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Market democracy has triumphed over communism. But for the majority of the world’s population the victory, while important in terms of human freedom, has not led to significant material or social improvement.

In the developing world, labour standards remain often appalling and inequality widens. Child and forced labour continue to flourish in many countries, and children are exploited as workers even in the European Union. Business leaders worry about the growth of corruption as the middlemen and contract-brokers of the new global trading system demand their cut or pay-off. The dynamic new market economies of Asia have based and some continue to base their growth on a suppression of modern democratic rights. Politically, China remains a totalitarian state which imprisons more than ten million of its citizens in forced labour camps. The ex-communist nations in eastern Europe develop unevenly, enriching some but witnessing a revival of renamed communist parties supported by citizens unhappy as the social fabric crumbles. In Russia apparatchiks survive, prosper, and tighten their grip on democracy while proto-fascist nationalists and resurrected Stalinists gain a hearing. Even in the advanced industrialised nations, while political and economic conditions are better, there is increasing economic instability and public anxiety over the economic future.

All of these developments have created a business and policy-making environment where the question of “business ethics” is becoming increasingly prominent. The ever-growing role of the multinationals in international economic integration means that decisions about wages and relocations, workplace safety and workers rights taken by a single corporation may affect thousands or hundreds of thousands of workers. And as multinational corporations seek to extract profit from the very spread of their operations—exploiting differences between wage levels, resource prices, and environmental and workplace regulations in different countries—the potential ethical problems involved in business multiply.

While environmental issues form the focus of important ethical decisions for business, the social question—the impact of business and economic development on democratic rights and civil society—is the ultimate concern behind
most of the ethical dilemmas emerging in multinational business. The "social question" is now, in short, a major world political theme, made international by the rapid integration of the global economy. It may seem a long way from Thai workers being burnt to death in a factory whose doors were locked to prevent them taking a break to the lack of well-paid work for many British men and women, but the new international, or global, economy renders many economic relations part of a worldwide chain. The United Nations reckons that 40 million people enter the job market each year in countries where wages are a fraction of those paid in Britain. These workers form part of a new global labour market which can be fully harnessed by British companies to provide goods and services.

The new labour market is however only one component of the new global economy whose emerging shape has become clearer over the past five years. From the restructuring of work processes to the internationalisation of capital markets to the decline and relocation offshore of manufacturing, the effects of a new stage of international economic integration have become clear in the developed world. In the developing world the effects are more dramatic still: the full integration of vast new areas in the market economy, and the corresponding transformation of cities, societies, and the environment. The successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round of GATT in 1994 and the formation of the WTO in spring 1995 tie these developments together in an international legal framework for the early decades of the twenty-first century. But the exact values, form and operation of the WTO are still in flux.

And trade itself shifts the stage of the ethical decisions and debates facing globalised Western business from the board room to the supermarket, High Street, and shopping centre. The internationalisation of trade means that Western consumers are faced with a range of goods produced all over the world, many by multinationals. Consumers and citizens judge corporations on the ethical decisions—concerning treatment of the environment and employees—embodied in those goods’ appearance in the shops. A recent Demos poll found that two thirds of Britons think that multinational corporations do not strike the right balance between profits and public interest. More and more consumers want to buy goods that are produced and traded on a fair, not an exploitative, basis. Concern over business’ moral capital—or lack of it—is likely to drive powerful and potentially damaging consumer campaigns against those corporations seen as unethical, such as Shell, and conversely help the profits of those, such as the Body Shop, which are seen as socially responsible.

The time is therefore ripe for a new proposal building the defence and promotion of social rights and an internationally agreed business ethics into
the new world order. The development of national economies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries led to common rules passed by Parliaments or Congresses to ensure that companies could not obtain unfair advantages by exploiting children or using slave labour. Companies were stopped from denying employees the right to organise in unions or to bargain to improve their wages, ameliorate their working environment and act in the wider community to improve education, housing and achieve other political ends. In her book, Britons: Forging the Nation, the historian, Linda Colley, argues that abolishing slavery was inimical to the immediate economic interests of Great Britain but it gave the nation a sense of confidence in its democratic and humane values that lasted for a century. The 19th century is much scorned by the modern left. The cliché about a return to Victorian values springs to the lips of anyone denouncing some new measure that worsens workplace condition in this country. Yet the 19th century was the time when a great deal of social legislation was passed that had both national and international import. This pamphlet will argue that the development and application of what might be called a 21st century Plimsoll line for social responsibility in the world economy is now overdue.

However it is important to stress that it is not practicable to dictate an off-the-shelf set of rules. Flexibility in application with special regard to local conditions remains vital but there are irreducible minimum levels—to use business parlance, a bottom line—below which companies and countries should not be allowed to sink if world economic development and open trade are to contribute to democracy and human rights.

National economies are now folding into a new global economy. New global laws are being urged to protect the right of capital or guarantee intellectual property rights across borders. Environmental and social rights require an equivalent international regulation: the global economy of the twenty-first century will require common rules in social and related areas in order to ensure equilibrium between the needs of capital and the rights of individuals. The global economy has to meet its social obligations. To achieve this requires new thinking by companies, governments, and the various organisations representing workers, consumers and environmentalists. The slogan “Think global; act local” needs to be reversed. It is global action that is now needed. Multilateral action is needed, but bilateral and regional agreements as well as private initiatives are required. Governments, companies, trade unions, campaigning non-governmental organisations, as well as the individual as citizen, consumer, employee and shareholder, can play a part. Global action is not the narrow preserve of big governments, rich banks and multinational companies. We can all act globally to assert humankind’s place in the new world economy.
A GLOBAL ECONOMY

Our main interrelated components have driven globalisation: increased global trade; the growth of multinational corporations; the internationalisation of finance; and the application of new technologies in all of these operations, especially computer and other information technology.

Increased world trade is both a key result and a prime motor of this transformation. The volume of world trade has grown 12-fold since 1950, double the corresponding increase in production. More importantly, developing nations' share of exports has increased dramatically, and while increased flows of non-manufactured goods have had a major impact on world markets—for example ores and minerals from the newly opened-up Russian mining industry—it is the change in export mix that is most significant. In 1955, according to Professor Adrian Wood, only 5 per cent of the South's exports to the North were in manufactured goods; by 1989 this had jumped to 53 per cent. Increasingly in the 1980s Northern-based multinationals have relocated their more labour-intensive functions in the South. In some industries such as textiles, footwear and apparel, this has meant that large parts of the manufacturing function itself have left the developed world, leaving behind the higher-skill and higher value-added management, financial, design and marketing functions.

Multinational corporations have played a central role in global economic integration. UNCTAD's 1994 World Investment Report counted 37,000 of them, two-thirds based in the developed world. They now account for a third of global output; trade within and between multinationals makes up 70 percent of world trade. Their growth has further internationalised trade, breaking down borders and opening up investment in areas previously ignored by Northern industrialists. According to Richard Kozul-Wright, their overseas investment doubled to $2 trillion a year between 1987 and 1994; the top 100 multinationals control around a third of the world stock of foreign direct investment (FDI).

These revolutionary shifts in the international economy are tied together by the internationalisation of finance. The deregulation of securities-dealing, banking and investment in many countries in the 1980s, combined with the vastly expanded communications capability and information overview provided by information technology, has caused an explosion in the mobility of capital. It is
estimated that $2 trillion now sloshes back and forth across world financial markets every day. Fifty new stock markets have opened since 1990.

Sources of investment have also changed: pension funds are now major players in international markets, especially in Europe and Japan. Increasingly complicated financial instruments, especially currency-based derivatives, have opened up further new areas of investment—and instability. For the system is becoming more anarchic and unstable, as illustrated by the panic caused by the Mexican government’s devaluation of the peso in December 1994. The collapse of the peso and the Mexican stock and government bond markets caused the powerful US mutual funds (unit trusts) to pull out of what they saw as similar “emerging markets” world-wide, triggering currency crises in places as disparate as Argentina, Poland and Indonesia.

It is important to recognise that it is this globalisation, rather than the industrialisation as such of the developing world, which is revolutionary. While the pace of industrialisation has picked up dramatically in many parts of the developing world—up 4.6 per cent annually, 1989-1995, compared to 0.1 per cent in the North—developing world industrialisation is not in itself new. Some developing countries have long-established manufacturing industries, and a majority of the population in most of them already live in cities. Many already had functioning national capital markets and domestic markets for consumer goods long before the most recent wave of integration.

What is new is their full integration into the world market, and especially their arrival within reach of the multinational corporations, who now employ 20 per cent of the non-agricultural workforce in the developing world and 10 per cent in the North. One quarter of UK manufacturing, for example, is controlled by foreign firms. Decisions can now be made by multinationals to shift their functions and capital and human resources theoretically almost anywhere in the world, and with great speed—even though that dynamic is often exaggerated, and in fact most continue to maintain most of their operations in their “home” countries. Nevertheless, investment by multinational corporations in the developing world has become a more reliable and stable source of investment for those countries than international portfolio funds, and is greatly boosting those nations’ productive capacities. That capacity now competes directly with many more of the North’s sectors—whether simply more in sectors where there had already been some penetration (agriculture and extractive industries) or in completely new areas (areas of manufacturing like software production, and services like data processing and accounting).

This is leading to massive Southern growth that will significantly reorder the relative strength of the world’s largest economies. The Economist
predicts that by 2020, measuring GDP at purchasing power parity, China will be the world's largest economy, with India fourth and Indonesia, South Korea, Thailand larger than Britain, France and Italy.

Some of these linear extrapolations need to be treated with caution. As Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson point out in their book *Globalisation in Question*, there will be 300 million Chinese over the age of 60 by the year 2020—an immense social security burden for the Chinese economy. And with the growth comes a widening gap between rich and poor, both between rich northern nations and poorer ones, especially in sub-Saharan Africa, and within developing nations between a new business-technocratic elite and the masses of workers. Most south and east Asian countries still have huge proportions of their populations living in poverty, and the export processing zone route to development preferred by several nations—notably Indonesia and the Philippines—passes on only very limited wealth from development to the working population.

Yet in the developing world, despite the inequalities of industrialisation, a socially responsible democratic market economy is ultimately a liberating force. The view of some Westerners that semi-feudal pastoralism is somehow "better" or purer than industrial capitalism is a patronising and deeply unrealistic attitude to economic development. When offered the choice between a continued agricultural village life, with attendant poverty, subservience to familial authority, poor sanitation and dependence on the vagaries of climate, and life in the industrialising cities, young men and women throughout the developing world are voting with their feet.

However, the impact of industrialisation in southern economies should not be exaggerated. Manufactured imports from the NICs still only account for 4 per cent of the G7 nations' total imports of manufactured goods; 81.3 per cent of manufactured exports still originated in the OECD in 1991, down from 86.4 per cent in 1979.

Indeed, Vincent Cable of the Royal Institute for International Affairs has recently argued that the whole process of globalisation has been exaggerated, especially in terms of FDI, and that large parts of most of the world's economies will remain unintegrated for the foreseeable future. He points out that globalisation is a phenomenon which is neither new nor necessarily more intense today than at earlier times in economic development, especially the turn of the nineteenth/twentieth century. It is thus perhaps prudent to draw a distinction, as Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson do in *Globalisation in Question*, between globalisation and *internationalisation*. While the latter is certainly taking place, national economies and policies are still salient enough, and likely to remain so for some time, to allow fully global economic integration.
Furthermore, without increased trade the economies of the developed world will not be able to overcome their long-term crisis of overcapacity/underconsumption. In 1993, according to Business Week the "output gap" between the potential and actual GDP of the six largest industrial nations was five per cent of GDP.

Finally, it must be remembered that trade is not a zero sum game: increased trade will ultimately increase production and capital accumulation in both more and less developed nations. And conversely, developing nations' economies would not suffer greatly from intervention in their labour markets via a social clause—or at least the dislocation and adjustment would be transitory. Free trade and foreign investment can be a win-win process provided the market lives by common social and ethical rules.

Like the explosive force of industrialisation in Europe in the nineteenth century, the globalisation of the market in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century has both negative and positive effects, and free trade is likely to amplify both. It accentuates what Schumpeter called the "gale of creative destruction"—dislocation, adjustment and growth—perpetually sweeping capitalist economies. These prospects have set some Northern commentators even outside the Left against free trade, advocating a "new protectionism"—notably Pat Buchanan and Ross Perot in the US, Jean Marie Le Pen in France, and James Goldsmith in Britain. All four are authoritarian political opportunists, but the fears that they play on are real.

Yet there are, so to speak, good and bad forms of protectionism. Bad forms seek to protect products or industries and de-connect nations from economic developments and challenges elsewhere in the world. Good forms of protectionism aim at enhancing skills, using education and training to strengthen workers' "employability" and "trainability", and at protecting people's right to work for fair wages. Openness and accountability in business—essential for the information-sharing within modern corporations that is crucial to competitiveness—needs to be protected from monopolies and cartels. Social structures which allow industries to grow, fade and be replaced also require protection. This second option, in the form of new world rules, is the one that socially responsible managers and centre-left parties have to embrace in order to meet two challenges. Firstly, to restore social and ethical priorities to the globalised economy. Secondly, to defeat the "new protectionism," with its authoritarian overtones which cannot be grafted on to any kind of democratic left political project based on the values of social justice.
Towards Global Social Rules

Agreements to place social restrictions on international trade are nothing new. The first international social clause was agreed between a group of 12 European nations in 1906, banning the trade and manufacture of matches containing white phosphorus, a substance causing serious injuries to workers in the industry.

There are long-standing ILO and UN conventions against child labour and other labour rights abuses, but these are not backed by enforcement mechanisms. Article 23 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights provides for "the right to form and to join trade unions." Other international agreements on labour standards include the EU's social chapter, and there are several multilateral agreements with some labour standards component, for example in the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), a weaker clause in the Organisation of American States' Convention on Human Rights, and a clause in the Mercosur treaty.

Existing types of international intervention in labour standards and business conduct, as well as national measures such as the United States' General System of Preferences (GSP), all use a relatively long-winded system of investigation and action.

The end result of petitioning the relevant international body may be the condemning of a particular practice or the issuing of a warning, but never, in practice, the introduction of trade penalties against offenders.

The International Labour Organisation (ILO)'s criticism of offenders against its conventions does have an impact: the ILO claims that in 1992-93 there were 44 instances where governments made changes in their laws or practices regarding workers' rights following criticism. But such changes may be temporary, and rarely result in broad improvement of big offenders' worker rights situations. The Financial Times reported in April 1996 that South Korea was to ease its draconian labour laws in order to gain admission to the OECD, whose trade union advisory committee carefully monitors labour issues in OECD member states and applicant nations.

The growing recent international debate on a social clause has focused
on GATT and its replacement, the World Trade Organisation (WTO), although the idea of a social clause within GATT has long roots. GATT’s charter already contains labour standards clauses, and the article against forced labour includes theoretical sanctions provisions. These provisions were essentially the scaled down version of the failed International Trade Organisation (ITO)’s unratified 1948 Havana Charter, which had quite ambitious social and labour clauses which could have been interpreted as allowing sanctions against offenders. They were opposed in 1948 by the Republican-dominated US Congress and as a result the ITO never came into being. The GATT and its secretariat were a temporary (1948–1995) instrument in its place.

The internationalisation of trade over the last 25 years brought calls for a more specific social clause within GATT. Most debate on the idea came from international trade union federations and other international organisations—the International Metalworkers Federation called for a GATT social clause as early as 1973. But the idea of a social clause in the Uruguay Round of GATT and the WTO only began to receive governmental support in late stages of the negotiations. In April 1994 at the GATT ministerial meeting in Marrakesh, US trade negotiator Mickey Kantor raised the possibility of the US not signing the new treaty if it did not include labour rights provisions; European Commissioner Leon Brittan also made noises in the same direction. They were met by a storm of protest from developing nations, who accused them, in the words of India’s prime minister PV Narasimha Rao, of using “an alibi for raising protectionist trade barriers.” Peter Sutherland, GATT’s Director and a former banker, was another strong voice against a social clause. The Americans raised the matter again at the ILO’s Governing Body meeting in November 1994, but only France, and to a lesser extent Germany, supported them. The Uruguay Round of GATT was signed without a social clause, and progress in that direction has been put on hold for the moment.

By mid-1996 formal discussion of a social clause in the WTO is stalled, although the idea is widely discussed in the media in many countries. British officials handling GATT affairs in Geneva have refused to support their European colleagues in organising the setting up of a working party on the issue. At the very least, a Labour government could order its officials to stop obstructing sensible discussion of these issues in co-operation with Britain’s North American and European partners.

European opinion outside Britain is not so hostile, however. The European Commission’s 1994 White Paper on European social policy recommended that the WTO “must tackle the subject [of a social clause] without delay, so that respect for basic social rights, notably the right of association and the right to
collective bargaining, forced labour and child labour, are reflected in the decisions taken.” In February 1996, the Commission called for the WTO to set up a working party to look into a social clause guaranteeing labour standards and freedom of association.

Indeed the question of a social clause looms ever larger as the problems created by economic internationalisation go unanswered: it will not go away while workers in the global economy continue to demand it. It continues to loom large at international gatherings to discuss trade and employment, despite the claims of its detractors that it is a dead issue. It caused considerable discomfort at the March 1996 Bangkok summit, where European Commissioner for Asian Affairs Manuel Marin warned that the issue of human rights “cannot be avoided.” And at the G7 employment summit in Lille in April 1996, the social clause was one of the central issues. Moreover Britain looked increasingly isolated in its anti-social clause stance as French president Jacques Chirac affirmed that trade liberalisation and development could “not be dissociated” from respect for universal labour standards. US Labor Secretary Robert Reich strongly supported Chirac’s position. In his last published article, the late Ron Brown, President Clinton’s Commerce Secretary, argued for a rise in the US minimum wage.

A Labour government committed to opting into European co-operation could take the lead with the United States in insisting serious consideration be given at the WTO to the social clause question. The global economy is becoming more integrated, at ever increasing speed. Now is the time for a serious and concerted international initiative to break through the logjams of previous arguments about the social question and trade, while the WTO’s institutional profile is still taking shape and while the debates are current. The debate over a social clause is a process. There is not an off-the-sheet regulation or set of rules that can easily be slotted into world trade agreements. But as business demands—correctly—fair rules for the conduct of global trade it will be impossible to ignore the legitimate demands of employees and the environment for internationally common rules that all business and governments abide by.
Current ILO conventions specify a variety of workers’ rights—both to certain workplace and employment standards and to trade union freedoms.

In summary, these are the right of workers to establish and join organisations, the right not to be discriminated against because of any such memberships; the right to assembly, freedom of movement and due process of law; the right to bargain collectively, the right to equal pay for men and women for work of equal value; to freedom from discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion or political opinion; the right to wages which are sufficient to meet their and their families needs, and the right to protection against excessive hours of work and to various health and safety protections.

Most of these rights were also agreed to as basic standards by the 1995 United Nations Copenhagen Social Summit, whose final declaration was endorsed by Britain. The right to strike is not specifically addressed by the ILO, but is implicit in union rights.

**Human vs workers’ rights**

Even in the above list, it is clear that what are strictly trade union and workplace rights (the right to form unions, strike, and bargain collectively) often tend to get lumped together with “human rights” in the more general sense (voting, freedom of speech, movement and assembly). All of these may be classed as “enabling” rights: they enable citizens demand better material conditions, but do not automatically grant those conditions. Most of them are examples of what some philosophers have called “negative freedom” (freedom from the interference of others, and the state in particular) as opposed to “positive freedom” (rights that imply a claim to a particular share of resources).

Yet very often, and indeed in some of the above ILO standards, “human rights” are extended beyond enabling rights to *material* rights: the right to much more general standards of economic and social well-being, such as certain wage levels, education, housing, health care and the like. This is the case in many of the Northern trade union social clause proposals—for instance those of the German trade union federation, the DGB—and in the standards aimed for by many development groups such as Oxfam or Cafod. Indeed in 1986 the UN passed the
Declaration of the Right to Development, and while this evidently does not carry
the same weight as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it does link the
issues of enabling and material rights.

Within the sphere of enabling rights, there are obvious links between
many of the rights that most Western trade unionists enjoy *qua* unionists and
those they enjoy as citizens in liberal democracies, such as voting, access to a
free media and the right to due legal process. The basic principles of union
democracy are similar to those of electoral democracy; and where there is no
tradition of electoral democracy and any suggestions of the idea are ruthlessly
suppressed (for example in many places in the Arab world) there can be little
realistic hope of achieving union democracy either.

The immediate problem, given the fuzziness of the line between worker
rights and “human rights,” is the extent to which prescriptions of worker rights
are either reasonable or realistic given the political, economic and cultural con-
ditions in many developing nations. There is a cultural and political problem in
getting international consensus on what human rights or workers’ rights should
be. In Britain and other long-established democracies, most would regard the
most basic of union rights—the right to join a union without getting fired or
harassed—as reasonable demands. Many governments in other parts of the
world do not, however, and it is often difficult for such western interventions to
escape the charge of being “imperialistic” and the like when they are made
solely in the form of a social clause.

Thus a social clause would accept that it is neither possible nor
proper to try to equalise wages and living conditions through trade agreements.
Recognising that the developing nations are at an earlier stage of development
than most OECD countries, with associated lower productivity, a social clause
must try to guarantee conditions where workers in the developing world can
work and organise their way to greater prosperity through collective bargain-
ing. The only real solution, both to the problem of “cultural imperialism” and to
the problems of definition of standards and rights, is direct support for trade
unionists in the developing world. And the most important support that a social
clause could give is via basic enabling rights that would make union organisa-
tion and collective bargaining legal and realistic.

**Employee rights in the developing world**

Even the most determined of workers’ movements need legal rights to or-
organise and bargain; or at least, without trade union rights those most basic
functions become extremely difficult. While historically some workers have
made real gains even under authoritarian regimes where they enjoyed almost
no rights, organising has been seriously impeded or completely halted in many other countries. This makes some kind of basic union rights clause a priority within any social clause proposals.

In Asia many governments allow only a single official trade union confederation (for instance in Indonesia the unions of the All-Indonesia Labour Union) and independent union activists are frequently persecuted and jailed. Conditions in the People’s Republic of China and in Myanmar (Burma) are especially repressive, with widespread jailing and torture of activists. As elsewhere in the developing world, repression is often worst in export processing zones, and is frequently merely sanctioned by governments while being carried out by foreign ownership—in east Asia frequently Korean, Taiwanese or Japanese firms and their managers. In the “Asian tigers,” where wages are now far above those of developing nations elsewhere in the region, union rights are still constrained.

In Latin America restricted trade union rights are combined with often extreme levels of violence against union activists, carried out by either governments, employers, organised crime, or by (usually government-run or sanctioned) right-wing death squads. In Brazil, despite strong unions in some sectors, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions reports that “gross acts of violence continued to be committed against rural trade unionists with impunity.” Colombia has perhaps the worst record. In 1992 alone, nearly 1,000 Colombian unionists were murdered and hundreds more disappeared or were forced into hiding. In free trade zones and Export Processing Zones throughout the region, for example in Honduras and the Dominican Republic, harassment, firings and violence against activists are the norm.

In Africa trade unions are suffering as the broader democratisation that seemed to be growing in the early 1990s has slowed. Strict limits on the right to strike, on union officials’ ability to carry out their duties, and on the right to join independent unions at all are the norm. In South Africa the situation has evidently improved since the end of apartheid in April 1994, but there is still violence against union activists. In the Middle East and the Arab world both unions and strikes are illegal in many countries (most Gulf emirates and Saudi Arabia). Strikes are illegal elsewhere, and only state-controlled official unions exist in most of the remaining countries (Iran, Iraq, Syria). Algeria had the worst record of any country in 1994 for repression and harassment of union members: 300 trade unionists were killed, mainly by militant Islamists opposed to the secular position of the Algerian general workers’ union.
Child labour

Perhaps foremost amongst the concerns of social clause advocates is child labour. The ILO estimates that in 1993 there were anywhere between 100 and 200 million children working world-wide—more than 18 per cent of children between the ages of 10 and 14 in parts of the developing world, making up 11 per cent of the workforce in some Asian countries, up to 17 per cent in Africa, and as high as 25 per cent in parts of Latin America. In many industries they suffer high rates of injury and occupational illness. Europeans cannot afford to be smug. Child labour is prevalent in Portugal and reported in the home-working sector in Britain.

Most countries have laws against child labour, but these often only apply to the formal sector of the economy and are rarely enforced in the developing world. While it is possible to argue that the problem will eventually go away with development, it may not. In India's carpet industry, for example, there were an estimated 100,000 children working in 1984, when the industry's exports were worth $100 million. In 1993 the industry's exports had grown to $300 million—and it employed at least 300,000 children. While child labour is a result of poverty, it exacerbates adult unemployment, worsening the economic prospects of the poor in developing nations. In the longer term, the damage it does to education holds nations back from developing skilled workforces.

In order to alleviate the problem, the only long-term solution is the eradication of poverty and greatly improved access to education. Indeed some Western aid and human rights groups, such as Anti-Slavery International, argue against the use of sanctions-based standards enforcement. Such measures, it is argued, address only the export sector, leaving intact cultural acceptance of child labour, particularly for girls and marginalised groups. Sanctions can also force enterprises using child labour into the informal sector—or if enterprises comply, children laid off as a result may be forced into unregulated sectors or worse, the sex trade in some countries. These arguments need to be considered but at some stage the world is entitled to say that child labour is as unacceptable today as slavery was 150 years ago! It should be outlawed internationally once and for all.

Health and safety

Health and safety conditions and working hours in many parts of developing nations’ manufacturing sectors also expose workers to unacceptable hazards. In recent years some major accidents have been reported in the West, such as the toy factory fires in Shenzhen, China in November 1993 (84 workers dead and 40 injured) and June 1994 (11 dead and 63 seriously injured). In
Thailand 188 workers were killed in a toy factory fire near Bangkok in May 1993 where management kept fire exits locked. And these are a tiny proportion of the total deaths in the workplace in the developing world. Long hours, repetitive strain injuries, exposure to chemicals and dozens of other hazards are affecting a greatly increased proportion of workers in the developing world.

Ultimately, international health and safety standards like laws of contract and trade must be based on common rules. But in much of the developing world it is simply unrealistic to expect such standards to be enforced. In the developing world, basic enabling rights and moves against corruption are both more urgent and more feasible. With the rights to empower themselves through democratic and responsible workplace structures such as trade unions and works councils, workers will be able to develop appropriate labour standards in their developing countries in the same way that workers’ unions and parties did in Europe. And with internationally agreed ethical standards for business, encompassing topics such as sourcing, openness, and relations with public officials and politicians as well as labour standards, Northern companies’ good example will help make corruption less acceptable.
HOW A SOCIAL CLAUSE CAN HELP DEVELOPING WORLD ECONOMIES

As debate on a social clause has increased over the last few years, a number of developing countries have mounted a steadily-growing attack on it. The so-called “Bangkok Group,” unofficially led by Malaysia’s Prime Minister Mahathir Mohammed, has denounced proposals for linking labour standards to trade as “imperialism.”

Their argument, very simply, is that developing nations’ principal “comparative advantage” is their cheap labour—“our sole advantage,” according to the Malaysian leader. Goods produced for the international market especially are subject to greater competitive pressures than those produced for the domestic market, and therefore employers and governments regard any improved labour standards or unionisation as reducing their competitive advantage. Labour costs are also a higher proportion of unit costs in the labour-intensive industries which are an important part of manufacturing found in the poorest developing nations.

The critics see the social clause as a piece of protectionism designed to prevent goods produced in the developing world from penetrating Northern markets, thus protecting the jobs of higher paid workers in the developed world. Many Asian leaders also claim that their nations exemplify “Asian exceptionalism,” and thus that their workers do not need or want unions or democracy because of their “Confucian” heritage. The evidence suggests that women and men in Asia have the same needs and desires as their counterparts in Europe or the Americas and that to deny democratic rights in the name of “Confucian” values mainly suits a ruling elite.

Nevertheless these criticisms have some resonance. Protests by China and India in particular helped scupper attempts by the US to improve the new GATT treaty’s labour provisions in 1994. The Bangkok heads of government summit in March 1996 was overshadowed by similar disagreements.

Nor is the Third World critique of “social clause protectionism” limited to the Right or business circles. The veteran Latin American socialist and ex-Venezuelan president, Carlos Andres Perez, told the 1992 ICFTU congress
bluntly that their defence of closed economic systems was “imperialism.” “How can we reconcile the interests of the workers of the developed world with the interests of the workers of the developing world [when] the industrialised countries close the doors of the markets to the products of the developing countries, to the detriment of the workers of these countries?” he asked.

But despite critiques from the left, most developing world business and political leaders oppose a social clause primarily from a right-wing economic position, warning that any non-market labour standards are an unacceptable distortion of market forces. They argue that economic growth will lead—and indeed is the only economically efficient route—to improved labour standards.

The reality, however, is that the process of economic development in the industrialised world illustrates ways in which labour standards legislation benefits employers. Protective social legislation in Britain in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries helped employers who already favoured improved workplace standards by protecting them from unfair competition within the domestic market from goods or services produced more cheaply thanks to exploitative labour practices.

Even today there are many instances in the developed world where unions have helped in the development of new partnerships with management to transform productivity (for instance in the British steel, car and retailing industries.) Where companies in the developing world need to develop high-productivity, flexible production systems, they are unlikely to be able to do so with oppressive labour relations and no worker representation. The ILO’s Dr. Guy Standing, one of the world’s leading international labour market economists, found in his recent study of Malaysian companies that unionised firms were more likely to upgrade technology, re-organise work to increase productivity, and diversify product range. Conversely, competition based on wage cutting tends to trap firms in obsolete product structures by emphasising price rather than product competition, to the detriment of R&D on new products.

Most importantly, in order to realise the full global potential of free trade, domestic demand in the developing world must be raised via collectively-bargained pay raises. Without this domestic demand will not rise, deepening rather than easing the global crisis of underconsumption. Even the World Bank is beginning to realise that economic growth without social and ethical standards is insufficient. Its 1995 development report, “Workers in an Integrating World,” concludes that “Denial of workers’ rights is not necessary to achieve growth of incomes,” and that given certain conditions, “Unions are likely to have positive effects on efficiency and equity.”

This is because labour costs are not the only or even necessarily the most
important factor in attracting investment and development. According to the *Economist* for example, low-skilled labour costs in the Asian semiconductor industry are only 3 per cent of total production costs.

In fact, low wages actually attract relatively little FDI, which tends instead to follow better-trained and more productive labour. The economist Stuart Holland has calculated that low and middle income developing countries saw their share of world-wide FDI flows fall from 25.2 per cent in 1980-1984 to 17 per cent in 1989, at the same time as they deregulated their labour markets and real wages fell; the relatively high-wage US, by contrast, remained the biggest recipient of FDI in 1993. High labour cost France attracted more inward investment than the UK in 1994. High-wage, high-skill growth is a better option for the developing world in the long run, just as it is for the North.

The Western example shows that democracy and modern democratic rights are an integral part of such development. And it is the new social forces in the developing world—most significantly the industrial working class in the manufacturing export sector, and the university-educated urban middle class—whose demands will lead to both greater democracy and more dynamic development. In South Korea it was the trade unions that forced the ruling military dictatorship to make way for more democratic semi-civilian government in 1987, even if that process is still incomplete. In South Africa in the 1980s it was the growth of a massive black trade union movement which proved decisive in bringing the white *apartheid* dictatorship to its knees. And in China in 1989 it was the appearance of insurgent industrial workers organising in Beijing towards the end of the students' days of democracy which rattled the government into taking brutally decisive action.

Independent union organising, collective bargaining and responsible political influence are the only ways that workers in Guangdong and Juarez can hope to harness the dynamism of industrial capitalism for mass benefit as workers in Essen and Detroit have partially done. In doing so, they would also address the world-wide crisis of underconsumption. A more democratic civil context would make development more inclusive, allowing issues of exclusion beyond simple economic inequality on to the political agenda—women's and minority rights, access to land, and environmental protection.

These ideals are not solely Western and to propagate them is not imperialistic. None of the world's major religions directly advocate human degradation and suffering; all have strong notions of human dignity, responsibility and justice. And the real threat to local cultures and values is not a social clause but the all-levelling, lowest common denominator of western commercialism. Global rules linking social to economic development would allow local communities to maintain their identity through self-empowerment.
CONSULTATION, ENFORCEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

There are three interlocking mechanisms for putting these principles in place and ensuring adherence to them: international codes of conduct and labour standards enforceable by international bodies against countries that violate them and against multinationals; pressure on multinationals from consumers and NGOs as well as the law and unions; and international trade union action.

Global responsibility

- It should be possible to stipulate a basic number of rights in post-Uruguay Round GATT discussions that can be given the force of law by international institutions. A first start would be a world-wide ban on child labour, sending out as clear a signal as the ban on slavery in the 19th century did. Other measures to pressure recalcitrant nations could include:
  - Tariffs on products made with forced, prison or bonded labour, or under conditions of gross environmental despoliation or health and safety risk. A Forced Labour Added Tax, or FLAT tax would bring home the economic cost to manufacturers who exploit forced, prison or unfree labourers and to consumers who enjoy the low prices of products subsidised by unfree labour.
  - Adequate labelling of household and industrial products to indicate country of origin and a commitment from importers that such goods have been produced under fair conditions.
  - Reporting systems on labour rights, along the lines of the European and American codes developed for companies operating in South Africa in the 1970s and 1980s. Companies, their subsidiaries and sub-contractors would have to report on their treatment of their employees in all countries where they operate. The reporting obligations of the codes on South Africa helped raise awareness about the poor employment practices of some multinationals vis-a-vis their black employees. In theory, a reporting code would allow the exposure of mul-
nationals that used forced and child labour, or traded in products made in those conditions; public opinion and consumer campaigns would exert sufficient potential punitive power on corporations breaking accepted labour and ethical standards. Thus gradual change would be brought about based on open and transparent information supplied by firms themselves and monitored by independent bodies and the media. While the local processes of inspection and reporting to ensure compliance would be complex, the principle is fairly simple, and indeed already in place to some extent in the ILO’s operations.

**Global Implementation**

Initially, GATT should set up a working party together with the ILO and relevant NGOs to develop mechanisms for building complaint and investigation procedures into trade relationships, and decide on appropriate pressures or sanctions on violators. The mere presence of such discussions, rules and procedures would in itself be a powerful pressure on recalcitrant governments and companies to respect the rights laid down in UN and ILO conventions.

A joint WTO/ILO advisory body should be set up to review periodically nations’ adherence to the seven main ILO conventions governing union rights, equal remuneration, employment discrimination, and abolition of forced and child labour. There should also be a WTO labour secretariat to work with the ILO in monitoring conditions and investigating complaints. A precedent has already been created. The United States and Mexico have set up a joint secretariat in Dallas, Texas—the Commission for Labor Co-operation—to oversee the labour rights clauses in NAFTA, the free trade treaty linking the three North American countries.

If a nation failed to meet the required standards, they could be given two years to improve the situation before a second investigation; and then another year to improve if they failed that inspection, followed by possible WTO trade sanctions.

There is also clear scope for greater involvement in labour standards of other international organisations, including UN agencies such as UNCTAD, and NGOs.

The World Bank and IMF must impose conditionally on lending, linking at least their labour market programmes to the participation of local trade unions, if they are democratic and independently controlled by their members.

Change through a combination of inspections, negotiations, pressures and agreements would be greatly preferable to trade sanctions which should be an instrument only of last resort. As Michel Hansenne of the ILO has warned, reduction of the problem to the issue of trade sanctions “gives only a very par-
tial view of the problem,” and “leads to confrontations that are predictably sterile.” There is room for considerable flexibility and sensitivity to local conditions through regional management of some inspection and reporting.

There may also be a danger in making a social clause purely punitive in its legal impact. Countries that made real improvements in labour rights should be rewarded through development and aid policies. Institutions like the Westminster Foundation for Democracy could play a key role in such a development approach, giving constructive aid to democratic parties and trade unions. And aid allocation policies should involve greater screening of labour standards in projects to be funded—as, for example, Canada’s International Development Agency has done for some time. Such positive rewards for improvements, tied to developments, could lessen the force of developing world accusations of Northern “protectionism”. Companies operating in different countries are increasingly anxious to have rules established governing international trade and investment, to safeguard their own investments and markets, and labour standards are a necessary element of such a legal response to economic globalisation.

**Multinational accountability**

Greater clarity in regulation of multinationals would be a starting point in re-establishing their ethical direction and their moral credibility with Western consumers: a recent Demos poll found that one third of Britons thought multinationals untrustworthy.

Inter-governmental initiatives can be supplemented by other actions that national governments or legislatures as well as firms themselves can undertake. These include:

- Greater legal regulation of multinationals, which currently occupy a very hazy area in international law. A House of Commons Select Committee on multinational companies, with the power to subpoena witnesses or, at the very least, create an overseas trade and investment sub-committee of the existing DTI select committee. There should be a special joint European Parliament-US Congress committee to investigate the activities of multinationals, also with power to subpoena witnesses and material, on the lines of the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee’s inquiry into the activities of ITT and other multinationals in 1974-75.

- A WTO/ILO/business working group to develop a code of ethics for international businesses, leading to a WTO requirement that multinationals produce a social and ethical audit. Some companies such as Dun and Bradstreet and the Hughes Corporation are already moving towards such practices with their ethics policies.
• New international legislation to create what Felix Rohatyn calls "fire walls" to protect the international financial system. The Mexican crisis of December 1994/January 1995, which prompted Rohatyn's call, demonstrated the dangerous instability of the system, as did the Barings collapse in February 1995. Although there have been periodic calls for a new Bretton Woods-type agreement, it is difficult to see exactly what form such an agreement would take given the transformed shape of international finance in the twenty years since Bretton Woods' collapse. But a start would be legislation to regulate internationally the trade in derivatives and other destabilising activities of hedge funds.

• A modest (less than one per cent) tax on all international bond and equities transactions above a certain amount. This tax, first proposed by the Nobel economics laureate James Tobin, would help reduce unproductive, speculative flows of capital, and the arising revenues, to be managed by the WTO or a newly created agency, could be invested in labour and environmental standards work in the developing world and in job creation world-wide.

**Multinationals and consumer activism**

The second mechanism for application of the social clause is to build from the bottom up by securing from multinational corporations a commitment to respect for modern democratic rights in the workplace. There is a growing concern among consumers and sections of the international business community alike that multinationals adopt recognised ethical standards for their business. For example despite Britain's opt-out from the European Social Chapter, many multinationals including United Biscuits, GKN, and others are setting up European works councils at British plants to allow them to consult with their workforce on a pan-European basis, in line with the EU's European Works Council (EWC) proposals. More than 300 UK-based multinationals will have to set up EWCs which will have an interest in ensuring that companies abide by responsible social rules, not just in the European Union but world-wide.

In the developing world, the multinationals already tend to act as vectors of Northern standards: while standards and conditions do not approach those of the North, UNCTAD's 1994 World Investment Report found that multinationals employees in the developing world tended to enjoy better wages, benefits and work conditions than those employed by domestic firms—although this is not always the case, and nor are "better" standards necessarily very good.

More importantly, multinationals producing goods for export back to the North are vulnerable to consumer opinion in the developed world. As vari-
ous recent consumer-oriented environmentalist campaigns have shown, there may be considerable leverage against recalcitrant multinationals via boycott campaigns aimed at the consciences of those who buy their products. Consumers International, the umbrella organisation for consumer groups in 86 countries, recently launched a charter for global business ethics targeted at Europe’s 100 largest companies, and in this country Oxfam has launched a similar campaign against high street clothing retailers who benefit from exploitative labour practices in developing countries. The successful Greenpeace campaign against Shell over the Brent Spar dumping highlighted the power of organised consumer concern. As yet such concern has focused more on environmental than social or workplace issues, but there is considerable scope for greater consumer action in persuading multinationals to improve workplace rights and broader ethical standards.

The attractiveness of public accession to such standards is increasing for companies that come under Northern consumer scrutiny. Levi Strauss came under fire in 1991 and again in 1994 for poor labour standards in their contractor shops in the developing world. A quarter of the 600 contractors failed to enforce Levi’s “Global Sourcing Guidelines” against child and forced labour and for prevailing wages; some were dropped. In this country Marks and Spencer has become aware of this, following publicity over the behaviour towards workers in North African countries of sub-contractors making garments with low-wage labour for sale in Britain’s high streets.

**Codes of conduct**

Pressure from outside the companies to improve standards observance has often taken the form of codes of conduct. These were particularly important in bolstering South African workers’ struggle against apartheid. IG Metall’s 14-point obligatory Code of Conduct forced German multinationals operating in South Africa in the apartheid era to respect trade union rights, and Sweden imposed similar standards on its multinationals there. The ICFTU Code of Conduct for investment in South Africa made similar emphases, as did the similar Sullivan Code in the US, signed by 56 large companies. Some efforts have been made to establish wider codes for multinationals’ conduct in the developing world. The ILO’s Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy lays down such standards, although it is entirely voluntary. The OECD has a similar, non-mandatory code. More recently a concerted campaign by the World Development Movement and others persuaded the British Toy and Hobby Association, the main toy industry grouping, to adopt a code of labour standards for British toy manufacturers and sub-
contractors in Asia.

A combination of codes of conduct, education of business leaders on the benefits of ethics policies, and the threat of public exposure and scrutiny can force multinationals to establish better conditions at the outset of new operations in the developing world.

This issue is also becoming more prominent in positive situations as well as boycotts and exposures. The success of businesses such as the Body Shop, with high ethical profiles, gives some idea of the concrete business results that can result from careful building up of moral capital. The Body Shop now runs an annual social and ethical audit to determine, amongst other things, the acceptability of the workplace conditions in which its goods are produced. Its implementation of the Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) is independently verified by outside authorities. Companies like the Body Shop and Traidcraft have now developed stakeholder-based approaches to social auditing, involving the participation of other “stakeholders” in the business in the wider community. The Body Shop summarises its process for social audit:

[Source: “The Body Shop Approach to Ethical Auditing”]

Such a system could form a model for corporate social audits to raise labour standards, enforced by consumers as well as unions and international bodies.

Action from the bottom against multinational corporations is by definition outside the ambit of specific policy proposals. But consumer activism would be greatly boosted by an EU or international reporting code, and by enhanced trade union links and solidarity.
GLOBAL CAPITAL: GLOBAL LABOUR

Capital has become global but trade unions remain almost entirely locked in national perspectives. This has to change if unions are to win back influence in the realm of economic and social decision-making. Trade unions should encourage outward-looking solidarity rather than inward-looking protectionism.

Trade unions are realising that purely national self-sufficiency in many areas and operations is inefficient and ineffective, even for the larger ones. Increased awareness and work in the international sphere can only increase the strength of unions as they match the knowledge of global businesses and begin to set the agenda for world economic developments. The ideas and knowledge from many workplace sources around the world which unions uniquely can tap into can make them centres of information which can be turned into power.

This realisation is starting to bear fruit in international labour campaigns. A good example is the ambitious international campaign being fought by telecommunications unions in many countries against Sprint, the US-based telecommunications multinational. When Sprint fired Hispanic workers trying to organise at its La Conexión Familiar subsidiary in San Francisco in July 1994, the industry's international trade secretariat, the Postal Telegraph and Telephone International, organised a campaign that used the multinational's global ambitions as leverage in co-ordinating a campaign against the company's policies. Members of the German communications union, the Deutsche Postgewerkschaft (DPG), have pressured Sprint to negotiate with its fired American workers while negotiating with their own employer, Deutsche Telekom, for a code of conduct of labour standards and better works council representation as DT enters a £2.7 billion joint venture with Sprint. French telecom workers are holding up a similar deal between France Telecom and Sprint over the company's actions in the US. Nicaraguan unions led a campaign against Sprint's bid as a Nicaraguan telecoms provider, and Brazilian unions have also launched large protests. And the Mexican telecoms union, STRM, and the Communications Workers of America have filed a complaint against Sprint under NAFTA labour "side agreements" which has led the labour ministers of the US, Canada and Mexico to order a comparative inquiry on the impact of plant closings on
workers’ rights to organise in the three NAFTA countries.

Specific new strategies and policies for the international trade union movement to bolster the social clause should include:

- A new doctrine of international labour, based on far more extensive horizontal international links between workplaces and joint efforts between unions. Increasing internationalisation of trade union operations, especially in communications, research and collective bargaining, will revolutionise their role in economic decision-making. All unions should establish international departments or strengthen existing ones.

- Unions should also push for the establishment of labour attachés at their nations’ embassies abroad, to be staffed by trade union officials on temporary secondment. Liaison with local trade unionists and other worker representatives should become as accepted in western embassies’ work as that of military or cultural attaches.

- European trade unions should make a concerted push towards international-level bargaining in Europe. The European Works Council directive offers the beginnings of such a transnational approach to industrial relations.

- A new and more proactive role for trade unions in reporting of labour conditions to international bodies. Trade union members and officials are the vital factor on the ground keeping both international legal bodies and consumer groups informed. There is a clear need for a reliable method for scrutiny of developing world conditions—for instance, by lodging complaints under Article 26 of the constitution by delegates to the International Labour Conference.

- An expanded role for existing transnational trade union groups such as the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the Commonwealth Trades Union Congress and the European Trades Union Confederation. The International Trade Secretariats (ITFs) could use ILO procedures better and more aggressively—for example, by lodging complaints under Article 26 of the constitution by delegates to the International Labour Conference.

- International legal initiatives by trade unionists to bring offending multinationals to justice. Fruit growers and farm workers in Ecuador are suing multinational American petrochemical and fruit companies—Dow Chemical, Occidental Petroleum, Del Monte, Chiquita and Dole—in the US courts, for dumping lethal pesticides banned in the US on the Latin American market. The case points up the potential for greater international legal enforcement of labour standards in multinationals’ western bases. There is scope for similar actions against multinational offenders through the European Court of Justice.
Workers' rights and the ethics of the economy within which they work are an issue that needs to be cast in universal terms and applied with political impartiality to have any semblance of credibility.

World social rules should include basic standards support and sustain the "negative freedoms" of not being prevented from speaking, writing and organising. Workers should be guaranteed the right to form and join unions and bargain collectively, free from discrimination and harassment. As a minimum for positive labour standards the import of products made with child and forced labour should be banned. This will guarantee real improvement in working conditions for millions of workers in the developing world, as they seek to achieve democratic rights in the social, political and economic spheres.

Yet it is perfectly possible to have reasonable labour laws that are not worth the paper they are written on. Any law is potentially meaningless without enforceable compliance and monitoring, especially in less-developed countries with fledgling civil societies. But mechanisms for enforcement of a social clause would probably not be especially difficult by the standards of international agreements, especially compared to GATT and the WTO.

More important is the consensus that must first be reached, and the mechanisms that must be built from the base through unions and consumer groups to ensure the adoption of a social clause. There is much work for opinion-formers and policy-makers to do in this respect. Even under a social clause, there will evidently continue to be dislocation in Northern manufacturing employment as more labour-intensive industries relocate to the developing world. Northern workers are unlikely to be persuaded of the desirability or even justice of globalisation if some concrete recognition is not made of its potential harmful effects on them.

Worse, if backward-looking business and governments continue to obstruct a social clause, the repercussions will be felt beyond the sweatshops of Vietnam. If multinationals are allowed to return to the exploitative labour practices now illegal in most of the developed world yet retain access to Northern markets, there may be serious political repercussions in the North too. Social regulations are an essential component of the global policies needed to tackle the greatest threat to social cohesion and peace: mass unemployment.
Conclusion

Workers' rights and the future of the economy. Writing on open work and its needs to be cared for, making police and political interventions to have the semblance of capability. No more necessities to have police and political interventions to control and limit the production. The emergence of new forms of production and consumption and the need for new forms of organization and regulation. The need for new forms of political and social organization to address the new economic and social situations. The importance of the struggle for workers' rights and the need for new forms of political and social organization to address the new economic and social situations. The need for new forms of political and social organization to address the new economic and social situations. The importance of the struggle for workers' rights and the need for new forms of political and social organization to address the new economic and social situations. The need for new forms of political and social organization to address the new economic and social situations.
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GLOBAL BUSINESS : GLOBAL RIGHTS

The economy is becoming ever more globalised, multinationals are growing more powerful and global trade deals are a strong force in international politics. Yet employee rights remain limited, child labour is more widespread and trade union representation is seen as a threat. This pamphlet is a must for anyone who is serious about minimum standards for employees across the world.

Denis MacShane MP, one of Labour's leading thinkers on international policy, argues that it is time for a greater balance between business needs and workers' rights. He argues for:

- A social clause in all major international trade agreements which guarantees a set of minimum standards. To include a ban on child labour, the right to organise in a trade union and health and safety standards.

- Global regulation and monitoring to penalise those who breach minimum standards. This would include tax raising powers and the labelling of products.

- Greater accountability of multinationals through a code of conduct, increased scrutiny and support for consumers taking action against unethical companies.

- Globalisation of trade union organisations. Specifically - international collective bargaining, an expanded role in trade negotiations and attachment of trade unionists to international embassies as labour attaches.
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