-marchi@libero.it

4. Global Accumulation of Capital as a Factor in Social Crises and Complex Disasters

Session proposes to examine the extent to which the antagonistic process of profit-seeking within the global capitalist economy can be considered the causal factor in social crises and complex disasters, involving deprivation of people and destruction of their lives, as well as of their natural, social, technical and cultural environment. Recent experiences in Iraq and Yugoslavia repose the question to what extent the competition of transnational corporations to gain unimpeded access to cheap raw materials, labor force and/or markets has contributed to the emergence and exacerbation of social crises and complex disasters with all their attendant consequences, including among other things pollution of air, ground and water, falls in production and rises in unemployment, increased death rates and illnesses of all kinds, and repression of social movements which are protesting the disastrous policies of transnational capitalist institutions.

Coordinator: Vera Vratusa, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

E-mail: vvratusa@f.bg.ac.yu (RC44 member)

5. Disaster and Sociocultural Changes: Changes other than those in the Organization of Civil Protection

Social Science disasterologists usually restrict their research and analysis to an assessment of the responses of organizations, communities and citizens with a view toward improving the effectiveness of response in future disasters. In this context, they usually investigate those aspects of social organization which relate to civil protection. Few studies have concentrated on the impact of disasters on other aspects of social organization. These few exceptions have dealt mainly with the impact of disasters on intra-group solidarity and deviance--processes which are short-term reactions with no implications for more permanent and extensive socio-cultural changes. This session invites theoretical, conceptual or empirical papers on the impact of 'natural' and/or "technological" disasters on other than civil defense institutions. The papers may take a macrosociological systemic approach (i.e. assess the impact on the entire social system) or an institutional approach (i.e. analyze the impact on specific social institutions such as the familial, the educational, the legal-political, the economic, and the religious).

Coordinator: Nicholas Petropoulos, Emergencies Research Center, Athens.

E-mail:erc@otenet.gr

Profile

Portuguese Unit

Preview

ISA WORLD CONGRESS, BRISBANE, JULY 2002

DATE: Monday July 8 to Saturday July 13, 2002.

THEME: **THE SOCIAL WORLD IN THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY:
Ambivalent legacies and rising challenges**

