NOVA

University of Newcastle Research Online

nova.newcastle.edu.au

Connor, Tim "Time to scale up cooperation? Trade unions, NGOs, and the international anti-sweatshop movement" *Development in Practice* Vol. 14, Issue 1-2, p. 61-70 (2004)

Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0961452032000170631>

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published in *Development in Practice* in 2004, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/0961452032000170631>

Accessed from: <http://hdl.handle.net/1959.13/1056628>

This is the Author's Original Manuscript of an article whose final and definitive form, the Version of Record, has been published as a journal article with the following reference: Connor TJ 2004, 'Time to scale up cooperation? Trade unions, NGOs, and the International anti-sweatshop movement', *Development in Practice*, 14 61-70

Time to scale up cooperation? Unions, non-government organisations and the international anti-sweatshop movement

Abstract:

Between 1991 and 2002 the international anti-sweatshop movement experienced significant growth. A series of interconnecting international networks developed, involving trade unions and non-government organisations in campaigns to persuade particular Transnational Corporations to ensure that labour rights are respected in the production of their goods. While the loose, networked form of organisation that characterises the movement has helped it to grow and progress despite its diverse constituency, arguably a lack of coordination has undermined its ability to achieve policy change. There is a need to develop new forms of global cooperation in order to avoid the movement fracturing and losing impetus.

In October 1999 unions and non-government organisations (NGOs) involved in the anti-sweatshop movement received a surprising proposal from Philip Knight, the CEO of Nike Inc. Knight's company has been a key target of the movement, and his letter expressed frustration that the company's attempts to engage individual organisations in bilateral dialogue, had been "episodic" and "repetitive" and had not allowed "progress or mutual understanding". He proposed that groups involved in the campaign select "a core team of individuals you designate as representative of your collective interests" and indicated that the company's vice-president of corporate responsibility would work with that group.¹ After much discussion the majority of the campaign organisations decided against accepting this proposal. In bilateral negotiations Nike had indicated very little interest in agreeing to some of campaigners' core demands, and they were concerned that establishing a structure for the proposed new talks would use up a lot of time while achieving little. While this may well have been the right decision, Knight's proposal highlights a key issue for the movement. At the international scale it has a loose, networked form of organisation that has proved well suited to spreading awareness of, and generating protest activity focused on, labour abuses in the production networks of particular Transnational Corporations. The negative side of maintaining this loose structure is that unions and NGOs have so far been unable to offer Nike and other companies an adequate incentive to respond positively to their proposals for improving respect for workers' rights. Arguably their ability to do so would be substantially enhanced if they could establish broad agreement on a mechanism for giving some credit to companies who make progress in this area. While they are a long way from establishing the depth of international cooperation necessary to develop such a

¹ The letter was dated 5 October 1999 and was addressed "To all the signatories of the Clean Clothes Campaign's open letter". A month earlier human rights organisations, unions and academic researchers from 15 countries had sent an open letter to Knight. Representatives of the Clean Clothes Campaign had delivered that letter at Nike's Annual Shareholders' meeting in Hilversum in September 1999.

mechanism, the existence of close and productive alliances between unions and NGOs in particular countries suggest that the task is at least worth attempting.

The problem of capital mobility

The international trade union movement is going through a difficult and challenging time, with unions experiencing falling membership across the industrialised world and struggling to gain a foothold in industrialising countries (Wills 1998, p. 113). The problem is particularly pronounced in industries such as apparel that require low-skilled labour and low levels of capital investment. The international garment industry is characterised by complex and fluid networks of production. Contracting and sub-contracting is common and homeworkers form a significant part of the industry's global workforce. This structure allows production to be shifted relatively easily from organised work-sites to non-union ones, and from states that respect and enforce workers' right to freedom of association to states that don't. This makes it very difficult for workers to assert their union rights, since any attempt to take industrial action could result in production moving from their work site to other parts of the production network, putting their jobs in danger. The belief that increasing capital mobility will inevitably continue the global decline in trade union power has been described as "something of an orthodoxy in much academic debate and political commentary about the future of labor organisation" (Wills 1998, p. 112).

In the context of the debate as to the best way to forward, one option being promoted is for unions to link with other civil society organisations in joint international campaigns (Wells 1998a, p.24; Wills 1998, p. 119). The hope is that by working together they might mobilise sufficient numbers of people to persuade companies and governments to respect workers' rights. The international anti-sweatshop movement—a series of interconnecting international networks of non-government organisations (NGOs) and unions campaigning to end labour abuses in the production networks of transnational corporations operating in particular industries²—presents a useful case-study of this kind of cooperation.³

Anatomy of a social movement

While anti-sweatshop campaigns have a long history, the current phase of international activity began to gather momentum in the early 1990s.⁴ The sizes, constituencies, geographical locations and political orientations of the trade unions and NGOs involved vary considerably. On the trade union side the campaign has included not only the relevant International Trade Secretariat, the International Textile Garment and Leather Workers Federation (ITGLWF) and its affiliates, but also small unaffiliated unions in

² Although industries such as toys and cut flowers have also received campaigners' attention, for the purposes of this paper I will focus on campaigns against companies operating in the clothing and footwear industry.

³ I have been involved in this movement since 1995, as coordinator of Oxfam Community Aid Abroad's NikeWatch campaign. See <www.caa.org.au/campaigns/nike>.

⁴ It was in 1991 that the Clean Clothes Campaign in the Netherlands was founded. In the same year US labour activist Jeff Ballinger initiated the Nike campaign in Indonesia. In 1992 the National Labor Committee managed to generate significant media coverage in the US of working conditions in factories in El Salvador and Honduras.

industrialising countries, some with only a couple of hundred members.⁵ NGOs that have had some involvement in the movement⁶ have varied in size from major development organisations such as Christian Aid in the UK and Development and Peace in Canada, to medium-sized labour rights groups with a dozen or so staff, such as the Urban Community Mission in Indonesia and the Asia Monitor Resource Centre in Hong Kong, to small volunteer organisations essentially made up of one or two people, including Thuyen Nguyen's Vietnam Labor Watch and Jeff Ballinger's Press For Change, both based in the US. It is difficult to estimate exactly how many organisations participate in the international movement, but they certainly number in the hundreds.⁷

For much of the 1990s the impetus for most of the research and campaign activity that involved international cooperation came from organisations based in industrialised countries, but it is becoming more common for unions and NGOs based in the South⁸ to take the initiative and for organisations based in the North to respond with support. Representatives of garment unions from a number of Southern countries, including Lesotho, South Africa, the Philippines and Indonesia, participated in the March 2001 Clean Clothes Campaign's strategy meeting in Barcelona. In May 2001 the Lesotho Clothing And Allied Workers' Union (LECAWU) called on the support of groups who had participated in the Barcelona meeting for their campaign to persuade the US government to make access to the US market under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) dependent on the Lesotho government's enforcement of its labour laws.⁹ At the request of the FSPTSK¹⁰ union in Indonesia, Oxfam Community Aid Abroad and other NGOs are currently seeking to persuade Nike Inc. to ensure that workers from the PT Doson factory receive their full legal entitlements when the factory closes in October 2002. Late in 2003 or early in 2004, Oxfam International will launch a global campaign on labour rights that will seek to support and draw international attention to local labour rights campaigns in at least ten countries, including Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Honduras and South Africa.

⁵ An example of such a union is Persatuan Buruh Indonesia/PBI (Indonesian Labour Union), based in Serang in West Java, Indonesia.

⁶ In so far as NGOs are concerned, it is necessary to distinguish which organisations are considered to be part of the movement, as in a number of cases targeted corporations have funded sympathetic NGOs to work with them on labour issues in a manner which fits the companies' priorities and objectives rather than those of organisations involved in the campaign. Nike Inc. has for example funded the International Youth Foundation to establish the Global Alliance for Workers and Communities, an organisation that runs development programs in some Nike contract factories. For the purposes of this paper I will use the term *NGO* to refer to non-profit organisations that have participated in public criticism of targeted corporations and that do not receive funding from those corporations.

⁷ The Clean Clothes Campaign, a European network of unions and NGOs working on the issue, runs an email list for representatives of unions and NGOs supportive of the campaign that has over 200 members. I coordinate a confidential discussion list for unions and NGOs involved in the campaign targeting Nike that has representatives from over 50 organisations.

⁸ When I refer to *the South* or *Southern* in this paper I am referring to countries with relatively low average per capita incomes and with economies that are either largely non-industrial or else in the process of industrialisation. Similarly when I use the term *Northern* or *the North* in this paper I am referring to industrialised countries such as Australia, UK, USA, Germany, France and Canada (see the *Oxford English Reference Dictionary* 1996, p. 990, defn. 2d).

⁹ I received a letter dated 31 May 2001 from Willy Mats'eo, National Coordinator of LECAWU to this effect.

¹⁰ FSPTSK is an acronym for Federasi Serikat Pekerja Tekstil, Sandang Dan Kulit.

A loose, networked form of organisation

A variety of organisational forms operate across the movement. Internally, the more established trade unions and larger NGOs, such as those unions affiliated to the ITGLWF and the various member organisations of Oxfam International, tend to have hierarchical decision-making structures and formal processes for international co-operation. Other groups operate differently. The Clean Clothes Campaign's European Secretariat office in Amsterdam, for example, makes decisions by consensus. At the global level there is a loose, networked structure that is common in broad social movements (Gerlach & Hine 1970; della Porta & Diani 1999). Such movements are rarely hierarchically or bureaucratically structured; they commonly exhibit a more flexible and mobile form and tend not to have a single leader or group of leaders with power to make decisions that bind others. Instead they have "multiple, often temporary, and sometimes competing leaders or centers of influence", and are "composed of many diverse groups, which grow and die, divide and fuse, proliferate and contract" (Gerlach 2001, pp. 289-90). Participants in these movements are drawn together by common elements in their value systems and political understanding, and hence by shared belief in narratives that problematise particular social phenomena. They do not share allegiance to a particular organisational form or to a particular strategy for action (Keck & Sikkink 1998, p. 5; della Porta and Diani 1999, pp. 27, 53; Ronfeldt & Arquilla 2001, p. 323).

This loose form of organisation has many advantages. In the context of the anti-sweatshop movement it has facilitated innovation and adaptive learning. There has not been an expectation that campaigners must seek approval from all other movement participants before taking action. This has freed individuals and organisations to experiment with new and potentially risky campaign activities without waiting for the approval of a slow-moving bureaucracy and without endangering the movement as a whole. Other participants have been able to distance themselves from tactics with which they disagree or which prove counterproductive and copy those that prove effective (Gerlach, 2001 #434). Email and other relatively new information technologies have increased the effectiveness of this form of organisation by enhancing campaigners' ability to learn from, and respond to, each other's experiments. Key campaigners are linked by numerous email lists through which they receive the latest reports on factory conditions, on meetings with particular corporations and on the success or otherwise of campaign initiatives. Future strategies are also discussed on these lists, or at least flagged and then debated more intensely by email amongst subsets of actors with higher levels of trust. Through participation in these lists participating organisations have gained an understanding of the other groups involved and of the dynamics of the movement itself. This has allowed them to engage with other groups in particular activities, without risking their reputations by being identified with everything done in the name of the wider movement. It has also allowed particular organisations and individuals to develop specialised roles, so that some are relied on for their expertise in health and safety, others for their knowledge of working conditions in the production networks of particular companies, and others for their skills in attracting the interest of journalists.

What has been achieved?

The movement has had significant success in raising public awareness of labour abuses. Since 1996 the campaign against the sportswear company Nike Inc. alone has generated more than a thousand newspaper articles a year linking the company's name to allegations of sweatshop conditions.¹¹ More than 350,000 people have signed petitions calling on Nike to allow independent factory monitoring,¹² and there have been hundreds of demonstrations against the company in North America, Australia, Europe and East Asia.¹³ In the US a growing student anti-sweatshop network called United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) has established branches on over 200 campuses and has persuaded over 100 universities to join the Workers Rights Consortium, an organisation governed by unions, students and sympathetic academics that investigates whether clothes bearing university logos are being produced in accordance with core international labour standards (*Lingua Franca* 2001).

Unfortunately the students' achievement in turning activist pressure into progressive policy change is an exception rather than the norm, and the students' impact has been limited to a relatively narrow section of the US garment market. Over the long term, most organisations involved in the movement aim to persuade all nation states to put in place legislated regulatory regimes that ensure that workers' rights, particularly their right to freedom of association, are respected. Many also put pressure on corporations to commit to a broadly agreed set of labour rights¹⁴ and to cooperate with credible unions and NGOs to establish systems of independent monitoring to ensure those rights are respected. For most of these groups codes of conduct and other voluntary forms of regulation are not seen as an alternative to legislation, but as a step towards it.¹⁵

¹¹ These statistics were generated by conducting "All Publications" searches on the *Dow Jones Interactive* media database on 4 July 2001. I searched for articles containing the word "Nike" within 60 words of a reference to factories, workers or labor and also within 60 words of a reference to sweatshops, exploitation, abuse or wages. The exact search phrase was "Nike near60 (factory or factories or worker or workers or labor or labour) near60 (sweatshop or sweatshops or exploit\$ or abus\$ or wage\$ or strike or hour or child)." The search phrase was only applied in English, not in other languages. I also reviewed a sample of articles from each year in order to estimate the percentage of articles picked up by the search that did not relate to sweatshop allegations against Nike. Note that this is a relatively blunt measuring instrument since many newspapers are not listed on the database.

¹² This includes over 200,000 signatures collected by the Canadian Catholic Organisation for Development and Peace and over 100,000 collected by the Belgian Clean Clothes Campaign.

¹³ In 1996 and 1997 the US organisation Campaign for Labour Rights used email to organise three 'days of action' against Nike, the most successful of which resulted in demonstrations on the same day in over 90 cities in twelve countries. Nike has also become a key target of the broader movement protesting neo-liberal globalisation. This movement, both documented and inspired by books such as Naomi Klein's *No Logo* (2000), has become much more visible since the demonstrations at the Seattle meeting of the World Trade Organisation in 1999. Its adoption of Nike as a key target has substantially increased the level of protest activity focusing on the company.

¹⁴ There is a relatively standard list of labour rights that are included in codes that have the broad support of unions and human rights groups. These include the "Clean Clothes Campaign Code Of Labour Practices For The Apparel Industry Including Sportswear", the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions' "Model Code of Conduct" and the Ethical Trading Initiative's "Base Code".

¹⁵ The strategy guiding Oxfam Community Aid Abroad's work on the NikeWatch campaign has been that if, through consumer and activist pressure, enough corporations can be persuaded to become involved in effective independent monitoring, then those corporations will want others to be held to the same standard and hence may support effective state regulation.

Both of these goals remain elusive. Few organisations involved in the movement would claim to have yet had a positive impact on government regulation,¹⁶ and so far progress with voluntary initiatives has been limited. Many companies have established their own codes of conduct but in the great majority of cases these have been nothing more than public relations tools, commonly avoiding key issues such as living wages and union rights and lacking any kind of enforcement mechanism.¹⁷ Some companies have established programs to implement their codes and monitor their effectiveness. There is at least anecdotal evidence¹⁸ that this monitoring can result in some improvements in health and safety conditions and increased compliance with some local laws in factories in the first tier of the supply chain.¹⁹ There is very little evidence of it improving respect for workers' union rights, which is a key priority of the movement. A number of multi-stakeholder initiatives involving representatives from both unions and NGOs have become established, including the Ethical Trading Initiative in the UK, the Fair Wear Foundation in the Netherlands, the No Sweatshop Label in Australia and Social Accountability International. The ITGLWF has also sought to persuade a number of companies to sign international framework agreements with the union. Thus far only a relatively small number of companies have been willing to participate in such programs and as a rule the more rigorous they are, the less companies are involved (Utting 2001).

Time to scale up cooperation

Notwithstanding the advantages listed above of a loose, relatively unstructured form of organisation, arguably a lack of broad global agreement on what companies should do is undermining the ability of unions and NGOs to persuade companies to respond positively to any of their proposed solutions. More specifically the lack of an extensively endorsed process by which companies can be recognised—in however limited a fashion—for making gradual, systemic progress gives them little incentive to do so. It is not that policy questions have not been debated at the international level. Since at least 1995 there have been numerous international conferences, meetings and email discussions considering the merits of various ways of institutionalising cooperation between companies, unions and NGOs to oversee systems of monitoring factory conditions.²⁰ However, those multi-stakeholder initiatives that have been

¹⁶ One possible exception to this is the FairWear campaign in New South Wales, Australia, which has been working to enhance respect for the rights of homeworkers in that state. In 2002, in response to lobbying from FairWear and the Textile, Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia the labour government introduced a package of policy and legislative changes that responded positively to many of the campaigners' demands.

¹⁷ A US Department of Labor Study of the codes of 42 US companies found that 'most of the codes...do not contain detailed provisions for monitoring and implementation, and many of these companies do not have a reliable monitoring system in place.' The same study found that many corporate respondents "did not know whether workers were aware of the existence of their codes" (US Department of Labor 1996).

¹⁸ Areas of improved compliance relate primarily to health and safety provisions, hours of work and the payment of legal minimum wages. I have found this, for example, when researching conditions in sportshoe factories producing for Nike in Indonesia (see Oxfam Community Aid Abroad 2002). In an email dated 29 October 2002, Ineke Zeldenrust of the European Secretariat Office of the Clean Clothes Campaign indicated that in her research in Indonesia and Pakistan, companies, auditors, trade unions and NGOs had all reported that company controlled monitoring systems were at least improving compliance with legal requirements in these particular areas.

¹⁹ That is, in factories with which brand name companies have direct contracts, as opposed to sub-contractors.

²⁰ See for example the history of the Clean Clothes Campaign network's debates regarding codes of conduct, summarised on that organisation's website at <<http://www.cleanclothes.org/codes.htm>>.

established reflect negotiated agreements between particular sets of unions and NGOs and particular sets of companies. They lack the support or endorsement of the wider movement, and some have drawn vigorous criticism from other unions and NGOs.²¹ Hence companies currently have no guarantee that participation in any multi-stakeholder initiative will improve their reputations. Indeed to the extent that an initiative requires greater transparency, such participation may well increase criticism, since other activists thereby gain access to much more information regarding labour abuses in companies' supply networks.

Agreement on some kind of scale by which companies' progress could be measured would also increase the movement's ability to mobilise supportive consumers and investors to reward companies that were making some progress, and to focus activist pressure on companies that were not. Much more research is needed into the extent to which consumers and investors are interested in this kind of action, but the constant phone calls and emails that anti-sweatshop campaigners receive along the lines of "what brand of clothes should I buy" suggest that interest would be considerable. Arguably part of the reason that stories of sweatshop abuses generate strong feelings is the challenge they present to the identity of their audience—consumers who might otherwise regard themselves as respectful of the dignity and welfare of others find themselves implicated in a system of exploitation. But unless campaigners can successfully promote credible means by which consumers can bring their actions in line with their self-understanding by helping to solve the problem, the campaign runs the danger of resulting in apathy rather than activism.²²

Building trust

In order to establish credibility such a system would need extensive international support from established unions and reputable human rights organisations.²³ These organisations would need to agree, or at least reach a compromise position, on a number of controversial questions. Detailing these issues and considering how they might be resolved goes beyond the scope of this paper, as do practical questions regarding how such cooperation and negotiation might be organised.²⁴ It is, however, worth considering the current extent and nature of cooperation between unions and NGOs involved in the movement in order to consider whether global cooperation is feasible.

²¹ See for example Labour Rights in China (1999).

²² Research into this has been minimal, but a 2001 survey into the effect of Oxfam Community Aid Abroad's NikeWatch campaign on attitudes amongst Queensland university students suggests that, in Australia at least, anti-sweatshop activists have been much more effective in raising awareness of labour abuses than in inspiring confidence that they can be brought to an end. The survey was of 185 first year social science students at the University of Queensland. Over 75% indicated that they were "incensed" at worker exploitation and over 80% reported that it made them "frustrated and angry". But a higher proportion, 85.8%, agreed with the suggestion that "trying to improve poor labour practices is more trouble than it is worth." This unpublished survey was conducted by Scott Bretton and Lotte ten Hacken as a final-year research project for their Social Science degrees at the University of Queensland. I have a copy on file which is available on request.

²³ It would be neither necessary nor desirable for all organisations involved in the movement to endorse such a system of assessment—it is useful for any strategy to be subject to rigorous critique.

²⁴ These issues are currently being debated by email and in various meetings by organisations involved in the international movement.

While the quality of cooperation varies considerably across geographical contexts, it is not difficult to find examples of strained relationships. As representatives of democratic organisations that derive their legitimacy from their membership, many union leaders have been wary of lending their credibility to a movement involving NGOs, whose mandate to work on labour issues is far from clear. In Indonesia a number of union leaders are concerned that labour rights NGOs are taking over roles that rightfully belong to democratic workers' organisations. In at least two recent cases, a new union that had become established as a result of education work conducted by a labour rights NGO has severed relations with that NGO on the grounds that the leader of the NGO was attempting to control the union.²⁵

Many unions have also been concerned that NGOs might bilaterally negotiate agreements with companies that benefit the companies' public image but which fail to effectively protect workers' union rights.²⁶ This fear was inflamed in November 1998 when the US NGOs involved in the Fair Labor Association (FLA) finalised an agreement on factory monitoring with participating companies against the will and behind the back of UNITE, the US clothing union that had been involved in negotiations regarding the FLA since 1996. Although the FLA's code of conduct affirmed workers' right to form unions, UNITE believed that the proposed monitoring program would not adequately protect that right. The NGOs decision understandably caused considerable animosity between those NGOs and US unions, and reinforced union concern about cooperation with NGOs.²⁷ On the NGO side there has been disappointment that a number of US unions have not been interested in cooperation with the broader NGO movement. In a March 2001 interview, Ballinger recognised that the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) had funded research and campaign work by a particular NGO, the National Labor Committee, and that the AFL-CIO's Solidarity Centres play an important role in funding unions in the South and in facilitating communication between such unions and Northern campaigners.²⁸ He was frustrated, though, that many US unions had not made more of the opportunity that the anti-sweatshop movement presented to "reach a lot of people who are not normally sympathetic to unions".²⁹ He noted, for example, that he had tried without success over many years to interest the US teachers' union in the campaign targeting Nike.

In other countries, experiences of cooperation have been more positive. A number of umbrella organisations have developed, representing national alliances or networks of

²⁵ International NGOs with links to both organisations have had to either choose between them, or else carefully maintain separate relationships with each.

²⁶ Union sensitivity to the danger of NGOs undermining their role has also lead to differences of opinion regarding what sort of factory-monitoring programs should be demanded of companies. Whereas a number of NGOs involved in the campaign have argued that corporations should allow local non-profit human rights groups to monitor factory conditions, many union leaders have been wary that such groups might undermine unions in factories that have them or act in place of them in factories that do not.

²⁷ Interestingly, in April 2002 the FLA announced a number of improvements in its factory monitoring program. It is not yet clear what the position of US unions on the new monitoring system will be.

²⁸ In the US the steelworkers union also provides financial support to United Students Against Sweatshops (Research interview with Ginger Gentile, Agatha Schmaedick and Chad Sullivan of United Students Against Sweatshops, Jakarta, 23 July 2001).

²⁹ Research interview with Jeffrey Ballinger, Director of Press For Change, 5 March 2001.

unions and NGOs. These include the eleven Clean Clothes Campaigns in Europe and India and the FairWear campaign in Australia. In these countries a considerable amount of work has gone into building trust, and in most cases it has resulted in relatively close working relationships. In an October 2001 meeting of the Clean Clothes Campaign unions and NGOs from several European countries reflected on their experience of working together. While some areas of concern were identified,³⁰ the overall assessment was very positive. Union representatives noted that cooperating with NGOs had allowed them to reach a broader audience, and significantly increased their ability to put pressure on companies to take account of workers' rights. At the international level, the ITGLWF has also indicated its willingness to coordinate campaigns with NGOs. In January 2002 the union organised a meeting in Singapore of representatives of workers from Taiwan, Indonesia and Vietnam to discuss the possibility of negotiating an international framework agreement with the Pou Chen Corporation.³¹ NGO and academic participants in the anti-sweatshop movement were invited in order to consider the viability of a joint campaign to persuade Pou Chen to sign such an agreement.

Conclusion

Given that in many countries the level of trust between unions and NGOs involved in the anti-sweatshop movement is still relatively low, it may well be utopian to hope for effective coordination of policy assessments at the international scale. In the absence of such coordination, however, it is difficult to see how the movement's considerable success in building awareness of—and generating protest activity against—labour rights abuses can be effectively leveraged to persuade Transnational Corporations to substantially reform their practices. The number of institutions claiming to ensure that participating companies are acting ethically is likely to divide and confuse consumers, activists and investors, and there is a danger that interest in the issue will peter out due to the lack of a clear direction forward. Fortunately at the national scale there are examples that suggest that when unions and NGOs put adequate time and resources into establishing cooperation then there is considerable potential to establish mutually beneficial working relationships. Whether such cooperation is achievable at the global scale remains to be tested, but the potential benefits make it well worth the attempt.

References

Asia Pulse 2000, 'Nationwide Financial News', 12 Sep.

Clean Clothes Campaign 2001, *Clean Clothes Campaign International Meeting, Barcelona 2001*, Report, Clean Clothes Campaign, Amsterdam.

Oxfam Community Aid Abroad 2002, T. Connor, *We Are Not Machines. Despite some small steps forward, poverty and fear still dominate the lives of Nike and Adidas*

³⁰ On the union side concern was expressed regarding the instability of NGOs, and the need for NGOs to establish their legitimacy through democratic and transparent structures. On the NGO side it was suggested that trade unions could do more to educate and mobilise their membership to take action on sweatshop issues and it was reported that in some countries NGOs found it difficult to persuade trade unions to prioritise issues of gender inequality.

³¹ Pou Chen is the world's largest sport-shoe manufacturer and a major supplier to Nike, Reebok and Adidas.

workers in Indonesia, Clean Clothes Campaign, Global Exchange, Maquila Solidarity Network, Oxfam Canada, Oxfam Community Aid Abroad, Sydney (www.caa.org.au/nike/reports/machines/index.html).

della Porta, D. & Diani, M. 1999, *Social Movements. An Introduction*, Blackwell.

Gerlach, L. P. 2001, 'The Structure Of Social Movements: Environmental Activism And Its Opponents', in *Networks and Netwars: The Future of Terror, Crime, and Militancy*, eds J. Arquilla and D. Ronfeldt, Rand, Santa Monica, pp. 289-310.

Keck, M. E. & Sikkink, K. 1998, *Activists Beyond Borders : Advocacy Networks in International Politics*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y.

Klein, N. 2000, *No Logo*, Flamingo, London.

Knight, G. & Greenberg, J. 2002, 'Promotionalism and Subpolitics: Nike and its Labor Critics', *Management Communication Quarterly*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 541-570.

Labour Rights in China 1999, *No Illusions, Against the Global Cosmetic SA8000*, Labour Rights in China (Asia Monitor Resource Center, China Labour Bulletin, Hong Kong Christian Industrial Committee, Hong Kong Confederation of Trade Unions), Hong Kong.

Lingua Franca 2001, Featherstone, L. & Henwood, D., 'Clothes Encounters. Activists and economists clash over sweatshops', Vol. 11, No. 2, March.

Ronfeldt, D. & Arquilla, J. 2001, 'What Next For Networks And Netwars?', in *Networks and Netwars: The Future of Terror, Crime, and Militancy*, eds J. Arquilla and D. Ronfeldt, Rand, Santa Monica, pp. 311-361

US Department of Labor 1996, *The Apparel Industry and Codes of Conduct: A Solution to the International Child Labour Problem?*, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, US Department of Labor, Washington.

Utting, P. 2001, *Regulating Business Via Multistakeholder Initiatives: A Preliminary Assessment*, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Geneva.

Wells, D. 1998b, 'Building transnational coordinative unionism', in *Confronting Change: Lean Production in the North American Auto Industry*, eds H. J. Nunez and S. Babson, Wayne State University Press, pp. 487-505.

Wills, J. 1998, 'Taking on the CosmoCorps? Experiments in Transnational Labor Organisation', *Economic Geography*, vol. 74, no. 2, pp. 111-130.