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Abstract

Inspired by the ‘transnational turn’ in history writing, this essay reviews recent scholarship dealing with industrial relations from a transnational perspective. The essay starts with conceptual reflections on the merits and potential pitfalls of a transnational approach, and suggests that such an approach should include not only the study of actors, networks and processes at the transnational level (top down perspective), but also that of the impact of transnational factors on industrial relations in specific countries and locations (bottom up perspective). The main part of the essay critically reviews the available scholarship with regard to this two-pronged agenda and makes suggestions for future research.

The call to look beyond national borders has come into fashion among historians, and this trend equally applies to labour history. The urge to overcome ‘methodological nationalism’ has entailed a whole flood of conferences and publications on ‘transnationalism’, while leading advocates have elaborated ambitious future research agendas for what is alternatively labelled as ‘transnational’ or ‘global’ labour history.

In this essay, I review a sub-field of this literature, namely the scholarship dealing with industrial relations from a transnational perspective. Industrial relations are broadly understood as the system of relationships between employees, trade unions, employers and the state concerned with the rules pertaining to labour aspects of production (Zeitlin 1987: 159). In the first part, the essay provides conceptual reflections on the merits and potential pitfalls of a transnational approach to industrial relations, suggesting that such an approach should include not only the study of actors, networks and processes at the transnational level, but also that of the impact of transnational factors on industrial relations in specific countries and locations. Sections two and three critically review the available literature in relation to this double inquiry; due to space limitation the discussion of transnational entanglements at the country level is confined to the cases of Britain and Germany. I conclude that the current state of the art is characterized by a disjuncture – while the study of transnational networks and organizations has made rapid progress in recent years, these analyses have often remained detached from ‘mainstream’ national industrial relations historiography. In the future, as Trentmann pointed out already in 1997 in relation to labour parties and trade unions, more efforts are needed ‘[…] to treat domestic and international thought and policy as interlocking spheres’.

I

A review essay is not the place for an extended discussion of the vivid and ongoing conceptual debates about transnational history writing. However, a few preliminary
conceptual reflections are necessary to clarify the assumptions that underpin the subsequent empirical assessment of the industrial relations literature.

Over the last two decades, the rapid growth of transnational history writing has primarily been driven by an increasingly widespread dissatisfaction with what came to be labelled as ‘methodological nationalism’, that is, past historians’ alleged tendency to conceive of ‘society’ as synonymous with ‘nation’ and/or ‘nation-state’, and to treat these nation-state societies as nomadic ‘containers’ whose interactions with the outside world were of secondary importance. There was an urge to historicise national categories – further nurtured by the broader spatial turn in the social sciences that spurred historians to question the ‘natural’ boundaries of national ‘space’ and to inquire into shifting notions of ‘territoriality’.

Unsurprisingly, against this backdrop, transnational history writing has to this date focused on all those connections and entanglements that ‘transcend’ national societies. There has been a strong emphasis on flows in general, and on the cross-border movement of people in particular – witness the prominence of migration issues in the transnational history debate. Moreover, a great deal of work has been dedicated to the study of transnational networks and institutions – from the scholarship on global institutions like the League of Nations and the UN, to the literature about international NGOs, cross-border political, economic and religious networks, and the ‘epistemic communities’ of experts.

While transnational history writing along these premises has been growing impressively, a number of scholars have warned against an excessive and exclusive focus on cross-border flows and networks, and the associated occasional tendency among transnational historians to perceive their approach as a radical new paradigm that cuts all connections with ‘traditional’ historiography. These critiques, I submit, need to be taken on board for a transnational history of industrial relations, too.

To start with, as Patel reminds us, a radical decoupling from ‘traditional’ approaches runs the risk of an implicit normative agenda that associates transnational history by definition with utopian ideals of cosmopolitanism and a peaceful ‘world society’. It is indicative of this normative bias that scholars frequently use the term ‘transnationalism’ rather than more ‘neutral’ categories like ‘transnationality’ or ‘transnationalisation’. This is problematic, however, because it implies a dangerous teleological understanding of transnational history and tends to restrict the scope of inquiry – at the extreme, the cross-border cooperation of criminals and racists is part of transnational history, too.

A second (and in part related) problem is that the radical urge to overcome ‘methodological nationalism’ at times goes hand in hand with an understanding of transnational history as ‘post-national’ history and an associated rigid demarcation from ‘traditional’ international history. Here, there is a danger to throw the baby out with the bath-water. While the precise relationship between transnational and international history is debatable, much militates against a clear-cut demarcation and even more so against a juxtaposition between ‘national’ and ‘transnational’. Indeed, a growing body of scholarship emphasizes the symbiotic nature of trans-nationality (inter-nationality) in nineteenth and twentieth century European history. Transnational (international) arenas and organizations – from the UN to international sporting events – have helped to entrench nationality as a universal principle of political and social organization, while a host of transnational factors have continuously shaped and reshaped nationally defined cultures and practices. Consequently, in the words of Sebastian Conrad, “[...] il ne s’agit pas tant d’expulser la catégorie de ‘nation’ hors de l’histoire que de proposer une explication alternative de sa constitution – constitution qui n’est pas due uniquement à une impulsion interne, mais doit se lire aussi comme produit de l’interdépendance des sociétés.”
The methodological upshot of these reflections is that transnational history should be understood as a complement rather than a radical anti-thesis to ‘traditional’ national historiography. This can be thought about in two different ways. From a top-down perspective, the analysis of transnational flows, networks and institutions should include systematic attention to their relationship to the national sphere. How, on the one hand, did national structures and actors shape the development of transnational flows and networks? And how, on the other hand, did these flows and networks impact upon domestic attitudes and practices?

From a bottom-up perspective, transnational history faces the challenge to relate cross-border entanglements to the analysis of place-specific processes of change. For example, a transnational approach can add a new dimension to the history of particular places – whether cities, regions or countries. At its best, the ‘added value’ of such transnational histories is not confined to a cumulative widening of perspectives, but implies the attempt to critically engage with existing narratives of national historiography – as illustrated, for example, in Conrad’s and Trentmann’s transnational approach to the history of nationalism in Germany and Britain in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Adopting the distinction between top-down and bottom-up perspectives as a structuring device, the remainder of this essay will now turn to the review of the existing transnational industrial relations literature.

II

The study of industrial relations-related transnational networks and organizations has made rapid progress during the last two decades. This is perhaps best expressed in the proliferating scholarly work on the International Labour Organization (ILO). Founded in 1919 under the auspices of the League of Nations with a unique tripartite decision-making structure (government, employer and trade union representatives), the ILO is often considered as the key organization in attempts to promote a ‘global social order’ – by the early 21st century it had adopted about 180 international conventions on work-related issues.

The ILO’s history started to spark professional academic interest since the late 1950s – by lawyers, political scientists and historians alike. But it is since the 1990s that we have witnessed a breakthrough towards a multi-faceted and sophisticated ILO historiography. Not only has the ILO’s institutional history been more systematically explored than before. More importantly, recent scholarship has branched out in many directions to address specific issues of the ILO’s activities – from its involvement in the struggles against child and forced labour, to the promotion of gender equality and the intellectual construction of social security regimes. Earlier biographical works on prominent ILO officials like Albert Thomas have been supplanted by a new stream of publications.

International Labour Organization historiography is also exemplary in its attention to the interaction between transnational and national spheres. Already in the 1960s and 1970s, a number of studies had scrutinized the ILO’s relationship with specific member-states, in particular with regard to the Cold War superpowers. Since the 1990s, this line of research has been extended considerably even if a ‘Western bias’ remains – ILO experts see closer attention to development issues and a broader involvement of historians from developing countries as one of the crucial future challenges.

From a narrower European perspective, perhaps surprisingly, the impressive growth of research on the ILO has not yet been matched by equivalent efforts to deal with European Community (Union) industrial relations regulation. There are a number of more
broadly designed studies on the evolution of supranational European social policy, which occasionally include a specific emphasis on the origins of EC social dialogue. But there is yet no comprehensive treatment of the historical development of EC/EU industrial relations agendas – from the promotion of equal pay between men and women, to supranational legislation on health and safety, training and employee consultation. More focused studies, for example with regard to the decade-long debate about EC/EU legislation on worker participation, have so far equally remained the domain of legal and political science scholars.

In a number of cases, transnational industrial relations regulation has taken place in more than just one regulatory arena. International labour standards, for example, have not only been promoted under the auspices of the ILO – their possible incorporation into the world trade regime has repeatedly been discussed within the GATT and WTO frameworks. Since the 1960s, through a consumer-driven dynamic, the labour standards issue has also been addressed in the transnational ‘fair trade’ initiatives. Attempts to regulate industrial relations in multinational firms, too, have been undertaken in a variety of arenas, from ILO to OECD and European Community/Union. Again, this is a field that has so far been dominated by political scientists and that merits closer scrutiny from labour historians.

If we shift the focus from institutional arenas to actors, the recent upsurge in the study of transnational trade union organizations is particularly noteworthy. Certainly, this topic had attracted some interest already prior to the 1990s, yet the last two decades witnessed a quantum leap forward. We now have at our disposal a whole range of good overviews of the institutional evolution and the activities of international trade union organizations – whether Catholic, Social Democratic or Communist, whether at the level of umbrella confederations or in individual sectors, whether global or regional (European) in scope. More focused studies include international union organizations’ involvement in Cold War conflicts, their role in the International Labour Organization, and their attempts to lobby for global and/or regional regulatory codes for multinational firms. The specific case of union-driven transnational bargaining in the maritime industry has attracted particularly strong interest. If a major gap persists, it is the missing local studies of cross-border cooperation in multinational firms. Moreover, unfortunately, the literature on international trade unionism at times suffers from the above mentioned normative bias, expressed, for example, in claims about a ‘prolonged transitional phase’ since the 1960s, which is ‘projected’ to end with the replacement of ‘national internationalism’ (dominated by high-level diplomacy between national union bureaucracies) by a new network-based ‘transnational internationalism’.

Compared to the rich trade union literature, other actors have received far less scholarly attention. This is particularly discernible in the case of employer organizations – except for a few ‘insider’ accounts, there is yet no serious academic analysis of the main international employer confederation, the ‘International Organization of Employers’. At the regional European level, the situation looks better, as we have already available several studies of the EC/EU-level peak employer federation UNICE (later renamed ‘Business Europe’), as well as of more informal groupings such as the ‘European League for Economic Cooperation’ and the ‘European Roundtable of Industrialists’. Moreover, there is also a sizeable literature in relation to European employer networks in specific sectors. However, industrial relations issues have so far not been systematically explored in this literature.

It is also worth pointing to the need for further work on transnational industrial relations expert networks, such as labour economists and lawyers, organizational psychologists or industrial sociologists. There are already a number of good studies about such expert
circles in relation to the activities of the ILO, yet more could be done with regard to the involvement of expert networks in issue-specific debates, for example with regard to the long international discussion about ‘industrial democracy’.

Next to these analyses of transnational regulatory arenas or actor networks, a third and final group of ‘top-down’ studies takes a thematic approach. Here, transnationality is explored in a much more ‘diffuse’ way, as scholars seek to uncover the ways in which industrial relations processes in different locations are connected through cross-border flows of goods, capital, people and ideas.

On the one hand, scholars have conceptualized cross-border flows of goods, capital and workers as constituting transnational labour markets and have sought to trace the impact of specific flows on industrial relations processes and outcomes. Historical migration research has demonstrated that the large-scale outflow of workers often had significant effects on wage levels both in the sending and receiving country, while Beverly Silver’s *Forces of Labour* convincingly points to the impact of global commodity and capital movements on worker bargaining power and strikes. There are also interesting studies on the impact of cross-border flows in concrete bargaining situations, e.g. with regard to employer tactics to ‘import’ foreign strikebreakers. This is a fascinating new area of research, which will hopefully be further developed in the future – through a widening of issues areas, but also through the engagement with sociological concepts such as the ‘commodity chain’.

On the other hand, and equally fascinating, scholars have sought to reconstruct the cross-border transfer of ideas and practices. In many cases, this is in fact connected to the flows of goods, capital and people. Migrants, for example, have not only had effects on host country labour markets, but have also frequently inspired new forms of collective action and trade unionism. Likewise, cross-border investment flows by multinational firms have been associated with the transfer of labour management practices – despite the fact that such transfers have usually been constrained by firms’ needs to adapt to regulatory institutions in host countries. There is a huge social science literature on this subject – in particular related to the experience of US-owned firms – with which historians have only just started to engage.

There are of course also many cases in which transnational transfers of ideas and practices are not directly connected to economic cross-border flows but are mediated through various channels of communication. Collective worker protests, for example, have repeatedly spread to other countries by means of media and/or trade union reporting. Labour management practices have likewise been propagated across borders: The post-1945 European ‘import’ of US-style ‘productivity bargaining’, for example, was the result of a multitude of transatlantic encounters – from the OEEC and the ‘productivity councils’ associated with the implementation of Marshall Plan aid, to bilateral employer and trade union meetings. Again, it is not difficult to think about possible other topics to extend this line of research – from the recent spread of ‘Human Resource Management’, to cross-border transfers of worker participation schemes.

III

Gaps and shortcomings notwithstanding, transnational industrial relations historiography from a ‘top-down’ perspective has made impressive progress over the last two decades. However, unfortunately, this is not matched by similar transnational advances in local and national industrial relations studies. In the following, I will use the cases of post-1945
Britain and Germany to illustrate this disjuncture and to make suggestions to better address this problem in the future.

The underdeveloped transnational dimension of British and German post-1945 industrial relations historiography is easily discernible if we take a look at standard reference works. In the case of trade unions, for example, transnational issues were virtually absent in such works in both countries until a few years ago. Indeed, still today, the analysis of transnational issues is usually confined to an ‘addendum’ related to the period since the late 1980. Beyond synthetic overviews, there is of course a more specialized literature dealing with some transnational aspects of post-1945 British and German industrial relations. For example, there is a growing body of scholarship on British and German trade union politics towards cross-border labour migration. Likewise, we already dispose of a quite rich scholarship in relation to trade union attitudes towards European integration. In the UK, this subject had attracted attention already in the 1970s and 1980s, not least because of the prominence of trade union voices in the heated debates about British EC membership during the 1975 referendum. German trade union historians neglected the issue for a long time but have recently started to address it in a systematic way. British and German employer attitudes towards European integration have also been analyzed in several studies. In recent years, moreover, scholars have started to explore the post-1945 development of industrial relations in British and German subsidiaries of multinational firms – even if much remains to be done in this area of study.

While encouraging signs are thus discernible, the literature suffers from a major flaw, namely that it has remained detached from ‘mainstream’ national industrial relations historiography. The problem is, in other words, that the impact of transnationality on domestic industrial relations patterns has hardly been addressed. The only exception in this regard is the Americanization literature, which has not only looked at the attitudes of employer and trade unions towards US models and practices, but has also traced in detail the changes of domestic practices as a consequence of transatlantic encounters during the first two post-war decades. In the German case, for example, the impact of US labour relations models has been shown to have contributed to employers’ post-Nazism transformation and trade unions’ abandoning of radical ideas of planning and public ownership.

The main future challenge for a ‘bottom-up’ transnational history of post-1945 British and German industrial relations is to follow this example and explore more broadly the impact of various transnational entanglements on domestic industrial relations. There is no lack of potential topics. In the British case, for example, historians could engage more with the contemporary literature on foreign-owned firms’ pioneering role in the spread of new industrial relations practices. More ambitiously, they could also systematically explore the transnational dimension of broader industrial relations reform debates since the 1960s, which have so far been studied through a purely domestic ‘lens’. In particular, historians should pay more attention to the importance of multinational firms as model cases and points of reference and to the role of discursive comparisons with foreign industrial relations practices – from the conflicts over the ‘import’ of US labour law and German-style co-determination in the 1970s, to the battle over the UK’s opt-out from EU-level industrial relations directives in the 1990s. In fact, following Howell’s sweeping study of Britain’s ‘three systems’ of industrial relations, such an analysis could even be extended to cover major reform debates throughout the period since the late nineteenth century – already then, cross-national comparisons appear to have played an important role in making (or opposing) the case of reform.
In the German case, it is high time to systematically examine the transnational entanglements in the history of co-determination. Given the more centralized and legally regulated nature of German industrial relations, the ‘demonstration effects’ of foreign-owned firms appear to be generally weaker than in the UK. Yet, they do exist – witness the recent work on the transformation of co-determination into ‘co-management’ since the late 1980s. At the same time, as in the British case, it would be worth exploring the broader discursive context, in particular with regard to the subliminal comparisons with foreign industrial relations systems for co-determination debates in the FRG, which were often connected to comparative assessments of bargaining and strike patterns. That the emergence of a few small and militant occupational unions (e.g. train drivers) in the early 2000s has again triggered German employer anxiety about the alleged danger to ‘import’ the ‘British disease’ should be sufficient proof of the salience of this rhetoric in the post–1945 period. In the specific case of supervisory board co-determination, wider European entanglements also still await scholarly treatment, in particular with regard to the role of German actors and the ‘German model’ in debates about board participation in other European countries and at the European Community/Union level.

It is not necessary to prolong this list of possible areas of inquiry because the general direction should by now be clearly discernible, namely, to repeat Trentmann’s verdict, that more efforts need to be made to treat domestic and international thought and policy as ‘interlocking spheres’. And, while a detailed literature assessment beyond the cases of Britain and Germany falls outside the scope of this review, it is not unlikely that this maxim could prove useful for industrial relations historiography in other countries, too.
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