TOWARDS TRANSFORMATIVE SOLIDARITIES: WARS OF POSITION IN THE
MAKING OF LABOUR INTERNATIONALISM IN CANADA

KATHERINE NASTOVSKI

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL THOUGHT
YORK UNIVERSITY
TORONTO, ONTARIO
September 2016

Abstract

Within the broad debates about neoliberalism, neoliberal globalization and the declining power of unions in the Global North, there has been renewed interest in the possibilities of international and transnational labour solidarity, coordination and action. Drawing from Rebecca Johns' (1998) distinction between transformative and accommodationist forms of international labour solidarity I argue that we need to critically assess how these practices challenge or reinforce global divisions of labour born of the historical development of capitalism.

To this end, this study provides an analysis of the dialectical relationship between the dominant practices of labour internationalism that emerged within the organized labour movement in Canada during the Cold War. I examine both the challenges to and possibilities for building transformative forms of international labour solidarity today. Challenges include the philosophies of social partnership, racism, white supremacy and nationalism that informed the labour imperialism and accommodationist solidarities of the institutionalized internationalism in this period. I argue that the brand of social democratic anti-communism that characterized this institutionalized labour internationalism was shaped by the wars of position over worker justice happening on the national level and internationally between unions, but also by ideas of race and nation. I outline the lessons from these practices by focusing on four cases: Kenya, Southeast Asia, The Caribbean and Palestine. Finally, I assess the grassroots labour solidarity that re-emerged inside the labour movement with the rise of the New Left. I argue that the model of international solidarity they built, called worker-to-worker, arose from the goals and strategies of class struggle unionism and constitutes an example of transformative solidarity that can inform discussions about organizing international soldiarity today.

Rooted in anti-racist Marxist feminist theory, my historical sociological analysis draws from both archival research and interviews with union leaders, activists and staff. I make sense of the solidarities that determined these practices by exploring the terrain of class consciousness in which they were formed. Situating my analysis within the social and political contours of class formation in Canada and internationally, I pay particular attention to how these practices of labour internationalism intersect with issues of race, gender, nation and class struggle, and how racialized and gendered class formation in Canada has influenced ideas of worker justice and responses to imperialism, colonialism and national borders.

Dedication

3A TATE
(For my Father)
1942-2015

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank all of the people I had the privilege and pleasure of interviewing for this dissertation. I met and talked with so many wonderful activists who kindly shared their stories with me. I learned a lot through these discussions and was inspired by how much each of these people gave of their lives, their time and energy to organize international labour solidarity. Much respect to all of these people. I am glad I could pay tribute to their work through this study. I hope that I have done their legacy justice.

Secondly, I would like to thank my committee members Himani Bannerji, David McNally and Mark Thomas. As activist academics, they very kindly took me on and have been so supportive. In particular, I am forever indebted to my supervisor, Himani Bannerji who encouraged me to write the dissertation and gave me constant encouragement. I also want to thank all the teachers who supported me in becoming an activist and academic and specifically to Al Jantzi and Atul Bahl.

Thirdly, I would like to thank all the workers in the coffee shops and libraries I worked in through this process. I would also like to thank my friends and co-workers from Dooney's, where I worked through my undergrad and Masters. Thanks to all my great students, teaching assistants and co-workers in the School of Labour studies at McMaster University. I have been very lucky to have such an amazing job teaching about workers' struggles and organizing.

Fourthly, I would like to thank my friends from York University. Especially those I worked with on the executive of the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) Local 3903 and the undergrad activists we organized with. Some of these people have become close friends who have been there for me throughout the writing process. In particular, I would like to thank Peter Brogan, Karen Walker, Alex Levant and especially Christina Rousseau. Thanks Christina for being such a good friend and such a wonderful Zia to my son Luke.

Fifthly, I would like to thank all the activists I worked with inside CUPE as a whole, at conventions, on committees and at union schools and conferences. I met so many smart and skilled trade unionists in my years as a full-time union activist in my MA and in the early days of my PhD. It is this organizing that prompted me to complete the PhD and to write about this work. I learned so much through the process of organizing and through the many insights arising from discussions at countless meetings. In particular, I would like to thank the people I worked with on the CUPE Ontario International Solidarity Committee, the National Global Justice Committee and Labour for Palestine, including the many great activists from the Canadian Union of Postal Workers. Special thanks to Ilian Burbano, an incredibly solid and committed organizer, with whom I worked most closely through these years. I would also like to thank all of the people I have had the pleasure to work with on issues of labour internationalism academically. Special thanks to Kim Scipes and Dick Roman. Thanks also to Chris Ramsaroop, who I have been lucky to be friends with for almost twenty years, with whom I always bounce ideas and debate with about organizing. Chris' dedication as an organizer gives me hope for radical social change.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family. First, I would like to thank my brother and sister- in-law as well as my aunts, uncles and cousins here and in Bulgaria, including all of my father's friends who were part of the close community I grew up in in Toronto. This was an activist community, whose bonds were built through experiences of becoming refugees as children in the early Cold War. I would especially like to thank the many women in this

community who were examples of committed and skilled organizers in my life and whose work has often gone unacknowledged.

To my father. I could not imagine having pursued a PhD without you. An especially thoughtful, funny and loving man, my father was a working-class intellectual who took the time most days after work to give his kids lessons in history and politics. He was the first person to teach me the importance of being a critical thinker. I dearly miss our coffees and daily discussions and debates. To my mother, a very kind, ethical and generous person. The help she has given me is immeasurable. Especially over the last very difficult couple of years. I owe her so much. To my son Luke, you are an absolute joy. I am so unbelievably lucky.

Finally, I cannot properly express the love and gratitude I have for my partner Tracy Supruniuk. Through this process I have subjected Tracy to various tortures, including reading through endless drafts and listening to me work through countless dilemmas. He has graciously taken on so many things to help me including more than his share of our reproductive labour. Tracy has also made sure to remind me to laugh and to relax. I would not have finished without you.

Table of Contents

Appendices

Introduction

Situating the Problematics of Labour Internationalism

All efforts . . . aiming at the economical emancipation of the working classes . . . have hitherto failed from the want of solidarity between manifold divisions of labor in each country, and from the absence of a fraternal bond of union between the working classes of different countries.
–Karl Marx
Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association
(quoted in Howard 1995, 366)

Solidarity Divided (Fletcher and Gapasin 2008), *Blood Brothers: The Division and Decline of Britain's Trade Unions* (Grant 1992) and *Unions in Crisis: The Future of Organized Labor in America* (Schiavone 2007) are just some of the many titles about the decline of trade unions and workers' power published over the last thirty years. These texts, particularly those about the crisis of unions in the Global North, have been so abundant that they could form their own sub-genre across several disciplines. These texts speak to the processes and effects of neo-liberal era union busting, spiking unemployment, the rising global reserve army of labour as well as declining strikes, working class political action and unionization rates.

The weakening of unions and workers' power in the Global North has also been symbolized by processes like deindustrialization, such as in cities like Detroit, once strong centres of worker resistance and industrial union organizing now abandoned by capital. Today, Detroit is a place of high levels of unemployment affected by massive outward migration, urban decay, gutted public infrastructure and services as well as widespread poverty. As such, cities like Detroit epitomize the neo-liberal offensive and the effects of the demise of once powerful unions.

Studies addressing the phenomenon of union decline in the Global North have assessed key battles, analysed the processes and effects of the neo-liberal offensive on specific sets of workers, regions or unions, and assessed the various strategies of unions to combat union busting,

deindustrialization, capital mobility, and privatization. The assessments and proposals to confront this decline are quite varied – from reviving more militant class-struggle based organizing approaches to economic nationalist schemes to a range of innovative community union strategies.

A set of the proposals aimed at combatting this decline that have gained currency since the rise of the discourse of globalization, considers the practices of international labour solidarity and transnational union collaboration. This includes scholarship on global labour campaigns and movements as well as on organizational transformations studied in the work on global union mergers, designs for mega-global unions and international framework agreements (non-binding agreements signed by multinationals that agree to a set of basic provisions for workers). This has led to significant research aimed at finding new openings and sites for resistance in the global reorganization of production. We find this in the work on global value chains (Herod 1997, 1998, 2000, 2001, 2003; Anner 2002; Anner, Greer, Hauptmeier, Lillie and Winchester 2006; Anner and Evans 2004), in the work on international labour institutions (Gagnon, Collombat and Avignon 2006; Collombat 2011; O'Brien 2000; Hyman 2005), in scholarship on particular international projects and campaigns (Ghigliani 2005; Wills 1996, 1998; Bieler, Lindberg and Pillay 2008; Bieler, Lindberg and Sauerborn 2010), as well as in studies on models of international labour solidarity (Waterman 1998, 1999, 2001a; Scipes 2014a, 2014b).

Toward Transformative Solidarities

Solidarity is not an act of charity, but mutual aid between forces fighting for the same objective.
–Samora Machel[1]
(quoted in Saskatoon Solidarity Committee 1981, i)

---

[1] Samora Machel was a leader of Frelimo (Frente de Libertação de Moçambique, the Mozambique Liberation Front) and the first president of post-colonial/liberated Mozambique.

While there has been renewed interest in labour internationalism in the face of the declining

power of labour in the North, international solidarity is not a new phenomenon. Exploring the way

workers have acted in solidarity with workers outside their national borders has been a significant

issue for activists on the broad left since the time of Marx and the establishment of the International

Workingmen's Association (IWA, the First International). David Featherstone discusses the actions

of British workers that inspired the First International (2012); British workers, for example, risked

their own livelihoods to uphold the cotton blockade aimed at ending slavery in the United States

(Featherstone 2012, 3-7).[2] These solidarity actions, Featherstone argues, were so inspiring because

they entailed conscious action by British workers that directly went against their own economic

interests. Drawing from this example, he proposes that solidarity is a transformative relation "that

shapes different ways of challenging oppression and inequalities" and that produces new

configurations of political relations that led workers to re-think the boundaries of working-class

political practice (Featherstone 2012, 5-8). The significance of this action was tied not only to the

risks taken by British workers in relation to their immediate material interests but also that the fact

that this happened despite ideological barriers such as hegemonic ideas about race, gender,

capitalism and nation. The class consciousness exemplified in this action is something that scholars

like Richard Hyman has noted is so crucial for overcoming the various forms of sectionalism

which have been impediments to the power and strength of workers' movements (Hyman 1975, 60).

---

[2] The First International grappled with issues of oppression and their relation to revolutionary strategy. In *Marx at the Margins* (2010), Kevin Anderson explores the positions taken by Marx and the IWMA on struggles against oppression, which in the case of Poland and Ireland, were intertwined with national struggles. Although the debates on these struggles are beyond the scope of my dissertation it is important to note that issues of oppression were a critical part of the discussions about solidarity and revolutionary strategy. An important example of this is the issue of racism. Marx and the IWMA considered racial oppression both in relation to Ireland and to the United States, particularly with regards to slave labour. The connection between revolutionary strategy and struggles against oppression are evident in Marx's analysis of slave labour. Marx, in a letter written in 1846, argued that "direct slavery is as much the pivot upon which our present-day industrialism turns as are machinery, credit etc. Without slavery there would be no cotton, without cotton there would be no modern industry . . . Slavery is therefore an economic category of paramount importance" (Marx, 28 December 1946 quoted in Anderson 2010). Anderson goes on to argue that for Marx, turning the civil war into a revolutionary war for slave emancipation was critical to prevent a capitalist system "openly structured upon racial and ethnic lines" (Anderson quoted in Smith 2013, 134). For Marx therefore, "labour in a white skin cannot emancipate itself where it is branded in a black skin" (Marx 1990 quoted in Featherstone 2012, 3-4).

Rebecca Johns, like Featherstone, draws from the example of the cotton blockade to theorize the implications of international solidarity action. She argues that solidarity can be transformative when workers in one place act to help others without expectation of reciprocity or that they themselves will benefit (Johns 1998, 256; Ryland and Sadler 2008, 475). These acts of solidarity entail the domination of class interests "over interests that are spatially derived and rooted," hence operating outside of the logic of nationalism and imperialism (Johns 1998, 256). And so, transformative solidarities presuppose the possibility of building class consciousness akin to that exhibited during the cotton blockade.

It is this transformative potential, the way solidarity can be a site of building strength and capacity to resist and for challenging hegemonic ideas and social relations that serve capital,[3] that makes solidarity such an important piece on the left. Like strikes and unions themselves, genuine acts of international solidarity can hit at the root of capital's ability to perpetuate competition between workers. Johns notes the importance of international labour solidarity today as a strategy to tackle competition between workers and strengthen possibilities to successfully confront the endless efforts of capital to reproduce uneven development and the global division of labour.

Featherstone likewise argues that the practice of solidarity can be transformative for the actors involved. This is something that Frederich Engels also considers in relation to acts of resistance. In *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (1845), Engels reflects on the vitality of experiences of resistance for political transformation and revolution. He discusses this in relation to acts of resistance like strikes, arguing that the processes of participating in these acts of resistance are transformative because they serve as sites of learning. Strikes, Engels argues, "are the military school of the working men in which they prepare themselves for the great struggle which cannot be avoided . . . and as schools of war the unions are unexcelled" (1845).

---

[3] There are numerous examples of these. They include racism, white supremacy, nationalism, and numerous other ideas that sustain feelings of competition between workers on an international scale.

Featherstone, following from this idea, contends that this practice of resistance can be part of a process of politicization (Featherstone 2012, 7). Andrew Howard similarly argues that acts of solidarity may work to promote the politicization of economic trade union struggles and catalyze broader levels of class solidarity and unity on the national and local planes (Howard 1995, 365). Acts of solidarity can do this in numerous interconnected ways. For instance, acts of solidarity often demand a reconceptualization of the terrain of struggle, and challenge deeply held common-sense ideas around race, nation, class and resistance. They can also challenge ideas of what unions do and how they function. It is this potential that underlies the hope and optimism about the development of new forms and practices of solidarity.

Assessing the Terrain

The more I tried to pin down the topic, the larger it grew. The history of U.S. labor and international solidarity turned out to be vast and slippery. Mostly it slipped sideways: across borders inside suitcases, in and out of social movements of all sorts, onto kitchen tables, into peoples' imaginations, and around the corner of state repression.
–Dana Frank (2004, 96)

International labour solidarity takes place within an ideological terrain that includes vastly different understandings of the function and goal of unions and visions of workers' justice. It also operates in a field that is gendered and racialized in terms of the social, political and economic differences that separate workers. For Dana Frank, besides the challenges of creating a sense of mutuality across very significant differences, international labour solidarity is difficult to grapple because it encompasses such a diverse set of actors and institutions (Frank 2004, 96).

International labour solidarity has a long history encompassing organizing within trade unions as well as other working class organizations, political parties and movements. This organizing has taken various forms, institutionalized and not, led by political parties, by rank-and-file workers, and by initiatives of leaders and staff. It is gendered and racialized in terms of whose voices are

heard in the debates about labour internationalism and which stories are told, i.e., official histories of trade unions have tended to highlight the role of an overwhelmingly white and male leadership in both the United States and Canada while marginalizing stories of rank-and-file and movement solidarity organizing (Frank 2004).

International labour solidarity and collaboration covers not only a huge range of actors and organizations, but also various types of activities. In a recent assessment of the field, Kim Scipes categorizes several key types of activities and goals. These include efforts to support workers and allies in their struggles to improve working conditions and wages or to improve the lives of workers and their families outside of the workplace, to develop legal strategies and tactics, to struggle against global and/or regional political-economic plans, to oppose militarism, imperialism and support liberation struggles and to build common struggles against multinational or transnational corporations.[4] These activities also involve various types of practices, from direct material support to direct action in the workplace to supporting a particular struggle by using pressure points, creating sanctuaries, demanding status for refugees, fighting for political prisoners and lobbying.

Practices of labour internationalism arise from a whole range of union philosophies, from economistic and nationalistic to revolutionary socialist, and therefore consist of not only practices of solidarity but practices that undermine the struggles of other groups of workers.[5] These traditions have operated simultaneously throughout the history of labour internationalism and have battled to win over workers to their vision.

---

[4] See Scipes 2014b.

[5] This terrain of competing traditions also includes forces that oppose internationalism entirely. This remains a strong force within many labour movements and local unions that construes their battle as limited to their relation to their specific employer.

Assessing Possibilities and Challenges

The purpose of this dissertation is to contribute to the broader goal of assessing possibilities for transformative forms of international labour solidarity and coordination. Assessing these possibilities is a daunting task. And available critical research that tries to make sense of and evaluate different acts of international labour solidarity or efforts towards internationalizing the power of labour is limited due to the national orientation of most studies of labour.

My contribution to this objective is to draw out lessons from the case of labour internationalism inside the organized labour movement in Canada. Specifically, I analyse the competing international practices that emerged within the Canadian labour movement during the Cold War. I examine the dialectical relationship between the dominant visions and practices that developed in this period and the battles that took place over the aims and strategies of labour internationalism. I make sense of the solidarities that determined these practices by exploring the terrain of class consciousness in which they were formed. Situating my analysis within the social and political contours of class formation in Canada and internationally, I argue that in order to develop a critical lens to practices and opportunities for international solidarity and coordination today we have to unpack the various ways that workers have reinforced or challenged global divisions of labour.

To make sense of the competing traditions, I use Rebecca Johns' distinction between transformative versus accommodationist forms of solidarity. For Johns, international labour solidarity can either serve to challenge the logic of capitalism and oppose the forces that deepen global divisions of labour, or they can serve to reinforce these divisions arising from capitalist development and imperialism. And so, drawing from David Featherstone, Chandra Mohanty and Antonio Gramsci, I see my task as firstly, to make "the project of empire visible" (Mohanty 2004, 71) in the practices of labour internationalism, and secondly, to challenge "the so-called common-

sense and instinctual notions that had penetrated the workers' movement" (Annunziato 1988, 161)

that underlie these practices. In this chapter, I begin by discussing some key features of capitalist

development that shape global divisions of labour today and the dilemmas raised by them. I then

consider how organized labour fits in, exploring why we have to think beyond organizational

solutions to issues of class consciousness in order to mine new possibilities for solidarity,

coordination and strength. Lastly, I consider how Johns' distinction can serve as a framework to

think through the tensions shaping the direction of labour internationalism in Canada.

Building Solidarity Across Uneven Landscapes: Contending with the Effects of Capitalist Development

> Once they colonized Mexico with no compunction, today they can have NAFTA with a seeming
> consensus process. Post-colonial, imperialist relations ensure the necessary economic and politico-
> military relations for this while hegemonic common sense gives it a concrete form and legitimacy.
> Meanwhile, in the metropolitan countries the white working class resents the non-white working
> class, while capital benefits as a whole from this manipulation.
> –Himani Bannerji (1995, 32)[6]

For Marx, the effects of capitalist development would "lead to common interests among

workers of different nationalities" (Gilbert 1978, 348). However, Marx did not consider "the nature

of these common interests or how they might be drawn upon in differing situations" (Gilbert 1978,

348). Richard Hyman argues that solidarity can either be rooted in a sense of shared identity, often

national, racial or religious, a sense of common interests that can be "best pursued collectively" or a

sense of mutuality despite difference (Hyman 2011, 26). One only needs to look to the immense

barriers to building solidarities within workplaces and locally across groups of workers and with

common language, religious or national identities to recognize that prospects for building

meaningful and lasting solidarities across national borders are fraught with challenges that often

seem insurmountable. International labour solidarity not only needs to contend with all the standard

barriers to trade union organizing along sectoral, regional and national lines but also with the

---

[6] NAFTA is the North American Free Trade Agreement, established in 1994.

immense material inequities between workers internationally stemming from the legacies of

colonialism, slavery and ongoing imperialist strategies that are maintained through the regulation of

the border.[7] The immense international unevenness between workers arising from the historical

development of capitalism means that people globally face radically different options for survival as

seen in different levels of precarity and propensities to informality.[8]

The processes of dispossession resulting in ongoing but intensified proletarianization in the

neo-liberal era has led to a new industrial labour force in many parts of the Global South under

conditions dictated by the needs of internationalized monopolies originating in the North.[9] The

International Labour Organization (ILO)[10] reports that between 1980 and 2007, the active global

labour force within the sphere of capitalist production rose by 63%, with 73% of the world's labour

force located in the Global South (Foster, McChesney and Jonna 2011, 3).

This has also led to increased competition between workers for fewer jobs as these processes

of dispossession continue to intensify. According to Marx, this reserve army "weighs down the

active army of workers . . . [as] the background against which the law of demand and supply of

labour does its work" (Marx quoted in Foster, McChesney and Jonna 2011, 8). Marx calls this the

absolute general law of accumulation. Capitalism operates to dispossess people of their means of

existence (primitive accumulation), and the resulting rise of available labour power leads to further

---

[7] By this I mean the use of borders to maintain global divisions of labour. For most states in the North, the border is a mechanism that allows employers to erode conditions of work for those workers deemed undesirable, outside and undeserving of state regulation. See Sharma 2006a, 2006b and 2007.

[8] See Rodney 1972; Harvey 2006; Wallerstein 1974.

[9] See Harvey 2003, 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c; Foster, McChesney and Jonna 2011; Glassman 2006.

[10] The ILO is a tripartite organization established in 1919. It has been a site for discussions over labour and industrial policies between states, unions and employers. As is evident in the article by Foster, McChesney and Jonna (2011), the ILO continues to produce important research on the global labour market. However, from the standpoint of labour organizations and those striving towards workers' justice, there are many critiques of the ILO's efficacy. These critiques are wide-ranging. They include critiques of the tripartite nature of the organization, the unenforceability of its conventions and recommendations, and the waning influence of the ILO on national policy implementation (Rodriguez Garcia 2008). Other critiques include the role of the ILO in supporting imperialism (Taha 2015).

accumulation by driving down wages and conditions for the active labour force. What we have seen

take place since the beginning of the neo-liberal period is an acceleration of this process and

therefore the expansion of the global reserve army of labour. Foster, McChesney and Jonna note

that as of 2011 the global reserve army of labour stands at around 2.4 billion, compared to 1.4 billion

in the active labour market (2011, 20).[11] The rise of the global reserve army of labour, in conjunction

with the successes of capital to remake the rules of production, has meant that workers compete

across a landscape where the disparity of wages between the North and South are estimated at 70:1

(translating into a ratio of 10:1 in purchasing power) (Bellamy Foster, McChesney and Jonna 2011,

16). And so the current global division of labour shapes conditions of work in both the South and

the North. In terms of the possibilities for solidarity, this has deepened divisions between workers

internationally, as seen in the existence of conflicting material interests as workers fight for jobs and

investments.

Aside from the actual material inequities that serve as contradictions that undermine

prospects for international solidarity, there are also the social divisions that are part of the

ideological terrain that sustains and supports the drive of capital to accelerate accumulation. These

social hierarchies and their concomitant ideological landscapes arising from the history of capitalist

development and incorporation of pre-capitalist social divisions serve as a complementary set of

contradictions that undermine prospects for solidarity. We see this in the histories of so many labour

struggles. For instance, Canadian labour history is replete with contradictions in building class

solidarity, seen in efforts to exclude women from workplaces and the demands for further

restrictions to the entry of workers of "undesirable races" (Creese 1987, 1988, 2007; Calliste 1993,

1995; Goutor 2007a, 2007b, 2011; Sharma 2006a, 2006b, 2007). As in the case of responses to

---

[11] They note that the ILO estimates that 1.7 billion of the 2.4 billion in the reserve army are in the informal sector which the ILO argues now makes up the majority of new employment in the world (Bellamy Foster, McChesney and Jonna 2011, 19-20).

immigrant workers historically, the way this rising industrial labour force and reserve army in the South is framed matters. Hegemonic ideas about race, gender, nation and class struggle are all part of the landscape in which solidarities are built or fail. As Bannerji points to when discussing the difference between the colonization of Mexico and processes of neo-imperialism that affect Mexico today, the hegemonic ideas associated with capitalist development and imperialism are themselves forces shaping and remaking social relations. And so we need to assess the possibilities of solidarity within the context of if and how workers and workers' movements have responded to global divisions of labour, the processes that make these divisions and the ideas that support these processes.

Beyond the National Lens – Reframing Class Struggle Internationally

Ramasamy notes that "most of the literature on labour and globalization posits the view that labour is a passive victim of global trends. While capital is seen as dynamic, mobile and aggressive, labour is seen as passive, reactive and immobile" (Ramasamy 2005, 7). The dominant conceptualization of globalization as an irreversible process invulnerable to the power of workers originates in part from the impact it has had on workers and unions in the North and the weakness of union responses to it (Ruccio 2003).

Some of the dominant depictions of globalization also reflect the application of a national, racial and gender lens to the terrain of workers' struggle. This is visible in the way that workers in the South have been framed as threats to the conditions of those in the North. Alicia Schmidt Camacho argues that:

> Depictions of subaltern women of color as the "nimble fingers" generating hyper-profits of globalized capitalism are now a commonplace in representations of its logic of commodification. The discourse of the fragmented laboring body constructs Third World woman workers as uniquely equipped by biological and historical conditioning to withstand the monotony and repetition of high-speed production. (Schmidt Camacho 1999, 80)

For Schmidt Camacho, these women, posited as the other to the Northern worker, are often depicted as unskilled and as having no agency in both management and development discourses (Schmidt Camacho 1999, 80).

Drawing from the work of P. Ramasamy, Carlos M. Vilas and Nederveen Pieterse, I argue that some of the narratives of globalization (those that generally begin with the rise of neo-liberalism and multinational corporations) can operate to deny and limit our analysis of possibilities for resistance because they limit the problem to specific innovations of global capitalism since the 1970s – such as the rise of multinationals and not capitalism itself. We see this in nostalgic rhetoric about Fordism expressed by some unions today. Lamenting the demise of the post-World War II compromise, what we have witnessed in many unions in the neo-liberal era is not the rise of labour internationalism, but rather efforts to resuscitate labour's pact with the state and national or regional blocs of capital. We see this in economic nationalist strategies that work to entrench global divisions of labour born of the history of capitalist development. We see this trend currently visible in the rise of Donald Trump in the United States. This leaves unions trapped in competition for jobs and investments and often also consenting to various forms of subsidies to companies operating within the nation-state, ostensibly to save jobs. Starting with the neo-liberal period is also dangerous, as it occludes the imperialism of the post-World War II period.[12] While many Northern workers were able to win significant improvements to their living and working conditions in this period due to a combination of class struggle, labour shortages, and the threat of revolution, this was also the period of the emerging US empire and the building of the infrastructure that would serve to undermine worker power in the North starting in the 1970s.

---

[12] Centring capitalism and imperialism is important to ward against romantic depictions of the early post World War II period. This was a time in which the architecture of the current strategies of imperialism, what we call globalization or neo-liberal globalization, was put in place. This was also a period when many peoples were still subject to colonial rule and when the American empire was rapidly expanding.

Following from Nederveen Pieterse and Vilas I argue that imperialism is a more apt term to account for the current processes shaping global class formation and the divisions of labour following from it (Nederveen Pieterse 2004). If we take a historical and global lens, global divisions of labour are rooted in the historical development of capitalism and imperialism, serving to create and expand the reserve army to prevent rising labour costs through strategies to continually displace people from other means of existence. Imperialism allows us to think about the innovations of the current period while keeping the analysis historically grounded in a much longer history of capitalist development and expansion that includes the golden age for Northern unions. And so, if we are to take an international lens to the struggle of workers, then imperialism and its many manifestations historically as features of capitalist development – rather than simply globalization – must be seen in its entirety as a central problem for labour.

New Solidarities and Openings for Resistance

Getting beyond a national lens to the problem of labour allows us to make connections between struggles as part of the overall terrain of struggle against capitalist development and imperialism. The current processes of imperialism, while deepening competition between workers for sites of investment and jobs, making it harder for people to live, and destroying lives, also creates the conditions for the development of new forms of solidarity. It means for instance drawing connections between wage workers and those in the process of being dispossessed from their land and means of production to become a part of the growing global reserve army of labour.

Alicia Schmidt-Camacho argues that the current phase of neo-colonial capitalism is characterized by

> flexible accumulation empowered to move unhindered around the globe, to organize the extraction of surplus by coordinating highly differentiated modes of production and rigorously segmented labor markets. These characteristics have forced a reconceptualization of the traditional terrain of class struggle and its privileged subjects. Rather than imagine a

labor movement predicated on a solidarity born out of the homogenizing tendencies of capitalist expansion, we are compelled to consider the hyper-differentiating effects of globalization – the dispersal and fragmentation of sites of production and markets – as the ground for new forms of political action, rather than as the occasion of their foreclosure. (Schmidt Camacho 1999, 80)

For Schmidt Camacho and Ramasamy we can re-frame the current phase of global capitalist development as providing openings to more radically reconfigure solidarities and as enabling new forms of resistance (Schmidt Camacho 1999, 80; Ramasamy 2005, 5). This is because imperialism, like capitalism itself, is a contradictory process. As such, it provides hope for finding new possibilities for resistance. There *are* new solidarities and strategies for resistance that have arisen to confront the current processes of global capitalist development. This includes the strategies of social movement unions in the global South (Ness 2015; Ramasamy 2005, 32),[13] global coordination of unions and civil society organizations (CSOs) around free trade agreements, and solidarity between wage labourers and those struggling against dispossession[14] as well as the new organizational forms and strategies between unions across national borders that share a single employer or coordinate across spaces in global production chains.

Global Divisions of Labour: Thinking about Imperialism, Centering Global Capitalist Development

The vast material disparities between workers, the immense global reserve army of labour and the hegemonic ideas that operate to sustain social hierarchies are all part of the terrain that limits transnational coordination between unions and workers' organizations. To make sense of the

---

[13] Ramasamy points to the lessons from the models of social movement unionism in countries like Brazil and South Africa which aims to build the capacities of workers themselves to resist capitalism and imperialism (Ramasamy 2005, 32). This model is rooted in an older tradition of anti-capitalist trade union organizing and provides many lessons for how processes of imperialism can be fought. For more see Bieler, Lindberg and Sauerborn 2010; Waterman 2008; Ness 2015.

[14] The broader conception of the terrain of class struggle that an international lens provides must also include consideration of the unemployed and the struggles of women against dispossession and around social reproduction as the majority of informal and subsistence workers. See Rowbotham and Linkogle 2001; Federici 2011, 2012; Mies 1998.

possibilities for international solidarity, we must grapple with the material conditions that serve to undermine solidaristic relations.[15] Marx argued that capital is always reinventing itself and its tools, so even in moments of class compromise, the pursuit of surplus value means new strategies and a never-ending pursuit of new markets and resources. For Marx and Lenin, this process follows from the logic of capitalism itself. As Marx says in the *Manifesto*,

> The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production . . . All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify . . . The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere. (Marx quoted in Lichtenstein 219)

Global divisions of labour have been shaped through the processes of imperialism but were also made possible by the historical legacies of pre-capitalist colonialism such as those of the feudal Spanish Empire and their strategies for extraction of labour power.[16] Now, while Marx did not develop a theory of imperialism, he did note that colonialism operated to dispossess producers from their land and means of production (Klassen 2007, 17). V.I. Lenin, in his book on imperialism, argued that "capitalism has grown into a world system of colonial oppression and of the financial strangulation of the overwhelming majority of the people in the world by a handful of 'advanced' countries" (Lenin 1969, 10-11) and was the result of monopoly capitalism and the development of finance capital (Klassen 2007, 20). In that work, V.I. Lenin classically defined imperialism as:

> Capitalism at that stage of development at which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital is established; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun; in which the division of all territories of the globe among the biggest capitalist powers has been completed. (in McDonough 1995, 352)

---

[15] It is important to note that while these conditions present serious challenges for building solidarities, they can also lead to the development of more radical visions of justice that challenge the logic and legitimacy of neo-liberal strategies of dispossession and of capitalism itself.

[16] This means it is important to also consider the influence of pre-capitalist forms of oppression and exploitation that capitalist development grew out of and how they have functioned to shape material inequalities between workers and between wage workers, peasants, the unemployed and informal workers within and across national contexts today.

For Lenin, imperialism was a new stage of capitalist development, one that was related to

monopolization, capital exports, colonialism and war (Klassen 2007, 28).[17] Lenin's theorization was

later criticized because his own data showed that colonies were not necessary for investment because

the bulk of foreign direct investment in Lenin's study happened within the capitalist economies and

that therefore imperialism was not an inevitable feature of capitalist development (Klassen 2007, 29).

Jerome Klassen's characterization of imperialism is useful in laying out some core features of

imperialism. He argues that,

> Imperialism is rooted in the uneven development of capital across the space of production
> in the world economy. The accumulation of capital takes place within the nation-state system
> and generates complex forms of rivalry, interdependence, and uneven development . . . these
> dynamics reinforce the unequal rate of growth between states, and the core-periphery
> structure to the world economy. The concentration and centralization of capital in the more
> economically-advanced states also allows firms from these countries to make foreign direct
> investments and to thereby extend their control over the worldwide circuits of capital . . .
> Imperialism, then, is the uneven development of capital within and across the nation-state
> system, the economic hierarchies through which the labour supplies and resources of some
> countries are exploited to the systematic benefit of others. (Klassen 2007, 67-8)

The New Imperialism

> The Third World is trapped in a poverty cycle, not because western countries have failed to
> commit their capital overseas, but because they are continually draining massive amounts of
> capital from the South.
> –Robert Carty and Virginia Smith (1981, 11)

The general drive for accumulation is part of the logic of capital and the actual competition it

generates between workers globally is real and has been intensifying since the 1970s. There are

several competing theories on the nature of imperialism today.[18] These theories contend with the

nature, direction and strategies of imperialism in what we call the age of globalization or neo-liberal

---

[17] This was also true of Nikolai Bukharin, who was a contemporary of Lenin and another important theorist of imperialism.

[18] Klassen outlines several proponents of the competing paradigms (2007). These include David Harvey (2003); Alex Callincos (2001); Giovanni Arrighi (2005); David McNally (1999); Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2001); Leo Panitch and Sam Gindin (2005, 2006a, 2006b).

globalization. This is a period that entails the full realization of the infrastructure laid out through

the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)[19] and the Bretton Woods system

put in place in the 1940s. The Bretton Woods institutions include the General Agreement on Tariffs

and Trade (GATT), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. The GATT later

developed into the World Trade Organization (WTO), and together these institutions are at the core

of maintaining and deepening global divisions of labour, serving the interests of multinationals and

providing the means for their expansion.[20] For Ellen Meikins Wood,

> the classic theories of imperialism belong to an age when capitalism, while well advanced in
> parts of the world, was very far from a truly global economic system. Capitalist imperial
> power certainly did embrace much of the world, but it did so less by the universality of its
> economic imperatives than by the same coercive force that had always determined relations
> between colonial master and subject territories. (Harvey 2007b, 58)

And so, new theories of imperialism were necessary to grapple with these changing conditions.

Wood argued that the new imperial order begins after World War II, when the United States

emerged as the major imperial power and built the Bretton Woods institutions (Harvey 2007b, 66).[21]

For David Harvey, the new imperialism begins in the 1970s with the rise of neo-liberalism, and it

"consolidated around the Washington Consensus of the mid-1990s" through a range of forces,

---

[19] The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was established as a Cold War military alliance of Western states. Its endurance in the decades following the end of the Cold War is sometimes attributed to its value as a mechanism of US Imperialism (see Folly 1988; Larres 2002; Gibbs 2001).

[20] The IMF and the World Bank were established very shortly after the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944. They were institutions meant to provide short-term (the IMF) and longer term (the World Bank) loans to states following the end of the Second World War. The GATT on the other hand was set up to drive trade liberalization and was established in 1947, later to become the World Trade Organization (WTO). These institutions signalled the emergence of the US as a superpower, and these institutions have been part of the infrastructure of imperialism in the post-World War II period. They have been responsible for an array of misery and dispossession around the world, driving down wages and conditions of life for most people in the world. For more, see Wood 2005; Harvey 2003, 2006a, 2007b; Bello 2000; Callincos 2001; Arrighi 2005; McNally 1999; Hardt and Negri 2001; Panitch and Gindin 2005, and 2006a and 2006b; Klassen 2007; Danaher 1994.

[21] See Wood 2005.

military, political, cultural and economic (Harvey 2007b, 69).[22] The result is capital's greater ability to move freely in pursuit of markets, resources, and cheaper labour (Harvey 2007b).[23]

In his study of Canadian imperialism, Klassen argues that there are six important features of imperialism today. First, as I outlined above, it functions to produce uneven development (Klassen 2007, 67-8). Second, it is a political project of the capitalist state (Klassen 2007, 69). Third, it is currently constituted primarily through the regionalization of the world market in the form of "regional trade blocs that compete for new forms of trade and investment and work together to incorporate the periphery into the world economy" (Klassen 2007, 69-70). Fourth, contemporary imperialism generates new forms of inequality and uneven development especially between the core and periphery, including "new forms of debt, emigration, disease, war and environmental destruction" (Klassen 2007, 70). Fifth, "there has been a reorganization of the imperial chain during the period of neoliberalism" (Klassen 2007, 70). This has meant that while the United States is still dominant financially and militarily, there are also a group of secondary powers in Europe and Asia who have their own imperial interests (Klassen 2007, 70-1). And lastly, "contemporary imperialism is dedicated to imposing neoliberal governance structures on countries around the world, especially in the periphery" (Klassen 2007, 71). It is important to underscore that features of the imperialism of the last 40 years marks a departure from that of the early Cold War, and further, it is critical to think about the specificity of imperialism today and its ability to intensify competition between workers through new mechanisms and strategies. However, I argue that we need to keep central that what is at work in the remaking of the global labour market is a process that is tied to the logic of capital

---

[22] The Washington Consensus was coined in 1989 and has been used to describe as set of ideas underlying the policies of the Bretton Woods institutions and other related actors (i.e. regional development banks). These include a range of core neo-liberal policies including trade liberalization, privatization, tax reforms, deregulation (Peck, Theodore and Brenner 2010; Williamson 2004).

[23] This process has culminated in a process of concentration and internationalization that has put the world economy under the substantial control of a few hundred-business enterprises which do not compete with one another according to the traditional rules of the market (Bellamy, McCheseny and Jonna 2011).

itself. In sum, when we think about capitalist development historically and internationally, we must centre imperialism as a critical feature of the making and remaking of global divisions of labour, and so the fight against imperialism also needs to be centred in our thinking about internationalizing the power of labour.

Unions as Sites of Resistance and Transformation

> [Organized workers] Ought not to forget that they are fighting with effects, but not with causes of those effects; that they are retarding the downward movement, but not changing its direction; that they are applying palliatives, nor curing the malady.
> –Marx at the International Working Men's Association in 1865 (Hyman 1971, 10)

Part of the difficulty in thinking about the prospects and potential for internationalizing the power of labour is related to the organizational limitations and contradictions of unions themselves. Despite their decline in the North in the neo-liberal era, unions remain significant civil society organizations within capitalism and key organizations of the working class. However, simply expanding current forms of union organization cannot contend with the current conditions shaping global class struggle. This is partly because unions are contradictory and limited through their relationship to capitalism. Perry Anderson argues that unions are "essential part of a capitalist society because they incarnate the *difference* between Capital and Labour which defines the society" (Anderson 1967, 264). Unions are structurally disadvantaged within the capitalist system since workers, having been dispossessed of land and means of production, need employers to live, whereas employers have a reserve army of labour at their disposal.

Marx and Engels argued that unions were limited in terms of what they could win economically (Hyman 1971). This is because their efforts always exist in a context of the market and of supply and demand in the labour market, which works to check the power of unions (Hyman 1971): "All these efforts naturally cannot alter the economic law according to which wages are determined by the relation between supply and demand in the labour market. Hence the unions

remain powerless against all *great* forces which influence this relation" (Hyman 1971, 5).[24] Yet even

though unions are limited in economic terms, Hyman argues that for Marx and Engels, unions had

great political potential.[25] This contrasts with Lenin and Leon Trotsky who thought that unions

"posed no threat to the stability of the capitalist order" (Hyman 1971, 11-12). Lenin noted that "it is

commonplace that trade unions, being able to achieve their economic objectives within the

framework of capitalism, display a natural tendency to integration within the system" (Hyman 1971,

14). Trotsky went further still, arguing that union bureaucracies played a crucial role in stabilizing the

capitalist system and mediating working class discontent, and as such were completely incorporated

into the system, operating to maintain capitalism (Hyman 1971). Unions therefore display competing

tendencies and possibilities that can contribute to or undermine the interests and goals of workers

and are limited by the contours of the market.

Class Consciousness

And so, internationalizing union organization does not in and of itself translate into greater

collective worker power. We see this for instance in how the desire of scholars and activists to find

ways to build international labour solidarity and organizational forms to sustain this solidarity has at

times translated into overly optimistic assessment of the potential of certain organizational solutions

e.g. international framework agreements. While some of these organizational and strategic proposals

are quite promising, others are extensions of very weak local strategies to the international scale.

Regardless, it is important to note that different organizational innovations cannot themselves

resolve the dilemma of organized labour today. Organizational forms will not themselves overcome

---

[24] "In merely economic action capital is the stronger side and therefore . . . union achievements were limited by the economic laws tending toward the increasing immiseration of workers" (Hyman, 1971, 5).

[25] For instance, as schools of war for the working class and the challenge they posed through their efforts to fight against competition between workers.

the fact that workers find themselves bound by the vicissitudes of the market. We therefore need to turn, as Marx and Engels argued, to the political possibilities of unions. This is where class consciousness comes in.

For Hyman, the sectionalism of the working class cannot be resolved simply through organizational solutions (Hyman 1975, 60). Rather, he argues that the sectional nature of unions, their divisions by skill, workplace or nation, is "the product of sectionalism and not the cause" (Hyman 1975, 60). This means that sectionalism (in this case including on national lines) is an issue of class consciousness and ideology (Hyman 1975, 60).[26] For Lenin and others, trade unions could only produce sectoral and corporate consciousness and not class-consciousness (Anderson 1967, 266-7). While Marx argued that unions fail by "limiting themselves to guerrilla war against the effects of the existing forces, instead of using their organized forces as a lever for the final emancipation of the working class" (quoted in Annunziato 1988, 143).

This is why for Gramsci, the examination of the "so-called common-sense and instinctual notions that had penetrated the workers' movement" became the primary focus of his theoretical analysis (Annunziato 1988, 162).[27] Gramsci argued that hegemonic ideas reflecting the values and legitimating the power of the ruling class become common-sense amongst the working class (Gramsci 1971).[28] Himani Bannerji contends that these sets of ideas "developed historically, not

---

[26] Hyman's insight here is important for thinking about organizational solutions to labour internationalism put forward in the literature on mergers, transnational bargaining and Global Union Federations but also for considering openings for building solidaristic relations more generally. Global Labour Federations are international sectoral organizations that serve to bring together different national unions in an industry or set of related industries. These developed out of International Trade Secretariats that operated semi-independently of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), which was the main international organization of unions in the North. The formation of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions in 1949 signalled the beginnings of the Cold War in labour. It was set up as a break away from the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) established in 1945 and adopted as an explicit anti-communist politics.

[27] Frank Annunziato points out that for Gramsci reformist socialists, by ignoring Marxist theory, were destined to support bourgeois ideology (Annunziato 1988, 161).

[28] Hegemony constitutes the "ideological and institutional preconditions for the legitimation of class rule" (Pozo 2007, 56).

based on reason but imparted truths through historical forms of practice that have become legitimate and in that sense are unquestioned and foreclose discussion" (Bannerji 1995, 44).

We see the relationship between class consciousness and international labour solidarity for instance in the fact that international solidarity was much stronger at the beginning of the twentieth century than it is today (Ghigliani 2005, 359-40). The emancipatory thrust of some forms of labour internationalism in this period is linked to the strength of revolutionary socialist forces within labour movements. For Gramsci, as for Hyman, transformative potential is linked to class-consciousness, necessitating a deeper assessment of the terrain of ideas and their material origins in the processes of class formation. And so, taking a step back to explore the contradictory ideological terrain shaping class consciousness within specific unions and labour movements is critical for unpacking their international programmes and for providing a full picture of the possibilities for transformative solidarities.

Thinking about class consciousness means thinking about how workers think about and respond to the social, economic and political context they find themselves in today. One aspect of this is considering the relationship between oppression and exploitation in the conceptualization and practice of labour internationalism. For instance, are these linked and how? Is racism understood as something related to imperialism; as an essential component of the development of capitalism? How are these ideas defined and how are they understood to shape class formation and relations? This means centring capitalism and imperialism in our analysis, asking workers to reassess the terrain of struggle and means of resistance and as well who their allies are. Rather than a nice deed or act in addition to the main struggle, this requires seeing international solidarity – and specifically anti-imperialism – as essential to the possibilities of challenging exploitation and oppression.

Contestations

Throughout the 20th century, there have been intense ideological contestations over the form and nature of labour internationalism. They reflect the tensions between revolutionary and accommodationist tendencies within trade unions and their relation to capitalism but also the dominant ideas about race and nation. And so, while the early 20th century was a time when workers took up arms to support the Republican side in Spain, it was also a time of growing nationalism within sections of the working class translating into the decision of European socialist parties and their trade union counterparts to side with the position of their national states in the First World War.

The international labour organizations that emerged in the 19th and early to mid-20th century, viewed together, reflect a broad spectrum of beliefs about what worker emancipation means. The conception of internationalism embodied by the First International, arising from Marxism, is one that denotes an emancipatory and revolutionary goal for workers (Chatterjee 2009; Waterman 1989, 1993a, 2000, 2004; Featherstone 2012). While many of the international labour organizations established since the First International were in some way influenced by it, many eventually abandoned or de-emphasized the aim of worker emancipation from exploitation and oppression. So much of the history and scholarship on labour internationalism is this contest over the goals of labour internationalism and, by association also, a contest over what internationalism as a practice can and should be.

These contests are evident in the rise of competing international labour organizations in the early and mid-20th century. On the one hand, there was the creation of the Amsterdam International, otherwise known as the International Federation of Trade Unions (IFTU) set up in 1913 mostly by Western European trade unions,[29] along with sectoral organizations called the

---

[29] See Van Goethem 2006.

International Trade Secretariats (ITSs), which still exist today, now reorganized and called Global Union Federations or GUFs). On the other hand, there was the emergence of the Red International of Labour Unions (RILU, Prointern), which was set up by communist parties after the Russian Revolution. These two organizations had vastly divergent approaches to the question of worker emancipation and class struggle.[30] These forces came together following the Second World War for a very brief period in the establishment of the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU), which was dissolved in 1949 with the emergence of the Cold War and the split of Western, pro-capitalist unions that left to form the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU).

Besides these principal international labour organizations consisting of national trade union federations, there was also the setting up of the International Labour Organization (ILO) in 1919. The ILO is a tripartist international organization consisting of member states, employer and worker organizations.[31] There were also international organizations set up in this period that were principally made up of national political parties, parties that impacted international relations between unions such as the Socialist International composed of social democratic parties and the Comintern, or Third International, which consisted of national Communist parties. Pre-dating all of these was the Second International, which consisted of national socialist and social democratic parties and which broke down during the First World War. The heavy contestation over the vision and goals of internationalism in this period as well as the energy and interest in developing international labour organizations speaks to the importance of labour internationalism in this period.

---

[30] Reiner Tosstorff notes that the RILU began as an alliance between Bolsheviks and syndicalists and included unions like the CGT in France (2003, 79). RILU, unlike IFTU opposed colonialism and imperialism and adopted a strategy of industrial action that challenged the division between political and economic struggles (Tosstorff 2003, 82). The policies of the RILU were closely in line with those of the Comintern, from advocacy of separate revolutionary unions – also called red or dual unionism – to seeking unity with the IFTU (Tosstorff 2003, 84). Lenin had opposed the idea of dual unions as an ineffective strategy to win over the broader working class. Instead, he felt that revolutionaries needed to work within the existing trade unions despite their accommodationist tendencies (see Lenin 1940). For more on RILU, see Tosstorff 2003 and Devinatz 2013).

[31] For more, see note 8.

In the post-World War II period, the dominant characterization of the tensions within labour internationalism has been between old and new labour internationalism (Waterman 2012) in which "old" denotes leadership-led, bureaucratic Cold War labour battles as contrasted to the new "forms" of greater grassroots solidarity that has involved links to community organizing and social movements. This characterization relates to labour internationalism in parts of the global North both at the level of trade union bureaucracy and the rank-and-file. This period also includes anti-colonial and anti-imperialist solidarities, some predating World War II, that operated inside and outside the structure of trade unions and their international institutions.

Tackling Global Divisions of Labour: Tracing Empire

Consideration of the way practices of international labour solidarity tackle embedded competition between workers flowing from the effects of the historical development of capitalism and their regional differences reveals the contradictions and murkiness involved in different forms of labour internationalism. The murkiness of international solidarity, or what Featherstone calls the "dark sides of solidarity," that work to re-entrench privilege (Featherstone 2012, 12) are a critical piece for analysing the consequences of different models of solidarity action, including those intended to be transformative.

We see these contradictions in the emergence of international departments and other institutional forms for facilitating international action in the unions that established the ICFTU. Many of the founding unions of the ICFTU operated to entrench privilege in various ways, from embedded inequalities reflected in the structure of the organization itself to actions that have included what has been characterized as labour imperialism.[32]

---

[32] For more see Buhle 1999; Carew 1998; Scipes 2000, 2010a, 2010b; Harrod 1972b; Sims 1992; Radosh 1969; Thompson and Larson 1978; Hirsch 1974; Bass III 2012; Saskatoon Solidarity Committee 1981; Murphy 1986.

Labour Imperialism

> Labor is not fighting for a larger slice of the national pie, labor is fighting for a larger pie.
> –Walter Reuther, President of the United Auto Workers, 1946-1970 (Frank 2000, 109)[33]

The politics of the post-World War II compromises between Northern states, capital and labour translated into many national labour movements consenting to and sometimes playing an active role in making the current architecture of imperialism. Labour imperialism consists of an alignment with and often active support for conditions that make possible the expansion of national capital, including the imperialist policies of specific nation-states or groups of states. Drawing from the work of Nederveen Pieterse, Scipes notes that imperialism does not only function through the actions of states and capital, but also through other political communities including civil society organizations such as unions (Scipes 2010a, 467). So, labour imperialism is both reflected in support for specific policies of the state and strategies of capital and as well operates at the level of inter-union relations internationally. We see this expressed in a variety of practices that function to undermine the efforts of other workers' movements or in destabilizations of progressive political governments internationally, as in the case of the activities of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) in the coup in Chile in 1973 (Scipes 2000, 2010a). In this case, the AFL-CIO's operations inside unions in Chile worked to support the development of the coup (Scipes 2000). Indeed, labour imperialism has characterized much of the history of the AFL-CIO's international actions (Scipes 2010a) and the practices of some of the original affiliates to the ICFTU.[34] Kim Scipes categorizes the types of actions that have characterized the AFL-CIO style of labour imperialism into three areas, namely, the undermining of specific labour organizations,

---

[33] Frank argues that once they were committed to the bigger pie, then logically they threw themselves wholeheartedly behind US foreign policy (Frank 2000, 110).

[34] For more see Buhle 1999; Carew 1998; Scipes 2000, 2010b; Harrod 1972b; Sims 1992; Radosh 1969; Hirsch 1974; Bass III 2012. This is also something that continues today. For instance, the AFL-CIO continues to use funds from the National Endowment for Democracy and supported the coup in Venezuela (Scipes 2004, 2005, 2005; Bass III 2012). We also see this in the actions of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) in raiding a democratic union in Puerto Rico (Rosado Marzan 2007, 2009; Early 2008).

support for reactionary governments hostile to workers organizing, and working inside other labour movements to attack progressive governments (Scipes 2010a, xxxi).[35]

The AFL-CIO is not the only national union federation that has engaged in labour imperialism. The labour imperialism of other federations, such as the British Trades Union Congress (TUC), differed from the AFL-CIO in terms of motives and strategies. For instance, Anthony Carew notes that while the AFL-CIO fiercely undermined left movements internationally, they often chose to try and co-opt sections of anti-colonial movements, while the British TUC, due to British colonialism and the Labour party's support for it (to which they were closely tied), often opposed outright the supporting of anti-colonial movements, including even the most right-wing elements of these movements (Carew 1996b). Then there is the anti-communist work of many social democratic centrals, which established, funded or politically supported anti-communist or less militant unions in a variety of countries.

Common to the many forms of labour imperialism has been a reliance on resources from respective state aid organizations. The ideological roots of the diverse practices of labour imperialism vary across labour movements and reflect the politics of the dominant currents within these movements. For instance, we see differences between social democratic labour imperialism and that of the American Federation of Labor (AFL) and then AFL-CIO that are often attributed to American nationalism, racism and business unionism.[36]

---

[35] Scipes argues that the AFL-CIO foreign policy leaders have "subverted the larger, desired purpose of any labour movement, and that is to advance the social, political and economic well-being of its members and, by implication, the well-being of workers everywhere" (Scipes 2010a, xxiv).

[36] For more see Saskatoon Solidarity Committee 1981; Murphy 1986; Gandall 1986; Nastovski 2014; Wahl 2004; Waterman 2001b; Scipes 2010b; Scott 1978a.

Accommodationist Solidarity

Besides the actions that were consciously intended to undermine specific movements, unions, political parties and struggles, there are those actions that are intended to be a form of solidarity but serve to re-produce inequality and support imperialism (Johns 1998, 252). Some of the international practices of unions dominated by social democratic leadership fall under this category. Johns introduces the idea of accommodationist solidarity in contrast to transformative forms of solidarity, arguing that solidarity actions fall on a spectrum between transformative and accommodationist. In contrast to transformative solidarity, accommodationist solidarity, while appearing to be genuine support, serves to protect the privileged (work)places in the global economy (Johns 1995; Ryland and Sadler 2008, 475). An example of accommodationist solidarity are activities that often arise from economic nationalist strategies that are premised on and ultimately support the border and the way it regulates workers, their options for and conditions of work, as well as their possibilities for resistance. Accommodationist solidarity, Johns argues, seeks to level social conditions, but does not challenge the institutions, processes and strategies that maintain uneven relations (Johns 1998).

The notion of accommodationist solidarity is critical for assessing solidarity actions because it highlights the need to think through the implications of different forms of action beyond what may arise from seemingly solidaristic motives. This is because accommodationist solidarity and even labour imperialism may appear benign or even progressive to workers in the Global North (Gandall 1986). This is possible in a context that does not recognize the uneven global division of labour, for instance, in a context that frames worker issues within a nationalist or regional lens and cuts out the struggles and demands of workers' movements in the South. How these actions come to make sense is what I seek to unpack.

The fact that labour internationalism has and sometimes still consists of labour imperialism and accommodationist forms of solidarity presents a significant historic dilemma for progressive labour activists and the left more generally. At its root, this dilemma of internationalism speaks to the very possibility of revolutionary action. It involves an implicit assessment of the potential of working class organizations, and particularly unions, to serve as sites of resistance and potential schools of war for the working class. This dilemma has been an important site of debate within political parties, unions, and movements on the left since the First International; it has been a site of resistance, hope, disappointments, betrayal, and inspiration (Featherstone 2012). If unions are meant to be spaces to challenge exploitation, strengthen worker power, and develop class consciousness and solidarity, then why did these practices emerge? What does the existence of labour imperialism and accommodationist forms of solidarity mean for the possibilities and prospects for international solidarity and resistance across borders? It is critical to consider how and why these practices emerge if we are to assess possibilities for international labour solidarity.

Exploring Transformative Possibilities: The Canadian Case

I argue that we cannot fully explore possibilities for transformative forms of solidarity without a proper analysis of how labour internationalism as an idea, vision and practice has developed in specific contexts. This means tracing the openings and possibilities for transformative forms of solidarity in the histories of the practices of labour internationalism that developed and became normalized. It also entails exploring the ways this terrain was contested and so what we can learn from the contradictions in the dominant institutionalized practices and from the models and practices which challenged them. This necessarily includes consideration of the way dominant forms

of labour internationalism have been practices of undermining the struggles of workers internationally and of maintaining the legacies and present of imperialism and colonialism.

I consider the dominant practices of and contests over labour internationalism in the organized labour movement in Canada. I begin from the mid-1940s, when international issues rose to prominence in the thinking and activity of the labour leadership of the Canadian Congress of Labour (CCL).[37] This led to the institutionalization of international activity through the formation of an international department and committee. Looking at both the level of the labour leadership and the consent or contestation from below, I explore the significance of labour internationalism as a contested terrain inside the labour movement from the 1940s through to the end of the Cold War. I argue that the battles in this period predate the Cold War and continue after it.

Visions of labour internationalism and debates over what models and practices should constitute this work are also sites of contestation over fundamental questions of what the union and what the labour movement is, *its role and possibilities.* The models and practices that developed in Canada during the Cold War reflect significant debates over how different groups of trade unionists envisioned worker emancipation and justice, how they understood capitalism and imperialism, the relationship between workers and capital, the role of state, the relationship between exploitation and oppression, and how all of this shaped their strategies of resistance

Making the Project of Empire Visible[38]

David Featherstone argues that assessing labour internationalism and the possibilities of transformative solidarity means developing a reflective approach, one that accounts for differences

---

[37] The Canadian Congress of Labour was set up in 1940 as a merger of the All-Canadian Congress of Labour and the Canadian Congress of Industrial Organizations as a federation of industrial unions in Canada. For more, see www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/canadian-congress-of-labour/

[38] I have drawn this title from Mohanty 2004, 71. I use "empire" because it can denote both imperialism and pre-capitalist forms of colonialism.

derived from the historical development of capitalism. For Featherstone, a reflective approach to solidarity entails working through and tackling this uneven power relation (Featherstone 2012, 6). My first task, therefore, is to assess the implications of the practices of labour internationalism in Canada by tracing the way that empire shapes these practices; by this I mean the way in which these practices operate to maintain unequal social relations flowing from the legacies and present impacts of the development of capitalism and its maintenance of divisions between workers. That is divisions that are historically rooted also in colonialism and pre-capitalist forms of slavery. Confronting unequal power relations and the way they function in the visions and practices of labour internationalism is critical for assessing the scale of the obstacles to international labour solidarity (Scipes 2010a). Drawing from Scipes, I argue that this means exploring why certain labour organizations have accepted capitalism, empire and the effects of these processes in creating hierarchies within the labour market based on race (Scipes 2010a). It is only by tackling what Featherstone calls the "dark sides" of solidarity that we can accurately assess possibilities of transformative forms of solidarity today. This means attending to the relationship between exploitation and oppression and the way that ideologies operate to shape and maintain social relations derived from the history of empires and the development of capitalism.

While it may appear odd to some to use empire or imperialism in relation to Canada, I argue that Canada cannot be understood outside of the idea of empire. This begins with the origins of Canada as a white-settler colony where colonialization meant the ethnic cleansing of the indigenous population. This meant that the population was drawn from outside the geographic space, many of whom identified strongly with the British Empire and before that the French Empire. The rise of US imperialism meant increasing Canadian economic integration with the United States, prompting some to argue that Canada was also subject to US imperialism while others saw Canada as a partner in US imperialism as a critical political ally in these ventures (Moore and Wells 1975; Carroll 1986;

Niosi 1981). More recently, Todd Gordon and Jerome Klassen have argued that Canada is an

imperialist power in its own right (Klassen 2007, 2009; Gordon 2009, 2010; Gordon and Webber

2008). Gordon argues that Canada, while not a significant imperial power, is an "imperial power

nonetheless – and the increasing control of Indigenous people and land is central to its political and

economic interests . . . [which is] at the core of the Canadian state project both within and outside of

its borders" (Gordon 2009, 48). Moore and Wells argue that "the historical tendency is towards a

lessening of dependence and an expansion of Canadian imperialism" (Klassen 2007, 113) and so the

decline of American ownership in Canada has turned Canada from a sub-imperial power to a "small

[yet] growing secondary imperialist power" with separate interests as an oppressor nation, one

having their own imperial interests (Klassen 2007, 114).

The first element of the task of tracing empire involves analysing the nature of North–South

relations – relations that are revealed through practices of labour internationalism and the

implications of such practices. This entails asking with whom relations of solidarity were forged and

why, the extent to which these operated to challenge capitalism, imperialism, colonialism (and the

legacies of the development of these in state policies), systemic racism, and other forms of

oppression that are central to class formation in Canada. It also means accounting for significant

differences between organizations and actors in terms of place, resources, and conditions and their

relationship to capital.

My aim is to explore the relations forged between Canadian trade unionists and trade

unionists internationally, including the way that ideas of worker justice, race, gender and nation

shaped these relations. I argue that the contestations over different visions and practices of labour

internationalism in this period reflect certain features of the social nature of Canadian class

formation and more generally the tensions within the class consciousness of different groups of

workers in this period. These tensions within class consciousness are visible in the struggles between the dominant visions of worker justice.

The second element of this task entails considering how ideas that maintain empire developed and operated in the context of the Canadian labour movement and, specifically, in the practices of labour internationalism during the Cold War. This, I argue, can provide us insight into the nature of these relations and of the ideas underlying them that the standard Cold War framework has failed to provide. For instance, when we look historically, these phenomena cannot be dismissed as the product of state action within the context of the Cold War. Rather, they also originate in specific labour movements and the dominant ideas operating within these movements to make sense of the world, ideas that were about capitalism and about nationhood, manhood and race preceding and following the Cold War. I argue that many of the ideological premises that produced these types of practices remain active in the discussions and practices of labour internationalism in Canada today.

Unpacking the Wars of Position: Tracing Counter-Currents

My second task is to uncover openings for transformative practices of international labour solidarity by exploring the way that different actors in the labour movement challenged these hegemonic practices and ideas that supported empire and its concomitant effect on social relations. What can we learn from their organizing and the way they challenged hegemonic ideas? Hyman argues that there are always counter-tendencies to the dominant practices which give us hope about the role of trade unions; it is these tendencies that can point us to openings for transformative solidarity (Hyman 1971, 25). These "counter-tendencies", he insists, are the lingering presence of the initial spirit that drove the creation of unions and that these constantly work to challenge the movement toward social/national integration (Hyman 1971, 25).

Gramsci's idea of wars of position is useful for understanding how different practices of labour internationalism developed in this period. Tracing the operation of empire helps give us part of the picture of labour internationalism. However, labour internationalism in Canada has always been, in varying degrees, a contested terrain. I argue that this terrain has consisted of wars of position over models and strategies of trade union action and ideas of worker justice as well as over strategies and ideas regarding oppression, equality and emancipation. For Gramsci, wars of position are battles over ideas that are preparatory to wars of manoeuvre, which are those aimed at seizing political power and transforming economic and social relations. There is much to learn from how the battle was fought as well as from the tensions and contradictions in these battles. These wars of position were over models of trade unionism and union action, the kind of world we want and what worker emancipation, justice and equality looks like.

This means analysing the battles and tensions between the dominant practices of labour internationalism and various counter-tendencies that produced activities, which Gramsci might call counter-hegemonic practices. Counter-hegemonic practices are those that challenge the hegemony, the dominance and power, of the ruling class, both in terms of control over the material and the political mechanisms of the society. This includes developing new practices and challenging ideas that accompany and legitimize their control and justify capitalist social relations. These types of practices are about getting workers to think beyond these everyday common-sense practices and to rethink political goals and strategies. For Gramsci, counter-hegemonic work is critical to transforming the contradictions in the labour movement and pushing them to "unravel in a revolutionary direction" (Annunziato 1988, 153). He wrote that "communist militants must be prepared to wage an unrelenting ideological struggle against the bourgeois ideology which controlled the workers,' and their leaders,' minds and hearts" (Annunziato 1988, 162).

For me it is essential to include alongside the examination of what Featherstone calls the "dark sides of solidarity," the ways workers have resisted, built new models and challenged the way certain practices became normalized. Without attention to the nature of the wars of position and the counter-tendencies, we would be left with a conservative and conservatizing narrative about labour internationalism in Canada. My aim is to use this scrutiny to think through openings and possibilities for building transformative forms of solidarity today. This aim reflects my orientation to the project as someone who has been active in international labour solidarity work. I have been active in the international solidarity committees at different levels of my union and in cross-union community solidarity organizations for more than ten years. In this time, I have participated in various forms of political mobilization and education around issues of international solidarity within my union and allied unions. This project is rooted in this activism, emerging as a side project years ago when I began trying to make sense of the political context in which we were operating. I took on this project to reflect and more deeply assess and make sense of how solidarities are built and how they are shaped by social process, economic forces, employer and union strategies. I wanted to know how people thought about international solidarity, the role race, gender, and location played in this and how acts of international solidarity operated in reshaping and reframing "local" struggles.

Broader Significance

I see this project as a contribution more broadly to thinking through the possibilities of trade union action in building working-class power and resistance. I do this by raising questions about certain strategies of union action and models of union organizing and considering the prospects for labour renewal through counter-hegemonic work within unions. Critically thinking through the history of the role of Canadian labour internationally is vital not only for challenging imperialism and labour imperialism, but also in terms of what it reveals about this labour movement itself. I

argue that an examination into how and why international solidarity work has been predominately framed and taken up in the way that it has been historically provides an important lens to the processes, analyses, strategies, limitations and contradictions of unions in Canada more generally.

I hope that this project, by foregrounding an analysis of key aspects of class formation in Canada that considers the social aspects of class including the role of different forms of oppression, colonialism, white supremacy, nationalism and patriarchy and an exploration of this history within a broader transnational framework will contribute to a rethinking of some aspects of trade union organizing in Canada today. This work also asks fundamental questions about the political analysis and direction of the Canadian labour movement in the period of the emergence of neo-liberalism and considers the role of unions, as civil society organizations, in the making and contestation of Canadian foreign policy.

Scope

The dearth of scholarship in the area of Canadian labour internationalism has prompted me to take a broad look at the contours of the wars of position shaping the development of labour internationalism in Canada. Using a historical sociological lens, I consider the role and practices of leadership, staff and rank-and-file members in the making of labour internationalism in this period. My study focuses on the mainstream organized labour movement in Canada; however, I also analyse the role of grassroots organizations and movements in shaping the international policies and practices of organized labour. I do not consider labour internationalism in Québec in any depth. While I do discuss the Québec labour movement to give some of the broader context, I do not delve into an analysis of Québec labour internationalism because of the substantively different political climate within the Québec labour movement, particularly after the 1960s.

Outline of Chapters

Chapter One:
Labour Internationalism —Assessing Openings and Contradictions

The first chapter is a review of the literature on labour internationalism and labour

imperialism. While there have been some analyses of Canadian labour internationalism, these have

mostly been provided within popular left presses and media connected to solidarity organizations.

Scholarly attention to the question of labour internationalism in Canada has been mostly cursory and

hidden in bits and pieces as part of broader projects on solidarity movements. For this reason, I also

consider the broader scholarship and debates over labour internationalism and labour imperialism.

In this chapter, I situate my work within these debates and elaborate on the concepts I draw from

and how this literature has contributed to the design of my project.

Chapter Two:
Analytical Methods: Historical Sociology rooted in Anti-Racist Marxist Feminist Theory

The second chapter explains my methodology. I begin with a discussion of my work as

critical social research. For me, critical social research entails what Himani Bannerji describes as

piecing "together a complex and interactive understanding of the relationship between history, social

organization and forms of consciousness" (Bannerji 1995, 12). And this means adopting what

Bannerji calls a socialized conception of class, seeing class formation as something that cannot be

divorced from social relations rooted in patriarchy, racism and other forms of oppression. These

forms of oppression shape how class is lived, meaning it shapes experiences of exploitation. For me

this includes not only challenging the erasure of colonization, white supremacy, class

accommodation, patriarchy and nationalism in thinking through this history, but also connecting

these events to the broader global forces that have shaped the actions, movements and processes.

This means not separating out the economic from the political and ideological forces and having a

long view of the way certain notions came to be hegemonic within the thinking of union actors in regards to their identities, views on their roles and strategies, and understanding of social change. My emphasis is on tracing the dialectical relationship between forces at work in the history I explore; this includes considering the ideological terrain, economic forces, wars of position, strategies of individuals and organizations, and alternatives to the dominant forces that arose in the periods I examine. I elaborate on what an anti-racist Marxist feminist approach means and why I see historical sociology as a complementary method for analysing my data. I discuss my data sources and explain my data collection process, which consisted of close to seventy interviews I conducted with union activists, leaders and staff involved in international solidarity work in Canada over the past forty years and research from four different archives.

Chapter Three:
Setting the Stage – Contextualizing the Wars of Position in Post-WWII Labour Internationalism in Canada

Chapter Three outlines the context in which the central wars of position developed. This chapter follows from the premise that any project for labour transformation needs to think through the links between oppression and exploitation and how particular practices and hegemonic ideas work to maintain inequality rooted in the legacies and current practices of (neo-) colonialism and (neo-) imperialism. This means exploring the contours of class formation in Canada and considering the ideas that formed the context for the wars of position that served to shape practices of labour internationalism. In this chapter, I work to make empire visible in the ideological terrain of the labour movement in the interwar period by thinking through the impact of settler-colonialism and politics of race, gender, citizenship, and class struggle on the different visions and forms of solidarity that emerged.

Chapter Four:
Wars of Position and the Making of Labour Imperialism and Accommodationist Solidarities

Chapter Four explores the context of institutionalization of labour internationalism in

Canada in the mid-1940s. I begin with a theoretical discussion to situate the wars of position that

shaped the orientation of the international programme of the CCL and Canadian Labour Congress

(CLC),[39] which represented the dominant current of Canadian labour internationalism in the early

Cold War era. I situate their work in the broader context reflected in the orientation and activity of

the ICFTU, the AFL, CIO and the British TUC as well as of the apex organization of the

international of social democratic parties, the Socialist International (SI).

Chapter Five:
The Institutionalization of Labour Internationalism in Canada, 1945-1968
Between Labour Imperialism and Accommodationist Solidarity

In this chapter, I draw out general features of the labour internationalism of the CCL and

then its successor, the CLC. I then analyse their programme more closely through an examination of

four case studies. The cases are activities in Kenya, Southeast Asia, the Commonwealth Caribbean,

and Palestine. Each case reveals specific class, racial and national dimensions of the politics of their

international programme. I argue that the work of the CLC's International Department for much of

the Cold War includes both what Johns would characterize as accommodationist forms of solidarity

as well as practices of labour imperialism.[40] This orientation and the practices following from it

emerged from a social democratic anti-communism, the rise and dominance of business unionism,

---

[39] Like the merger of the AFL and CIO in the United States in 1956, the CLC was set up the same year and similarly entailed the merger of the Canadian craft and industrial federations.

[40] Examples of this are their role in the Colombo Plan, their support for NATO and for the colonization of Palestine (see Nastovski 2014).

and unionism rooted in ideas of social partnership, often called social unionism,[41] as well as from the

white supremacist logic of Canadian national identity as a white settler colony. This meant an

economic and political strategy that saw the interests of Canadian workers as tied to upholding the

global status quo and helping both to beat back communism as well as socialist-oriented liberation

struggles.[42]

Chapter Six:
Wars of Position Heat Up – The Birth of CIDA, the New Left and the Worker-to-Worker Model, 1968–1991

While I note some of the counter-currents to the dominant labour internationalism within

Canadian unions in the early Cold War, major counter-currents do not develop into a significant

force until the 1960s and 1970s. This battle heats up in the 1970s as the Cold War repression begins

to wane slightly and New Left forces resuscitate models of class struggle unionism and anti-

imperialist international labour solidarity. I begin by examining the way the dominant development

aid model used by the International Affairs department of the CLC changed and grew in this period

with the establishment of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) in 1968. I look

at the wars of position over how to confront the rise of neo-liberalism and the implications for the

practices of labour internationalism that were in conflict in this period. Finally, I examine the

significance of the Worker-to-Worker model that was central to the organizing of grassroots labour

solidarity with struggles in Central America and against South African apartheid, including some of

---

[41] Definitions of business unionism vary. Most simply, this model is a form of economic trade unionism limited to gaining benefits for a specific set of workers rather than for the broader working class (Scipes 2014b), which translates into workers often tying themselves to the fate of their employers and the interests of capital (Scott 1978a) (often a national or regional bloc). This is often juxtaposed to social or social movement unionism. However, as Scipes notes, the way this distinction has been taken up in the North has radically altered its meaning. Emerging from movements in the South that operated as militant movements against capital and for broader political programmes, social movement unions have much more in common with the early unions that were critical to anti-colonial struggles (those that Northern unions sought to co-opt or defeat) than to anything we have seen in North American over the past twenty years (see Scipes 2014a and 2014b).

[42] Underlying this strategy was support for the prosperity and expansion of American companies and therefore often American imperialist projects as well.

the limitations of these efforts.

I conclude the study by pointing to some areas that need further analysis, identifying gaps and remaining questions. I also consider the implications of this analysis for the organizational questions that constitute much of the debates around labour internationalism today. Lastly, I offer some reflections and raise questions about the implications of different aspects of this analysis for the prospects today of transformative solidarity and for labour transformation more generally.

Chapter 1

Labour Internationalism – Assessing Openings and Contradictions

At best, one can describe the literature on labour internationalism in Canada as disjointed and particular. Other than the important pamphlet produced by the Saskatoon Solidarity Committee (SSC) (1981) in Saskatchewan, the literature consists mostly of a smattering of short reflections, reports and critiques within popular left media. For this reason, I take a broad lens to the literature, exploring the vast field of scholarship on labour internationalism including the literature that explores the way that certain forms of labour internationalism have operated as labour imperialism.

To have a full understanding of the scope and significance of the vastly different competing traditions of labour internationalism (including labour imperialism), it is vital to situate the actions, interests and ideas underlying these traditions within the broader ideological and political commitments shaping solidarities. So I begin with the literature on Canadian labour internationalism and move into a discussion of internationalism and labour internationalism more generally, charting the different conceptualizations of and approaches to the issue. I then move into the literature on the problem of labour imperialism with an emphasis on the way academics and activists have tried to make sense of the terrain of class consciousness that has grounded practices of labour internationalism.

As Peter Waterman argues, internationalism is classically a critique of the nation-state and of capitalism (Waterman 1987). The visions of labour internationalism emerging from the history and debates of the various Internationals made central the pursuit of ending the exploitation of workers. While many of the international labour organizations established since the First International were in some way influenced by it, many eventually abandoned or de-emphasized the aim of worker emancipation from exploitation and oppression (Waterman 2000, 2004). Much of the history and

scholarship on labour internationalism reflects this contest over the goals of labour internationalism and, by association also, a contest over what internationalism as a practice can and should be. Is it part of a vision of worker emancipation and revolutionary strategy? Is it a strategy by unions to match the power of multinational corporations? A means of building cross-border strike support? Or perhaps union-to-union international development? This is a hotly contested sphere with many layers within debates, and is an area that has a lack of clearly definable limits.

The dearth of scholarship in the area of international labour solidarity in Canada is a rather curious phenomenon. Theoretically, internationalism is at the heart of Marxist theory and a significant aspect of trade union history. It would seem to follow, then, that internationalism would be of interest to scholars engaged in Canadian working-class history and trade union politics. However, instead, when we look at scholarship on Canadian labour history, when internationalism and international solidarity are raised it is often in a quite cursory way, situated as peripheral to the main story.[1]

I argue that there are a whole range of factors that have contributed to the marginalization of the question of internationalism in working-class and trade union scholarship in Canada and elsewhere. This ranges from the dominance of nationalist Left politics in the 20th century to dismissals of internationalism as too ephemeral and abstract, a story of inevitable failure, or simply as unimportant or even distracting to the real terrain of struggle. It is also a question of theory and ideology and a way of normalizing the discussion of movements and struggles along national lines. This follows from the national basis of the organization of most unions, working-class organizations and political parties.

---

[1] An example of this would be the collection entitled *The Workers Revolt in Canada, 1917–1925* (1998), edited by Craig Heron, on the general strike actions in Canada in 1919. While some of the authors in this collection identify and discuss the Russian Revolution as a factor in the strikes or other actions taken up, the analyses stop short of analysing the specific impact of the revolution in terms of class consciousness, the specific connections that developed, or the acts of solidarity that it led to. These issues are sometimes taken up in histories of the left or specific political parties such as the Communist Party of Canada, but not in the context of the life of trade unions.

The great exception to this omission is the work on relations between Canadian and US unions, and to a much lesser extent, with those in the United Kingdom. In Canada, the "International" within the context of trade union politics more commonly connotes US-based unions that operate in Canada rather than being evocative of ideas of global relations. Today, these unions, called "Internationals," include the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), the United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW), the Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees – Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees (UNITE–HERE), the United Steelworkers of America (USWA), and many craft unions as well. US-based unions have had a significant presence in Canada since the rise of unionism in the 19th century, and while many Canadian unions have emerged (some arising as break-aways from US parent union), US-based unions continue to play a role in Canadian union politics today. As such, there is a significant amount of scholarship on the particularities of relations between Canadian and US unions and on Canadian workers and US unions (Scott 1978a; Crispo 1967; Lipton 1978; Abella 1973).

Besides these texts, which specifically deal with Canada and US union relations, the most noteworthy contributions to the analysis of Canadian labour internationalism are pieces in the left press and solidarity movement publications rather than academic sources. These texts speak to the importance of internationalism within specific organizations and amongst different groups of labour activists. The bulk of the work on labour internationalism emerged from organizing efforts. These texts include pamphlets, newsletter articles, convention reports and course curriculum developed inside different unions. I would argue that the activist and union publications on labour internationalism in Canada fall into two broad categories that reflect the tension within the problematic of internationalism itself. These texts either focus on challenging or exposing problematic histories (e.g., instances of labour imperialism in Canada), or on providing analyses of solidarity campaigns and of the context of different struggles internationally.

In this first category, I would argue the most significant text is the Saskatoon Solidarity Committee's 1981 pamphlet entitled *Partners in Imperialism: The Canadian Labour Congress and Social Democracy in the Third World*. I would also include Michael Murphy's Masters' thesis from the University of Saskatchewan on the CLC and CIDA which was in many ways an extension of the pamphlet (Murphy 1986). Both of these texts explore the relationship between the Canadian labour movement, the New Democratic Party (NDP), international Cold War organizations such as the ICFTU, foreign affairs and CIDA, and the ideology of business unionism and social democracy. These pieces are also probably the closest thing to a general history or political analysis of labour internationalism in Canada available.

Another important but short piece in this category is Marv Gandall's 1986 article, "Foreign Affairs: The CLC Abroad" in *This Magazine*. Gandall's piece covers the Canadian Labour Congress' role in supporting Israel and its working to undermine the movements against South African apartheid and in solidarity with the Sandinistas in Nicaragua (Gandall 1986). Besides these texts, there are a few articles in various left publications that challenge the role of Canadian unions or the positions of unions on specific issues (e.g., on Palestine), but these remain the key texts that attempt a general analysis of internationalism in Canadian labour.[2]

Within the second category of pieces that analyse specific struggles and solidarity campaigns, there are organizing materials that assess the contexts of these struggles, or make the case for solidarity action. These can be found in left presses and as reports from unions themselves, for instance in newsletters. This category consists of a wide range of disparate pieces and a handful of more comprehensive texts like the Latin American Working Group (LAWG)/British Columbia

---

[2] It is important to note that since many Canadian workers are in international unions whose international affairs departments and staffs have historically been US based, Canadian workers are also implicated in the history of US labour imperialism. I do not spend much time in this study on the unions whose international policies and practices are set primarily in the US because these unions have tended not to be very engaged in international solidarity debates or organizing in Canada. An example of this is SEIU.

Trade Union Group (BCTUG) book on free trade called *Crossing the Line* (Sinclair 1992). These articles are from publications such as *Briarpatch Magazine*, *Our Times*, a whole range of Marxist papers including *People's Voice*, *The Militant, Socialist Action*, and those produced from solidarity organizations themselves like the Toronto Committee for the Liberation of Southern Africa (TCLSAC)'s *Southern Africa Reports* which include a few pieces on labour internationalism and publications from LAWG, BCTUG, and the South African Congress of Trade Unions Solidarity Committee. In terms of union publications, there are pieces in *Canadian Labour*, the CLC's publication, a whole range of union newsletters and overviews like the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) National International Solidarity Committee booklet on how to do international solidarity work or materials from the Steelworkers International solidarity course.

There are also a few important academic pieces that touch on aspects of labour internationalism in Canada. These include "Canadian Labour, the Cold War and Asia, 1945–1955" by John Price (2003), *Northern Shadows: Canadians and Central America* by Peter McFarlane (1989), *Weaving Relationships: Canada-Guatemala Solidarity* by Kathryn Anderson (2003), Linda Freeman's *Ambiguous Champions: Canada and South Africa in the Trudeau and Mulroney Years* (1997) and Edur Velasco Arregui and Richard Roman's *Continental Crucible* (2013). With the exception of the piece by John Price, these and other similar texts contain only short references to the role of unions and union activists in broader solidarity efforts.

The disjointed nature of much of the work on labour internationalism in Canada reflects the context in which these articles or popular publications emerged. These articles grew out of solidarity work itself and specific moments and goals in the organizing of solidarity, involving strategic discussions of whether to do education, make a case for action or in the case of articles on labour imperialism, to chart some of the obstacles to the work. Together, these sources help to provide part of the picture. However, they are also quite limited, as they mostly lack an analysis of the historical

context of this work and a broader lens to the overall landscape of international solidarity organizing; in other words, there have been very few links made between the work that was happening concurrently within the Canadian labour movement. Besides *Partners in Imperialism* (1981)*,* the only texts that come close to this are Ken Luckhardt's "International Working Class Solidarity: From the Cold War back to the Class War" published in *Briarpatch* in 1999 and the article by John Price (2003) mentioned above; Price examines the role of the CCL in supporting imperialism in Asia in the immediate post-World War II period. Luckhardt charts the movement against the work of the CLC and the Cold War agenda that lasted until the late 1980s and how more grassroots, worker-to-worker models of international solidarity developed within a number of unions in the 1990s (Luckhardt 1999). There are also a number of more general and substantive accounts of labour internationalism focused solely on Québec and texts covering important periods of labour activism in Québec in the 1960s and 1970s that draw links to ideas and practices of labour. Turning to the broader academic literature on labour internationalism provides a way to fill in some of the gaps in this set of texts and offers some helpful theorization to pull this material together.

Labour Internationalism

Due to the limitations of the available sources on Canadian labour internationalism, I situate this discussion in the broader scholarship on labour internationalism. Peter Waterman notes in a review essay that while the idea of internationalism is often associated with the left, most dictionary entries note that it also has liberal and bourgeois roots (Waterman 1989, 6). For instance, a liberal conception of internationalism underlies the theory of cosmopolitanism developed by Immanuel Kant and is a fundamental idea implicit within the field of international relations in the discipline of political science. This field includes liberal approaches like that of the already mentioned Kant or Woodrow Wilson and realist approaches associated with the theories of Thomas Hobbes and

Niccolo Machiavelli. Internationalism is also at the heart of models of international institutions like the League of Nations and the United Nations.

The Oxford dictionary defines internationalism as relations or cooperation between nations, processes of being or becoming international, or the principles of the four communist Internationals (oxfordictionaries.com). This definition speaks to the vast fields and contexts that apply to the term. All three aspects of this definition are at play in studies of labour internationalism. In the Global North, the idea of workers or labour internationalism as cooperation or diplomacy between unions in different nations has been a part of some visions and practices of unions and of international labour organizations. Similarly, the idea of internationalizing unions has been a theme within studies and discussions of labour internationalism, becoming particularly prominent in studies on global unions.

However, it is the idea of internationalism that emerged from socialist and communist thought that is most often associated with the term internationalism. The reasons for this include the fact that the socialist and communist internationals predate any major attempts at building international organizations inspired by liberal visions of internationalism. Internationalism is also mostly associated with socialism and communism because of the role of socialist and communist workers in supporting or promoting international labour solidarity. The idea of internationalism, emerging from the Internationals, is an idea of labour or workers' internationalism; it refers particularly to visions and goals of workers. Workers are inherent to this conceptualization of internationalism because wage labourers are posited as the principal revolutionary agents in most socialist or communist theories.

In exploring the history of labour internationalism as envisioned and practiced within worker's organizations, we see everything from revolutionary visions to that represented in organizations like the ICFTU, where internationalism was, for much of its life, primarily focused on

anti-communism. Internationalism has also at times been opposed by unions that embraced corporatist or tripartite strategies, often as a product of nationalist approaches to the problems of labour. As numerous Marxists and scholars of labour internationalism have noted, many unions in the 20th century have seen their struggle and sought stability within a national frame (Waterman 2000; Hyman 1971, 1975, 2005). As a result, these unions have therefore been disinterested or even hostile to the idea of international labour solidarity or coordination.

In his review of the concept of labour internationalism written in 1989, Peter Waterman notes that there existed almost no contemporary literature on labour internationalism (Waterman 1989, 5). As a result, he reviewed traditional labour and socialist writing but also work on Third World solidarity movements and literature on Third World aid and development policy, international relations and feminist theory (Waterman 1989, 5). Since then, there has been a whole range of new scholarship on labour internationalism, including significant texts by Waterman himself. This literature covers the histories of the Internationals and the international labour federations as well as solidarity movements within labour that challenged nationalist tendencies (Carew 1984, 1996b, 2000a, 2000b, 2003; Lucio 2010; Silverman 2000; Ramasamy 2005; Moody 1997; Schmidt Camacho 1999; Featherstone 2012; Munck 1988, 2002, 2004, 2010a; Waterman 2000, 2001b, 2004, 2005a, 2005b; Waterman and Wills 2001; Frank 2000).

While my work examines the ideas and practices of internationalism within the context of trade unions in Canada, I draw from the literature on labour internationalism rather than only trade union internationalism. Trade union internationalism as an area of study focuses solely on the activity of unions, and often this translates into an emphasis on the actions of leadership and staff or on the official positions and decisions of various trade union bodies (Waterman 2001a). I think such work on trade union internationalism is important, but as highlighted by Frank's idea of the slipperiness of the field, it can also be narrow and thereby miss key aspects of the practice of

internationalism happening outside the main offices of major trade unions and federations or at other levels of union activity. Specifically, the literature on trade union internationalism often omits or marginalizes the role of political parties, social movements and coordinated rank-and-file action. Labour internationalism as an area of study is broader in scope, encompassing studies of trade unions but also includes workers' self-activity in building international solidarity and activities of workers in spaces other than trade unions. I also look at the literature on labour internationalism because, while it includes relations between national trade unions and transnational inter-union relations, it is not solely limited to action at the institutional level (Ghigliani 2005, 360). For example, the exploration of the role of social movement action in labour internationalism is critical to writing and understanding the story of solidarity from below, including helping to answer why rank-and-file union members envisioned internationalism in particular ways in different historical periods and to understand the context in which they took various forms of action.[3]

Old vs. New Labour Internationalism

While theory on labour internationalism has included a variety of periodizations and typologies (Waterman 2005), the most pervasive distinction is that of old versus new labour internationalism (Ghigliani 2005; Lambert and Webster 2001; De Angelis 2000; Ramasamy 2005; Hodkinson 2005; Munck 1988; Waterman 1987, 1988 and 2001a; Waterman and Wills 2001; Lucio 2010; Carr 1999). This distinction is important because of its prevalence in much of the literature since the 1990s (Ghigliani 2005), but also because it has also been used by trade unionists as a way to distinguish their practices from those of their predecessors.[4]

---

[3] We see this emphasis in the work of Featherstone (2012) and Silverman (2000).

[4] For instance, this distinction was important for the election of John Sweeney in 1995 as president of the AFL-CIO; Sweeny made central to his campaign the remaking of internationalism and the overhauling of the international department (see Schmidt Camacho 1999).

Peter Waterman and Ronaldo Munck were both critical to the development of the idea of a New Labour Internationalism (NLI) and wrote important pieces on the idea in the late 1980s. Old Labour Internationalism (OLI) has generally been used to describe the labour internationalism typical of much of the 20th century, one characterized by bureaucracy, undertaken at the highest levels by expert staff and leaders in a diplomatic fashion, disconnected from workers, and sometimes done in association with state agencies developing paternalistic relationships with unions in the Global South (Waterman 2012, 321-322; Hodkinson 2005, 40). In contrast, the idea of NLI has been used to denote an end to this process and the birth of practices that "include more social movement actors and grassroots organizations along a model of social movement unionism transcending the limitations of the old bureaucratic models" (Lucio 2010, 541). New labour internationalism (NLI) is used both as descriptive of a shift in the practices of labour internationalism and as an idea of what labour internationalism could potentially be.

As a descriptive term, NLI emerged as a way to describe what Waterman calls "shopfloor" or "grassroots" internationalism, the grassroots practices of international solidarity that emerged in many trade unions in the global north in the 1970s and 1980s (Waterman 1987, 2). As a vision or goal, NLI represents the possibility of a globalized social movement unionism, that is if, as Waterman proposes, it can overcome its past, including its nationalist orientation (Waterman 2005b, 210). NLI has also been used since the 1990s to describe new relationships between unions and social movements and in relation to their involvement in the anti-free trade fights and the anti-globalization movement in the Global North as well as new social movement union practices and networks in the Global South (Carr 1999; Waterman 2001a; De Angelis 2000; Lambert and Webster 2001). As such, it also denotes the new possibilities for solidarity opened up by changes arising from neoliberalism and its impact on global divisions of labour and conditions of work, as seen for instance in North America in the mobilizations against the North American Free Trade Agreement

(NAFTA).[5] Another example of the new possibilities of solidarity brought about by these new material conditions are strategies for coordinated action across global production chains (see Herod 2000, 2001). In this sense, NLI is useful for highlighting real historical shifts in the terrain in which labour internationalism happens, including the rise of multinational employers.

I think that the characterization of the NLI as a form of grassroots internationalism that sought to build beyond the union and in coordination with social movements is an accurate and useful depiction of the practices in some parts of the global North in the 1970s and 1980s. I also think that the use of NLI to emphasize new possibilities of solidarity and coordination is useful to prompt a way of thinking of labour internationalism beyond the Cold War and inter-union diplomacy. However, I have some reservations about the use of this distinction, reservations that prompt me to draw instead from Waterman's more recent piece "An Emancipatory Global Labour Studies is Necessary!" (2012) and Silverman's "Whither Global Labour" (2010) in cautioning against the uncritical lauding of all that might be described as NLI. Firstly, I think that the currents described as NLI, whether they are from the 1970s or 1980s or more recently,[6] reflect a vast spectrum of visions of worker resistance and emancipation, some of which are clearly accommodationist in orientation. For instance, some of these forms of internationalism moved from being deeply connected to social movements and community struggles to becoming financial backers of dialogue between different actors involved in aid management (Barry Shaw and Oja-Jay 2012). Secondly, the emergence of new practices in the Global North in the 1970s did not coincide with the end of practices characteristic of old labour internationalism. As Schmidt Camacho (1999), Scipes (2004, 2005 and 2010a) and Bass III (2012) have argued, this new era has not necessarily meant a departure from the practices of labour imperialism or accommodationist forms of solidarity.

---

[5] See Kay 2005, 2011; Robinson 1994, 1995; Dreiling and Robinson 1998; Carr 1999.

[6] See Bieler et al. 2010; Lambert and Webster 2001; Webster, Lambert and Bezuidenhout 2010.

Also, the labour internationalism practiced within many unions today continues to have much of the features Waterman assigns to the OLI including heavy bureaucracy and leadership control as well as a diplomatic orientation. And thirdly, the idea that NLI replaces OLI creates a danger in that it can discourage a critical lens when viewing the contours of the new. This is especially visible in the insistence that labour imperialism is an old Cold War issue that is no longer relevant in thinking about prospects for labour internationalism today. We see this in the way this term has been used by some trade union activists, leaders and staff who have attempted to distance themselves from labour imperialism.

The ideological tensions over models of workers' justice and what this entails in terms of strategic and organizational questions and political vision predate the Cold War and have not disappeared in the post-Cold War. Politically, some of the newer forms of labour internationalism are quite limited in scope and others, while sometimes serving as a bridge between different civil society organizations, can also re-inscribe global inequality.[7] Hence, while this concept describes some of the organizational and political shifts in the activities of unions in the North in this period and new possibilities brought about by the rise of multinational employers and new global production chains, it cannot be seen as necessarily emancipatory or transformative. And so I argue that there needs to be a critical lens on the specific practices of internationalism characterized as NLI and an evaluation of the political implications of these practices.

Rather than seeing the new practices as necessarily supplanting the old labour, I find it more useful for my study to think about the coexistence of a variety of models and strategies of labour internationalism. If we think of the histories of labour internationalism on a global scale, we see the

---

[7] For more, see Schmidt Camacho (1999). There are multiple issues with the building of alliances between trade unions and social movements, including the fact that social movements are not necessarily working-class organizations and do not necessarily consider or take up issues of class. An example of this is some of the international practices by unions in Canada today in unions that have funds with charitable status, like the Steelworkers Humanity Fund. Charitable status means that these funds are quite limited as a basis for supporting the development of international solidarity and coordination between workers across borders in their struggles against exploitation and oppression.

ongoing existence of competing models of labour internationalism. As Richard Hyman notes, even in periods of accommodation and integration, there are always counter-tendencies to integration (Hyman 1971, 25). Even in the North, in the context of heavy trade union repression in the early Cold War and the dominance of business union leaders like George Meany in developing the direction of labour internationalism in the United States, there were counter-currents within the labour movement. Examples of counter-currents in the Canadian context include the significant solidarity with the Cuban revolution that was mobilized by trade unionists in the 1960s despite the intense anti-communist direction of much of the labour leadership (Wright 2009).

For this reason, I explore the dialectical relationship between different forces within the labour movement, including those arising from leaders and staff and those from activist members and dissenting locals. And so I use grassroots labour internationalism rather than new labour internationalism in my discussion of the 1970s and 1980s in order to connect these practices with the longstanding practices on the labour left and a constant, though often muted, counter-current to the dominant labour internationalism of the institutional labour movement. I think that the term grassroots internationalism encompasses a wider array of strategies existing in different eras and places emphasis on the importance of the ideological dimensions of these practices and their goals. I think that this connection to older models emerging from radical left parties and workers' organizations is an important one to draw. This alternative grassroots labour internationalism is visible in the early part of the 20th century in the Canadian context in the efforts in support of the Spanish Republicans, which included the building of the Mackenzie–Papineau Battalion (an International Brigade), and which re-emerged in the 1960s, reflecting the ideas of the New Left and becoming a powerful force in the Canadian and Québécois labour movements in the 1970s and 1980s.

Why Labour Internationalism and not Labour Transnationalism

While there were some studies on labour transnationalism prior to the last twenty years, the past decade or so has seen a huge upsurge of studies on the ways unions and workers have attempted to act transnationally (Munck 1988, 2008, 2010b; Wells 1998a, 1998b; Bieler, Higgott and Underhill 2004; Bieler, Lindberg and Pillay 2008; Bieler, Lindberg and Sauerborn; Fougner and Kortoglu 2011; Kay 2005, 2011; Gajewska 2009).[8] The theoretical roots of this concept are evident in the idea of new labour internationalism, which recognized new possibilities for action related to the rise of new social movements, new material realities, and technological change that could facilitate the development of networks and coordination between unions and social movements. The concept also relates to theory coming out of feminist scholarship and studies on migration (Mohanty 2003; Moghadam 2005; Alvarez 2000; Nagar 2002; Mendoza 2002; Mojab 2006; Pratt and Yeoh 2003). Contrasted to historical practices of solidarity between groups of workers, labour transnationalism is often used to denote coordinative struggle rather than support between groups of workers in their distinct struggles. An example of this in the Canadian context would be the Steelworkers and various efforts towards transnational coordination and organizational change.[9]

I argue that we cannot fully understand the potential for coordinative possibilities without looking at the history of labour internationalism and in particular taking account of how workers and union members have understood and acted internationally. Carty and Das Gupta note that at times the terms transnationalism and internationalism are used interchangeably (Carty and Das Gupta 2009, 100). I use the term labour internationalism rather than transnationalism for several reasons. First, internationalism as a concept more clearly speaks to the history I analyse; as such, this

---

[8] The term transnational often denotes a sense of the transcendence of national borders.

[9] For more on the work of USWA, see Peter Evans (2014) and Tamara Kay (2011). These efforts are quite varied politically. The dark side of these transnational organizing efforts can be seen in the case of the SEIU in Puerto Rico.

conceptualization more accurately captures the way those I interviewed viewed their practice.[10]

Second, transnational practice is often conceptualized as a more recent and emerging phenomenon and so does not capture the dominant practices in the eras I explore. Third, the history of the idea of labour internationalism is one rooted in anti-capitalist, revolutionary left movements and parties and the vision of solidarity that emerged from socialist and communist organizing (Chatterjee 2009, 134). As such, labour internationalism denotes an emancipatory goal with respect to relations between workers internationally (Chatterjee 2009; Waterman 1988, 1989, 1993a, 1993b, 1998, 2004; Featherstone 2012). It is this emancipatory connotation of the idea of labour internationalism that I want to emphasize and preserve. Fourth, and related to the last point, is that the use of the term labour transnationalism varies quite markedly and does not necessarily imply a critique of capitalism, imperialism or include an emancipatory vision for labour. As a result, some studies in labour transnationalism do not consider and sometimes even de-emphasize global inequality and imperialism as part of the context in which these practices emerge and play out. Piya Chatterjee argues that transnationalism "can mask the geopolitics of empire" (Chatterjee 2009, 134), meaning that it can ignore differences between actors involved in building transnational links. This for me is one of the central dangers of the transnational framework and something essential to consider when analysing these practices.

While transnational projects can seek to challenge and overcome national boundaries, there are important differences between organizations and actors in terms of place, resources, and conditions that shape their struggles. Hence, analytically at least, labour internationalism as a concept, because of its rootedness in socialist and communist tradition, at least in theory, connotes the necessity of thinking through inequality, imperialism and differences in power and interests between parties.

---

[10] Many of those I interviewed understood their work as part of a longer history of international labour solidarity.

However, the analytical erasure of national boundaries (which itself may mask global inequality and ignore imperialism and capitalism) also serves as part of the appeal of transnationalism as a concept. Some argue that the concept of transnationalism more fundamentally challenges the role, importance and legitimacy of the nation-state form. For instance, Linda Carty and Monisha Das Gupta explain their preference for the term by arguing that international "retains the mythical intactness of the nation-state and legitimizes various types of violence based on the idea of sovereignty" (Carty and Das Gupta 2009, 100). They also argue that the term international does not capture the flows of labour, capital, information, and culture (Carty and Das Gupta 2009, 100). This is an important critique, but one that speaks to certain historical practices of internationalism rather than necessarily to the concept itself (though it can be argued that these historical practices eclipse whatever original meaning the concept may have had).

As Waterman notes, labour internationalism is classically a critique of the nation-state, nationalism and capitalism (1988) and has been a critical concept within various strands of the left since the First International. And though, as I noted in the Introduction, much of the practice of the left since the First International has been to reinforce the nation-state form and often nationalism more explicitly (Forman 1998; Waterman 2000), one of the purposes of this thesis is to reclaim the initial use of the term internationalism as a concept that challenges borders and nationalism rather than abandoning it as solely denoting *inter*-national relations.

Approaches to Labour Internationalism

Studies on labour internationalism are very diverse in emphasis and approach and are considered and debated across a range of disciplines. Trade union internationalism constitutes a large part of the literature and includes studies of various international bodies like the IFTU, ICFTU, ILO, and the ITSs (Windmuller 1954a, 1954b; Foster 1956; Carew 2000a, 2000b) or studies of the

role of national unions or federations on the international scale or in these international organizations (Olmstead-Hughes 2011; Sims 1992; Thompson and Larson 1978; Silverman 2000). More recently, the work on trade union internationalism has also included a whole range of studies on labour transnationalism, including research on global unions and mergers, particular transnational trade union campaigns, and transnational efforts to establish global framework agreements (Ghigliani 2005; Stevis and Boswell 1997). Other texts that I would include under the category of labour internationalism are William Z. Foster's *Outline History of the World Trade Union Movement* (1956), which considers the role of parties and the history of the Internationals. I would also include Victor Silverman's *Imagining Internationalism in American and British Labor, 1939–49* (2000) and David Featherstone's *Soldiarity: Hidden Histories and Geographies of Internationalism* (2012) because of their emphasis on rank-and–file and worker action independent of trade unions. Others include Kathryn Anderson's *Weaving Relationships* (2003) and Linda Freeman's *The Ambiguous Champions* (1997), both of whom consider the relationship between different civil society actors in solidarity movements, including organized and unorganized workers. All of these texts range from more historical pieces to ones emerging from sociology, geography, and political science.

I focus on a few approaches to labour internationalism, approaches that have been particularly important for my work. The first are histories and primarily sociological studies of international labour organizations and their relationships (Pasture 2002; Jakobsen 2001; Carew et al. 2000; Ramsay 1997). Then I look at studies that have sought to examine labour internationalism from below (rank-and-file and broader workers in solidarity movements both organized and unorganized). Finally, I draw out approaches that emphasize the ideological dimension. Some, like Victor Silverman's, combine aspects of all three approaches.

Studies of International Labour Organizations

Many scholars have attempted to understand labour internationalism by examining the history and politics of international labour organizations and efforts to build them. Part of this history is the story of "the Internationals" themselves. The international trade union bodies emerged from "the Internationals," and the Internationals were the first attempt at such an organization (Foster 1956; Waterman 1989). While we can trace the intellectual or political histories of many international trade union organizations to the First International, these organizations have been quite varied ideologically and in how they have been structured (Foster 1956; Van Goethem 2006; Windmuller 1954a, 1954b; Hyman 2005; Waterman 1989). As Richard Hyman argues, these organizations reflected competing visions of the function and goals of trade union action. The focus of these studies has been primarily on aspects of these organizations (Carew 1984, 1996b, 1998, 2003). This includes analyses of the structure of these organizations, their goals and debates, and examinations of what they did and how. These studies include the pre-World War II histories of the IFTU (Van Goethem 2006), ITSs (Windmuller 1954a, 1954b; Neuhaus 1982), and of the RILU or Profintern in histories of national communist parties or national labour movements (Endicott 2011; Johns 1998; Worley 2000). Also in this era, there was the Catholic Labour International, the World Confederation of Labour (WCL), which was preceded by the Confédération internationale des syndicats chrétiens on which there is very little written in English, and the ILO built on a corporatist model (Mainwaring 1986; Butler 1939; Harrison 2008; Taha 2015; Garcia 2008).

The ideological tensions between these bodies softened enough during the Second World War to allow for a brief merger between the RILU and IFTU to form the World Federation of Trade Unions (Carew 2000a; Jakobsen 2001; Waterman 2001b); this broke down in 1949 (Windmuller 1954a and 1954b; Silverman 2000) with the formation of the ICFTU (Carew 1984, 2000a, 2000b; Smaller 2009; Weiler 1981; Foster 1956). Besides specific studies on the histories of

the ICFTU or WFTU, studies of the Cold War and political parties during the Cold War also sometimes discuss the split and tension between the two bodies. The histories of these organizations are very important to assess the ideological tensions between the different visions of internationalism expressed by these bodies. They encompass a range of visions for labour, different definitions of what the struggle is, and what is possible from liberal democracy, social democracy and corporatism based on nationalism, religion or ethnicity and revolutionary socialism or communism.[11]

One of the limitations of this approach is that many organizational analyses do not consider the social and how much race, white supremacy, patriarchy and nationalism shaped the visions and practices of internationalism. These race and gender "neutral/blind" studies are problematic in that they ignore the way these visions intersected with other struggles and issues (Pasture 2002; Carew 1996b and 2003). This is especially true in studies that could be characterized as trade union internationalism, which exclude unorganized workers and the unemployed and are also gender neutral and Workerist, excluding the labour of women in informal work and unpaid household work who were involved in labour internationalism of a different kind (e.g., the wages for housework campaign). I argue that the failure of a number of studies to attend to gender and race has significantly limited what we can glean from these histories in aid of our consideration of the possibilities of labour internationalism today.

---

[11] While the histories of both the ICFTU and the WFTU are relevant to my study given that unions in Canada were affiliated to the ICFTU and now the ITUC. An exception to this is the Québec Confédération des syndicats nationaux (CSN), sometimes referred to as Confederation of National Trade Unions (CNTU), which was affiliated to the WCL until its merger with the ICFTU to form the ITUC in 2006. The WCL was an international Christian labour federation that operated mostly in Latin America and Europe. Given the centrality of the ICFTU, I draw more closely from the material on the ICFTU since it has been more influential in terms of the policies and practices of the Canadian Labour Congress and its affiliates. The policies of the WFTU, however, are important to situate some of the actions of the ICFTU and to make sense of the analysis and actions of some trade union activists, particularly those in the CP or on the revolutionary left more generally. It is important to note that the politics of unions affiliated to the WFTU throughout its history has been quite varied, including the politics of those unions which were tied very closely to or fully integrated with the state in parts of the Soviet bloc, to a variety of communist-leaning unions in places where the communist party was not in power, and on to a range of unions tied to anti-colonial struggles with a mix of left politics. These unions have varied in terms of how they saw the role of unions and the relation between unions and broader transformative struggle translating into a range of organizational structures and strategies.

Another limitation of the organizational approach is that the emphasis is often on leadership and staff of the international bodies, those of the key national federations involved, or other relevant state or political actors. In part, this emphasis reflects the nature of these organizations and how they function because they mostly limit participation and decision-making to those in top leadership or staff positions. Amongst other things, the distance and expense involved in some international labour activities only adds to the limitations on participation operating in other spheres of union activity. Part of the problem with the organizational and leadership approach is that it gives us only a partial picture of internationalism in practice by overvaluing the official positions at the expense of how workers actually envisioned internationalism (whose positions do not necessarily coincide with those of the labour leadership and staff involved in shaping the international programme).

Studies of labour internationalism that focus on the workings of the international organizations alone are thereby analytically limited. This is because the actions of the leadership and staff in these organizations cannot be said to stand in for the union as a whole since this occludes the practices rank-and-file workers engaged in and what they believed internationalism to be (Waterman 2005b, 214; Ryland and Sadler 2008; Featherstone 2012; Silverman 2000). In the case of recent literature that examines prospects for union-to-union international cooperation through the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)[12] or the GUFs, the assessment of these prospects are examined without consideration for how internationalism has been envisioned or practiced by workers at the level of locals or councils.

Labour Internationalism from Below

As we have just seen, if we are interested in assessing the prospects for deeper or substantial international coordinative action between workers, then it is critical to explore internationalism

---

[12] The ITUC was established in 2006 as a merger between the WCL and the ICFTU.

beyond the analyses of leadership and staff. For instance, Rebecca Ryland and David Sadler develop

their approach to labour internationalism from below by challenging the singular focus on mergers

and new union formations. They argue that while union survival and strength is generally seen as

dependent on organizational restructuring and coalition building through the adoption of

international links, size does not in and of itself necessarily translate into strength (Ryland and Sadler

2008, 473-74). Following from this, they develop one of the rare studies that focuses on the way

internationalism is envisioned by union members. They compare two public sector unions, one in

the United Kingdom and one in Germany, in an effort to assess possibilities for "building grassroots

led collective identities, solidarity and community beyond national borders" (Ryland and Sadler

2008, 471).

There are a set of texts that explore the history and practice of labour internationalism from

below (Featherstone 2012; Silverman 2000; Ryland and Sadler 2008). Mostly, these analyses exist

within the popular left presses and not as academic texts (Marshall 2009; Marshall and Orgales-

Garcia 2005; Walker 2010; Rosenfeld and Kidd 2006; Luckhardt 1999). Some academic publication

exceptions include Ryland and Sadler (2008), Castree (2000), Silverman (2000), Featherstone (2012),

Carr (1999), and Zweig (2005). There are also some texts that discuss labour internationalism from

below as part of histories or interdisciplinary studies of broader solidarity movements or struggles as

we find within histories of feminist movement organizations and migrant worker solidarity

organizations (Freeman 1997; Anderson 2003; Rowbotham and Linkogle 2001). While my work is a

critique of the labour practices from above, my intention is to also contribute to the development of

an analysis of Canadian labour internationalism from below.

In part, I am doing an organizational history, looking at the influences of the decisions and

actions of the international bodies and relations between the CLC and other national federations.

However, I include the role of grassroots solidarity organizing by union activists that were rooted in

community organizations in this organizational history. I also explore how internationalism has been

discussed, debated, acted upon, and how it influenced workers in defining their struggle.

Visions of Internationalism

Some texts, like Victor Silverman's *Imagining Internationalism* (2000), succeed in doing an

institutional history that includes solidarity from below while also emphasizing the broader

implications of the contest of ideas that marked this history. His focus is on the early 1940s and the

immediate post-World War II struggle over the vision of internationalism in the American and

British Labour movements. What I find particularly useful in this approach – and others like those

of David Featherstone and Dana Frank – is the interest in the way workers have envisioned the

international and the possibilities connected to labour internationalism. These studies link the

question of the possibility of coordinative action and strength across national borders to the

ideological dimensions informing working-class action. For instance, Kim Scipes (2010a), in his

recent book on the AFL-CIO's imperialist practices, emphasizes how these practices emerged from

within the US labour movement itself and aspects of its ideological orientation. These include a

history of anti-immigrant politics, business unionism, and nationalism. This is important because it

enables us to think more deeply about how these practices are produced, but also how

internationalism can itself be a clue and window into the broader processes that limit the power of

worker resistance in specific movements.

As Richard Hyman notes, we need to consider these underlying tensions regarding class

consciousness (Hyman 1975). Without this assessment, we are left with a whole range of new

proposals and organizational solutions vis-à-vis labour internationalism that not only do not

overcome these underlying tensions, but also serve to reproduce them (Hyman 1975). This is one of

the serious limitations of approaches to labour internationalism that attend to organizational

possibilities but which fail to situate and assess these models in the context of class consciousness. This can serve to normalize the solutions and goals of business unionism by uncritically assuming these principles and goals in the organizational solutions proposed. For instance, this is visible in the exuberance around the internationalism of some prominent business unions like SEIU. Failure to address the serious limitations of this type of union as a means of class struggle leads to an inaccurate picture of their potential for serving as a model of effective labour internationalism.

For these reasons, I draw from Silverman's approach in doing an organizational analysis that considers internationalism from below with an emphasis on the way internationalism was envisioned, including the various contradictions embedded within these visions (Silverman 2000, 3). In particular, I appreciate Silverman's attention to the relation between the vision and positions of the leadership and the histories from below. This approach emphasizes the interplay between different forces inside these unions and the contradictions in them.

Labour Imperialism

Another important set of studies that are relevant for my project are those that consider labour imperialism. Some of the studies I have noted above on labour internationalism also tackle the problem of labour imperialism. This literature is important because it seems to all but have disappeared from the current studies on labour internationalism. With some notable exceptions, such as David Featherstone, labour imperialism tends to be either absent from discussions or noted as a historical artifact not relevant for thinking about labour internationalism in the post-Cold War climate.

My approach to labour imperialism as a phenomenon owes a great debt to the work of Kim Scipes. In particular, his 2010 book *Solidarity or Sabotage* provides a very useful critical accounting of the existing literature on labour imperialism of the AFL-CIO and the central debates about it. I

begin this section with an overview of the literature on labour imperialism and then, drawing from Scipes' literature review, I introduce two debates or points of contention in the literature, the first issue being differences over the dating of labour imperialism and the second being the question of whether labour imperialism has arisen from within the labour movement or was externally imposed by either or both the state and capital. I then move onto the different ways people have tried to make sense of labour imperialism. I begin with analyses that focus on the opportunism or betrayal of leaders and Lenin's labour aristocracy thesis. I then outline those like Jack Scott (1978a) who saw labour imperialism as linked to business unionism, those like the Saskatoon Solidarity Committee and Michael Murphy who link the case of Canadian labour imperialism to social democracy, and others like Scipes and Frank who make links to race, racism and nationalism. Lastly, and less common, is the work that denies that this is labour imperialism, and situates this history as legitimate action to counter communist expansion (Olmsted-Hughes 2011).

There is a significant body of literature on the labour imperialism of the AFL-CIO and the British TUC and their respective affiliates. The majority of the texts on labour imperialism are on the AFL-CIO, in part due to their extensive programs and their involvement in high profile imperialist projects such as the coup in Chile. The texts on US labour imperialism include work by Ronald Radosh (1969), Jack Scott (1978a), Fred Hirsch (1974), Beth Sims (1992), Kim Scipes (2010a), Olmsted-Hughes (2011), Paul Buhle (1999), Spalding (1992), and Waterman (2001b). There are also some important texts on the role of the British TUC (Gupta 1975; Frank et al. 2010; Basdeo 1981; Horner and Stewart 2010) and others that compare the imperialism of the AFL-CIO and the British TUC (Silverman 2000; Thompson and Larson 1978; Carew 1984, 1996b). These include accounts of coordinated actions of the AFL-CIO and the TUC in international anti-communist organizing, like that of Rodney Larson and Don Thomson's *Where were you Brother? An Account of*

Trade Union Imperialism (1978) to articles like Carew's, who compares the two labour centres with respect to their roles vis-à-vis anti-colonial struggles.

The most noteworthy texts for me in understanding Canadian labour imperialism have been Kim Scipes' *Solidarity or Sabotage* (2010a), the Saskatoon Solidarity Committee's pamphlet *Partners in Imperialism* (1981), and Michael Murphy's thesis on the CLC and CIDA.[13] I use Scipes' work throughout in part because I model my work on it, particularly in that I am trying to outline the contours of labour internationalism through the approach of historical sociology. Also, some of what Scipes writes is useful for understanding the Canadian context given the role of American unions in Canada. I also see this project as building from the tradition of the Saskatoon pamphlet and the committee work.

Scipes' *Solidarity or Sabotage* (2010a) surveys the extensive existing literature on US labour imperialism. Scipes periodizes the various approaches to the question of why labour imperialism emerged, from the early accounts that understood it as being externally imposed by the state and state agencies like the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to more recent accounts that see it as emerging from within the labour movement and linked to the rise of business unionism (Nastovski 2011). This literature includes early activist exposés on the involvement of the AFL-CIO in CIA operations, to more recent pieces outlining the role of the AFL-CIO Solidarity Centers channeling resources provided by the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) to the anti-Chavez forces involved in the coup attempt against him in 2002. A recent dissertation by George Bass III makes an important new contribution to this work on the role of the solidarity centers, building on the work of Scipes (Bass III 2012).

---

[13]All three of these texts grew out of activism against labour imperialism. The text most clearly aimed at serving as an activist tool was the SSC's pamphlet. This pamphlet was circulated within union spaces in Canada in the early 1980s. Michael Murphy's thesis grew out of the work of the SSC and was an attempt to deepen and extend the analysis developed there by charting the specifics of the relationship between the CLC and CIDA in various projects internationally.

A significant aspect of Scipes' work is his emphasis on and analysis of the way labour imperialism emerged from within the labour movement as opposed to being imposed externally. For Scipes, US labour imperialism is evident in the actions of the AFL-CIO to try and dominate other labour movements (Scipes 2010a, xxiv). This includes their efforts to undermine democratically elected governments, as was the case in Chile and Venezuela, or "support for reactionary governments and attacks by their affiliated labor movements on progressive workers and their organizations seeking democratic change," as was the case in the Philippines (Scipes 2010a, 40).

The Saskatoon Solidarity Committee pamphlet and the work of Michael Murphy explore the internationalism of the CLC from a Marxist perspective, arguing that labour imperialism is connected to social democracy and corporatism as well as to business unionism. Murphy's thesis charts the relationship between the CLC and CIDA from its beginning in 1969 to 1983 and, like Scipes, he argues that the relationship between labour and the state was not imposed by the state but grew out of the CLC leadership's own interests; for Murphy, this relationship grew out of a meeting of interests. For the CLC, it was about advancing social democracy internationally (Murphy 1986, 6), while for CIDA, it was about legitimization and influence over labour in Canada and internationally. Like Scipes, Murphy sees labour imperialism as a set of practices that undermine workers' struggles internationally. This has taken on a different character at different times and places. For instance, while the AFL-CIO fiercely undermined left movements internationally, Anthony Carew notes that they often chose to try and co-opt sections of anti-colonial movements while the British TUC, due to British colonialism and the Labour party's support for it, was often wary of or against supporting anti-colonial movements, even those furthest to the right (Carew 1996b).

One major point of contention amongst the scholars of labour imperialism is over dating the phenomenon. Is it solely a product of the Cold War as some would suggest? Does that then mean it is now over, as leaders of some prominent federations would suggest? There is much at stake in how

this phenomenon is dated. For instance, the depiction of labour imperialism as solely a product of the Cold War can serve to occlude critical examination of what the nature of labour internationalism looks like post-Cold War. This depiction of labour imperialism can also function to obscure other dimensions of labour imperialism that pre- and post-date the Cold War. For example, it may occlude the role of race and racism, nationalism, and colonialism, all of which can provide us with a more accurate picture of how and why labour imperialism functions the way it does in specific contexts.

It is telling that Lenin and many other revolutionaries raised this issue of labour imperialism as a phenomenon long before onset of the Cold War. Others like Scipes and Frank trace the ideological and political roots of this phenomenon in the United States to early trade union organizing and anti-immigrant campaigns as early as the late 19th century (Scipes 2010a; Frank 2000). In the British case, this begins much earlier, given British colonialism and the TUC's alignment with the interests of the British Empire (Thompson and Larson 1978; Carew 1996b; Davis 2000; Zeleza 1984). It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to explore texts on other colonial powers and workers' movements in their colonies (e.g., Portugal, Belgium, France etc.…); but it is clear from the British case that any such studies would have to start prior to the Cold War.

While, like Scipes, I do not think it is accurate or useful to narrow the analyses of labour imperialism to the Cold War, it may be useful to look at this period as a phase of labour imperialism with some distinct dimensions. Pablo Ghigliani argues that Cold War labour imperialism was active at a time when "internationalism became a rhetorical cover for a politicized trade union foreign policy on behalf of Western powers and of the Soviet Union" (Ghigliani 2005, 361). This has been distinct in some contexts from pre- and post-Cold War labour imperialism in that it often meant closer and more formal ties between states and labour movements with regards to international activities. However, it has been noted by Scipes, Bass III, and others that, for instance, the close

financial ties between labour and the state with regards to international activities remains a constant after the end of the Cold War.

In the case of the AFL-CIO, one of the main arguments used to support the claim of labour imperialism is the relationship with the state, and, in particular, the significant proportion of state funding used for union "solidarity" projects.[14] Beth Sims notes the AFL-CIO's work in Latin American under the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD)[15] received 89% of its funds from the state between 1962 and 1967, and another 5% from corporate funding (Sims 1992, 22). Scipes, Bass, and others note that the vast majority of funding for AFL-CIO international activities continues to come from the state, now through the NED set up by Reagan, which replaced the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) as the major source of funding.

As I explore in my work, state funding has also been quite significant in the international work of the CLC. This funding relationship and the sometimes close personal and political ties between state personnel and politicians and labour leaders or international department staff in certain federations has led some to argue that labour was co-opted or infiltrated by state agents (Radosh 1969). Scipes notes, with regard to US labour imperialism, that this way of accounting for labour imperialism was salient in the early pieces about AFL-CIO international actions, often produced by union activists mostly in the mid-1960s to the early 1970s (Scipes 2010a, 38-40). Scipes situates his own work and the work of people like Carew, Filipelli and Nack as part of a more recent trend in the analysis of US labour imperialism that sees this phenomenon as emerging "from the ideology of labor itself" (Scipes 2010a, xxii-xxiv). I would also add Frank and Silverman to this tradition as well. The work of the Saskatoon Solidarity Committee stands somewhere between these

---

[14] I put solidarity in quotation marks here because, while often presented as projects of international solidarity, especially in the case of the AFL-CIO, many of these projects have been revealed as actually undermining workers struggles in other countries.

[15] The AIFLD was a major vehicle for labour imperialism. Set up by the American labour movement it has been closely tied to the American CIA. See Spalding 1976, 1984, 1992; Romualdi 1967; Scott 1978a; Scipes 2000; Hirsch 1974.

two approaches, both exploring the points of ideological connection between the state and the labour movement with regards to international action but also questioning the role of specific players and whether they were in fact agents of the state.

Union action internationally has been a contested terrain even in countries where the main labour federations were often decisively supportive of imperialism. While as in the US case, there are moments of very close connection between the state and labour in Canada with regards to international action, including possibly state agents or overt control over specific labour-led projects, this is not the focus of my examination. Even where the role of the state has been very extensive, as in the US between the AFL and the CIA as documented by Buhle, Scipes, Carew, Olmstead-Hughes and others, the efforts of the state to dominate labour's actions internationally only tell us part of the story. The role of the state in using labour's international programme cannot in and of itself account for the extensive and long relationships between state and labour bodies in their international activities. For some, labour imperialism is explained away as a product of "bad apples," is attributed to the actions of leaders or as the coercive imposition by the state to use the labour movement for their own ends. I caution against these narratives. This is not to deny the close relationships between union leaders and the state in these efforts and the strong ideological commitments and sometimes personal gain for some leaders and staff in pursuing these practices; rather, this approach obscures the deeper connections that go beyond those actors implementing the practices. As folks like Scipes, Murphy and others have argued, this alliance would not have been possible if there was not also an interest in and consent for this alliance within the labour movement. To understand this, one needs to explore why there was, as Murphy and the SSC describe, a meeting of interests between the CLC and the state.

One of the other issues arising from understanding labour imperialism as solely a product of state action or interests is that it can also miss the way labour imperialism can exist independently

and sometimes in opposition to state interests or policies. For instance, Peter Hahn notes in his study of American union support for Zionism that union support for the colonial project in Palestine pre-dated US state support for Israel, and that in fact the role of the labour movement and specific labour leaders was significant in shaping new state policy toward the emerging state of Israel (Hahn 2001, 156). This was true in the Canadian context as well, as I explore in Chapter 5. Independent labour support for imperialist projects is a phenomenon that can be particularly useful in sketching the ideological context within labour that facilitated cooperation with the state internationally and on other fronts.

So instead, I think it is important to look more closely at explanatory frameworks that help us move beyond the proclivities or material interests of specific leaders, staff or state actors. The extent of rank-and-file knowledge and support is a site of debate amongst scholars of labour imperialism; some like Scott argue that support of members arose from seeing their interests with those of the employer and the state. Others, like Scipes, argue that while the ideological roots of labour imperialism were present in the broader movement, we cannot argue that there was active support because there has historically been so little information available to union members about the international activities of their union federation.

An approach that considers the role and position of rank-and-file as well as its leadership is critical to making sense of actions supporting labour imperialism that involved extensive rank-and-file participation. One such action is explored by Hyslop in an article on the development of solidarity between British and white South African workers against the inclusion of black workers in the South African labour market in 1914 (Hyslop 1999). The connections forged and expressed in this 1914 rally in London's Hyde Park complicate notions of solidarity and show how rank-and-file members could be racist and strong supporters of imperialism and labour imperialism.

Scholars of labour imperialism that have focused on it as emerging from within labour (broadly defined) rather than the imposition of the state or capital have arrived at a whole host of different theories to make sense of this phenomenon. This leads us into the next set of explanations of labour imperialism, which may help to make sense of support for labour imperialism amongst the leadership and the sections of the rank-and-file. These include ideological commitments as well as political practices. There are many points of connection between these sets of ideas and practices; however, I identify two broad areas. The first are models of unionism that tend to align with the interests of their respective states and capital, including both business unionism and social democratic unionism. The second are related to the nation and nationalism. Included in this is the labour aristocracy thesis as an explanation for this alliance and those that see this identification of interests as ideological and rooted in the concept of the nation, along with the racial connotations and logics of this national identification. Nationalism, business unionism, social democratic unionism, racism and white supremacy are often interlinked in the ideas and assumptions of labour imperialism and accommodationist forms of solidarity. This means that in order to understand how and why these forms of labour internationalism developed, we need to explore the particularities of class formation in specific contexts.

Business Unionism

The role of business unionism as an ideology and practice is one of the central explanations for labour imperialism (Sims 1992; Scott 1978a; Scipes 2010a; Thompson and Larson 1978). Jack Scott's *Yankee Unions Go Home!* (1978) is a critical contribution in this regard and is a significant text for understanding an element of the Canadian context.[16] Scott challenges the idea that the

---

[16] Scott was himself an active trade unionist in Vancouver, and his work is broadly known amongst Canadian labour activists of the late 1970s and through the 1980s and particularly amongst those active in opposing US trade union control over Canadian locals or those building Canadian unions. His book on US labour imperialism was itself part of a

commitment to labour imperialism constituted betrayals by staff or leaders of union principles; instead, he argues that it follows logically from the ideology of business unionism, which is built to cooperate with and support capitalism (Scott 1978a, 11). And further to this he proposes that with some exceptions, "the skilled workers, who made up the bulk of the trade union movement in the United States, agreed with the movement's leaders in identifying the members' interests with the stability and prosperity of the established social order" (Scott 1978a, 11) – and while there was opposition, the revolutionary voices were not powerful enough to challenge this orientation (Scott 1978a, 12). For Scott, the business unionism that supported US labour imperialism was also tied to American nationalism and triumphalism (Scott 1978a, 12).

The philosophy of business unionism is associated with professionalization and bureaucracy, a lack of political engagement beyond electoral politics, disinterest in concerns or struggles of the broader working class – not only the unorganized but sometimes also those in other unions – and a view of members as individuals buying a service from professional negotiators and representatives. Business unionism as an ideology accepts capitalism and is associated with cooperative relations with employers and sometimes also with corporatism as a strategy, in that they see their fate as tied to their bosses (Scott 1978a). Sims argues that business unionism is

> designed to meet immediate, concrete objectives within the general outlines of the distribution of power and other resources of a capitalist society. The tactics consequently focus on collective bargaining and negotiations in the interests of maintaining labor–business harmony. Strikes and other militant actions are considered only as last-ditch options, as are alliances with social sectors outside the labor community. (Sims 1992, 5)

As a result of this way of seeing the interests of workers as tied to those of capital and the state, Scott argues that their adoption of American foreign policy logically follows (Scott 1978a). This is because of the narrow sectionalism that is the basis of business unionism, meaning a narrow commitment to the immediate interests of small sets of workers in specific industries that thereby

series aimed at analysing US labour and challenging their power over Canadian workers struggles. Scott's work is a history of the role of the AFL-CIO, especially in Latin America.

prioritize these demands over the interests of other groups of workers, whether locally or internationally.

Scipes also draws out the connection to business unionism by examining the work and ideas of Samuel Gompers, head of the AFL from 1886 to 1894 and again from 1896 until his death in 1924, who is a founding figure in the philosophy of business unionism and whose own actions internationally are important illustrations of how business union goals and practices translate into international action.[17] Scipes takes this analysis of business unionism a step further by also connecting the philosophy of Gompers to the racism of the AFL unions that sought to protect the jobs and conditions for certain groups of skilled white men (Scipes 2010a, 6); "In other words, business unionism accepts capitalism, and has traditionally accepted race and empire" (Scipes 2010 475b). For Scipes, this support for imperialism arises from the narrow interests of specific workers, and to understand these interests, it is crucial to look at who these workers were, their social location and their strategies.

Social Democratic Unionism

Business unionism has been associated with a range of ideologies including variations of conservatism, liberalism, and labourism (a kind of liberalism that was important in the Canadian, Australian, and British contexts) as well as social democracy. According to the Saskatoon Solidarity Committee and Michael Murphy, the dominant model of unionism that emerged in Canada in the post-World War II context was social democratic industrial unionism. And for them, the power of this model of unionism shaped the particularities of Canadian labour imperialism in Canada. Since social democracy has never been anywhere near as influential in the United States as it has been in Canada, the scholarship on US labour imperialism is not too helpful for fleshing out the role of

---

[17] Scipes 2010a, Chapter 1; www.theodorerooseveltcenter.org/Learn-About-TR/Themes/Capitalism-and-Labor/Samuel-Gompers.aspx.

social democracy. In this regard, the work on various European federations, and those federations prominent in the ICFTU, is more useful for understanding models of union action like business unionism that are conciliatory towards employers and the state.

For the SSC and Michael Murphy, one feature of the politics of this model of unionism was a desire for closer integration with the state and capital reflected in their efforts to build unions approximating the corporatist structures of Europe (Saskatoon Solidariy Committee 1981; Murphy 1986). For Murphy, social democracy constituted the central factor in shaping labour internationalism in Canada (Murphy 1986, i-ii). The principal goal of the CLC, according to Murphy, was the advancement of social democracy locally and internationally and as with the SSC, this was rooted principally in the triumph of social democracy locally (Murphy 1986, i-ii). Murphy's study, which explores the relationship between CIDA and the CLC from 1969 to 1983, contends that social democracy worked to mediate "the essentially antagonistic relationship between capital and the working class" (Murphy 1986, 1). Murphy argues that the CLC developed a relationship with CIDA to assist in its goal of advancing social democracy by strengthening their capacity to engage in international work through the agency's funding (Murphy 1986, i-ii). State support, he argued, also gave the CLC a certain amount of power and clout within the ICFTU and served, lastly, to legitimize the leadership of the CLC (Murphy 1986, i-ii).

The SSC characterizes the international activities of the CLC and the ICFTU as a liberal and social democratic brand of imperialism which operated as an alternative to American imperialism in the Third World (Saskatoon Solidarity Committee 1981, 36). Politically, they argue that this social democratic imperialism was facilitated and shaped by relations with the NDP and its ties at the international level to the Socialist International (SI). The analysis offered by the SSC and Michael Murphy on the role of social democracy and corporatism offers a look at the ideological landscape grounding Canadian labour imperialism that is useful in drawing out the specifics dimensions of how

business unionism functioned in Canada and contributed to the development of a specific variety of labour imperialism distinct from the American one. One of the gaps in these studies, however, and more generally amongst many Marxist left scholars in Canada, is the failure to explore the role of nationalism, settler-colonialism and racism in a project like social democracy or as part of business unionism. For this, I turn to some of the American literature and secondary Canadian literature on social democracy and nationalism in order to extend this analysis of the CLC's internationalism.

National Horizons

Each universal workers' organization, from Marx's own International Workingmen's Association to the world federation, failed in the end to overcome the penetration of national interests in class concerns.
–Victor Silverman (2000, 13)

The ideas of labour internationalism emerging from the history and debates of the Internationals made central the pursuit of ending the exploitation of workers.[18] Internationalism, Waterman notes, was not only about relationships "between workers in distant places, it was a value without which labour and unions were imprisoned within the capitalist state-nation" (Waterman 2005b, 210). Waterman argues that this emancipatory thrust of internationalism was replaced when "early industrial capitalism developed into a "national-industrial-colonial capitalism (NICC) and the internationalism of labour became literally inter-national. This shift meant the loss of its emancipatory aspiration and capacity (or vice versa)" (Waterman 2004). And so many unions focused their struggle on winning reforms through the nation-state.

Labour Aristocracy Thesis

For many Marxists, this dilemma of nationalism and its translation into labour imperialism became a significant dilemma during the First World War when Socialist parties, despite pledges of

---

[18] For more on these debates, see Forman (1998).

76

internationalism, overwhelmingly sided with their respective states in the war. The decision of many

socialist parties and unions to side with their respective governments during the First World War led

to massive splits in the Second International and put in question the possibilities for international

labour solidarity. Lenin wanted to know why workers and labour movements, particularly in

industrialized countries, were supporting the imperialist endeavors of their governments. For Lenin,

the reason workers in "advanced" capitalist states have supported their government's international

actions was because imperialism creates,

> an alliance between an insignificant section at the 'top' of the labor movement, and its 'own'
> national bourgeoisie, directed against the masses of the proletariat, an alliance between the
> servants of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie, directed against the class that is exploited by
> the bourgeoisie. (Howard 1995, 367)

As Max Elbaum and Robert Seltzer note, Lenin sought to understand the relationship between

opportunism and imperialism "and its social roots in the labour aristocracy" (Elbaum and Seltzer

2004, 11).[19] Variations of Lenin's labour aristocracy thesis have been developed by other Marxist

intellectuals since Lenin wrote[20] and also by non-Marxists who remove the material basis for this

alliance and understand the labour aristocracy, for instance, as a product of the ideological climate of

the Cold War (see Sims 1992).

Post notes the different variations of the labour aristocracy thesis. For Marx, the "super

profits from industrial monopoly in the world-market allowed British capitalists to give more and

secure employment to craft workers" (Post 2010, 7), while as noted above, for Lenin (and also for

Zinoviev), "a minority of well-paid workers in the industrialised countries shared the super-profits

their capitalists derived from the exploitation of low-wage workers in the 'colonial world'" (Post

---

[19] Elbaum and Seltzer explain that for Lenin, imperialism produced two different political and economic trends in the labour movement, one that was opportunistic and materially grounded in the labour aristocracy and one that was revolutionary (Elbaum and Seltzer 2004). Max Elbaum and Robert Seltzer note that for Lenin this opportunism, often associated with the conciliatory approach of social democracy, was a serious barrier to revolutionary action (Elbaum and Seltzer 2004, 11).

[20] E.g., by Ernest Mandel, Samir Amin, Max Elbaum, and Robert Seltzer.

2010, 7). This theory of a labour aristocracy arose from an observation made by Engels about the British working class, namely that the dominance of British capital on account of the British empire meant that British capital could "provide a minority of workers with relatively higher wages and employment security," leading to the conservatizing ideological tendencies of the British labour movement (Post 2006). Lastly, Post notes Elbaum-Seltzer's version, which argues that superprofits through imperialism "operate as a kind of bribe in the form of higher wages in the North" (Post 2010, 7). This theory plays a part in numerous explanations of labour imperialism, including those that see it as a betrayal of their members on the part of the labour leadership who are invested materially in this alignment. For Post, the labour aristocracy thesis functions as a truism on the revolutionary left, but lacks a sound empirical footing, arguing that instead higher wages are the product of class struggle rather than derived through imperialism.

For Dana Frank, this alignment with national capital and the state internationally is seen in the economic nationalist tendencies within the US labour movement and the way this is deeply intertwined with anti-Asian racism. In her ambitious history of economic nationalism in the United States beginning in the late 18th century, she examines how specific labour leaders as well as locals and internationals came to adopt economic nationalist positions that led to alliances with the state and employers and support for their interests abroad; Frank, like Scott, argues that they saw their interests as aligned with US foreign policy (Frank 2000, 11). Similarly, Scipes' work draws the historic links between labour imperialism, nationalism and racism in the context of US labour history. Scipes, in a more recent article on US labour imperialism in *WorkingUSA*, challenges the idea that support for labour imperialism was predicated on a rational interest-based alliance of labour with capital and the state for the sake of job creation through imperialist expansion (Scipes 2010b, 469-470). Scipes argues that it was not simply an intellectual commitment to economic nationalism as an appropriate strategy for labour, but rather that labour imperialism "flows from the

belief in American Nationalism – which is based on race, empire, and capitalism . . . *and* the superiority of the 'American' version of each" (Scipes 2010b, 475). The connection between nationalism, racism and capitalism is vital here. For Scipes, as for Frank and Schmidt Camacho, labour imperialism is the counterpart to racist ideas and practices at home and an outgrowth of its underlying ideology and logic.

Racism and White Supremacy: Unpacking the National Lens

> Throughout the twentieth century, the Buy American call has come as part of a package deal with anti-Asian racism, and it would be naïve to expect that the two are now separable.
> –Dana Frank (2000, 251)

> Every industrial and commercial centre in England now possesses a working class *divided* into two *hostile* camps, English proletarians and Irish proletarians. The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers his standard of life. In relation to the Irish worker he feels himself a member of the *ruling* nation and so turns himself into a tool of the aristocrats and capitalists of his country against *Ireland*, thus strengthening their domination *over himself.*
> –Karl Marx (quoted in Gilbert 1978, 359)

Dana Frank, like Scipes, argues that we cannot see the alliances with capital and the state on foreign policy as simply a result of an assessment by labour leaders, within a business union framework, that their interests rationally lie with those of their employers. It also demands an analysis of the role of ideas about race, nation and citizenship in the labour movement. This is because business unionism and strategies such as economic nationalism are historically interlinked with maintaining relations arising from the historical legacies of capitalist development, specifically, the social nature of global divisions of labour. This is visible in the operation of the border, which relies ideologically on notions of race and nation and serves to maintain global division of labour by making entry into the north restrictive and engendering vulnerability for those who do enter (Sharma 2002, 2006a, 2006b, 2007). For Schmidt Camacho, Frank, Scipes and others, the racism embedded in this model and these strategies has a dual character, operating locally and making a

certain common sense of inequality globally. Scipes argues that this dual process meant that unions in the U.S.

> accepted the established social order based on empire, race and capitalism; fought to keep immigrants out of the country – starting with the Chinese and other peoples of color but also working later to exclude those coming from Southern and Eastern Europe; and has tried subsequently to maximize gains within this social order for union members. (Scipes 2010a, 1)

While the term racism is used make sense of the assumptions linked to nationalism, economic nationalism and many business union strategies, white supremacy may be more useful as a descriptive term for the Global North. White supremacy highlights how racist underpinnings are rooted in the history of colonialism and imperialism that shaped ideas of whiteness premised on the superiority and presumed entitlements of white bodies.[21] This is often most evident in the development discourse that characterizes certain murky forms of labour internationalism (e.g., within the aid paradigm).

The role of race, racism and white supremacy is central to the analyses of Scipes and Frank with regard to US labour imperialism. However, racism and white supremacy embedded in the Eurocentrism of other labour bodies has also been considered in studies of the ILO, ICFTU, trade federations and other national federations like the TUC (Scipes 2010a; Carew 1996b; Zeleza 1984).[22] Like Scipes, I think that in order to examine the connection between racism, white supremacy and labour imperialism, we need to chart the origins to exclusions rooted in local class formation. Scipes argues that we can see the roots of labour imperialism in the emergence of alliances based on race rather than class in the development of business unionism exhibited in things like the AFL's campaign in support of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 (Scipes 2010a, 12-15). While some

---

[21] For more on white supremacy see Harrison 2001; Allen 1994; hooks 2000; Roediger 1991; Smith 2006.

[22] There are also many important pieces on questions of race and labour in the United States more generally (Roediger 1991; Schmidt Camacho 1999; DuBois 1989; Davis 1981; Yuval-Davis 1993) and in Canada (Bannerji 1993, 1995, 2000; Das Gupta 1996, 1999; Das Gupta et al. 2007; Sharma 2002, 2006a, 2006b; Abu-Laban and Bakan 2008).

scholars on the left would rather minimize the prevalence of racist ideas and practices inside the labour movement, doing so does not help us to make sense of them nor help us to challenge them. Frank argues that understanding this phenomenon demands an analysis of the role of ideas about race and nation in the labour movement. Her chapter on making the world safe for American products is particularly useful in linking the ideologies within international strategies to racism at home and how this has been exhibited in buy American campaigns adopted most prominently by the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU) and the United Auto Workers (UAW).

Labour Imperialism as Labour Solidarity

The last relevant explanatory framework is that body of research which understands what others call labour imperialism as legitimate action in the fight against communism. These works are useful in that they demand that those of us who do understand these actions as imperialism to be more explicit in laying out how they so are. They are also important in deploying arguments close to the common rebuttals to the charge of labour imperialism coming from leadership and staff of specific union federations in the past and today. One text in this category is the recent book by Olmsted-Hughes (2011), who presents new archival data on the links between the CIA and the AFL in the 1940s. While her text is an important contribution to the scholarship on labour imperialism, she tends, like much of the scholarship on the ICFTU, to read this alliance as somewhere between benign and legitimate in the fight against communism. This reading is only possible if we choose not to ask about the implications of these operations on workers generally – and particularly on the labour movements in which they intervened (Nastovski 2013). However, Olmsted-Hughes does identify some connection to business unionism. Though not naming it as such, she outlines how the interventions of the AFL were also an attempt to export a specific model of trade union organization, one that reflected the ideology of the AFL, which eschewed political action and

promoted friendlier relationships with employers and the state (Nastovski 2013). Other texts that fall into this category include various union reports on international activities and programs as well as articles on unions and international development.

These explanations, offered in the existing literature on labour imperialism, offer very useful ways of exploring the development of this phenomenon. There are gaps in this work, however, which the literature on solidarity helps to fill and that I hope to draw out in my own work. One of these gaps is the role of patriarchy in all of this. While there is some mention of this in the works of Frank and Scipes, this area is generally undeveloped in the literature and almost completely absent from attempts to understand this phenomenon. Just as nationalism, racism and white supremacy are tied together in settler-colonial contexts, patriarchy is also an important part of these ideas and practices. Nationalism and racism shape the contours of the patriarchal logics through which gender is regulated. This logic is crucial to understanding how these ideas and practices operate socially in the development of labour imperialism. Patriarchy is not only critical to the way we understand the effects of labour imperialism, which often affects women differently, but also in outlining the way it has operated within the labour movement historically and how it has been connected to nationalism, racism and business unionism. Despite the importance of patriarchy to understanding the complex contours of each of the main explanatory frameworks, an elaboration of this dimension of labour internationalism and imperialism in Canada is beyond the scope of my dissertation. Mostly, patriarchy is visible in the empirical work through omission. As such, patriarchy is embedded in the framework in which the discussions about labour internationalism take place from the 1940s until the 1970s and where challenges to patriarchal labour internationalism arose in the counter-movement to the dominant institutional internationalism of the CLC.[23]

---

[23] This dimension of the wars of position over labour internationalism is something that would be useful to explore, but is beyond the scope of this current project, which is an attempt to draw out the general contours and lessons over a long period. Connected to this is the general problem of dominant Workerist notions, ideas that centre wage labourers to the

Canadian Imperialism

Lastly, I think we need to situate the exploration of Canadian labour internationalism within the history of Canadian imperialism. Canada is a white-settler colony. This means that the colonial project that led to the building the Canadian nation-state was based on ethnic cleansing and genocide of the indigenous population. Up until quite recently, discussions of imperialism in Canada have not considered colonialism. Rather, they have almost exclusively focused on US imperialism. Since the 1970s, we have seen the emergence of scholarship on the role of Canada and Canadian capital in what can be called imperialist projects (Moore and Wells 1973; Carroll 1986; Niosi 1981; Klassen 2009; Gordon 2010). Gordon argues that Canadian capital, supported by the Canadian state, has its own imperialist interests and has engaged in its own independent imperialist ventures, particularly in the interests of the mining and financial sectors (Gordon 2010, 10). A clear example of Canadian imperialism is the recent role of the Canadian state in supporting the coup in Honduras in line with Canadian business interests there (Gordon 2011). Gordon argues that the expansion of Canadian capital in the Third World in the last 30 years has mostly been within Latin America and the Caribbean, but also to some extent in the Asia-Pacific and African regions (Gordon 2010, 10-11). Klassen argues that Canadian capital expansion has really emerged in the last two decades and has coincided with "a militarization of Canadian foreign policy," which has replaced its Cold War-era role as a middle power in relation to American imperialism (Klassen 2009, 163). This means that Canada is now a source of foreign direct investment (FDI), and many Canadian corporations have an international base of accumulation that creates independent interests in new imperialist ventures (Klassen 2009, 184)

This analysis of Canadian imperialism stands in contrast to the view that has been hegemonic on the Canadian left for decades, situating Canada as subject to US imperialism and not

---

exclusion of women who are not wage labourers, peasants, slaves, informal workers, and so on in studies of labour internationalism. This too is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

an active agent itself (Gordon 2010, 9; Klassen 2009, 163). Particularly prominent in this tradition is dependency theory, in which Canada, as a result of American imperialism, was unable to develop an independent economy and national bourgeoisie. Within this framework, Canada is seen as underdeveloped and a source of primary resources. This analysis, dominant within a range of left organizations and parties for decades, has meant a focus on the role of US imperialism in Canada often to the neglect of the independent actions of the Canadian state and other political actors, including capital and civil society organizations.

I argue that the focus on US imperialism might be helpful in understanding the lack of research on Canadian labour imperialism. For instance, Jack Scott's important book *Yankee Unions, Go Home!* (1978) was part of a series of books aimed at challenging US control over Canadian unions. Scott did not venture to tackle the role of the CLC internationally. This makes sense within the Canadian left nationalist framework that saw this as something to tackle only after first winning independence from US unions. This is not to say that those who focused on US imperialism were fine with the policies of the CLC; but they attributed the stance of the CLC as resulting from AFL-CIO influence, rather than something arising independently.

Canadian Imperialism and Civil Society Actors

Besides the work of Klassen and Gordon, which both arise from a political economy perspective, the Canadian left nationalist analysis of imperialism has also been challenged by activists examining the role of Canadian civil society organizations in imperialism. For instance, in the realm of labour, both the SSC and Michael Murphy's thesis on the CLC and the CIDA consider the Canadian state and the Canadian labour movement as active agents in imperialist endeavours (Saskatoon Solidarity Committee 1981; Murphy 1986). Also, more recently, an addition to the study of civil society level imperialism is a book on the imperialism of Canadian non-governmental

organizations (NGOs) (Barry-Shaw and Oja-Jay 2012). These texts have been important in charting the path of Canadian capital internationally, the role and function of CIDA, and the particularities of the way these practices were understood by different political actors and organizations in Canada. I situate my own work as connected to the current that challenges the passivity of the Canadian state and non-state actors in imperialist ventures.

In conclusion, this chapter has provided an overview of the key texts on labour internationalism and a discussion of some of the important theoretical debates. In this first section, I also contextualized my study within the limited scholarship on Canadian labour internationalism. I then explored the key points of contention around labour imperialism including its periodization and source. I also explored the primary explanations of labour imperialism, including the labour aristocracy thesis, nationalism, business unionism, social democratic trade unionism, racism and white supremacy. The literature on labour imperialism is important to include in any discussion of labour internationalism in the Global North because it points us to the need to think about the social nature of class formation and class consciousness in the making of different practices of labour internationalism.

<u>Chapter 2</u>

Analytical Methods:
Historical Sociology rooted in Anti-Racist Marxist Feminist Theory

I situate this research in the tradition of critical social research. The purpose of this study is to have a critical assessment of internationalism for developing transformative forms of solidarity. An important part of this is thinking through the politics, visions and practices of labour internationalism historically. This analysis is a lens to the limitations and prospects of unions in social and political transformation more generally. For me, critical social research constitutes what Himani Bannerji describes as piecing "together a complex and interactive understanding of the relationship between history, social organization and forms of consciousness" (Bannerji 1995, 12). This entails attending to the social and historical context in which phenomena arise and how this connects to the ideological landscape in which phenomena exist (Harvey 1990, 19-20). Critical social research seeks to piece these elements together to support strategies for social change. This is activist-oriented research that sees knowledge as a tool to inform the organization of resistance and to think through new openings and ways to effectively tackle obstacles.[1]

This assessment demands mapping out challenges and openings for transformative forms of international labour solidarity and finding ways to confront imperialism and labour imperialism as well as the ideas and practices that operate inside the labour movement to support these processes. This means examining how and why the dark sides of solidarity operate inside the labour movement through the actions and ideas of the leadership, staff and rank-and-file activists. This is necessary to make sense of why unions, which are meant to be sites of challenge to exploitation, sometimes

---

[1] I use the term action-oriented research very broadly to mean research that is oriented to further social change. This orientation is discussed in a broad range of disciplines and methodological approaches (Sudbury and Okazawa-Rey 2009; Choudry 2014; Lipman 2005)

operate to reinforce inequalities through explicit and implicit support for imperialist processes, their legacies and impacts.

In this chapter I introduce my theoretical framework, which is rooted in an internationalist anti-racist Marxist feminist thought. I focus on three interrelated premises drawn from this framework that are central to my research design and data analysis: the social nature of class formation and relations; how these social relations are shaped by and shape different forms of consciousness; and that examining these social relations and forms of consciousness entails viewing these phenomena dialectically. I then move into a discussion of how the historical sociological methods I use follow from this theoretical framework and how this has informed my data collection. Lastly, I discuss the specifics of my research design, my data collection process, and issues arising from it.

Anti-Racist Marxist Feminist Theory: Assessing Prospects for Transformative Solidarities

Indifference towards all theory is one of the main reasons the English working-class movement crawls along so slowly in spite of the splendid organization of the individual unions.
–V.I. Lenin, *What is to be Done?* (quoted in Hyman 1975, 2)

Hyman argues that industrial relations as a discipline avoids theory (Hyman 1975). This also holds true for several other disciplinary approaches to the study of workers and unions. A significant number of studies mirror the analyses of struggles produced within struggles; that is, they provide an assessment of the conditions that shaped certain battles and the implications of them. This is a useful approach orientated towards informing strategies of future struggles. What these analyses often lack, however, is engagement with theory. My aim is to retain the practical and activist orientation of this approach, but also to draw in theory to assess and broaden the scope of analysis. Theory is necessary for examining the assumptions that underlie the activities I consider and their

implications. Otherwise, as Engels notes, action and strategy stays within the confines of the eternal present, from immediate battle-to-battle, task-to-task.

I use Internationalist anti-racist Marxist feminist theory as my framework to do critical social research. The analytical tools that have been produced in this framework are used to find openings for resistance and change by strengthening our understanding of conditions for creating more effective strategies by bringing to light omissions and their consequences and assessing challenges to radical social change (Bannerji 1995, 47). Anti-racist Marxist feminism includes a wide range of analytical tools developed by a range of authors (Bannerji 1993, 1995, 1999, 2000, 2005; Mohanty 2003; Brand and De Shield 1991; Brand 1999; Davis 1981; Anthias and Yuval-Davis 2005). And within this broad set of texts there are significant differences in how to make sense of the social nature of class. Some offer important insights on the nature of racist social relations and class but not gender (Mills 2003; Allen 1994; Harrison 2001), or class but not gender and race. Also, some frameworks, like intersectionality, work to tie these all together analytically. However, as noted by Bannerji, intersectional approaches often conceive of race, gender and class as distinct dimensions that get teased apart rather than seen as co-habitating to form a singular experience (see Bannerji 2005; Smith 2006). A historical-materialist orientation to the social dimensions of class formation is therefore important for contesting the separation and competition between these frameworks. As Bannerji argues, these social realities are material and happen in lived experiences, and as such they cannot be ontologically separated out.

The nature of my study demands an emphasis on the international and so I emphasize the need for an international perspective; I draw from theories that think through labour internationalism (Waterman 1987, 1988, 1993, 1996, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2004, 2005a, 2012; Hyman 1999, 2005; Frank 2004; Silverman 2000, 2010; Schmidt Camacho 1999; Johns 1998; Featherstone 2012). This means considering the tensions between nationalism, regionalisms and

internationalism in the thinking through of union strategies. While Marxism and anti-racist Marxist feminism is theoretically internationalist in orientation, the nationalist character of most Marxist parties in the 20th century prompts me to emphasize this orientation as something additional to anti-racist Marxist feminism.

Mapping the Terrain: The Social Nature of Class Formation and Relations

The first premise I draw from anti-racist Marxist feminism is the social nature of class formation and relations. I outline this theory and then why and how it has been important in shaping my research design and analysis. Tied to the question of transformative solidarity is the question of the possibility of effective class struggle towards the emancipation of the working class. Considering this entails an assessment of class formation and relations. EP Thompson argues that class must be thought through historically as an active process and social relation (Thompson 1991): "Class itself is not a thing, it is a happening" (Thompson 1991). This means that class cannot be abstracted as an isolated ahistorical category with certain features. Rather class, as a social relation, exists in the unfolding of human relationships. Class therefore can only be understood through an analysis of ever unfolding and changing social relations.

Bannerji, following from this premise, argues that these social relations produce very different experiences based on the nature of class formation and the interplay of exploitation and oppression within specific contexts. She argues for the adoption of a socialized conception of class, that is, one seeing class formation as something that cannot be divorced from social relations rooted in patriarchy, racism and other forms of oppression. These forms of oppression shape how class is lived, meaning it shapes experiences of exploitation. Like class, Bannerji argues that race and gender cannot be abstracted and removed from each other or from class relations and material conditions (Bannerji 2005, 145). To abstract class, race and gender as distinct ontological categories is to do

what EP Thompson argued sociologists have done to class, namely, to abstract these phenomena from the lived experience of social relations, rendering them ahistorical concepts that actually serve to obscure social relations. Bannerji argues that this is also at work in intersectional frameworks. Intersectional approaches are grounded in seeing race, gender and class as distinct ahistorical categories rather than as embedded in the historical development of social relations, and therefore they do not accurately capture lived experience. Lived experience is embodied, and as such the effects of racism, patriarchy, capitalist production and imperialism operate all together and at once in everyday experiences within social relations (Bannerji 2005, 144).

A socialized conception of class, one that considers embodied social relations, beyond providing a more accurate view of the complicated and contradictory nature of class relations, also operates against economistic readings of class that separates exploitation from oppression (Bannerji 2005, 148). A socialized conception of class contests desocialized, disembodied and dehistoricized conceptions of class, race and gender that remove experiences of race from those of class and gender and experiences of gender from those of class and race and from the specific histories like colonialism and imperialism that shaped those experiences (Bannerji 2005, 155).

How this Premise Has Influenced My Research Design and Analysis

Having an embodied, socialized conception of class allows for an analysis that attends to the complicated picture of social relations that have given rise to certain models and practices of labour internationalism. An analysis of the nature of class formation that attends to the social nature of class relations is key to making sense of the why working class organizations, in this case unions in Canada, took the direction they did with respect to internationalism. This is an integral piece for understanding the social relations that shape the strategies and analyses of workers locally and how this informs different conceptualizations of the international terrain. The experiences of workers are

not singular. These differences in experiences of class as embedded in social relations helps to make sense of the competing visions and interests of groups of workers and their unions internationally. By examining the specific context of social relations that led to specific models of union action and of conceptions of international solidarity, we are able to trace empire and make sense of the contradictions embedded in the practices that arose. This includes how the social nature of class formation shapes ideas of skill, ability, and entitlements and which bodies are considered threats and which bodies are considered allies.

A socialized conception of class also allows for an understanding of the social dimension of imperialism. Rather than thinking of imperialism as solely economic or political, a socialized conception of class includes consideration of the social dimensions and effects of imperialist processes and how implicit and explicit support for these processes is rooted in existing social relations. This is critical to thinking through the nature of struggle and resistance against imperialism. By attending to the social aspects of imperialism and its justifications, a socialized conception of class provides a more complete picture of how imperialism functions and how it is embedded in the everyday common-sense thinking of many trade unionists in the North.

Specifically, for my project, having a socialized conception of class relations means understanding the social nature of relations between actors internationally – not only North-South relations but also North-North – and within unions and federations. I explore relations between Canadian and international union actors in the context of class formation and relations in Canada and consider the relevance of these relations on the way internationalism was envisioned and practiced. This entails asking with whom relations were forged and why, the extent to which these relations challenged capitalism, imperialism, colonialism and the legacies of these in state policies, the operation of the border, and systemic racism and other forms of oppression that have been central to class formation and relations in Canada. It also means accounting for important

differences between organizations and actors in terms of place, resources, and conditions and their relationship to capital.

In the case of both the examination of inter-organizational relations and relations internal to specific organizations that gave rise to different decisions and practices of internationalism, a focus on social relations is key. Like abstracted, dehistoricized and disembodied conceptions of class, race and gender, organizations cannot be understood in abstraction outside of the specific social relations that constitute the actions of these organizations. As Hyman notes, "organizations do not take decisions or perform actions, people do" (Hyman 1975, 66) – and therefore data analysis demands consideration of underlying social relations to understand specific organizational practices, structures and decisions.

An examination of the underlying social relations within organizations provides a lens to the dynamics and factors at play in the decision-making of trade unions and helps aid in the consideration of "the possibilities that exist within these sets of relations" (Hyman 1975, 67). This also needs to be historically situated in the specific context of class formation:

> We cannot expect to find its [i.e., labour's] history only by looking into offices and convention halls. Certainly we have to look closely at labour's main goals, ideologies, leadership and strategies over the years. But we must consider how these activities and ideas were shaped by specifically Canadian factors, especially the economy, the class structure and the state. (Heron 1989, x)

And this involves attention to the differences in experiences of class shaped by racist and patriarchal state and employer practices as well as to racist and sexist assumptions and relations within workplaces and unions. To this end, I begin my study with an overview of the contours of class formation in Canada and the relevant contradictions within this context that have shaped practices of labour internationalism.

Unpacking Social Relations: Exploring Forms of Consciousness

The second premise I draw from anti-racist Marxist feminist theory is the necessity of thinking through the interrelation between social relations and forms of consciousness. Social relations are shaped by and in turn shape different forms of consciousness. For Bannerji, the social entails "the complex socioeconomic and cultural formation, brought to life through myriad finite and specific social and historical relations, organizations, and institutions" (Bannerji 2005, 146). These social relations are "mediated and articulated with their expressive and embedded forms of consciousness" (Bannerji 2005, 147). Bannerji argues that these forms of consciousness develop historically and can become hegemonic, that is, they become "legitimate and unquestioned truths, not because they are rational but because they derive from historical forms of practice that give them the appearance of being common sense" (Bannerji 1995, 44).

For instance, what Bannerji calls common-sense racism, which reflects and retains the "norms and forms thrown up by a few hundred years of pillage, extermination, slavery, colonization and neo-colonization" (Bannerji 1995, 45), expresses social relations rooted in racial hierarchies in workplaces regulated through racist state practices that function to support imperialism and colonialism and which retain their legacies. Common-sense racism exists in everyday practices, functioning to normalize these practices, and making hierarchical social relations appear natural and even inevitable. As Bannerji argues, these ideas and forms of consciousness express particular aspects of existing social relations, shape social relations, and can operate as a way to explain or justify those relations. As such, thinking through forms of consciousness is key to making sense of social relations and to the possibilities of changing them. Hence, whether these forms of consciousness are understood as ideology or as hegemonic or common-sense ways of thinking, analysing particular forms of consciousness and how they come to be dominant is a critical component of many strands of left scholarship.

Before I go into how I analyse forms of consciousness in my study, I then briefly outline a few of the Marxist approaches to understanding forms of consciousness. As Marx discusses in *The German Ideology*, forms of consciousness are connected to the historical processes that gave rise to particular ways of organizing society socially, politically, and economically. In his emphasis on the need to examine the unfolding of historical social relations rooted in particular economic and political formations we see the rationale for the historical-materialist method. Ideas in this framework are material, they are rooted in material conditions of life. In particular, these ideas derive from economic and political processes and social relations and serve to make sense of them. And so ideas serve a function in supporting dominant social, political and economic relations. This means that the dominant ideas reflect the dominant interests in society. This is what Marx called ideology.

There is much debate over what Marx meant by ideology, and Marxists have taken up this concept in various ways. Some argue that as reflective of dominant interests, ideology is a set of ideas or worldviews that serves to distort the reality of social, political and economic relations (Harvey 1990, 24). In this sense, ideology, as interpreted by theorists like Georg Lukács and Karl Manneheim, is a kind of false consciousness in that it works to mislead the working class into accepting ideas that directly conflict with their interests (see Little 2015). Others argue that this conception is limited and that we need to see ideology function, as Bannerji argues, as rooted in material processes that produce specific social relations (Harvey 1990, 24; Bannerji 2005, 146-47). Ideology is reflective of these social relations. Dorothy Smith argues that ideology exists as a "practice in thinking about society" (Smith 1990, 35; Sharma 2001, 420). Nandita Sharma notes that for Smith, it is through these ideological practices that categories and ideas arise that "leave the relations of ruling in which people's experiences are embedded out of view" (Sharma 2001, 420).

Smith's conception, rather than claiming the falsity of dominant forms of consciousness, emphasizes how ideology operates in everyday life and social relations to obscure power and normalize social relations rooted in exploitation and oppression. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva argues that ideology, as conceptualized by Smith as a practice, operates "in such a way that people not only gain a certain kind of consciousness about their co-ordinated activities, but also, often, the very fact of co-ordinating this knowledge is suppressed" (Bonilla-Silva 2000, 192). This conceptualization situates ideology produced in everyday social relations rather than as conceptions that formulate ideology as filtering down to people through institutions. As a practice rooted in social relations, everyday activities create and reinforce ways of thinking that maintain existing social, political and economic relations. This is opposed for instance to a conception like that of Louis Althusser for whom ideology shapes "actions and practices through an array of apparatuses such as the family, church, trade unions, systems of communication of the relations of a class-based society" (Grele 1975, 47). For Smith, ideological practices cannot be abstracted to institutions; they exist and are visible in the ideas produced by actual people whose activities and relations constitute these institutions in the context of specific material conditions.

Another important interpretation of ideology is that of Antonio Gramsci. For Gramsci, the task of understanding how ideology operates was critical for the possibility of organizing against exploitative and oppressive social relations.[2] Gramsci saw ideology as a practice, particularly as the mechanism through which the ruling class won consent to their rule. Building on Marx's conception, Gramsci introduces the idea of hegemony, which relies on the "spontaneous loyalty that any dominant social group obtains from the masses by virtue of its intellectual prestige and its supposedly superior function in the world of production" (Gramsci quoted Grele 1975, 47). For Gramsci, while the rule of the bourgeoisie is always backed by coercion through their control over

---

[2] For Gramsci, "communist militants must be prepared to wage an unrelenting ideological struggle against the bourgeois ideology which controlled the workers', and their leaders', minds and hearts" (Annunziato 1988, 162).

the organized means of violence exerted by the practices of various state and private institutions, their rule also demands forms of consciousness that consent to it (Gramsci 1971, 263). Luis Pozo offers an example of the way this operates in myths of community underlying nationalism. He argues that nationalisms become hegemonic by "de-classing social consciousness, emphasizing the 'organic' unity of the dominant and dominated" (Pozo 2007, 56). Hegemonic ideas are a critical part of how capitalism and its exploitative and oppressive social relations are maintained.

The most useful conceptualizations for me are those of Gramsci and Smith. Both of their conceptions posit these forms of consciousness as material, rooted in the social world and in social relations and as functioning to normalize or make sense of certain practices as components of the maintenance of the rule of the bourgeoisie. These conceptions, in the way that they situate ideas as emerging through the process of ongoing social relations, counter economistic readings of ideology that abstracts ideas from their actual production. Delinking ideology from the way ideas are produced by living beings, economistic readings of ideology posit these ideas as direct expressions of institutions and economic processes. This understanding of ideology cuts out human agency and the contradictions and contestations embedded in the production of ideologies, which are produced through human interaction and people's attempts to make sense of the world. In centring their analysis on the production of ideology in the social world, both Gramsci and Smith's conceptions fit most closely with a socialized conception of class as posited by anti-racist Marxist feminist theorists, demanding attention to the social nature of ideas, which are material phenomena and embedded in an economic system.

Examining Forms of Consciousness

Examining forms of consciousness is complementary to the task arising from the initial premise I outlined, that of examining social relations. Unpacking ideological practices and

hegemonic ideas is an integral component of understanding the social and social relations and how they operate in constituting the actions of organizations, in this case Canadian unions. Attention to production of ideas helps to make sense of the way certain ideas, analyses and practices of labour internationalism have become dominant and unquestioned.

Part of this work is connecting dominant ideas and practices to historically specific social, economic and political conditions. For instance, how did the various actors involved in shaping Canadian labour internationalism see the role of unions in society, how did they understand their relationship to capital and the state, to workers internationally, and how did they envision worker justice and equality? This is rooted in their analysis of capitalism and their understanding of history. Understanding how unions were thinking about and attempting to respond to the economic and political conditions of their day tells us a great deal about why they were orientated to the international in the ways they were. For instance, as many scholars in this area have argued, if we look at business union practice at the local level, a practice that sought a conciliatory relationship with the state and capital, then their alliances with the interests of national or regional capital blocs and the state internationally is a logical extension.

Connecting the practices of internationalism to ideological practices and hegemonic ideas provides a way to go deeper into the underlying tensions and contradictions present in specific events and practices. Without an analysis of dominant forms of consciousness, the explanation of the dark sides of solidarity can be simply ascribed to the role of certain leaders, their interests or corruption. This misses more fundamental factors at play, namely, the way dominant forms of consciousness operate to bolster, make sense of, and give consent to practices of labour internationalism that work to undermine workers. This means, for instance, "uncovering the way in which the construction of Canada as a national space, with an attendant national identity, has been tied to a transnational discourse of whiteness" and how this operates in shaping the practices of

labour internationalism (Dua, Razack, and Warner 2005, 4). It is in the different sets of ideas that shaped these practices that we see some of what we need to confront to build a fighting union more generally, that is, ideas, as Johns (1998) argues, that are rooted in place and that posit the interests of workers in the North as aligned with capitalism, and the social, economic and political legacies of imperialism and colonialism. This examination is also essential to understanding the social and political terrain within the labour movement and the possibilities and obstacles created by these forms of consciousness to class struggle. The ideological practices and hegemonic ideas are expressive of the contradictions of unions, particularly the way they are tied to capitalism and the conflicts within them. This means that unions are shaped by different tensions – for example, trying to get a higher price for the labour for certain workers by means of supporting the use of the border to deny entry to workers, as seen in the anti-immigrant campaigns of the early part 20th century and the general silence on the question of immigration in the later part.

I unpack the ideological practices and hegemonic ideas shaping practices of labour internationalism in Canada by examining the nature of the dominant practices, political affiliations, and statements coming from unions and leaders, but also the ways these were contested by other forces inside and outside the labour movement. Another aspect of this analysis is thinking through omissions. Bannerji argues, for instance, that we often see racism in its omission. So part of the analysis is about grappling with the broader context and working out not only how certain issues are framed and tackled, but also how and why particular issues get erased or do not even get posed (Bannerji 1995, 47).

Thinking This Through Dialectically

Mapping the ideological practices and hegemonic ideas that shaped dominant practices of labour internationalism in Canada is a key part of identifying openings for developing counter-

narratives and practices. According to most Marxists, these counter-narratives and counter-tendencies to the dominant practices, social relations and forms of consciousness always exist alongside the dominant forms.

For example, for Gramsci, hegemony is never total. Rather, he sees hegemonic ways of thinking as always contested. Gramsci argues that one way to contest hegemony is through wars of position, the battle between forces entrenching hegemonic ideas and forces at work to counter these, which he calls counter-hegemonic practices. For Gramsci, this battle, which takes place within civil society, is an essential aspect of the overall revolutionary strategy (Gramsci 1971, 233). The war of position, rather than attempting to take direct power of the state, which he calls the war of manoeuvre, aims to challenge the consent to ruling class ideas. For Gramsci, the war of manoeuvre is the ultimate goal but must be preceded by a war of position. For Gramsci, then, the battle within civil society to unmake hegemony is a key task and battle for organizers.

The way Gramsci frames the process of making and undoing hegemony draws from the broader Marxist orientation to historical development, that is, dialectical process. Marx, drawing from G.W.F. Hegel, understood history as unfolding through battles of forces, over resources, their production and distribution, political power and the ideological terrain sustaining the dominant forces. Unlike Hegel, for Marx this is a material process connected to economic conditions and social and political forces in certain contexts. For Marx, understanding social phenomena outside of the context of the contradictory relations between capital and labour distorts these phenomena by abstracting and fetishizing them, making them into things (Gordon 2007, 15). In order to avoid this abstraction, a dialectical approach to understanding social phenomena starts with the totality of forces, their interconnection and contradictions (Gordon 2007, 7-8).

Richard Hyman outlines a process for thinking through social phenomena dialectically. Starting with totality, that is, the need to look at phenomena as interconnected, Hyman argues that

this totality must be understood in the dynamics of historical unfolding and the contradictions and tensions at play in that history and, lastly, that social phenomena must be understood as the products of human subjects who find themselves historical, economic, social and political contexts (Hyman 1975, 4-5). This dialectical method is aimed at outlining the terrain and possibilities of struggle.

For me, the dialectical method provides an approach to the data I consider that ties together the first two premises I have outlined. Specifically, I trace the dialectical relationship between forces at work in the history I explore; this includes considering the ideological terrain, economic forces, political currents and strategies of individuals and organizations as well and resistance to the dominant forces that shaped the periods I examine as a totality that is constantly changing, contested and contradictory. Bannerji argues that history "is as much about ruptures as continuities, and about contradictions as homogeneities" (Bannerji 1995, 29). Drawing out these contestations, ruptures and contradictions is a critical piece to giving an accurate picture of the unfolding of international labour practices. These tensions must also be situated in an overall analysis of material conditions and the terrain of class struggle. One way that I situate this dialectical movement in the terrain of class struggle is through tracing the wars of position that have shaped the making of labour internationalism in Canada. I situate these wars of position inside the labour movement within the context of class formation in Canada and the historical, political and economic conditions in which these battles were waged. I think through how the different forces inside labour that engaged with international questions and worked to build international relations with workers and unions saw the strategy of labour vis-à-vis capital, the state, and the broader working class both nationally and internationally. Specifically, to what degree were their efforts transformative, accommodationist or imperialist?

Following from this, I begin my project by situating the context of class formation in Canada and exploring aspects of social relations and their connection to material and political conditions and the contradictions embedded in this history. I then trace the contests within the labour movement over labour internationalism and how these reflect broader wars of position taking place in these times. This means outlining the process and contradictions in the dominant forces within Canadian unions in these periods, the ideas they were promoting and practices they were engaged in. It also means exploring what Hyman calls counter-tendencies, which formed part of the counter-hegemonic forces at play in these wars of position. For Hyman these counter-tendencies are part of the impetus that gave rise to unionization and continue to exist within unions as forces that challenge "specific processes of integration, oligarchy and incorporation" (Hyman 1975, 25). And so, I tracing these counter-tendencies in the wars of position that led to certain practices of labour internationalism in different periods. I explore the interplay between the forces that became dominant (i.e., won consent and/or were able to steer the international policies and practices of particular labour organizations) and the counter-hegemonic forces contesting these practices and policies, as well as the contradictions within each set of forces.

Historical Sociology: A Complementary Methodology

This shaping of action by structure and transforming of structure by action both occur as processes in time. It is by seizing on that idea that history and sociology merge and that sociology becomes capable of answering our urgent questions about why the world is as it is; about why particular men and women make the particular choices they do and why they succeed or fail in their projects.
–Philip Abrams (1982, 3)

The central premises I draw from anti-racist Marxist feminist theory – namely, a socialized conception of class, an engagement with the way social relations are expressive of and shaped by forms of consciousness and how these unfold dialectically in history – all led me to historical sociology as a methodology. Historical sociology provides a means to capture the totality and

interconnection of social phenomena by situating them historically and theoretically. Historical sociology examines social history; but unlike social history, historical sociology does so with an engagement of theory (Bonnell 1980, 159-60). As Philip Abrams argues, sociologists often fail to consider time, while historians often fail to think through the organizing ideas that structure the interpretation of data (Abrams 1982, xvi). By drawing from theory to understand the dynamics underlining social relations, historical sociology provides a way to unpack the dialectical interconnections and contradictions within various social forces.

In terms of my study, this approach allows for the collection and interpretation of data in a way that attends to the social nature of class formation and relations and its implications for competing forms of consciousness in a way that traces these processes dialectically in historical context. This is a materialist approach, one that looks at the interconnection between the economic and political conditions of capitalist development, including Northern post-war compromises between labour and capital, new practices of imperialism, the rise of neoliberalism and the nature and dynamics of class formation and relations. These conditions, changing forces and relations are significant to grappling how the international terrain was understood, fought over and engaged with. This approach is also complementary to my overall political goal of charting both empire and transformative possibilities in these practices as a means of better understanding and learning from this history to build transformative solidarity today.

What does historical sociology entail? Abrams, drawing from E.P. Thompson, argues that historical analysis demands "a mutual interrogation of concept and evidence (Thompson quoted in Abrams 1982, 12). As such, outlining the dialectical forces of history requires both empirical evidence and theory. In the case of my study, the empirical data comes from semi-structured interviews with union activists, leaders and staff, archival research, and various secondary sources. And as a research strategy that is engaged with theory throughout, this method "also entails the

selection of concepts" (Bonnell 1980, 161) and engagement with these concepts to design the research strategy. These core concepts and themes that led to the research design are constantly contested, evaluated, rethought and expanded through the research process. As Lee Harvey notes, these concepts begin as rough approximations (Harvey 1990, 14) that are deconstructed and reconstructed throughout the investigation and writing (Harvey 1990, 29-30). This data then comes together as an analysis through what is referred to as successive approximation, which begins with questions and a framework of concepts through a "process of organizing and re-organizing that moves toward a comprehensive analysis with generalizations" (Neuman and Robson 2011, 326). This involves coding and recoding the empirical data alongside and while simultaneously evaluating and reworking relevant concepts and secondary historical data that provides context. It is a movement between data and theory.

Data Collection: Issues and Techniques

The goals of my research and the theoretical premises that influenced my research design are evident in my data collection process, my techniques and analysis. For instance, the interview questions I devised reflect the activist orientation of the project and my interest in organizing strategies and obstacles, as well as attention to the social nature of class relations (see list of interview questions in Appendix A). In this section, I outline my data collection process and the epistemological issues arising from the process of conducting and interpreting the data.

To get a sense of the different forces at work in the making of labour internationalism in Canada, I did both archival research and interviews. The archival data I explored provided a picture of the official policies developed, alliances made, and the rationale for these arising from leaders and staff of the Canadian Labour Congress and major affiliates engaged in this work. To establish some of the context of this work, I began with the archives of the ICFTU held in Amsterdam at the

International Institute of Social History (IISH). These archival documents helped to provide part of the political context within which the CCL and then the CLC developed their international policies and practices. In the end, to narrow my project, I chose to draw more from existing secondary sources on the ICFTU than the documents I gathered at the IISH.

My primary archival sources came from three separate archives: the CLC and Kalmen Kaplansky Fonds at Libraries and Archives Canada (LAC); the in-house Canadian Labour Congress archives; and the Histadrut files at the Canadian Jewish Charities Committee National Archives (CJCCN). I selected these archives to get the background and broad orientation of the dominant practices of labour internationalism in Canada in the late 20th century. Of the three, I drew most heavily from the CLC Fond at LAC. In this fond, I looked primarily at volumes and files related to the international department or figures related to the international department such as Charles Millard, who was a leading figure in the early Cold War CCL international affairs committee, and Kalmen Kaplansky, who was the second director of the CCL's international affairs department. While at the archives for a third visit, I discovered that there was a separate Kalmen Kaplansky fond, and so I looked through the fond files related to his time as director of the international department. After the CLC fond at LAC, the fond I drew most from was the in-house Canadian Labour Congress. I chose to visit this archive to find documents on international activities from the 1980s until the present. I looked at materials related to the international department, international department staff, and files related to CIDA. I did not look closely at the immense volumes on CIDA project reporting and focused more on meeting minutes and letters. I explored how the department staff and the leadership understood their role, their goals, how they operated as aid managers and how they related to CIDA rather than choosing to randomly pull out and discuss one or two of the hundreds of development projects that have been managed since the 1970s. Lastly, I visited the CJCCN to look at files related to the Histadrut. As a Palestine solidarity activist in the labour

movement, I already had a sense of how significant labour links to Israel were, and so I hoped to get

a more complete picture of how this developed by looking at the main (Canadian) Histadrut

holdings at CJCCN. While there was some duplication of materials between the CLC and Kaplansky

Fonds at LAC and the Histadrut materials at CJCCN, this archive provided some insights in terms

of the organizational dimensions of the Canadian labour links to Histadrut. However, I ended up

using less from this archive in the dissertation than I had originally expected. Instead, I discuss the

findings from this archive more closely in a more focused comparative discussion of Canadian

labour activism against South African and Israeli apartheid published in 2014 (see Nastovski 2014).

In this dissertation, I provide a general discussion of the broad contours, tensions and

contradictions through the Cold War, emphasizing competing models and significant cases. The

archives I drew from served to provide data to analyse the overall direction, decision-making and

rationales behind the general direction of the international work institutionally.[3] These archives also

provided a sense of the level and nature of consent and opposition to various practices and policies.

However, there is a great deal more to grapple with more closely. Sources for more focused studies

include the vast CIDA project files, the CLC's publication *Canadian Labour* and the publications of

the CCL and TLC, archives of certain affiliates and federations, as well as those of important

organizations like the LAWG.

To get a sense of the counter-tendencies to the official policies and practices, I mainly relied

on interviews, secondary material, and personally held primary documents that were generously

offered to me in this process. I interviewed close to seventy union activists from across Canada and

Québec. While I exclude the Québec labour movement from my study because of the different

---

[3] An exception to this is the CJCCN archives which I visited to make sense of one of the major campaigns of the early
Cold War, which was solidarity with the Israeli Histadrut.

union organizations and political climate,[4] I did conduct some interviews in Québec to get a sense of some of the ways the context of Québec influenced solidarity work in Anglo unions. For instance, some key activists of the new left who went on to do solidarity work inside Canadian unions were politicized in the context of the great upheavals in Québec in the late 1960s and 1970s.

The vast majority of the people I interviewed were union activists, some playing various roles throughout their lives as rank-and-file activists, in leadership positions and/or for a time as staff. The unions they came from were a relatively even mix between public and private sector, with a slightly higher number from the public sector. This reflects my own location and experience as a union activist in the public sector. The activists I interviewed were mostly active in periods ranging from the late 1960s to the present, and more were from national unions than international unions. I later changed my project to focus on the Cold War period. This meant that I had to rely exclusively on archival materials and secondary sources for the early Cold War period from the late 1940s to the late 1960s. As a result, the interviews I draw from in this project total forty-three. This means that my chapter on the early Cold War is uneven in terms of outlining the counter-currents to the dominant practices that existed within the membership. Due to the unevenness of the data for this period, I mainly draw from secondary material to outline the tensions and contestations over this work, for instance, on the context of the rivalry between the WFTU (Windmuller 1954a, 1954b; Carew 1984, 1996b, 2000b; Foster 1956; Weiler 1981; Kofas 2002) and grassroots campaigns in solidarity with the Cuban revolution (Wright 2009). Principally, I used these interviews to provide a sense of the major features of the late Cold War contestations of the internationalism of the CLC.

---

[4] While many trade unionists in Québec were involved in this history as members of TLC-, CCL- and then CLC-affiliated unions, the overall union climate on internationalism evolved differently in Québec as a whole. There are a whole host of factors contributing to these differences including the role of the CSN (affiliated to the WCL rather than ICFTU) and the Centrale des syndicats du Québec (CSQ) (no international affiliation) and the social dimensions of class formation and Québécois identity (for more see Gagnon, Collombat and Avignon 2006).

And so, there is still a lot that can and should be gleaned from these interviews. I will return to these interviews for closer analysis at a later time.

I found the activists I interviewed primarily through my contacts within the labour movement. This project emerged from my own work as a trade union activist engaged in international solidarity work, which offered me an extensive network of contacts who were happy to suggest activists to interview and provide me with contact information. And so the arranging of interviews unfolded through a snowball sampling that was so effective that when I stopped doing interviews, I was left with a list of more than a hundred additional activists I could potentially interview. It also meant that I did far more interviews than I had initially intended. This speaks to the extensiveness of grassroots labour internationalism. Interviewing these activists was the most rewarding part of my research process. These are people who have spent much of their lives fighting for social justice and for whom I have tremendous admiration and respect. And the list of activists I have of those I could not interview is a hopeful indication of the capacity for international labour solidarity that can be built.

I also found some interviewees through a mass mailing I did to national unions, Canadian sections of international unions, labour councils, provincial labour federations and some select local unions that have a history and reputation for activity on international issues (see Appendix B). I had compiled this list prior to beginning this research project as part of the international solidarity work I was engaged in. This mailing request did not lead to very many interviews; however, it may have if I had conducted follow up phone calls. I chose not to follow up because I had found so many interviewees through my own contacts and those they shared with me.

Reflexivity

> No matter what the construction of the narrative, the product we create is a conversational narrative and can only be understood by understanding the various relationships contained within this structure.
> –Ronald Grele (1975, 44)

My own location and experience as a union activist who had been engaged for years in international labour solidarity work is a significant factor that influenced my research design, assumptions and the way interviews were designed and conducted. One way that this influenced my data collection was through the way my first-hand knowledge of the players, organizational dynamics and issues led to an easy conversational style of interview. This was a huge advantage for me as an interviewer in most cases because it allowed me to easily follow up with questions to take the discussion deeper than the initial interview questions; it allowed me to build rapport with many of the interviewees; and it meant that they often viewed me as an insider. While my approach was not as a participant observer, as an activist academic whose project emerged from being involved in labour solidarity work my collection process shares some of the characteristics of this approach.

This insider status arose through the fact that I already knew and worked with the interviewees, was introduced to them through a fellow activist, or through how I introduced myself and described my project. Being an insider meant that many of the interviews were based on a certain level of trust that made for a comfortable rapport and led in some cases to interviewees being more forthcoming with their experiences and reflections. This also worked in the reverse in some cases where people had clearly looked me up and knew who I was, or had read my work and were quite careful with what they shared – and sometimes gave responses that were very clearly tailored for me.

My position as an activist also meant that some interviews were a mixture of interview and discussions about how to build up the solidarity work today, specific conversations about ongoing campaigns, or about the state of unions more generally. This positionality also meant that my

assessment of the interviews draws from first-hand knowledge of the intricacies of the internal

dynamics and contradictions of this work in the union. However, as has been noted by researchers

who employ participant-observation strategies, this can also be a hindrance to the analysis of the

data because of the way the researchers' experiences shape assumptions and motivations.

For me, the issues of my own positionality (that is, to what extent my positionality shaped

what I heard, or what was emphasized or left out by an interviewee) are things to consider in my

analysis of the data rather than to avoid outright by feigned objectivity. My project is rooted in a

commitment to building international labour solidarity, and I see my role as building from existing

activist scholarship such as that of the Saskatoon Solidarity Committee to deepen our understanding

of some of the challenges and their roots as well as to bring together the reflections of activists in a

way that is useful for organizing today. Drawing from feminist and other activist methodological

traditions, I explicitly identified my interests, experience and the aims of project to my interviewees

and disclose it here as a conscious choice and orientation shaping my research design and analysis.

As Dorothy Smith argues, feminist sociologists must refuse to put aside their experiences, which are

the essential starting point for inquiry (De Vault 1999, 39).

Verification

One of the issues arising from the use of interviews as a part of a historical project is the

problem of reliability and possibilities for verification. For one, there are issues of memory and

accuracy when we are using oral history to elucidate specific historical events. Grele argues that oral

history is often dismissed as not having adequate standards for judgement and is even sometimes

seen as merely hearsay (Grele 1975, 40-1). In my work, the use of interviews to provide a picture of

historical events is verified using material evidence, secondary sources and other forms of

verification. The interviews are also about thinking through people's reflections on the impetus for

the work, their rationale, goals and source of their commitments as well as the lessons they drew from their organizing. Some of the complementary material evidence includes those from the CLC archives, convention reports, newspapers, personal documents of activists and academic and activist texts on specific campaigns. In terms of the role of my positionality as activist and interviewer, I took this into consideration in my assessment of the interviews. And while this explicit identification of my positionality may have led to certain emphases or de-emphases in the process of the interviews, I feel that this limitation was unavoidable. While limiting in one sense, it was also a benefit to the interview process as well.

One issue major issue arose during my research process that significantly restricted with the pool of documentary evidence that I expected to draw from to verify oral accounts. This was the dumpstering of archival materials at CLC headquarters. Based on accounts from staff and former staff at the CLC, materials in the archives were thrown away when the CLC moved offices a few years before I started my project. What specific documents were thrown away I am not sure; but it is a very big loss for current and future researchers in the labour movement and outside of it.

Representativeness

Lastly, I worked to develop a pool of interviewees that were from different parts of the country, active in different periods, in different positions in the union (rank and file, leaders and staff), and different unions (national and international, public and private sector). However, none of my interviewees were from craft unions, and very few were from internationals that were passively engaged in international issues or who relegated this work to the CLC or the AFL-CIO, such as the SEIU or UFCW. Also, the fact that my contacts came largely through sets of activist networks meant that I was limited by the information they had available. For instance, it meant that I missed

out on interviewing groups of Chilean activists in Alberta because my contacts did not have up-to-date information on where the key activists had moved; some had returned to Chile.

Finally, the way I designed the project and found interviewees meant that I could not attend to the perceptions of rank-and-file members regarding this work. The people I interviewed were the activists mobilizing in their unions. They could offer their own reflections on the actions and perceptions of rank-and-file members to their work and to the positions and policies of the official union departments. However, these reflections are limited and partial. I see this as a big gap in the work on labour internationalism. Without a closer study of the way that members understand and seek to respond to the international, we cannot fully assess the level of consent to the dominant practices and orientation and how to respond to these in strategizing how to build solidarity today. I see my contribution as elucidating the dominant practices, how the central players shaping these sought consent, and how this was tied to broader hegemonic ideas in these eras.

Chapter 3

Setting the Stage:
Contextualizing the Wars of Position in Post-WWII Labour Internationalism in Canada

In the 1940s, internationalism became an important area of concern and activity in the Canadian labour movement. As a result, the practice of labour internationalism became more formally institutionalized in the CCL and then the CLC, which set up an international department before any other department (LAC CLC Fond). The Second World War was a key factor in the increased attention to the international. However, to fully understand why internationalism became such a prominent concern in this era and why it was taken up in the way that it was – that is, why particular goals came to guide this practice – it is essential to explore the social and political context prior to the war.

The broad aim of this chapter is to sketch a few essential aspects of class formation and relations in Canada and to provide insight into the forms of consciousness that became the basis for the contests over labour internationalism during the Cold War. In this chapter, I consider some of the tensions and contradictions within the social nature of class formation in the interwar years and how these played out in the intellectual and political climate within the organized labour movement in Canada. I consider the social nature of class formation, introducing the ways that "race," nation, gender, class, skill and status mediated visions and practices of resistance and solidarity.[1] I identify key features of the structure of the labour market. These include the way settler-colonialism, patriarchy, and racism[2] as well as the regional differences shaped the labour market, conditions of

---

[1] I see these different dimensions of the social nature of class formation as material practices embedded in the practices of the state, employers and intra-class relations and also as ideological. These are important to the shape of working-class life and are historically and geographically variable.

[2] It is important to think about the development of notions of skill in relation to race, nation and gender. See Das Gupta 1996; Ng 1993a, 1993b; Calliste 1993; Abu-Laban 1998; Schmidt Camacho 1999; Man 2004; Baines 2001; Mojab 1999.

work and social relations within the working class. I argue that these factors offer insights into the overall social context and the nature of worker responses, including how and with whom they organized. Drawing from the work of Jack Scott, Kim Scipes, Dana Frank, Alicia Schmidt Camacho, and others, I contend that the way workers choose to organize and resist processes of exploitation and oppression locally has a direct bearing on the kind of international practices that develop. These choices are shaped by the specific material conditions and political terrain they find themselves in. When radical options are eliminated or marginalized, then workers tend towards accommodationist solutions.

Following from this premise, I spend the remainder of the chapter discussing some key immediate pre-World War II tensions and battles over resistance and organizing, including some of the relevant tensions between different ideas of justice, emancipation and equality. I do this to draw out the ways that different forces inside the labour movement defined their struggle, who they considered their allies to be, and what kinds of strategies they developed to resist and fight for worker justice. I start by outlining the diverse models of union organization and action that emerged in this period. The various models that arose reflect the unfolding ideological and political contests of this period. I argue that the competing models of unionism, as well as the ideological tensions underlying them, help to make sense of the wars of position over labour internationalism that developed in the post-WWII period.

I introduce the key themes and points of contention within the dominant political forces inside labour organizations in this period. Loosely, these fall into models and forces rooted in various revolutionary socialist ideas and those that were based on liberalism. Specifically, I focus on the differences in the way these forces understood the problems of worker emancipation, justice, and equality, including how this shaped their understanding of the function and purpose of unions. And I end the chapter by drawing out how these contests over models of resistance and their

concomitant notions of justice, emancipation, and equality were reflected in the international labour bodies of this time, the RILU, IFTU, and the ILO.

Thinking Through the Social Nature of Class Formation in Canada

In this section, I introduce aspects of class formation that influenced the way institutionalized labour internationalism developed in Canada. I ask: What are important features of class formation in Canada? What are some key factors that influenced the way the labour market developed and was structured? My emphasis here is on the social implications of central aspects of the economic and political context to provide a backdrop to how solidarities and competitions were formed in light of social processes shaped by racism, location, employer and state strategies. The analysis of class formation must start with the specifics of the colonial project here in Canada, the demands of capital and what this meant for the nature of capitalist development and nation-building. These processes cannot be thought through independently; the economy developed within the context of specific state policies and practices that created the landscape for capitalist development, for instance, its importation of a workforce.

Settler-Colonialism

When delinked from its history as a white settler colony and its present as an imperialist capitalist state which continues to import labour on the basis of ethnicity, race and class – creating "class" in its own terrain – the Canadian economy becomes an abstraction.
–Himani Bannerji (1995, 77)

Canada was established as a white-settler colony. The particularities of the colonial project that led to the creation of the Canadian state was and remains central to class formation.[3] As a white

---

[3] While for the most part I use the past tense to refer to these overarching processes because my purpose here is to provide some of the context, these aspects of the labour market organization are relevant today.

settler colony of the British Empire, the Canadian nation-state and its economy exists through colonization. The specific processes of colonization developed out of a mixture of the interests of the French and then British empires. The interests and demands shaping the colonization process are linked changing strategies for accumulation. For instance, the mercantilist strategy of the French and then British Empire was possible because of the wealth accumulated through other colonial endeavours and on the backs of non-white bodies, as workers, slaves and through forms of indenture. The impact of international forces, therefore, is not something new. Canada and its economic landscape has from the beginning been a product of the international forces that created it, namely, colonialism and imperialism. The making of the settler economy involved various forms of resource extraction. This included, significantly, the fur trade, forestry, fishery and related industries and infrastructure that arose alongside these activities, and agriculture (Innis 1933, 1999; Naylor 2014; Easterbrook and Watkins 1984; Coultard 2014; Abele and Stanislaus 1989).

A key feature of this project consisted of violent practices of exclusion and domination of the indigenous population, including those with genocidal threats or more explicit genocidal objectives (Abu-Laban and Bakan 2008, 651-52). The processes of colonization also meant the marginalization of the indigenous population from the labour market in most areas of the colony, particularly as industrialization developed (which varied regionally). Canada, then, unlike other British colonies such as like India, was not heavily reliant on indigenous labour. The labour power necessary to fuel capitalist production and extraction of resources was procured through a settlement plan that was based on racial preference for northern European migrants. This aspect of the nation-building project in Canada is why Canada has been characterized as a white-settler colony, following from the way northern Europeans were constructed as "white." As David Goutor notes, feminist and anti-racist historians have shown "that making Canada white [is] almost universally

viewed as a key part of Canada's nation-building project" (Goutor 2005, 61; see also Epp, Iacovetta and Swyripa 2004; Pierson, Chaudhuri and Burr 1998).

While preferential status for settlement was given to people from northern Europe, mostly without specific work or residential restrictions, this did not fulfil the needs of the state and employers for labour. This need was met by extracting the labour power of non-northern European people whose access to settlement was restricted in a variety of ways. This extraction involved the use of slaves and indentured labourers, the recruitment of predominately male workers from other parts of Europe and Asia who could work only as sojourners (Heron 1989, 33) without the ability to settle and those whose bodies were deemed necessary for expansion of the colony through settlement, like Ukrainian migrants (Lehr 1977). The role of the British and then the Canadian state, through the organized means of violence (the military, police) as well as the institution and perpetuation of the use of slave labour and the establishment of racist immigration policies, have played a critical role in shaping and regulating the Canadian labour market.

This has ongoing relevance for thinking about work in Canada today. Patrick Wolfe argues that settler-colonialism is not a set of past events; it is a structure and one that exists today (Wolfe quoted in Arvin, Tuck and Morrill 2013). The hierarchies based on colonization, changing conceptions of "race," and state regulations of these different categories of racialized bodies are essential features of class formation and social relations in Canada. This has significant implications for working-class resistance. For instance, this has been utilized by employers to enable various forms of particularly exploitative and oppressive practices towards non-white workers, usually with state help, through a whole range of policies and lack of policies and regulations that reinforce employer power. It is critical for understanding the terrain of struggle, employer strategies and for thinking through the organization of resistance. This is because historically there has been consent and explicit support for colonization and imperialism and for racial and gender hierarchies by certain

groups of workers. Colonization and its implications for class formation in Canada has had lasting effects on the labour market, the nature of labour resistance and relations between workers, including on an international scale.

Considering the Logics of White Supremacy and Heteropatriarchy

> Forms of property and labour enshrined in Canada, from the first land grabbing and occupation to now, have been wholly organized by and inscribed with the difference of "race" and ethnicity. There is no "class" here without "race."
> –Himani Bannerji (1995, 33)

As a white-settler colony, the dominant sense of Canadianness as whiteness must be understood as arising from transnational forces. As John Price notes, the "racial anxieties and the desire of male, British elites to consolidate control soon gave birth to the demand for a 'white' Canada" (Price 2013, 629). The ideas, practices and policies that were part of building Canada as a white settler colony engendered a racially segregated society of unequal privileges within the working class. This was and still is reflected in the labour market, where body (race and gender) and status (citizenship status arising from the creation of nation-states in the context of colonialism and ongoing imperialism) are key factors in the kind of work available to people, the conditions they encounter and the consequences they face for resisting exploitation and oppression. The structural racism that we find in the Canadian labour market is grafted on the racist violence towards the indigenous population as well as the racist immigration policies it was built on.[4] "Racism is always anchored in real practices and it reinforces social relations among racialized subjects in a social order" (Bonilla-Silva 2000, 192) following from "the historical processes of European enslavement, colonization and cultural and political imperialism against the world's indigenous and non-white

---

[4] The treatment of the indigenous population and then the migrant and slave bodies is important for thinking through internationalism because it reveals longstanding ideas and practices that are embedded in the making of local social relations, and, by extension, come to inform the way workers in other countries are seen.

peoples" (Dei 1996, 252). Dei argues that these historical processes of racialization resulting from enslavement, colonization and imperialism work to distinguish different social groups and subject them to unequal treatment based on "supposed biological, phenotypical and cultural characteristics" (Dei 1996, 252). To understand the specific development of racist social relations in Canada and the way these relations have shaped class formation, the theorization of white supremacy is useful. Like Bannerji's concept of common sense racism and the concepts of Dei and Bonilla-Silva above, the theory of white supremacy links racial hierarchies to colonialism, slavery and the development of capitalism (and therefore also imperialism). This contrasts with theories of racism steeped in liberalism, where racism is equivalent to discriminatory practices and attitudes that can be adjusted through state policies and judicial measures without the need to challenge the underlying relations of power born of global capitalist development.

Hubert Harrison (1883-1918), a Harlem intellectual and activist, first developed a theory of white supremacy as an explanation for the limited working-class consciousness that developed in the United States (Perry 2013, 188). He argued that "white" workers, including socialists, put race before class (Perry 2013, 188). This idea was then taken up by Theodore Allen, author of *The Invention of the White Race* (1994), who argued that the idea of whiteness was an invented term tied to the development of capitalism and to exploitation (Allen quoted in Mills 2003). For Harrison and Allen, white supremacy is an essential feature of the history of the development of capitalism and therefore also of class formation and relations. More recent theorizations of white supremacy that are useful are those of Charles W. Mills, David Roediger and Andrea Smith. Charles W. Mills argues that white supremacy encompasses "de facto and de jure white privilege, that would refer more broadly to the European domination of the planet for the past several hundred years that has left us with the racialized distributions of economic, political and cultural power we have today" (Mills 1994, 108). Mills explores the way white supremacy, as a key aspect of the organization of the global social and

political world, is intimately tied to practices of European domination and operates within western philosophies. Smith, on the other hand, elaborates a theory of white supremacy to make sense of the specific impacts and dynamics shaping the experiences of different groups of non-white people in the United States. She outlines how white supremacy operates as a set of logics rooted in the history of slavery, the colonization and the genocide of indigenous peoples, and orientalism stemming from colonization and imperialism (Smith 2006).

Smith argues that the first logic of white supremacy is based on slavery and operates by not only commodifying but by fully dehumanizing non-white and particularly black bodies, rendering them unworthy of basic entitlements to life (Smith 2006, 67). For Smith, the practice of slavery and the ideas that underlie the enslavability of black bodies are a critical feature of capitalism and the racial hierarchies that remain in the post-abolition context (Allen 1994; Smith 2006, 67).[5] While Smith's conceptualization arises from the history of the United States, and while Canada has a different history of slavery, nonetheless slavery has been a part of the making of "whiteness" in Canada.[6] We see this operate in state and employer practices in Canada today regarding agricultural workers and live-in caregivers, whereby state regulations allow employers to employ workers in indenture-like and unsafe conditions due to their race and citizenship status (Smith 2015; Sharma 2001, 2002, 2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2007).

The second logic of white supremacy is that of genocide. The logic of genocide operates through erasures, the actual murder and displacement of populations, and through erasing the histories of indigenous people as a means of laying claim to their land and resources (Smith 2006, 68). This is evident through a vast array of state practices, from strategies of displacement, the

---

[5] See Allen 1994; Roediger 1991.

[6] See Allen 1994 and Roediger 1991 for more on how this making of whiteness operates in general, and see for the Canadian context see Bannerji 2000; Backhouse 1999; Bolaria and Li 1988; Brand 1999; Ng 1993a, 1993b; Mackey 1998; Stanley 2011; Das Gupta 1996; Das Gupta et al. 2007; Goutor 2007a; Satzewich 1990, 1998, 2000, 2011; Walia 2010.

Indian act, and ethnic cleansing through to the residential school system and conditions in indigenous communities that are without basic state infrastructure, including in some cases lack of access to clean drinking water (Amadahy and Lawrence 2009; Kulchyski 2007, 2015; Razack 2002; Coulthard 2010, 2014; Judd 1980).

And lastly, Smith, drawing from the work of Edward Said, argues that white supremacy also operates through the logic of Orientalism, whereby Europeans define themselves as a superior civilization in opposition to the inferior civilizations of the "Orient." Smith notes that the construction of the peoples of the "Orient" as inferior differs from the logic at work in the slavery and genocide of indigenous populations because these people are recognized as civilizations, they are human, but inferior and permanent threats (Smith 2006, 68-9). We see this today in state discourse about Arabs and Islam or the "threat" of China.[7] The local manifestations and impacts of this logic are also evident in events like the internment of Japanese (1942-1946), Italian (1940-1944) and Ukrainian Canadians (1914-1920).[8] And like the other logics of white supremacy, this logic is rooted in international relations and exists because of the movements of people and the practices of states and capital outside their national borders.

Orientalism arose from specific processes of international relations, specifically from histories of colonialism and imperialism and the ideas related to these processes. Said's work explores the depictions, primarily of Arabs, that arose through European empire-building and the ways that the very self-concept the West as morally and intellectually superior to the peoples of the "Orient" developed. That this emerges through specific histories and practices of imperialism and colonization partly speaks to the differences in the way certain groups of non-white people became

---

[7] For more on the specific ways anti-Asian racism was manifested in the Canadian labour movement, see Goutor 2005, 2007a.

[8] See Morton 1974; Oikawa 2000; Iacovetta, Perin and Principe 2000; Kordan 2002; Luciuk 2006.

characterized. As Smith argues, the characterizations of and comparisons to the "Other" is an important aspect of the way that whiteness has come to be defined and represented in specific contexts. These processes of comparison simultaneously say things about the "Other" and the "Self;" comparisons that are grounded in a context of oppression and exploitation. Bonilla-Silva notes that the construction of the West was itself the creation of white supremacy (Bonilla-Silva 2000, 192), and that this "has been an essential component in the structuration of various kinds of social relations of domination and subordination between 'western' and non-western peoples, between whites and non-whites in the world system" (Wallerstein and Balibar in Bonilla-Silva 2000, 192). This is critical for understanding labour internationalism because these ideas exist as part of a broader intellectual and political climate in which international events and issues have been and are thought through. And important for understanding the current operation of white supremacy in international relations between workers is, as Bannerji notes, the fact that these ideas rooted in imperialism are ongoing and are reproduced through current imperialist projects (Bannerji 1995, 44). An example of this in the Canadian context is in the discourse around the war on terror and visible in the specific arguments made for the invasion and occupation of Afghanistan after 9/11.[9]

The logics of white supremacy, while having different histories, processes and effects, function based on the idea of white as a racial category and of the superiority of whiteness intellectually and otherwise. These sets of logics work to justify imperialism, colonization, slavery, indenture, poor wages and dangerous conditions for non-white workers. These logics are embedded in the operation of various institutions, judicial and legislative processes, and discursive practices within literature, academia, popular culture, and so forth.[10]

---

[9] See Jiwani 2005; Albo and Klassen 2013.

[10] See Bannerji 2000; Backhouse 1999; Mackey 1998; Sharma 2001, 2003.

Another important factor that is intertwined with white supremacy is the function of heteropatriarchy. Patriarchy refers to the entrenched structural power based on hierarchies of gender, whereby those gendered as women are subordinate. Whereas the concept of heteropatriarchy emphasizes the way that way patriarchy functions through heterosexuality. As was outlined by Frederich Engels in *Family, Private Property and the State* (1972), patriarchal relations are intimately tied to the institution of (heterosexual) marriage. The history of the institution of (heterosexual) marriage is a critical piece of how patriarchy functions and how capitalism extracts reproductive labour from women (Seccombe 1974, 1980; Dalla Costa 1972; Briskin 1980; Nilliasca 1980; Hollstrom 1981; Mies 1998). Heteropatriarchy is part of class formation in Canada and intertwined with the logics of white supremacy. The interlocking logics of white supremacy and heteropatriarchy are evident in the development of the Canadian state through the Indian Act, the history of immigration policies, family and labour law and a host of other policies and practices of the state and employers.[11] Heteropatriarchy is an important logic underlying the idea of and the making of nations, ideologically and politically. We see this in the way that the heterosexual family unit, based on male dominance, has been conceptualized as the basis of and model for the nation-state.[12] The logic of heteropatriarchy, then, is also a piece of the making of the white-settler nation-state, its self-concept seen in national mythologies and reflected in the policies and practices of nation-building.

[11] See Carty 1999; Turpel 1993; Lawrence 2003; Sharma 2000; Walia 2010; Razack 2002; Backhouse 1999; Rousseau 2015; Dua and Robertson1999; Luxton and Corman 2001; Fudge and Vosko 2001.

[12] See Kinsman 1987, 1991; Kinsman and Gentile 2010; Puar 2007.

The Making of the Labour Market:
The Relevance of the Logics of White Supremacy and Heteropatriarchy

The logics of white supremacy and heteropatriarchy are evident in history and development of the Canadian state, particularly in its laws and policies, but also in national mythologies, and it is embedded in the economic and political landscape, including the structures of the labour market and specific organization of particular workplaces.[13] There are historical and regional differences in the way white supremacy and heteropatriarchy have functioned in Canada through practices of the state, employers and in relations between workers. This is evident in things like the changing definition of "white" (Satzewich 2000; Frager 1989 and 1999; Epp, Iacovetta and Swyripa 2004; Avery 1979; Goutor 2005, 2007b). Many who are deemed "white" in Canada today, such as Italian, Ukrainian and Jewish workers, were not considered "white" in the pre-World War II period and into the post-war period, seen in part through residential, settlement and citizenship restrictions. These policies, that granted entitlements to those workers who were deemed "white," had significant consequences for what work was available for those who were non-white, the conditions of this work and the level of risk and danger involved in resistance in the workplace. What is particularly useful about Smith's conceptualization of white supremacy is the way it is linked to heteropatriarchy and her emphasis on how the logics of white supremacy function in different ways, resulting in different ideas and treatment of different groups of non-white people. Drawing from this conceptualization, I give a broad sketch of some of the ways these logics have been a part of the making of and dynamics within the Canadian labour market through practices of the state, employers and workers.

State Practices

> The racialization of categories commonly considered to be race-neutral – including citizenship, religion, and democracy – must be explicitly recognized as part of the continued exercise and

---

[13] See note 2 for relevant texts.

reproduction of state power. In particular, these categories are part of the continued imperialism and an ideological privileging of a constructed and hegemonic whiteness.
–Enakshi Dua, Narda Razack and Jody Nyasha Warner
(quoted in Abu-Laban and Bakan 2008, 638)

Todd Gordon argues that "racism is not a mere policy option pursued by the state; it is part of the state form" (Gordon 2007, 24). The state, from its origins as a key vehicle for enacting colonization and the making of settler society, has been critical to creating a labour market rooted in the logics of heteropatriarchy and white supremacy, particularly through the logic of genocide. The settler state emerged through what Veracini calls "the founding violence," specifically, "the genocidal practices perpetrated by the administration of the state against" and displacement of the indigenous population (2008, 338). While Veracini's analysis concerns the fact that this founding violence needs to be erased for the settler state, in the case of Australia and Israel, to have legitimacy, this history and ongoing ideological practices of erasure applies equally to the Canadian state. Sunera Thobani argues that Canadian state actions operate through the erasure of the indigenous population and by "emptying them of human status" (Thobani 2007; Leroux 2008, 443). This is seen in an array of ideological practices within the institutions that constitute the state as well within treaties, the Indian Act, and the reservation and residential school systems.

Through and because of these various processes of the nation-state's founding violence, the Canadian state proceeded to recruit workers to meet the settlement aims and economic needs of capital based on racial hierarchies, reflecting the logics of white supremacy. As I have noted, white supremacy has been a key feature of Canadian immigration policy since its inception. The development of these policies has been analysed by numerous historians, political scientists and sociologists. This is reflected in some policies that are very similar to ones that targeted Chinese workers in the United States (Goutor 2005). In Canada, this included the Chinese Head Tax (1885-1923) and the Chinese Exclusion Act (1923-1947). While in Canada there were no explicit white only settlement laws in the way there were in Australia, the impact of immigration policies and

practices always privileged white bodies through seemingly benign policies.[14] The Immigration Act

of 1910, for instance, gave immigration officials discretion to restrict entry to any immigrants seen as

unsuited to the climate or requirements of Canada (Das Gupta, James and Maaka 2007, 183;

Jakubowkski 1997). Then there were state acts such as the refusal to accept Jewish refugees during

World War II (Abella and Troper 1983, 2012) or the refusal to allow workers aboard the Komagata

Maru to entry the country in 1914 (Johnston 2014; Kazimi 2011; Kaur 2012).

Intimately tied to these practices and policies around settlement and citizenship are ideas of

the nation that reflect the intertwined logics of white supremacy and heteropatriarchy. As Nandita

Sharma notes, we see the ideological production of the Canadian nation and "Canadian-ness" as

whiteness in the policies governing migration and citizenship and the parliamentary debates that led

to the adoption of various policies (Sharma 2001). An example of this is the way the immigration of

women was regulated. Historically, policies governing the settlement of women were tied to the

logic of white supremacy evident in the various restrictions to settlement confronting many groups

of non-white women (and the way this was regulated through patriarchal policies and tied to

heterosexual union).[15] These restrictions were tied to the aim of white nation-building. Tania Das

Gupta argues that the restriction of the reproduction of undesirable bodies was necessary because of

the threat their reproduction posed to the project of white-settler nation-building (Das Gupta, James

and Maaka 2007, 187). Today, this continues through programs like the Non-Immigrant

Employment Authorization Program (NIEAP), adopted in 1973. The NIEAP set the framework for

the current context in which workers increasingly come to Canada through temporary work

programmes rather than through avenues that create a path to residency (Sharma 2006a). This

means that non-white women who come to Canada today are more likely to come as temporary

---

[14] See Thobani 2000a, 2000b, 2007; Sharma 2002.

[15] See Iacovetta 2000; Man 2004; Ng 1993a, 1993b; Sharma 2000; Thobani 2000a, 2000b.

workers (working for low wages and sometimes under indentured-like conditions) and are barred from settlement.[16] Immigration policies are a critical mechanism for the making of the nation and the labour market. These policies reflect who is deemed desirable and who is entitled to basic life entitlements defined through the idea of Canada as a nation belonging to white settlers.[17]

Looking Inside the Organization of Work and Workplaces

To understand the making of class formation in Canada, we need to link state practices to capitalist development. The needs of capital and the specific practices of employers are a critical piece of this narrative. This involves the role and influence of capital over state policy, but also the participation of employers in the making and upholding of white supremacist and heteropatriarchal practices and hierarchies in the workplace. Employers play a key role in the making of a labour market marked by hierarchies of race and gender.[18]

The development of capitalism in the Canadian context begins with what Marx calls primitive accumulation, the way in which processes of displacement make way for the development of a capitalist economy. Marx's discussion of this in *Capital* considers how peasants were displaced from their lands through forms of enclosure, resulting in a loss of access to the common lands on which they had been able to ensure their survival. This created pools of people without the means to survive and who, as a class, eventually became wage labourers. However, as David Harvey notes, this process of accumulation, which entails dispossession, is an ongoing process – and one that has been intensifying within neoliberal capitalism.

---

[16] See Ng 1993a; Man 2004; Das Gupta 1996; Sharma 2000, 2006a.

[17] The policies of immigration and ever-unfolding colonization are not the only ways that the Canadian state practices reflect the logics of white supremacy and heteropatriarchy. This is also evident in a whole host of laws governing everything from security certificates, residential restrictions, laws governing work and practices such as police violence, foreign policy, and so on (see Backhouse 1998).

[18] See Hunt and Rayside 2000, 408; Das Gupta 1996.

In Canada, primitive accumulation is rooted in the processes of colonization and displacement of the indigenous population. As Harvey points out and as we have just noted, this is an ongoing process. We see the ongoing battles against primitive accumulation today in indigenous struggles against the oil and gas companies and the state in the extraction of and distribution of the Tar Sands.[19] As in the colonization of Palestine, extracting surplus value from indigenous labour was not a feature of colonization in Canada (Coulthard 2014).

While indigenous workers were employed in some industries, particularly those related to resource extraction, waged workers were predominately settlers (High 1996). Accumulation in Canada was therefore also shaped by immigration policies and practices. Immigration policies function to shape the opportunities and conditions of work that workers find themselves in. The aim of building a white-settler colony of the British Empire was coupled with the demands of capital in the making of immigration policies. As Nandita Sharma has shown, the precarious status of non-white workers, produced through state policies, has always been of huge benefit to employers in Canada.[20] Non-white workers have historically found themselves in jobs that are often unsafe, poorly paid and temporary. Citizenship and immigration status has been an important tool used by the state and capital to criminalize worker resistance and for making for more vulnerable flexible workers. Today's incarnation of temporary work programmes that have grown out of the NIEAP, like the Temporary Foreign Worker Program (TFWP), are not new.[21] Citizenship was always given to some alongside others who were denied it and thereby subject to poorer working conditions; the Canadian state has always produced these different pools of workers simultaneously. The benefit to employers is reflected in the poor pay and dangerous working conditions they give to these workers

---

[19] See Kulchyski and Bernauer 2014; Mills and Sweeney 2013.

[20] See Sharma 1994, 1996, 2000.

[21] See Sharma 1996, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2006a, 2006b.

compared to white workers, as seen in the history of Chinese railway workers or agricultural farmworkers today.[22] And as in these cases, while the conditions are enabled through state practices, they are also maintained through the actions of employers who then use the white supremacist logic of "Canadian-ness" that underlies who gets status to justify reduced wages and more precarious and dangerous working conditions.[23]

Bonilla-Silva argues that an important feature of the racist social system is that "the race placed in the superior position tends to receive greater economic remuneration and access to better occupations and prospects in the labor market, occupies a primary position in the political system, [and] is granted higher social estimation" (Bonilla-Silva quoted in Mills 2003). These are some of the effects of white supremacy in the organization of workplaces. State practices like immigration policies shape this, but so do the practices of employers and the white supremacist assumptions and ideas underlying their practices and reflected in them. For instance, employers create and maintain differential treatment in their function as organizers and managers of workplaces where race, gender and status function in the assignment of work and in its monitoring. Tania Das Gupta explores the role of particular managerial approaches to race and gender, which includes: the subjective biases of white managers towards bureaucratized controls, requirements for formal training for specialized tasks that are inaccessible for most workers of colour, racial divisions of work due to racial stereotypes stemming from colonialism and the relegation of particular workers to particular jobs based on the perceived suitability of tasks according to race and gender (Das Gupta 1996, 8-9).

These practices that function in the organization of workplaces and affect job allocation, wages, and conditions reflect and reinforce ideas of skill shaped by ideas of white supremacy and heteropatriarchy. Das Gupta argues that racism preserves powerlessness and low wages for non-

---

[22] See Bolaria and Li 1988; Creese 1988; Smith 2015.

[23] See Sharma 2005, 2006a; 2006b.

white workers "through systemic practices in the labour market and related institutions like the educational system" (Das Gupta 1996, 14-15). Underlying these employer practices, from hiring to task assignments, are ideas of skill and what bodies are seen to fit what tasks.[24] This is reflected in the way that the non-white workers are more likely to be viewed as unskilled, their skills not recognized as valuable, and their work seen as less valuable and therefore also paid less (Das Gupta 1996). This operates in the devaluation of the work of women as well. Related to the erasure of reproductive labour as work, the wage labour of women is devalued through patriarchal ideas about skills (Man 2004). Much has been written about the way that patriarchal notions of skill, work and tasks associated with what is ascribed as the "natural" or innate skills of women – such as tasks associated with care – operate to devalue and segregate women into low-paid jobs (Frager 1999).

How white supremacy and heteropatriarchy function in the production of ideas of skill and therefore also in the organization of workplaces and the labour market more generally is reflected in wage differentials amongst workers, in job segregation and in segregation of specific workers into certain industries. Historical examples of this job segregation within certain industries in Canada include the racist division of labour in work on trains; Agnes Calliste notes that work in the dining cars was exclusively for white workers while black workers were exclusively hired as sleeping car porters (Calliste 1995). Another example is noted by Ruth Frager in the way the textile industry in Toronto was organized by gender and race, and so with correspondingly differential wages (Frager 1992). Then there is the way this differential treatment is currently entrenched in the labour market by the segregation of certain groups of workers into particular industries. For instance, Roxana Ng has shown that non-white women predominate in textile work that has been outsourced to women working by piece in their homes in Toronto (Ng 2007). These employer practices, upheld through various kinds of ideological practices and assumptions regarding skill, are also reflected in

---

[24] See Das Gupta 1996; Frager 1999; Schmidt Camacho 1999.

differential wages. For instance, Das Gupta notes that Chinese workers earn anywhere from one-quarter to one-half the wages of unskilled white men in the same industries (Das Gupta, James and Maaka 2007, 183).

Contradictions in the Resistance to Employer and State Practices

The various practices and strategies of the state and capital in the making of hierarchies and inequalities in the labour market based on race and gender were met with an array of competing and contradictory responses from different groups of workers in Canada. Exploring the ways workers have confronted, accepted, ignored or erased these embedded inequalities within the organization of the Canadian labour market gives insight into how and why particular international practices were developed. The way Canadian workers have responded to inequalities tells us how they have understood their struggle against exploitation. These responses are evident in how they strategized around the challenges of the competition embedded in the logic of capitalism and its specific manifestations workplaces through various state policies and employer strategies to nurture competition locally and internationally. As Kim Scipes argues, the labour imperialism of the AFL-CIO has origins in the exclusions and inequalities unions supported locally, and so labour imperialism can be understood as an extension of these local strategies vis-à-vis inequalities and competition in the labour market (Scipes 2010a, xxviii-xxix).[25] Like Scipes, I think that when we examine historical anti-immigrant campaigns and racist union exclusions we see the roots of labour imperialism in the emergence of alliances based on race or nation (and rooted in patriarchy) rather than class (Scipes 2010a, 12-15; Nastovski 2010).

The history of the Canadian labour movement has many similar stories. White workers in Canada have responded to different groups of non-white workers in different ways; these responses

[25] Ideas of skill, as in the case of craft unions in Canada and the United States, were historically used to justify exclusions based on gender, race and nation.

have varied historically and have been shaped by regional differences in the way the economy was organized and the kinds of jobs available to different racialized groups. For example, Goutor argues that part of the reason for the different responses on the part of "white" workers to Chinese and Black workers had to do with the fact that, unlike Chinese workers, Black workers very seldom competed for work in industries dominated by "white" workers (Goutor 2005).

The way workers in Canada sought to deal with inequalities based on race and gender in the labour market as is marked by many conflicting strategies. This is a history of struggles of white and non-white workers and revolutionary and feminist organizations to challenge various forms of oppression as well as responses on the part of white workers to uphold relations marked by oppression. One prominent strategy, which parallels that of white workers in the United States, is the attempt to limit or eliminate competition through various efforts to exclude women and non-white workers from the labour market.

An important historical example of this – and one that has echoes today in popular depictions and discourses about the threat of China and Chinese workers to manufacturing jobs in the North – are the efforts to exclude Chinese workers from the Canadian labour market. David Goutor argues that Chinese workers were deemed to be "menaces" by white workers, meaning that Chinese workers were thought to be "cheap," "docile" and "unmanly" workers who undercut white wages and took white jobs (Goutor 2005, 57-8).[26] These events are revealing of white supremacist logics in the depictions of Chinese workers, but are also revealing in the way white workers depicted themselves as "native" and entitled to various rights and privileges stemming from their erasure of the existence of the indigenous population in their self-concept. These types of efforts have been rationalized through ideas about the qualities of the Canadian nation, Canadian nation-building, and

---

[26] In this depiction, we also see the connection between white identity and masculinity.

also in the early 20th century ideas of Britishness and the British Empire.[27] This was a part of broader efforts by white workers to exclude non-white workers and women from the labour market through campaigns and actions for more restrictive immigration policies and against immigrant workers, against the hiring of women workers, and the exclusion of women and non-white workers from particular jobs through gate-keeping of apprenticeships within craft unions.[28]

James Naylor, analysing working class revolt in Ontario in 1919, argues that while some white workers were involved in anti-immigrant actions, such actions also existed alongside efforts by progressive/radical unions like some meatpacking and steelworkers' locals that organized to challenge racism and craft union exclusions (Naylor 1998, 148). These strategies of cross-class organizing built solidarities that sometimes challenged patriarchal and white supremacist practices of the state, employers and fellow workers. Such organizing strategies have been a feature of many struggles and various organizational formations of Indigenous, immigrant and women workers to confront the interconnected effects of exploitation and oppression.

<div style="text-align:center">

Confronting Exploitation and Oppression?
Models of Unions, Strategies for Action and Organizing in the Inter-War Years

</div>

The overarching logics of white supremacy and heteropatriarchy that shaped social relations between workers, their employers, and the state and between workers themselves operated in the interwar years in a context of heightened class struggle. The Canadian economy, while extremely regionally diverse, was very volatile in this period across the country.[29] This volatility, which included

---

[27] For more see various works on the history of what is called nativism in Heron and Siemiatycki 1998; Goutor 2007a; Naylor 1998. Another example of the white supremacist discourse operating in these actions is Naylor's depiction of nativist demonstrations in Toronto in 1919, where these white workers created a dichotomy between "British democracy vs. the 'Hun'" as an argument for their moral and superiority vis-à-vis Chinese workers (Naylor 1998, 148).

[28] See Goutor 2007a; Heron and Siemiatycki 1998.

[29] Regional diversity was shaped by the interests of state and capital as well as the availability of resources for certain forms of accumulation. For instance, craft work was for a long time centred in Ontario with textile and meatpacking in

some boom years, recessions and the great depression, as well as the impact of socialist, communist and anarchist ideas and organizing, had a major impact on the way workers responded to exploitation and oppression.

The heightened class struggle was seen in the explosion of new forms of organizing amongst waged, unwaged and unemployed workers. This included the building of new organizations, developing new strategies of resistance, experimenting with different tactics, rethinking who should be organized and how, and engaging in broad debates on what it means to win, including developing new demands and overarching goals. Throughout this period and into the early post-World War II period, these various organizing strategies led to a whole range of concessions from employers and the state resulting in huge increases in unionization and legislative measures that led to the formation of the social welfare state. As many Canadian labour historians have noted, these concessions, including various types of policies like unemployment insurance, also reflected employer and state fears of these organizing efforts (Palmer 1992; Heron 1989). This was the soft side of their response to the growth of organizational power of workers and of the left more broadly. Another side of the heightened class struggle of this period is evidenced in increased employer violence and aggression, including their use of scabs, police, private thugs, the setting up company unions, and so on.

The Saskatoon Solidarity Committee pamphlet *Partners in Imperialism* situates post-World War II labour internationalism in Canada as following from the aftermath of the struggle over what model of union organization workers wanted (Saskatoon Solidarity Committee 1981). Like the SSC, I argue that what we see emerging in the battles over models and philosophies of unionism in the interwar years shows us that these battles over the direction of trade union organization and action was something that preceded the Cold War. The SSC poses a tension between craft business unionism, class-conscious unionism and social democratic industrial unionism in this period

---

the main urban centres, while in the north and west the industries were resource-based (mining, logging, sawmills, fisheries).

(Saskatoon Solidarity Committee 1981).[30] I elaborate on this context here. This was a time in which there existed vastly different models of union organization and action. Craft unions remained a strong force, however, the One Big Union (OBU) emerged, the rise of industrial unionism more generally, both those that were social democratic and class-struggle oriented, the emergence of red unions represented by organizations like the Workers' Unity League (WUL), and various forms of workers' associations and organization in labour halls sometimes based on a sense of shared race or ethnicity and organized by workers who were often excluded from craft unions.

The new forms of organization challenged craft union dominance and its narrow ideas about who ought to be organized and how. I introduce some of the models of union action and organization that were developed in this period and some of the ways these different models responded to the economic and political context, including the social organization of the labour market. Visible within the battles over models of union organization and action are some of the key ideological and political forces, ideas and debates that shaped the climate in which practices of labour internationalism developed in the post-World War II period. I draw out the competing forms of consciousness underlying the battle over union action and organization and some relevant aspects of these forces and their strategies to confront exploitation and oppression. In particular, for the purposes of understanding labour internationalism, I examine how different forces inside labour sought to confront exploitation and oppression (including strategies and solidarities built) or how they worked to accommodate capital and operate as sites for the maintenance and perpetuation of inequality based on race, gender and status.

---

[30] I outline these models here, however, I think that an analysis of union philosophies as forces within different models rather than models is more useful. This is because we see in the case of industrial unions for instance, competing forces within these unions. While, as the SSC explain, the majority of the industrial unions in the post-World War II context were dominated by social democratic forces, some also operated at different times as more of an explicit business union or were guided by a class struggle orientation (i.e. on the class struggle side we see the UE (United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America) and Mine Mill in Sudbury).

The dominant form of labour organization in the early 20th century was the craft union model represented by the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada (TLC) and its affiliates. This craft model of unionism sought to protect and improve wages and working conditions for a very narrow group of workers who were considered to possess certain skills. It was based on the idea that union power came through controlling the price of labour by limiting the pool of available workers via union membership of all the workers who possessed certain skills. These unions often also controlled entry into these jobs via control over who could train to develop these skills, that is, through apprenticeships and the regulation of and credentials for the craft. These unions participated in the maintenance of the social inequalities in the labour market. The majority were headquartered in the United States. Like their US-counterpart locals, the workers in these unions were predominately Anglo-Celtic men, and their unions often pursued policies that were anti-immigrant and racist and worked to preserve patriarchal relations.[31] This was reflected for instance in how voting rights in the union were linked to race and/or immigration status (Goutor 2007a, 186). The white supremacist and heteropatriarchal logics that operated within this model were also visible in their strategies. Heron notes that these unions sought to prevent "the degradation of the craftsmen's work experience" by seeking political means to bar immigrants, women and children from jobs' and the use of prison labour (Heron 1984, 61).

The craft unions were also often characterized by conciliatory strategies with capital, evidenced in their efforts to campaign in the interests of their employers, as during the "Union Label" and "Buy Canadian" campaigns.[32] Both campaigns, with origins as employer strategies, became recast as means of fighting for local jobs (Heron 1984, 69). What is important about these

---

[31] See Scipes 2010a, Scott 1978a, Goutor 2007a; Creese 1987, 1988. Craft union militancy was often imbued with a sense of entitlement based on white supremacy and masculinity. For instance, Heron notes that in British Columbia "the first miners' unions were built on overtly racist attacks on Chinese workers, who were believed to be threatening the white working man's standard of living" (Heron 1989, 10).

[32] For more, see Heron 1984.

strategies is the way workers came to identify their interests with those of their employers. While this craft union strategy is not a phenomenon exclusive to craft unions, it was more commonly found amongst them. These employer alliances are prominent in many different economic nationalist union strategies and are also intimately tied to racial or national identification with employers.[33]

In contrast to the mainstream craft union model of this time, there were unions that were more explicitly aimed at class struggle and revolutionary goals, such as the OBU. This is what the Saskatoon Solidarity Committee called class-conscious unionism and others call class-struggle unionism, mostly these existed as forces within certain industrial unions (Saskatoon Solidarity Committee 1981; Ness 2014). The more radical strategies of the OBU and those that emerged inside some other industrial unions, aimed at organizing beyond a narrow set of skilled workers; this meant organizing those considered unskilled and the unemployed.

The emergence of industrial unionism was a huge development in this period. Industrial unions sought to broaden organizing to unskilled workers and to organize by industry as opposed to skill or trade. Besides these two models, there were also ethnic or racially based unions or workers' organizations that were excluded from the mainstream labour movement, such as the Chinese Labour Association (CLA) and the Chinese Workers' Protective Association (CWPA) (Das Gupta, James and Maaka 2007, 184; Creese 1987, 1988; Seager and Roth 1998, 239, 252). Racially or ethnically based unions began to decline with the rise of class-struggle oriented and industrial unions[34] because of the active involvement and recruitment of racialized and immigrant workers (Creese cited in Das Gupta, James and Maaka 2007, 185). These models explicitly challenged the exclusionary nature of craft unions based on their notion of class, particularly the way it was limited by race and status.

---

[33] For a good account of this the various issues surrounding workers and economic nationalism, see Frank 2000.

[34] Many of the unions in this period that can be classified as class-struggle oriented were industrial unions.

The idea of class embraced by many industrial and explicitly class-struggle oriented unions meant a broader focus for organizing that extended to immigrant, racialized and unskilled workers, extending at times also to women (Mitchell and Naylor 1998, 183) as well as – in the case of the Workers Unity League – also unemployed workers (Endicott 2012; Manley 1994).[35] Both the social democratic and class-struggle oriented industrial unions in this period employed more confrontational tactics and strategies with employers that were linked to the expanded vision of who constituted a worker. Canadian labour historians have noted that some of the elements of the class analysis and organizing strategies contained in these models can be found in the 19th-century Knights of Labour (KoL) (Palmer 1992; Heron 1989). Some elements common to these models are the emphasis on building the strength of the working class as a whole rather than segments of it according to skill or job. Another important aspect of this model includes the emphasis on building capacities to resist, exemplified in efforts to support worker self-activity.

In the interwar period, the most significant explicitly class-struggle union that emerged was the OBU. The OBU saw itself as a revolutionary industrial union and sought to organize the entire working class irrespective of skill or workplace, and it "saw improvements in workers lives coming principally through toughness on the picket lines, not through the binding contracts that the craft unionist favoured" (Heron 1989, 41).[36] Heron notes that a significant effect of the influence of OBU activists in this period was the development of general strikes as occurred in the strike waves of 1919 (Heron and Siemiatycki 1998). An important feature of their orientation was their internationalist bent as well as their notion of class as transcending race, gender, status and skill divisions. There was

[35] It is important to note that the WUL has been subject to critique because they spent their energies building a new and competing labour federation rather than working with or working to organize workers into the already existing unions.

[36] See also http://www.historymuseum.ca/cmc/exhibitions/hist/labour/labh21e.shtml.

also a boost to this approach given by the Russian revolution, inspiring membership in the immediate post-First World War years.[37]

The OBU declined after the immediate post-First World War era, though some of the activists went on to form or join the Communist Party of Canada (CPC) or became active in the WUL in the 1930s or in industrial union organizing.[38] Like the OBU, the WUL was anti-capitalist in orientation.[39] Stephen Endicott argues in his recent book that the WUL was inspired by the ideas of Lozovsky, who insisted that the international labour movement should focus on organizing the unemployed, building independent or "red" trade unions where appropriate, and broadening the basis of strike strategy so as to develop stronger and more effective resistance to capital (2012, 21). Craig Heron provides evidence that the great majority of strikes in Canada in the early 1930s were led by affiliates of the Workers' Unity League (Heron 1989, 70-1). They saw their strength as lying with the power of workers to act and sought to mobilize on a very broad basis, as seen in their role in organizing unemployed workers in the 1930s (Endicott 2012).

Industrial unions were slower to form in Canada than in the United States, forming after the height of the OBU and WUL. This was due in part to the fact that the CPC pursued a different trade union strategy than the CPUSA; communist organizers in Canada were busy building the WUL as compared to their counterparts in the United States, where communist organizers were the driving force behind the development of industrial unionism through the creation of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO). In the Canadian context, communist and revolutionary socialist organizers eventually joined with social democrats to build industrial unions.

---

[37] For more see Leier 1990; Peterson 1981, 1984.

[38] It is important to note here the strength of the radical left in the west. This regional political divide remains important the development of internationalism, as alternatives to the institutional practices of the CLC were often found in the west or generally outside of Ontario.

[39] The OBU was founded on the slogan that "no worker can be an alien so far as we are concerned. Our alien . . . is the master class" (quoted in Mitchell and Naylor 1998, 184).

Institutionally, industrial unionism in Canada was represented by the formation of the

Canadian Congress of Labour (CCL) in 1940, which was the result of a merger between the All-

Canadian Congress of Labour (ACCL), which was a nationalist-oriented union federation, and the

Canadian section of the CIO. The legacy of the involvement of social-democratic trade unionists in

the rise of industrial unionism in Canada was visible in the leadership and political orientation of the

CCL (Abella 1973).[40] Their aim was to organize more extensively. As compared to the craft unions,

the strength of the industrial and class-struggle oriented unions developing in this period laid in their

ability to organize broadly, rather than work to limit the quantity of available workers. It was in their

numbers and their ability to shut down entire workplaces or cities that they had strength through

organizing and the mobilization of workers and the class more generally. This orientation meant that

the membership reflected the composition of the workforce, which was constituted by workplaces

organized on stratified conditions rooted in white supremacy and heteropatriarchy. This meant that

industrial unions, by virtue of their organization, were more inclined to confront rather than

reinforce the unequal conditions imposed by employers on different groups of workers explicitly

according to race and gender or through job assignment and other means. What this has meant in

practice within industrial unions is complicated and contradictory. However, at least in aim, the

industrial model which continued to grow through the post-World War II period encompassed a

broader notion of the working class and (usually in a limited way) challenged the strategy of

employers to stratify workers within workplaces.

---

[40] This in significant for understanding the differences between the US and Canadian labour internationalism post-war, because while there are many parallels, the extent of social democratic presence and level of political organization meant a different political make up of leadership and staff in the Canadian sections of the industrial unions in the postwar period.

Contests and Contradictions:
Wars of Position over Visions of Worker Justice

The approaches represented in the union models and orientations in this period reflect the heightened ideological and political battle unfolding over strategies for worker justice. To explore this more deeply, it is instructive to look at some of the specific ideas of worker justice underlying the battles over union organization. I focus on two broad ideological camps that were prominent forces within the union models and orientations in this period. Specifically, I explore how these respective forces understood their struggle, how they conceptualized worker justice and how this affected the strategies they adopted to confront (or not confront) capitalism, imperialism and inequalities within the class and in the workplace.

I argue that the dominant political visions inside the labour movement in this period fell into two broad categories. The first consists of liberal approaches to justice and equality, specifically of those who saw capitalism as requiring provisions for basic rights and needs, sometimes including demands for confronting racism in its manifestation as discrimination within workplaces. This acceptance of capitalism also meant that they often saw their fate as tied to their employers and the state.[41] I include social democracy in this first category. Inequality and injustice in this orientation is not seen as inherent to capitalist logic nor as growing out of the development of capitalism and the history of colonialism and ongoing imperialism. The second encompasses revolutionary socialist ideas – of those for whom the contradictions of capitalism were viewed essential to it and therefore who saw justice and equality as only possible through the emancipation of the class via revolution and the development of a wholly different economic system based on need (including anarcho-syndicalism and various communisms). I argue that the battle between these visions of workers' justice was reflected in the battle over models of union organizing and constituted a war of position over the political direction of the labour movement.

---

[41] See Scipes 2010a; Scott 1978a.

The ideas and analyses underlying the competing models of unionism in this era give us insight into how different alliances and solidarities formed and how these were extended to the international realm. The analyses and actions of the competing trade unions are crucial for understanding the development of their international strategies – and specifically, whether they confronted imperialism or saw their interests as aligned with ongoing imperialist practices and why. There are many contradictions within and points of overlap between the respective camps I outline in regards to how these ideas actually played out in practice locally and in terms of international solidarity. However, the overarching differences in these broad positions are critical to understanding the emergence of labour imperialist practices as well as different forms of international solidarity, both accommodationist and transformative, in the Canadian labour movement.

A significant current within the liberal vision of worker justice that was especially strong in the early 20th century was labourism. Labourism was closely associated with craft unionism and its efforts in seeking justice for a very small set of predominately white, male workers.[42] This parallels the orientation of their American counterparts. However, there are important differences between the philosophy of Samuel Gompers, often seen as the dominant force inside American craft unions in this period, and Canadian labourism, including their ideas of political action.[43] In his study of Canadian labourism, Craig Heron argues that labourism blended elements of agrarian populism, liberalism and socialism (Heron 1984, 45, 54), and unlike the philosophy of Gompers labourism, Canadian labourism embraced political engagement as a necessary component of union strategy.

---

[42] While associated with craft unionism, we can see in this philosophy some of the antecedents to the business unionism of some later industrial unions.

[43] This is not to say that the philosophy of Gompers did not have buy-in amongst some workers in Canada; see Babcock 1974.

Heron defines Canadian labourism as a hazy and contradictory (Heron 1984, 50) working-class liberalism that sought the end to "restriction[s] on liberty and equality in Canadian political life and sought the abolition of franchise restrictions, proportional representation, and the abolishment of the senate" (Heron 1989, 48).[44] Labourists understood worker injustice as stemming from "parasitic monopolists and middle-men" rather than capitalism itself and viewed themselves as entitled to basic rights on the basis of recognition of and respect for their skills and the value of their labour (Heron 1989, 10, 49). The other in this construction, that made them worthy of rights, were the employers and managers who were not seen as productive in society and the unskilled workers (who were predominately immigrant, non-white or women) who undercut their recognition and rights. This analysis, which emphasized recognition and rights, remains a critical piece of social democratic discourse in Canada today.

The Canadian labourists' demand that workers should receive the "full promise of liberal democracy" (Heron 1984, 55) was intimately connected to white racial identity and ideas of citizenship and skill that were related to whiteness and to masculinity. Heron argues that they had a strong belief that advancement should be according to merit (Heron 1984, 59), which I argue was related to skill and was interpreted through the logics of white supremacy and heteropatriarchy. Workers worthy of basic entitlements were a limited group, a group that needed protection from the way employers degraded them by employing unskilled workers. The racial, national, gender and status components of this brand of working-class liberalism was tied to the organization of craft unions themselves and to the processes by which workers became craftsmen within the specific context of settler-colonial class formation in Canada. However, as Jonathan Hyslop argues in his

[44] Heron notes that their political demands also included "referenda, a more democratic franchise which included women" (but not indigenous or non-white workers), and "the sweeping away of all property qualification and election deposits" (Heron 1984, 54). "The labourists shared a loose consensus about what a properly constructed society ought to look like. It was a vision of a decentralized society of small-scale production, where social and political power were widely diffused, where citizens were not far separated in social status, were treated equally under the law, and enjoyed equal opportunities, and where self-reliance, voluntary association, and mutual assistance would be more important than state coercion" (Heron 1984, 73).

work connecting British, South African and Australian labourisms, these forces must be understood in an international context and within the contours of the British Empire (Hyslop 1999). Following from this, Hyslop calls for understanding the developments of national labour movements in this period, including their dominant political currents, in connection to the international flows of political culture (Hyslop 1999, 399). As a white settler-colony of the British Empire, Canadian labourism, like the strands of socialism that developed here, was influenced by the experiences of settlers prior to immigrating to Canada and to connections they had to movements internationally. Craig Heron for one notes that Canadian labourism was inspired by British and Australian labourism (Heron 1984, 54). However, the specific connections to these movements have not to my knowledge been examined.

Hyslop, drawing from Ann Laura Stoler and Frederick Cooper's discussion in *Tensions of Empire* (1997), argues that using a national lens to understand phenomena like labourism and its white identity is limited and misses the way this developed within the context of the British Empire. Hyslop explores the way that white racial identity underlying British, South African and Australian labourisms in the pre-First World War era was actually a transnational phenomenon linked to British colonialism and the British Empire. As in Canada, these labourisms combined a programme for worker justice (though ones that were not as liberal as in Canadian labourism) with white racial identity, a programme for justice for white workers which included active campaigning for the exclusion of non-white workers from the labour market through restrictive immigration policies and other measures (Hyslop 1999). Hyslop uses the example of the militancy mobilized based on labourism in a solidarity in Britain in 1914 that combined ideas of dignity and justice for workers with whiteness. This international solidarity rally against the deportation of white South African labour leaders who had been fighting for the exclusion of non-white workers was the largest British labour demonstration in the early 20th century (Hyslop 1999, 398). Through this case, he argues that

we see, first, the transnational development of labourism within the British Empire as ideas that were circulated amongst the imperial working class, and second, the centrality of the "the imperial framework . . . in shaping the self-conceptions of British and colonial workers before 1914" (Hyslop 1999, 400).

The link here between whiteness and empire is important for understanding the specific nature of white supremacist logic within the Canadian working class in this period. Canadian labourism functioned to support white supremacist relations in Canada, just as in Australia, through efforts to impact immigration policies (Goutor 2007a), and this was founded on a transnational white identity in the context of the British Empire. This meant that "the cause of international labour was seen as identical with the cause of the globalised white British labour diaspora" (Hyslop 1999, 418-19). The solidarities built via this transnational identity combined notions of class with white identity, making whiteness the basis and promise for fighting exploitation.

The connections forged and expressed in the 1914 rally in London's Hyde Park and in Canada in the Chinatown Riots in Vancouver in 1907 (Sugimoto 1973) complicate notions of solidarity and show how it can combine exploitation with a desire to be incorporated or recognized "within the dominant racial structure" (Hyslop 1999, 418). Both events reflect the popularity of labourism and indicate that white supremacy, identification with empire and support for imperialism cannot be dismissed as simply the products of the labour leadership. The conception of justice put forward by labourists is something that became hegemonic amongst the white-settler working class in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. And this is situated within and shaped by an international context in which, Hyslop argues, labour movements were fighting for their members to be recognized as "white" (Hyslop 1999, 418). I argue that this configuration and the labourist analyses it is rooted in and the strategies it led to are critical to understanding the rise of labour imperialism

and accommodationist forms of solidarity in the Canadian labour movement in the later part of the 20th century.

In 1921, the Trades and Labour Congress withdrew backing for the labourist movement due to what they perceived to be its growing socialist orientation (Heron 1984, 71). Social democracy in Canada arose in part out of labourism and came to replace it as a dominant force within the labour movement. The rise of Canadian social democratic ideology and the establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) in 1932, which later, after creating a more formal alliance with labour, became the New Democratic Party (NDP) in 1961, happened in the context of the rise of growing revolutionary socialist forces and as a response to them.[45] The socialist-inflected liberalism of the CCF was also influenced by the experiences of immigrant workers in this period, an experience which also brought ideas of worker justice that were influenced by growing international socialist movements. Like the labourists, Canadian social democracy sought to secure worker justice within capitalism through union organizing and a political strategy focused on electoral change and legislative and judicial reforms (Naylor 1998, 169; Heron 1989).

The social democratic vision of worker justice differed from labourism in important ways, including in the "strong interest in civil liberties, contributing to the pull away from the most obviously racist positions" (Hunt and Rayside 2000, 410). For the most part, the social democratic approach to oppression has been rights based, and social democratic labour activists worked primarily to end workplace discrimination based on race and creed.[46] Like their labourist predecessors, they fought for fulfillment of the promises of liberal democracy for a wider group of workers, though still within the national framework that connected entitlements to citizenship. Unlike labourism and parallel to the approach of rising industrial unionism, social democrats

---

[45] See Horowitz 1968.

[46] For more, see Goutor 2011; Patrias and Frager 2001.

responded to employer use of racial discrimination by seeking to raise the conditions of non-white workers through processes of inclusion and demands for rights. This is reflected in the involvement of social democratic trade unionists in the rise of industrial unionism and then in activism for human rights legislation.[47] However, with some notable exceptions, this was done within a framework that did not challenge imperialism, colonialism or immigration policies steeped in the logics of white supremacy and heteropatriarchy.[48] This is important because it highlights the liberal character of the challenge to oppression that developed, one which made oppression equivalent to discrimination rather than to processes and practices steeped in the history of colonization, the development of capitalism, and ongoing imperialism. As a politics trying to reconcile capitalism with principles of egalitarianism and justice for the working class, anti-discrimination was a logical outgrowth because it did not fundamentally challenge capitalism or the logics of white supremacy that underlie ideas of Canada and "Canadian-ness."

As an amalgam of ideas from different currents of socialism and labourism, Canadian social democrats based their demands and strategy for worker justice on moral grounds (which particularly in its early years involved moral critiques of aspects of capitalism) rather than critiques of the logic of capitalism and the legacies of its development (Heron 1989, 76; Heron 1984, 71; Horowitz 1968). We can trace the current emphasis of the Canadian labour movement on labour rights and the discourse of fairness to Canadian social democratic thought. Like labourism, this moral rationale was steeped in ideas of respect and recognition and supported an understanding of class relations within a pluralist framework. In this paradigm, inequities between workers and capital could be mediated and resolved through the role of the state, which can operate as an equalizer through protection of rights and redistributive policies. This pluralism rests on the social-democratic belief in the state's

---

[47] See Goutor 2011; Patrias and Frager 2001.

[48] See Goutor 2011; Patrias and Frager 2001. For more on immigration and white Canadian identity, see Thobani 2000a, 2007; Sharma 2006a, 2006b, 2007.

capacity to transcend the logic of capitalism to create equilibrium between workers and capital. This analysis of the state and of the logic of capitalism is a significant component of the corporatist strategies that arose inside the social democratic-dominated leadership in the trade union movement during the Cold War.

The rise of socialism in this period that was part of producing Canadian social democracy also gave rise to revolutionary socialism, reflected in the formation of syndicalist, anarchist and communist workers' organizations and political parties. This too was a transnational phenomenon. Canadian revolutionary socialisms cannot be thought outside this international dimension. Workers considered non-white, many of whom were recent migrants, constituted the overwhelming majority in many of these organizations. As Stephen Endicott notes about the Communist Party, "although the overwhelming majority of the population was made up of Anglo-Celtic and French-Canadian workers, 95% of the party membership was confined to three other language groups – Finnish with 60%, Ukrainian with 25%, and Jewish with 10%" (Endicott 2012, 27). The overwhelming presence of immigrant workers in the party was met with various forms of state repression in the form of the banning of "alien" newspapers and exhibited in state actions and those of capital represented in and reflected in the name of the Citizens' Committee of 1000 during the Winnipeg General Strike (Mitchell and Naylor 1998, 180).

There were many differences between the different strands of revolutionary socialist organizing in this period that we see in the various parties, campaigns and newspapers. The primary feature distinguishing these from that of the social democratic trade unionists is that they did not see egalitarian principles as reconcilable with capitalism. For revolutionary socialists, protection of rights and other measures of state action within a capitalist system are insufficient because they do not overcome the logic of capitalism, which because of the creation of surplus value means that workers are inevitably subject to exploitation. Worker injustice in this view, therefore, did not arise from a

lack of recognition or of rights but from the fundamental logic and contradictions of capitalism itself. For these revolutionary socialists, workers' justice meant emancipation from capitalism and capitalist social relations altogether. Political action, while sometimes electoral, primarily concerned with building working-class power and capacities to fight through various organizing strategies. Examples of this are the methods and strategies of the class-struggle oriented OBU. Building working class power translated into organizing; these were strategies that went beyond the narrow confines of mainstream trade union organizing, including organizing the unemployed, women and non-white workers regardless of ethnicity or citizenship. We also see an internationalist orientation in the efforts of the CPC to organize volunteers to fight in the Spanish Civil War (Howard 1987; Petrou 2005).[49]

While revolutionary socialist organizers were very active and strong in this period, their challenges to exploitation and oppression were also limited by several factors. The CPC provides a good illustration of the contradictions in the practice and strategy for worker justice. For one, the British migrants often dominated the leadership in these organizations despite the majority Jewish, Ukrainian and Finnish memberships.[50] And as Donald Critchlow's study of unions in the US with Communist leadership, their politics of challenging oppression did not always translate into organizing strategies and practices within the union to challenge racism (Critchlow 1979). And while organizing immigrant and racialized workers, strategies were sometimes chosen that reinforced racist notions through appeal to ideas of citizenship based on race or the superiority of British institutions to legitimize strike aims, as during the Winnipeg General Strike (Mitchell and Naylor 1998, 184 and 211).

---

[49] While beyond the scope of my project, events like Spanish Civil War point to the need to think through Canadian labour internationalism in this period of rich ideological and political contestations within the labour movement.

[50] Manley discusses the Canadianizing of the party noting that "his ethnicity undoubtedly helped sell the Party's new *Canadian* identity" (Manley 2002, 20, emphasis in the original).

Related to this is the nationalist tendencies seen in the CPC, which became particularly prominent during the war with the party's calls for national unity (Horowitz 1968, 92). The rise of nationalist politics during and after the war was a transnational phenomenon within communist parties (though not encompassing all parties) fuelled by the dissolution of the Comintern. While nationalism was increasingly permitted and even encouraged after the dissolution of the Comintern, some nationalist tendencies predate the dissolution. During the interwar years, some revolutionary socialists made alliances with nationalist forces, for instance, the CPC's alliance with the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees (CBRE), which was a nationalist union that maintained racist job segregation to form the ACCL in the late 1920s (Heron 1989, 70). This was also reflected the discussion of the colonial question on the left more generally. Allan Seager and David Roth note that it was not being debated at all in British Columbia except by indigenous organizations, and as Endicott notes, the discussion around Canada as a colony was focused on whether Canada was a colony of the United States or Britain (Seager and Roth 1998, 240; Endicott 24-5). This configuration of the colonial question operated in the logic of white supremacy in its erasure of the indigenous population and by framing white settlers as subject to the colonization of Britain and/or the United States. Another way that some revolutionary socialists failed to challenge the social nature of class relations was through Workerist biases within some revolutionary socialist movements (McKay and Morton 1998, 59). This meant that some currents within revolutionary socialist movements desocialized class, abstracting class from lived experience, which erased the racial, gender, national and geographic dimensions that shape different experiences of class. We see this for instance in the assumptions around who is working class and whose struggles matter (Frank 1998, 80).

Thinking Internationally

The dominant forces and ideological tensions in Canada in the interwar years over the nature of and strategies for worker justice are full of contradictions. These tensions and contradictions in how to confront the injustices borne of capitalist development and its effects on the social nature of class relations must be understood in the international context. This is because, as a settler colony, the particular sets of ideas that arose in the Canadian context were constantly being shaped and reshaped by continuing streams of migration and the ideas and experiences migrants brought with them. The international context is a reminder that the war of position vis-à-vis capitalism was a transnational phenomenon predating the Cold War. The wars of position over worker justice that were being fought in Canada were also being fought in many other national contexts predominately in the Global North.

E.H. Carr argues that the split between social democracy and communism had already reached the international level of the trade union movement (Carr 1946, 73). This was reflected in the set-up of the IFTU and the RILU between 1919–20 (Foster 1956) – and I would argue also in the set-up of international institutions like the ILO, a liberal institution based on a model of pluralism and cooperation between workers' organizations, states and capital. The TLC, the craft union federation, was involved in the ILO (Goutor 2007a, 192), reflecting and complementing their conciliatory approach to capital and the state. And the WUL was affiliated to the RILU, which was a part of the wider communist structure growing out of the Russian Revolution and the rise of the Communist Party of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (CPU).[51]

The wars of position over worker justice, and along with this models of union organization and action, shaped certain kinds of solidarities that impacted the goals and methods of labour internationalism. In the next chapter, I begin to unpack the dominant labour internationalism that

---

[51] See Endicott 2012.

developed in the early Cold War and how these wars of position operated in the development of these practices and policies.

<u>Chapter 4</u>

Wars of Position and the Making of
Labour Imperialism and Accommodationist Solidarities

In this chapter, I explore how Canadian unions responded to the hierarchies characterizing

global divisions of labour in the immediate post-World War II period. I situate the development of

the dominant vision and practice of labour internationalism inside the Canadian labour movement.

The dominant vision in this period is exemplified the policies and practices of the CCL's

International Affairs Committee (IAC) and International Affairs Department (IAD), and after 1956

that of the CLC.[1] This examination follows from my analysis of the debates over worker justice and

models of union organization and strategy in the interwar years. The practices and omissions that

characterized the way these different forces confronted capitalist development and the social

inequalities born of local class formation carry through in the thinking that came to inform their

responses to international divisions of labour in this defining period. I argue that the CCL and then

the CLC's international programme can be characterized as operating between labour imperialism

and accommodationist solidarity. By this, I mean that while aligned with the state and capital (both

Canadian and American) and their interests in expansion internationally over and often against the

aims of the dominant forces of workers in many parts of the Global South, their actions were often

framed and understood as solidarity.

I begin this chapter with a theoretical discussion of accommodationist tendencies expressed

in different models of unions, and their goals and strategies for workers' justice. Here I review,

---

[1] Note that the TLC was not an active player in international affairs. Though they were involved in the ILO, they did not, despite the pleading of the CCL, join the WFTU. In this period, it was primarily the CCL that was dedicating significant energy to developing an international programme. They emphasized the lack of necessity of engaging in international activity. At their 1954 convention, Percy Bengough argued for the priority of domestic affairs and said that "Sending millions of dollars abroad to aid the depressed with a view of raising their standards of living should be the right thing to do, but shouldn't we ease up doing these nice things until we have found out where we can get the money to initiate work for our own people . . ." (Price 2003, 15). This sentiment remains a dominant one inside the Canadian labour movement today.

assess and elaborate on the frameworks used to understand the phenomenon of labour imperialism, starting with Johns' distinction between accommodationist and transformative forms of solidarity. I continue by considering features of different models of trade unionism and their ideological underpinnings. Then, drawing from Charles Post, I argue that the tendency toward accommodationist solidarity, rather than having a direct material basis as an expression of the interests of workers, is an issue of class consciousness. I maintain that we need to look to Gramsci and what Luis M. Pozo calls mechanisms of class accommodation that operate in this tendency toward accommodation. Accommodation is exhibited in the common-sense notions that shaped ideas about the interests of the Canadian working class, and these notions are rooted in the social nature of Canadian class formation and the dominant ideas of race, nation and class flowing from it. I return to the global context in which the CCL/CLC's international programme was established, including the major wars of position over the future of capitalist development. I then look at the main players in the set up and operation of the ICFTU and the closest federations to the CCL/CCL institutionally and politically.

Accommodation and Transformation

The tensions between the tendencies of unions to be sites of accommodation and transformation are central to the Marxist debates on the possible revolutionary character of unions, from Marx and Gramsci on the more optimistic side to Lenin and Trotsky on the more pessimistic one (Hyman 1971). Johns' distinction between accommodationist and transformative forms of solidarity reflects the tensions in these debates, retaining a sense that there is within trade unions a potential for transformative forms of solidarity, ones that hold class interests "over interests that are spatially derived and rooted" and which thereby operate outside of the logic of nationalism and imperialism (Johns 1998, 256). Accommodationist solidarity on the other hand involves activities

that, "while using the rhetoric of internationalism and union solidarity . . . seeks not to transform social relations but to accommodate them while reasserting the dominance of a particular group of workers within capitalism's spatial structures" (Johns 1998, 256). This distinction highlights the role of the logic of nationalism and imperialism and the tendency toward accommodation even in practices that may even arise from a sense of solidarity. Accommodationist solidarity, therefore, can be distinguished from labour imperialism through intention rather than the consequences of specific practices. I argue that labour imperialism is imbued with a clear sense of opposing interests and a more self-conscious attempt to smash certain labour, social or political forces or boost others in a specific contest for power. Johns' contribution is important for highlighting the complexities of the support for and acceptance of the logics of imperialism and nationalism that may appear (and might even be genuinely held to be) solidaristic.

Johns notes that class identities are complicated by race, gender, sexuality, national identity, and geography, which create mixed "messages of brotherhood and sisterhood that clash with messages of self-preservation at any cost" in terms of the ability to challenge competition between workers (Johns 1998, 253). For Johns, drawing on David Harvey, this tension arises from material conditions in which capital is able to create and deepen inequality across space, inequalities that have arisen through the historical processes of uneven development that underlies global divisions of labour (Johns 1998, 254). Johns elaborates on this tension that exists in practices of international labour solidarity by outlining levels in the spectrum of forms of solidarity. She calls the first level zero; this is essentially labour imperialism in which "labor defines itself in an emphatically geographic manner" (Johns 1998, 259).[2] This often involves explicit nationalist and/or xenophobic responses to workers on the international level as "foreign competition" (Johns 1998, 259). Level

---

[2] Johns' spectrum spans from accommodation to transformation, whereby level zero is a form of accommodation. However, as the zero denotes, this is not a form of solidarity, and therefore I refer to this approach as labour imperialism rather than a level of accommodationist solidarity.

one refers to instances where workers understand international solidarity as a "useful mechanism for achieving the protection or improvement of their own standard of living through the elimination of pools of cheap labor" (Johns 1998, 259-260).

In contrast to this are two levels of transformative solidarity. The first is a conception of solidarity in which there is a sense of interconnection with workers beyond one's own national borders. In this framework, there is recognition of national differences between workers and their interests, however these workers identify as both national and as part of an international working class (Johns 1998, 260). This has been common for instance in the solidarity work of various left nationalist movements. Lastly, there is level three: workers see themselves in solidarity with workers internationally because they see themselves as part of an international working class and thereby put class before what are seen by them as "national" interests (Johns 1998, 260). This last form is anti-capitalist and internationalist in orientation and aims at "eliminating capital's spatial advantage over labour, seeking to transform global capitalism" (Johns 1998, 260). Johns' categorizations can function to hold elements of both the optimistic and pessimistic approaches to trade unions in a tension, whereby possibilities for real social change exist in the forces and tendencies – or as Hyman argues, as currents and counter-currents – inside the labour movement.[3] The potential for overcoming accommodation calls on us to unpack the elements and underlying roots of this tendency.

Accommodation and Transformation: Inside Different Conceptions of Trade Unionism

In the absence of effective, collective class-organisation, workers are pitted one against another – on the basis of race, gender, nationality – for jobs, promotions, education and housing.
–Charles Post (2010, 34)

---

[3] However, this approach and my own in that they look to labour as a space where such contests take place, is closer to the optimistic approaches of Marx and Gramsci in that we cannot write of trade unions as structurally unable to serve any function but accommodation.

Unpacking how and why different practices of labour internationalism developed in different places requires both a historical analysis of class formation and of how this translated into battles over conceptions of workers' justice. These battles, which take place in debates over the goals, strategies, tactics and organization of trade unions, are expressions of tensions within class consciousness and are reflective of how they conceptualize resistance and worker justice. Hyman argues that most trade unions emerged as social movements (Hyman 2001, 60). However, as Lenin noted, unions "display a natural tendency to integration with the system," and their endurance is often attributable to some level of accommodation (Hyman 2001, 2; Hyman 1975, 14).

There are different conceptualizations of trade union models, philosophies, tendencies and ideal types. For the purposes of this study I draw from Hyman's conceptualization of three trade union ideal types that he uses to unpack the politics of Western European trade unionism. These are business unionism, social democratic unionism, and revolutionary unionism. These ideal types provide a framework for situating the tensions between accommodation and transformation within unions. Although in the interwar years in Canada these different ideal types translated into new models of unionism, in the early Cold War these ideal types are more useful for analysis if understood as representing ideological tendencies or currents within certain unions or labour movements (which may come to be dominant in unions or movements at specific times).

I draw from Hyman's categorization rather than the more common framework used in North American scholarship and union discourse today between business and social or social movement unionism (Moody 1997; Robinson 1993, 2000; Ross 2007). This framework has provided useful insights on strategies for trade union renewal and raises critical questions about the direction

of unions in North America today;[4] however, the tendency to conflate social democratic and anti-capitalist philosophies makes this framework ill-suited for the purposes of this study.[5]

Accommodative Philosophies

Just as the social democratic orientation becomes conflated with revolutionary approaches in some frameworks, in other texts it becomes synonymous with business unionism.[6] While both the social democratic and business union philosophies are accommodative approaches, they have distinct philosophies, and these differences are important for understanding labour internationalism in Canada.[7] I will begin with some of what they share and then go into the important differences.

First, the models arising from these philosophies are both now in crisis. Both the dominant social democratic types, strongest in continental Europe but also in Canada, and business union types have witnessed the benefits won through their strategies and pacts made with the state and capital, within regional or national frameworks, diminish or disappear in the Global North in the past forty years. Second, they deny that the logic of capitalism is a barrier to worker justice. These philosophies see the union as a means in and of itself (or with the help of the state) to overcome or mitigate exploitation and oppression despite the vicissitudes of the market that shapes their ability to do so. Third, these philosophies do not necessarily see workers as being in conflict with employers. Fourth, while the sectionalism of business unionism is far narrower than that arising from a social

---

[4] I cannot discuss here the variations and different uses of the terms (for more, see Moody 1997; Ross 2007; Scipes 2014b, which offer useful discussions of strategies for building the capacities of workers).

[5] Also, there is also the question of whether the term social movement unionism should be applied in the North American context given the very different goals, strategies and tactics of unions there from those trade unions in the South that initially inspired the term social movement unionism (for more, see Scipes 2014b).

[6] For instance, in the work of the SSC (1981) and Murphy (1986); due to the accommodative nature of the dominant social democratic trade unionism in Canada, they see the two as synonymous. Hyman also notes the conflation in his rationale for treating them as separate ideal types (Hyman 2001, 3).

[7] As I outlined in Chapter 3, these types as well as the revolutionary type were present and distinct in the Canadian context in the early 20th century. And as I outlined in the Canadian context in the interwar years, these accommodative types share liberal roots and an acceptance of capitalism.

democratic orientation. From the social democratic philosophy, even in places where it effectively mitigates against sectionalism based on industry, it often retains a strong sectionalism based on national citizenship.

Business Unionism

Samuel Gompers, head of the AFL from 1886 until his death in 1924, is often thought of as the archetypal business unionist. When asked the purpose of trade unionism, Gompers simply replied "More" (Hyman 2001, 13). Hyman argues that business unionism, most common in the United States, is a model of conscious economism (Hyman 2001, 3). As noted in studies of American labour imperialism, business unionism generally eschews political action and sees itself as outside the realm of politics (Hyman 2001, 15).[8] Business unionism emphasizes collective bargaining and understands the function of the union as serving to meet the material needs of those in a specific occupation (Hyman 2001, 3). As noted by many American labour scholars, the strong sectionalist approach of business unionism has historically often also translated into racist, sexist, nationalist and pro-imperialist tendencies.[9]

The Philosophy of Social Partnership:[10] Social Democratic Unionism

Hyman uses the term social partnership to characterize the model of integrative trade unionism that developed in many parts of continental Europe, tying it to both social democracy and the orientation of the early anti-socialist Christian unions in Europe (Hyman 2001, 3). These early

---

[8] Though business unionists sometimes seek to influence the state regarding the nature of the legal regime governing industrial relations.

[9] See Scipes 2010a; Frank 2000.

[10] Philosophies of social partnership are referred to by some Marxists and revolutionary socialists as class collaboration. However, I use social partnership in this dissertation because it is more widely used today in relation to social democratic unions. It is important to unpack this characterization as benign.

anti-socialist Christian unions, unlike the early social democratic unions which he argued had adopted many of the features of the business unionism, opposed business unionism and denied differences in interests between workers and employers, arguing for partnership on the basis of the moral dignity of workers (Hyman 2001, 2-3). Both visions of social partnership denote a replacement of class struggle with forms of cooperation (Hyman 2001, 48) that varied significantly based on the historical development of this vision in different contexts. The ILO, for instance, is an expression of this ethos as an international tripartite organization that seeks cooperation between governments, unions and employers.[11] Some of the strongest tendencies towards this type of social partnership are exhibited in the industrial relations systems in most major Western European nations. Like the anti-socialist Christian unions, Hyman argues that the social democratic approach to the union as "a vehicle for social integration" also arose as a response to visions of the union as a site for challenging capitalism (Hyman 2001, 3).

In contrast to business unionism, the philosophy of social partnership translated into an engagement in politics. Often this meant formal alliances with social democratic political parties which in some cases sought to build tripartite structures as a way to secure better conditions for workers. And so, unlike business unions, their activities sought political change to improve conditions for workers nationally or regionally rather than only for those in a specific workplace or occupation. However, Hyman notes that this type of unionism, as a form of political economism (Hyman 1994 cited in Hyman 2001, 55) meant that, while engaging in political activity, "political aspirations unconnected to the material interests of unions' actual or potential constituents tended to become largely ceremonial and rhetorical" (Hyman 2001, 55). This orientation is useful for thinking about the international because this activity was largely focused on the nation as horizon and on the conditions of full citizenship. On the level of trade union action, this national political economism

---

[11] For more on the imperialism of the ILO, see Taha 2015.

resulted in "a synthesis between pragmatic collective bargaining and a politics of state-directed social reform and economic management" (Hyman 2001, 55). In sum, underlying this orientation and model of trade union action was a belief that through social partnership workers could achieve justice within and despite the crises of capitalism through collective bargaining coupled with the redistributive mechanisms of the welfare state (Wahl 2004, 4) for citizens of Northern nation-states.[12]

Transformative Philosophies

The last ideal type Hyman describes are union philosophies and strategies arising from various anti-capitalist traditions, including "radical social democratic, syndicalist and communist" approaches and all the variations within, historically, regionally and ideologically (Hyman 2001, 2). This type of unionism, which we might call transformative, revolutionary or class-struggle unionism aims to challenge capitalism and capitalist social relations.[13] The orientation of this ideal type is to build worker power and resistance to capitalism through the promotion of militancy and socio-political mobilization. There are numerous strategies that characterize class-struggle models of union practice, particularly those practices that emphasize building class consciousness and militancy through organizing spaces of resistance. This has translated into various configurations, including organizational strategies that have led to different strategies of organizing within craft and industrial unions and also has led to forms of political unions – for instance, those unions that were and are part of larger movements and struggles, such as those that grew or were created in and as part of

---

[12] Despite the fact that, as in the case of the post-World War II Europe, these pacts were made possible through the class confrontations of the previous generations (Wahl 2004, 5).

[13] See also Ness 2014. While I prefer the term class-struggle unionism, I think it is important to note that in order for this philosophy or model of unionism to be transformative in the sense that Johns discusses, it must entail a socialized conception of class and a vision of workers' justice.

broader anti-colonial or anti-fascist struggles, or radical syndicalist unions like the One Big Union.[14] And there is a huge diversity amongst these unions and workers struggles and movements. Regardless of the course strategies of revolutionary workers have taken, from radical syndicalist to communist, common to their philosophy of unionism is an emphasis on worker power, particularly the importance of organizing the broader working class (including those outside national borders) and the unemployed as well as a focus on strengthening worker capacities and class consciousness. This is an approach to trade unionism that sees unions as sites for building class consciousness and working-class power, an approach which is encapsulated in Engels' pronouncement that unions are "schools of war" for the working class (Hyman 2001, 1973). This ideal type runs up against the issues and contradictions of trade unions themselves, including the accommodationist tendencies that arise from unions being forms of organization essentially linked to and products of capitalism (Anderson 1967, 264). Also, some of these unions were radical by self-definition rather than consistently in practice, particularly in cases where they were subsumed to the rule of a party or movement.

Wars of Position

These ideal types exist as tensions within unions as dominant currents and counter-currents that are dialectically related to one another throughout the histories of unions and other workers' organizations. For Gramsci, "the superstructures of civil society are like the trench systems of modern warfare" (Gramsci 1971, 235). Unions, as key civil society organizations of the working class, are therefore important sites for contestations over the legitimacy of capitalism. For Gramsci, we see this contestation in battles over ideas and efforts to keep or take direct power. The first battle is a preparatory war of position which concerns the making or unmaking of hegemonic common

---

[14] For more, see Scipes 1996; Scipes 2014; McNally 2006; Ness 2014; Leier 1990; Peterson 1981, 1984.

sense within civil society (Boelhower 1981, 584). This is in preparation for the second battle, which is a direct war of manoeuvre aiming at taking state power. For Gramsci, these are both necessary. However, he argued that where war of manoeuvre is not possible, such as in many parts of Western Europe in his time, the focus had to be on building a power base in civil society through a war of position (Gramsci 1971, 206-207; Boelhower 1981, 584). This entails contesting the existing hegemony and building a new one. For Gramsci, this is no small task and requires "enormous sacrifices by infinite masses of people" (Gramsci 1971, 238). These wars of position mark the everyday life of civil society organizations and relations within them, intensifying or waning depending on the specific social, economic and political context.

The contests between the different ideal types, as philosophies, strategies and models of trade union activity, I argue should be understood as wars of position over the nature and direction of trade union action and over visions of worker justice. Inside unions, these ideal types exist as tendencies or forces represented by groups of rank-and-file workers, leaders or staff.[15] The wars of position take place over the policies and strategies of the union, in debates over organizing and political action, and much more. However, these wars of position are not limited to the politics inside specific unions. As evidenced by the histories of labour imperialism, the wars of position became increasingly internationalized as the Cold War began. The Cold War does not mark the beginning of the internationalization of these wars of position,[16] however, in this period the machinery and resources focused on advancing philosophies of workers' justice and trade union action grew significantly.[17]

---

[15] Sometimes these forces are organized or affiliated to political parties and at other times emerge more organically from social, economic or political conditions.

[16] As noted in Chapter 3, this is already visible in the contests between RILU and IFTU in the early 20th century.

[17] We see in this period the increased role of states (particularly those in Western Europe, North America and the USSR) and the availability of state funding for these wars of position inside the international labour movement.

Imperialism as a Material Interest?

An often-cited explanation for the accommodative tendencies of workers and unions in the North is some version of the labour aristocracy thesis, which holds that these workers form an elite group that have a material interest in supporting imperialism.

> The epoch of imperialism is one in which the world is divided among the "great" privileged nations that oppress all other nations. Morsels of the loot obtained as a result of these privileges and this oppression undoubtedly fall to the share of certain sections of the petty bourgeoisie and to the working-class aristocracy and bureaucracy. (Lenin quoted in Post 2010, 10-11)

For Lenin, this translated into an alliance between the more privileged part of the labour movement in the industrialized nations with "its 'own' national bourgeoisie, directed against the masses of the proletariat'" (Howard 367; Post 2010, 11). Post argues that some more recent variations of this thesis take this even further. For instance, Ernest Mandel argues that the labour aristocracy in fact encompasses the entire working class of the North (Post 2010, 23).[18]

Charles Post offers some significant critiques of this theory which has been a dominant assumption or explanatory framework for trying to understand North–South working-class relations (2010). Drawing from his critique, I argue that the labour aristocracy thesis is not useful for making sense of labour imperialism and accommodationist solidarity. Post's critique centres on the material basis for this "bribe" or "share in the profits" made possible for workers in the North as a direct product of imperialism. Post argues that the "benefits to the working class of industrialized countries from imperialist investment are neither automatic nor evenly distributed" (Post 2010, 24). The uneven distribution of benefits within the countries of the North does not itself invalidate some versions of the theory that would see grouping of the most privileged workers and labour leaders as the real beneficiaries. However, his questioning of the automatic transfer of the spoils of imperialism

---

[18] This is one extreme; others have used the labour aristocracy thesis in more nuanced ways, arguing that while the post-World War II pact and the development of welfare states were "encouraged by economic developments of imperialism," they were not inevitable (Howe 1986, 3). Howe, like Post, points instead to class struggle as an explanation of the benefits won in this period.

to sets of workers in the North does fundamentally challenge this thesis. Post, looking at the case of the United States, examines the levels of foreign direct investment (FDI) in the South. He argues the profits derived through this investment have not translated into better conditions for American workers. Post examines the proportion of domestic wages linked to these investment profits and finds a huge divide between profits and these profits as a proportion of domestic wages (Post 2010, 24). Instead, in the context of huge profits for American multinationals, the American working class have experienced falling real wages due to the rise of competition between workers and a growing global reserve army of labour (Post 2010, 24, 27). Thus, Northern workers do not automatically derive a share of the profits of imperialism.

This, however, does not change the fact that workers see their interests as aligned with imperialism and that some currents within unions in the North saw themselves as a part of a labour aristocracy. As Walter Reuther declared, "Workers don't want a larger share of the pie, they want a bigger pie" (Frank 2000). So instead of seeing their benefits derived through struggle for a bigger share of profits, they saw their interests as aligned with the employer's ability to accumulate, including through imperialist expansion. The belief in shared interests and of imperialism as a source of security for Northern workers is critical. It proposes social partnership as an alternative to class struggle as a route to prosperity and security. In Post's formulation, the benefits derived from workers in the North, whether derived domestically or internationally, are a product of class struggle (Post 2010, 27).

Evident in the way that union leaders like Reuther came to see imperialism as a source of prosperity for workers is the conservatism of this thesis. It serves to both obscure the role of class struggle in the derivation of benefits from employers and it also operates to write off the potential of sections – or in some cases the entire working class – in Northern states. A direct and necessary correlation between imperialism and the material conditions of workers in the North and its use to

explain the actions of Northern workers would leave us with very little hope for resistance or solidarity.[19]

This is not to say that there are not real material forces at play in the relations and possibilities of international solidarity. So while Post challenges the theses of Lenin and others in terms of the gains made for workers through imperialist expansion in the form of ratios of wages earned by workers in proportion to their investments, material conditions (real and perceived)[20] do play a role in the making of different labour internationalisms. For one, there are real material differences in conditions of work internal to nation-states and on an international scale.[21] This is particularly pronounced in the current context that allows for the easy movement of capital, which means that workers are in fact in competition with each other for investment and jobs. As such, real material conditions arising from the nature of capitalist development is a factor in shaping relations between workers internationally. This can sometimes mean that workers are fighting for investment and jobs, and so they are fighting over their short-term material interests.

Real differences in immediate material interests, however, do not automatically translate into accommodative practices. Post notes that the most well paid workers, those who could fall under the category of the labour aristocracy, have also engaged in radical and transformative action.[22] This

---

[19] If this were the case, then there would be no need to write this dissertation, we could simply dismiss workers in the north as necessarily accommodative and imperialist.

[20] For instance, this is sometimes more perceived than real. An example of this is a Canadian union that refused to support the boycott campaign against Coca Cola for their role in the murder of Colombian trade unionists due to the potential impact on their workers in Ontario. Now, while the material impacts of such a campaign on workers in Ontario is questionable, the perceived threat translated into a failure to be in solidarity against the killing of fellow trade unionists.

[21] Post argues that we also have to look to the "role of race, nationality and gender in the creation of a stratified working class which competition and accumulation continually differentiate in terms of profitability, wages and working conditions" (Post 2010, 28).

[22] Post argues that when we are looking historically at some of the most highly paid workers, there is no evidence that these workers should be necessarily accommodative – and that what history tells us is that some of these workers did in fact engage in radical actions (Post 2010, 30-1).

is true also when we look at relations between material interests and acts of international solidarity. Those who are the most materially privileged and those who may face material consequences for challenging exploitation and oppression have not automatically acted based on their material interests. One of the most poignant examples of this is the case of the British cotton workers, whose acts of solidarity ran them the risk of losing work. This expression of class consciousness overriding what are immediate material interests was why this was such an inspiration for Marx. And so rather than seeing a direct correlation between the immediate material interests of workers and their actions, we need to centre class consciousness and, as Post argues, look to the ways capitalism operates to pit workers against each other (Post 2010, 34). There are many factors at play in the making of class consciousness and sources for accommodative tendencies within workers' organizations, and our analyses of these factors need to be situated in specific histories of class formation. I will focus on two interrelated sets of ideas that are relevant for understanding the source of accommodative solidarity that developed in Canada: first, nationalism and the nation-state form, and second, race, racism and white supremacy.

Nationalism and the Nation-State Form

What's good for GM is good for America.
–Charlie E. Wilson, CEO of GM and then US Secretary of Defense under Eisenhower 1953-1957[23]
(Patterson 2013)

Despite Marx's insistence that workers have no country, trade union practice has often been shaped more by conceptions of national identity and national interests than by ideals of proletarian internationalism.
–Richard Hyman (2001, 39)

For Lenin, the labour aristocracy thesis was an explanation of the alliances formed by

workers, unions and socialist parties with their respective states and national bourgeoisie (Post 2010,

---

[23] Justin Hyde argues that this statement was in fact a misquote of Charlie Wilson, who served as CEO of GM and then directly after as secretary of defense under Eisenhower (see Justin Hyde 2008). However, this quote remains salient as a slogan that became a part of common-sense thought and popular discourse.

11). The inadequacies of the labour aristocracy thesis require consideration of how a sense of a mutuality of interests in supporting imperialism developed in different contexts. In part, this alliance is rooted in the contradictions within capitalism that lead some workers to see their fate as aligned with the prosperity of their employers. We see this in the case of the specific partnerships expressed in economic nationalist and corporatist strategies or aims in Canada and the United States. While promoted by specific employers in times of heightened class struggle, these strategies were also actively supported by labour in specific periods.[24] To understand how this alignment with employers becomes an alignment with the interests of the state and national capital, or in the case of early post-World War II Canadian labour leadership with Canadian and American capital, we have to look at how the organization of states and ideas of national identity shape specific communities of interests. I argue that the racial dimension of this national identity is important for understanding how an accommodative community of interest was shaped internationally between workers in the United States and Canada, their employers, and their respective state interests.[25]

For Luxemburg, the alignment of socialist parties with their respective states during the First World War was a product of nationalist ideology imparted from the bourgeoisie (Luxemburg quoted in McNally 1991, 247). Luis M. Pozo argues that "the nation" operates as a "mechanism of class accommodation" working to "render the reality of class divisions politically irrelevant by stressing the 'organic' unity of dominant and dominated" (Pozo 2007, 55, 58).[26] Pozo's conception of the mechanisms of class accommodation draws on Gramsci's discussion of hegemony to think about

---

[24] See Frank 2000; Heron and Siemiatycki 1998, 5, 26.

[25] The race–nation nexus, particularly in white-settler societies, is a critical piece of this alignment. For instance, in regards to American labour imperialism Scipes argues that "business unionism accepts capitalism, and has traditionally accepted race and empire" (Scipes 2010b, 475). In this article he also emphasizes the role of race in the American nationalism at work in American labour imperialism.

[26] Frank Annunziato argues that for Gramsci, "reformist socialists, by ignoring Marxist theory, were destined to support bourgeois ideology" (Annunziato 1988, 161).

the way that class is erased from social consciousness (Pozo 2007, 58). For Pozo, the accommodative function of the idea of "the nation" is exemplified in the structural conditions that existed in the making of nation-states, in the way the nation-state form was tied to the rise of capitalism and in the ways it was imagined and constructed (Pozo 2007, 58). Specifically, he argues that we see the "corporate and fictive family metaphors" of feudal societies in "ideas of citizenship and modern forms of corporatism and ideologies, and practices of 'social partnership'" (Pozo 2007, 58).

For Waterman, the end of the era of emancipatory internationalism was marked by a national-colonial-industrial nexus whereby unions became "imprisoned within the capitalist state-nation" (Waterman 2000, 2005b, 210). In this period, in the North, there is a turn to national-states as sites to win a larger portion of wealth generated by workers for the working class. The pacts made in this period with the state and capital resulted in the development of welfare states.[27] Benefits won through battles during the war and after reinforced a sense of a community of interests as national. These benefits were for the most part available only to national citizens. They therefore operated to promote and reinforce the logic of entitlements rooted in divisions based on such citizenship.[28]

The role of "the nation" as a mechanism of class accommodation is not limited to its expression as an explicit nationalism of nationalist political parties and movements; it is also expressed in a commitment to the nation-state form,[29] the logic of the border and the national

---

[27] These benefits, won through class struggle, were important to the lives of many workers in the Global North. However, we need to remember that this was always for a limited group that existed simultaneously with colonialism and the creation of a massive reserve army without access to these entitlements, alignments with imperialist policies of the state and racist immigration laws. I raise this because this is often omitted from nostalgic conceptions of the post-war pact and the development of the social welfare state.

[28] Many of these benefits also reinforced patriarchy as they were based on participation in waged labour. An example of this is unemployment insurance, which excludes women's reproductive labour.

[29] It is important to note that the revolutionary left has been not immune from this. The issue of nationalism and strategies to confront it has been a serious problem for left movements throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. After the Russian Revolution, nationalism, which Marxist internationalism was initially an implicit critique of, became subject to far less debate and criticism as an idea of the ruling class amongst Marxists and within Communist parties, which were

organization of states. Underlying this are mythologies of what the nation is and represents. While

ideas of the nation often have racial and moral connotations, the nation is not simply ideological; it

is as a central structure of political life under capitalism.

The Border

> Nation-states have "historically depended on the difference of *citizenship* to make common sense of
> gross inequalities."
> –Nandita Sharma (2007, 72)

As outlined in Chapter 3, nation-states are critical actors in the creation and reproduction of

divisions based on race and gender that operate to reproduce inequality and competition between

workers within capitalism (Brodkin 2000, 248). As noted by Nandita Sharma, "inequalities based on

national identification schemes are inevitably created through national state categories of differential

membership that accomplish, both materially and ideologically, the gendered racialization of class"

(Sharma 2007, 73). For Sharma, this happens through the operation of the border, which serves to

uphold what she calls a system of global apartheid that entails the differential treatment of groups of

people (Sharma 2007, 72).[30] The border, she argues, has real material consequences for people and

the way they are exploited. This rests ideologically on the idea of the modern nation as a division of

humanity largely along racial and ethnic lines (Sharma 2007, 77). Nation-states are key actors, both

through imperialist practices and the regulation of borders, in the production and reproduction of

---

organized on national lines (for more, see Forman 1998). Eric Hobsbawm noted that "Marxist movements and states have tended to become national not only in form but in substance, i.e. nationalist" (Anderson 1991, 3). Tom Nairn adds that the end of nationalism is nowhere in sight and that the failure of Marxism to theorize this phenomenon is one of its greatest failures (Anderson 1991, 3). This meant that throughout much of the twentieth century, particularly after the dissolution of the Comintern and due to the nationalist character of many revolutionary anti-colonial struggles, critiques of nationalism from the revolutionary left have been marginalized or limited.

[30] "National borders have been organized through a set of institutionalized relationships based on the law, the market and extant social relations of 'race', class and gender within and across variously imagined spaces" (Sharma 2007, 71). Sharma argues that the border produces "legal differentiation of people within the same space" (Sharma 2007, 72). This serves to deepen divisions within national labour markets making some bodies more easily subject to greater levels of exploitation. David Theo Goldberg argues that "citizens were presumed to be white, especially in the liberal democracies of the Global North" (Goldberg 2008, 1712).

inequalities within the global working class. These inequalities are born of capitalist development and are grafted on the racial logics at work in colonialism and pre-capitalist forms of slavery.[31] The connections between nation, gender, race and class are highlighted in the operation of the border. As Sharma outlines, it is not that workers from the South are barred from entering the North; it is rather that the border, resting on ideas of race and nation, means that they enter under conditions of "unfreedom" (Sharma 2006b; Smith 2015; Ferguson and McNally 2015).[32] In sum, the border and the underlying ideas supporting the logic of the nation-state form operate as critical pieces in the maintenance of global divisions of labour and the huge disparities between nations and between the people within them.

Race, Racism and White Supremacy

Like the conception of *nation* that emerges more or less coterminously, race proceeds at its inception
by arming social subjects with a cohesive identity.
–David Theo Goldberg (1993, 4)

David Theo Goldberg argues that "the *modern* state has always conceived of itself as racially configured" (Goldberg 2002, 233). For Benedict Anderson, the emergence of the nation-state meant the imagining of a political community beyond the one which was rooted in face-to-face contact (Anderson 1991, 6). The nation-state and nationality became a universal socio-cultural concept (Anderson 1991, 5) based on a sense of biological connection, as something one embodies. We see this in the mythologies that trace "national histories" to antiquity through ideas of "bloodlines and genetic pools" (Goldberg 1993; Anderson 1991, 5). For Goldberg, the identity and community

---

[31] I elaborate on this point in the next section.

[32] As McNally and Ferguson note, they not only work for less and under conditions of unfreedom, but they are also stripped of access to the entitlements of the Northern welfare states. Stripped of all political power and always subject to the threat of deportation that employers are happy to threaten or use when they deem certain bodies no longer useful, that is, when they get injured, sick or resist. The right of national states to differently categorize people is enshrined within the global system of governance and are enmeshed with racialized and gendered ideas of entitlements, value, ability, and so on (Ferguson and McNally 2015).

inferred through the modern nation-state has a racial character (Goldberg 2002, 233). "Race is integral to the emergence, development and transformations (conceptually, philosophically, materially) of the modern nation-state" (Goldberg 2002, 234).[33] And while he argues that there is no specific state that we can call the "racial state," what we can identify are "generalizable conditions in virtue of which the modern state is conceived as racial, and as racially exclusionary or racist" (Goldberg 2002, 233). This exists even within those nations rooted in liberal racelessness like Canada.[34] As we see in the function of the border, the liberal ideology underlying the modern nation-state has always afforded rights and "entitlements based on property, gender and race" and operates to rationalize them (Mills 2008, 1382-83). Mills argues that for Kant, Locke, and other prominent liberal philosophers, this did not contradict liberal universalism because non-whites were never considered "full persons" (Mills 2008, 1382). Liberal ideology is therefore realized in the operation of the nation-state. This has political and material consequences. As Bannerji notes, this imagining of the national community organizes "practical and ideological exclusions and inclusions within the national space" and operates to hide "social relations of domination" (Bannerji 2000, 65, 97). It is therefore important to understand the racial character of the nation as a mechanism of class accommodation. To this end, I explore some relevant features of the ideology of race and racism as a material and historical phenomena and a set of power relations and, lastly, features of white settler colonies.

---

[33] For Goldberg, this includes everything from debates on enslavement during Spanish colonization of the Americas to debates on citizenship and national identity, which all relate to the racial connotations underlying the power of the modern state (Goldberg 2002, 234). He argues that "the racial state is racial not *merely* or reductively because of the racial composition of its personnel or the racial implications of its policies – though clearly both play a part. States are racial more deeply because of the structural position they occupy in producing and reproducing, constituting and effecting racially shaped spaces and places, groups and events, life worlds and possibilities, accesses and restrictions, inclusions and exclusions, conceptions and modes of representation" (Goldberg 2002, 239).

[34] See Backhouse 1999; Price 2013, 626. Goldberg argues that "given the regime of equality before the law the state cannot engage in racially discriminatory acts vis-à-vis its own citizens because it would call into question the legitimacy of this system . . . race becomes erased from the state and the socioconceptual landscape" (Goldberg 2008, 1713-44).

The birth of ideas of race and nation was intertwined ideologically with the European Enlightenment era and the rise of liberalism, which Goldberg argues was critical to the normalization of racial exclusions (Goldberg 1993, 1). Ideologically, the idea of race is embedded not only in the nation-state form, but also in the concept of modernity itself, including ideas of civilization, progress and development.[35] In the European Enlightenment era, what emerges is the idea of continuous progress in the mastery of nature, "material, moral, physical and political improvement;" in "the development of civilization, the general standards for which the West took to be its own values [are] universalized" (Goldberg 1993, 4). These are critical features of the ethos of colonialism, rooted in a sense of the moral and cultural superiority of the west (Goldberg 1993, 166). Not all peoples determined to be the "uncivilized" or "undeveloped" others to the European are framed as inherently inferior; some are viewed "historically immature and so in principle capable of development" (Goldberg 2002, 236). And while the racial connotations of the Enlightenment era that marks liberalism create hierarchies and exclusions based on ideas of inferiority and superiority, as Andrea Smith notes, this does not preclude the depiction of the "other" simultaneously as a threat (Smith 2008, 68-9). We see this in the logic of Orientalism as outlined by Edward Said, in which the "other" is both inferior and a threat. We also see this in W.E.B. DuBois' essay on the concept of race (1940), in which he argues that there are real fears and anxieties over "colored revolt against white exploitation" (DuBois quoted in Horne 1999, 443).

Race and Class: Thinking Race Historically, Materially and Transnationally

> Labour in a white skin cannot emancipate itself where it is branded in a black skin.
> –Karl Marx (quoted in David Featherstone 2012, 3–4)

---

[35] It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to consider all of the important insights from anti-colonial thought and scholarship on race, racism and white supremacy across numerous disciplines that can help make sense of the historical development of race as a concept and relation. Instead, here I draw out a few points that are relevant for the purposes of my dissertation.

The ideological terrain that renders the "other" both inferior and threatening points us more directly to the material and historical dimensions of the making of race. Within a liberal framework, "racist expressions are generally reduced to personal prejudices of individuals, to irrational appeals to irrelevant categories, to distinctions that delimit universal liberal ideals" (Goldberg 1993, 7). For Goldberg, such expressions amount to a "singular phenomenon of wrongness," stemming from pre-modern prejudice operating to deny the history of racialization by denying its relevance as a concept (Goldberg 1993, 7). This is the essence of liberal racelessness or colourblindness that grounds the universality liberalism professes while functioning to occlude the racialized dimensions of the history of exploitation and oppression marking capitalist development.

An antidote to the ahistorical readings of race within a liberal framework is provided by numerous anti-colonial and anti-racist thinkers who emphasize the need to understand the idea of race and processes of racialization historically, materially and transnationally (Rodney 1972, 1981; Williams 1994; Fanon 1963, 1967, 2008; Fanon et al 1988; James and Grimshaw 1992; James, Dunayevskaya and Boggs 1969; DuBois 1940; Bonilla-Silva 2000; Bannerji 1995, 2000, 2005; Bolaria and Li 1988; Dei 1996; Goldberg 1993, 2002; Balibar and Wallerstein 1991; Mills 1994, 1997, 2003, 2008; Lake 2003). The ideological terrain of racialization as a phenomenon must therefore be grounded in the history of capitalist development and the global class formation. As Bonilla-Silva notes, racism is not a free-floating ideology; rather, it is "anchored in real practices and it reinforces social relations among racialized subjects in a social order, that is, it supports a racialized social structure" (Bonilla-Silva 2000, 192). The historical processes of racialized and gendered class formation, as noted in Chapter 3, shape the everyday lives of workers' today and the conditions of work they may expect.

Outlining the historical processes of the racialization of global class formation is beyond the scope of this dissertation, so instead I outline some relevant aspects for the purposes of this study.

The processes of racialization and racial hierarchies that mark global divisions of labour today stem from practices of colonialism, including slavery, indenture, and forms of internal colonialism of white-settler states and in ongoing imperialist practices (Mills 1994, 109).[36] Bonilla-Silva, drawing from Immanuel Wallerstein, argues that "the national capitalist economies in the world have formed a world system for over six hundred years" (Bonilla-Silva 2000, 191). The extension of that system into Africa, the Americas and Asia in the sixteenth century involved the racialization of the peoples of the entire world (Balibar and Wallerstein 1991; Rodney 1981). European expansionism and the conquest and the expropriation of indigenous peoples is central to that process in that "non-Europeans were progressively conceptualized in ways that dehumanized them and enabled their dispossession and subordination," and race, which became a part of "a global structure of privilege, normative entitlement and normative exclusion, is inextricably tied up with the development of the modern societies" (Mills 2008, 1388). These processes of racialization that emerged through the various effects of European expansionism, including genocide and ethnic cleansing of indigenous peoples and capitalist forms of slavery, formed "a worldly web of racial arrangement, relationally produced over time, positioning not only people(s) but nation-states in terms of the fashioned hierarchies" (Goldberg 2002, 253). These processes were intimately tied to specific material interests of the emerging capitalist class in Western Europe and entailed the active participation of their respective nation-states (Rodney 1981). The violence and theft of the colonialism of British Empire, for instance, unlike that of Spain, was not just the looting of minerals for feudal lords, but entailed the making of unfree labour as part of the development of global production chains. Processes of

---

[36] Race "has been an essential component in the structuration of various kinds of social relations of domination and subordination between 'Western' and non-western peoples, between whites and non-whites in the world system" (Wallerstein and Balibar in Bonilla-Silva 2000, 192). While Charles W. Mills does not take a Marxist approach to this question, he argues that "a historical materialist account of global white supremacy can be developed" (Mills 1994, 115). He points to the work of David Roediger and Theodore Allen who have thought through the "importance of race in class formation, and how European domination imposed "regimes of super-exploitation on indigenous and imported populations, and the differential motivation and cultural/ideational power of local and metropolitan ruling classes to ensure that 'race' crystallizes as an overriding social identity stabilizing the resultant system" (Mills 1994, 115).

174

racialization became an important component of the normalization of the theft of resources, the making of unfree labour and stark global inequalities. These processes, a feature of global class formation as capitalism expanded, are upheld today through ongoing imperialism, through borders, and through other practices of the Northern nation-states that maintain social and economic divisions internally and through hegemonic raceless liberalism.[37]

Whiteness and the Making of a Transnational Community

As I outlined in Chapter 3, the idea of "white" as a race denoting superiority, civilization and modernity that renders various others enslaveable, non-existent, inferior and threatening was very much a part of class formation in the Canadian context as a white-settler colony.[38] However, it is important to situate this idea of whiteness – which has varied historically and geographically in terms of who has been included and excluded – and white superiority or supremacy as a transnational phenomenon. Whiteness, denoting power relations arising through the historical processes of racialization in global class formation, while being a feature of national identities and shaping state and employer practices, has also served as a basis for connection across national borders. In the case of working-class solidarities, this is evident for instance in the case of labourism as an ideology. Labourism blended liberalism and a transnational white identity across white male subjects within the British Empire (Hyslop 1999). We see this in the connections between unionists in Canada and the United States in anti-immigration politics – and particularly in Chinese exclusion that was rooted in a sense of white workers as native and deserving protection from the non-white other that threatened their wages and working conditions. On a more general level, the transnational

---

[37] See Choudry and Smith 2016.

[38] For more on the emergence of the idea of whiteness, see Roediger 1991; Allen 1994. For detail on how in historical this term has changed in the Canadian context, from the exclusion to the inclusion of the Irish, Italians, Jews and Eastern Europeans, see Chapter 3.

dimensions of whiteness and white supremacy are evident in the ideas of the Enlightenment, in the self-definitions of "the west" itself and what is meant to be European or, in the case of white-settler colonies, descendants of Europeans.[39] In the history and usage of the notion of whiteness, we see how it has operated as a basis of identity and community that is not limited to a particular nation, but rather to a set of nations with a sense of national identity as white connected to other nations who are seen as sharing this heritage or intellectual and moral characteristics.[40]

The racialization that became a feature of the global processes of capitalist development as well as the transnational transmission of ideas emerging through these processes of theft, enslavement and domination have led some to use the term global white supremacist capitalism (Mills 1994, 2008; Munro 2009). Whiteness is intended to highlight the racialization that marks global class formation that is minimized or left out completely in economistic analyses of capitalist development and imperialism (Mills 1994, 2008). It is also useful in that it explicitly ties racialization – and more specifically the racial hierarchies privileging whiteness – to actual historical material practices and strategies of specific sets of states and capital.

As Andrea Smith (2008) outlines in an analysis of the logics of white supremacy, these practices operate through a set of logics and assumptions linked to historical events and ongoing material practices. The processes of racialization have not only imparted racial features to those in peripheral nations, but also have impacted the core nations "by crystallizing a set of binary oppositions that defined the peoples as developed/underdeveloped, civilized/barbarian, rational/instinctive" (Bonilla-Silva 2000, 191-92). Marilyn Lake argues that what we see is the emergence of "a new definition of civilization, defined not in terms of antiquity, splendor or riches,

---

[39] As noted by Bonilla-Silva, the construction of the West was itself the creation of white supremacy (Bonilla-Silva 2000, 192).

[40] Here, again, Hyslop's example of international solidarity on the basis of a transnational racial identity is illustrative.

but the white man's standard of living" (Lake 2003, 360).[41] Whiteness, as the idea of the

embodiment of a set of superior qualities vis-à-vis non-white "others," became the basis for a sense

of entitlement (Roediger 1991; Mills 1994, 2008; Allen 1994; Harrison 2001).[42] These entitlements

include those provided by the state, the privileges of citizens of the North, better jobs, higher wages,

and all the things that came to be associated with white standards. An example of this is the idea of

the American standard, which was a racialized concept that was obviously not meant as an indicator

of and did not reflect the living standards of most non-white Americans.

Whiteness and Class Struggle

For David Roediger, whiteness comes to be a feature of American class formation with the

active participation of the white working class who are invested in this identity (Roediger 1991, 6).

He argues that Marx fails to address why so many workers defined themselves as white and

proposes that what is evident in the American case is that some workers chose a white identity and

saw themselves and their interests as white (Roediger 1991, 6). In this way, a sense of a community

of interests, like that underlying labourism, intertwined a sense of class solidarity with whiteness,

national identity and patriarchy. This sense of a community of interests was also extended beyond

the national state through whiteness, where workers understood themselves as part of both a

national and transnational white community. This idea of whiteness, he argues, is rooted in settler

colonialism and slavery, a whiteness defined against the indigenous population and the African

slaves and which comes to connote not only moral superiority, but also superior skills (Roediger

---

[41] It is important to note that this transnational identity of whiteness was also tied to gender, with Lake noting that "the discourse on civilization regularly invoked links between manliness and whiteness" (Lake 2003, 361). Bannerji also draws this out in her discussion of whiteness, arguing that it "extends into moral qualities of masculinity, possessive individualism and an ideology of capital and market. They are treated as indicators of civilization, freedom and modernity" (Bannerji 2000, 107-108).

[42] White supremacy encompasses "de facto and de jure white privilege, that would refer more broadly to the European domination of the planet for the past several hundred years that has left us with the racialized distributions of economic, political and cultural power we have today" (Mills 1994, 108).

1991, 21, 100, 150). For Mills, whiteness became the basis for a racial contract. This contract, which crossed class lines, existed between members racialized as "white" and operated to render those racialized as non-white as inferior (Mills 1997, 11). This translates into those racialized as non-white having subordinate civil standing and being denied "equal socioeconomic opportunities," which resulted in greater levels of "exploitation of their bodies, land, and resources" (Mills 1997, 11).

What is important in both of these analyses is that there is an adoption of this white identity and identification that happens within the "white" working class. Racial identity then becomes the basis on which there is the expectation of certain standard of living. Roediger's analysis but also those who analysed the specific histories of racialization and working-class racial identities (discussed in Chapter 3) are critical for guarding against desires to write off these aspects of working-class history and identity. It is important to consider the role of consent and active participation in the maintenance of racial hierarchies. As Theodore Allen argues, it is critical to retain keep central the role of the bourgeoisie and the practices of states in the making and promotion of the idea of whiteness. However, in the case of accommodationist solidarities and labour imperialism, it is essential to think about why a sense of community based on race and nation came to be so appealing. Just as Luxemburg saw nationalism as the penetration of bourgeois values, so Allen sees the idea of whiteness as emerging from bourgeois ideology and becoming hegemonic amongst sections of the working class. Whiteness both contributes to nationalism as a mechanism of class accommodation and is a mechanism of class accommodation in its own right. It is something that operates beyond national borders, connecting and creating a sense of community within a white world (between different white settler states and these states with those of Western Europe). Acknowledging and thinking through the racial and national dimensions of histories of working-class solidarities is essential to thinking critically about the possibilities of transformative forms of solidarity. In sum, whether we are talking about AFL-style Gomperist business unionism or social

democratic philosophy, race and nation are critical pieces to understanding the accommodationist and labour imperialist practices arising from their distinct versions of social partnership.

Early Cold War Institutionalized Labour Internationalism in Canada

In this section, I explore the development of an institutionalized labour internationalism in Canada within the late 1940s in the CCL that was a precursor to the internationalism of the international department and committee of the CLC. I argue that we need to consider how the material interests of Northern workers became conceived as aligned with the interests of their respective states and capital, and how this alignment of interests was shaped ideologically in the context of tensions within class consciousness rooted in class formation and struggle. In Chapter 3, I outlined, in the context of Canadian class formation, some of the contours of the internal wars of positions over philosophies and models of trade union action in the interwar years. This institutional labour internationalism was shaped by and reflects the wars of position rooted in Canadian class formation and struggle, but also those at work within labour movements internationally in the context of early Cold War.

I expand beyond a national lens by situating the CCL's programme within the dynamics and tensions in the international wars of position over workers' movements. The CCL's international department did not develop in isolation; it was modelled on other departments and committees being set up in many unions in the Global North at this time,[43] many of which were aimed at building the ICFTU.[44] I situate the political direction of the CCL's internationalism by briefly

---

[43] Northern union federations adopted a range of strategies to build a political programme that in general supported the continued global domination of Northern states and capital, exemplified in the establishment NATO and the institutions established at Bretton Woods.

[44] These other committees and departments were important in shaping the political direction of the CCL's department and committee, but also its very structure. The CCL contacted the British TUC, the CIO and the German Trade Union Federation (DBG) concerning how they structured international work. Out of these consultations, they decided on a

outlining features of the organizations to which the Canadian labour movement was either allied or influenced by. These include the ICFTU, the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), the British TUC and the SI. And finally, I introduce some of the key features of the international policies and practices arising from the CCL and CLC in the early Cold War era which, I argue, can be situated between labour imperialism and accommodationist solidarity.

What's at Stake? Designing the Post-War World

The multi-faceted offensives of Northern capital and states in the immediate post-World War II period reflect the threats (and opportunities) they perceived as impacting their future interests. These threats took numerous forms, including the militancy and explosion of unionization rates as seen in the Canadian context during the war and after (Heron 1989), huge shop floor militancy (Wells 1995), and massive strike waves.[45] On a global scale, this offensive was primarily represented in the expansion of communism, revolutionary socialist and socialist anti-colonial movements, and militant unions that refused the separation between politics and union organization and action.

We see the offensive of key Northern states and capital in the main policies and efforts of the emerging Cold War.[46] These took on the form of wars of manoeuvre and of position. On the military front, the war included the formation of NATO and the Truman Doctrine. The Truman Doctrine was first used to smash the communist uprising in Greece in 1949 which inaugurated the

---

committee of seven to eight persons whose task was to raise funds for the ICFTU programme, to conduct seminars with staff and the education department, and to develop promotional materials (LAC CLC Fond 501-19).

[45] This also points to the ongoing tensions between the politics/ideology of the leadership and the actual activities and commitments of some groupings of rank-and-file members.

[46] This period saw the rise of the power of the US state and capital which took a lead on many of these offensives.

new era of US imperialism.[47] On the economic front, this included the Marshall Plan and the formation of new northern financial institutions known as the Bretton Woods system. This system encompassed the IMF, the World Bank and the GATT, and formed the groundwork for neo-imperialism.[48] The coercive activities of states also involved opposition to internal resistance to these global offensives. This is symbolized by American McCarthyism, which was a strategy to expel communist organizers and their impact ideologically and politically, including of course within trade unions. Variants of this strategy for fighting internal resistance existed in many Northern states in this period. The stylistic and strategic differences in state responses to internal resistance also carried over to differences in their international strategies and tactics for fighting communism. These offensives were also intertwined with the wars of position. On the ideological front, the war of position involved expounding the notion of the "free world" and selling capitalism as the model for prosperity and justice for the South. This was no easy task in the context of heightened class struggle at the global level, the expansion of communism and socialism throughout Eastern Europe, and the growing anti-colonial struggles. Hence, the importance of the economic and military components of the offensives.

Emerging International Labour Wars of Position

Complementary to the wars of manoeuvre and position of the Northern states and capital in the i early post-World War II years were the wars of position unfolding within and amongst unions internationally. These wars of position did not emerge with the beginning of the Cold War. Rather, they were continuations of the wars of position during the interwar years over ideas of worker justice and models of union organization and action. However, we see in the post-World War II era

---

[47] On the Truman Doctrine, NATO and the Greek uprising, see Lefeber 1989; Kaplan 1993; Jones 1997; Powers 1969; Wittner 1982.

[48] And locally, in concessions to labour movements in the form of the emergent welfare state.

the intensification of these wars of position within the labour movement. This relates to the

emerging Cold War, at which time most labour movements in the North, aside from the dominant

movements in Italy and France, largely aligned with the direction of their respective states vis-à-vis

foreign policy. Some of these unions also took part in the activities of their respective states

internationally by engaging in programmes to change the political direction of certain national labour

movements. This intensification is symbolized by the establishment of the ICFTU. The ICFTU was

formed in December 1949 and began operating in early 1950; its goal was to build new trade unions

along anti-communist lines. The organization was dominated by the British and the Americans in

this early period (Carew 1996b, 149; Windmuller 1954a, 436). The establishment of the ICFTU

signaled the intensification of the international wars of position within labour, ending a few years of

international labour peace within the WFTU. The WFTU was set in 1945 and included most of the

major labour federations, apart from some Catholic unions that were affiliated to the WCL. The

ICFTU was formed as a break-away from the WFTU. The affiliates of the WFTU and ICFTU after

1949 were generally seen as reflecting support for either capitalism or Soviet communism and so

correlating alignments with the interests and policies of the states within these spheres. As a

breakaway federation from the WFTU, the ICFTU was throughout its history competing with and

responding ideologically and politically to the WFTU in the battle to win and keep affiliates.[49] This

battle was not only over the future of capitalist development, but also over ideas of freedom, over

the extent and nature of human rights, models of union action, prosperity and worker justice, and

over colonialism and imperialism. Within the overarching war of position over visions for workers'

---

[49] The competition and monitoring of WFTU activities and support is visible throughout CCL documents. One report from the ICFTU consultative council in Brussels in May 1954 discussed WFTU membership and their concern with WFTU influence in several countries and regions. Specifically, they were concerned with their influence in Italy and France, India, Latin America (with the establishment of the Confederacion de Trabajadores de America Latina or the Confederation of Workers in Latin America which was a WFTU regional organization) and in North Africa due to the presence of the Confédération Générale du Travail (CGT, General Federation of Labour) (LAC CLC Fond 502-504). The direct organizational competition between the WFTU and ICFTU diminished with the end of the Cold War; however, the ideological markers of the Cold War have not disappeared.

justice, there was much variation in terms of the politics put forward by different unions and the models and philosophies of trade unionism they promoted. Just as there was great diversity within the politics of labour movements across the Global South in this period, from conservative Christian unions to militant anti-colonial movements, so there were variants in the North, from the business union philosophy of the AFL to the corporatist social partnership of the Histradrut and to the transformative anti-capitalist solidarities of American Pan-Africanism in the 1940s.

The Question of Colonialism

What is often marginalized in the discussions of the institutional rivalries between the ICFTU and WFTU in this period is the question of colonialism. The intensification and massive expansion of international work on the part of Northern unions relates to the way this battle played out as a war of position over the future of labour movements in the South. If we consider the socialized nature of class formation at the international level, arising from colonialism and the development of capitalism and imperialism, then reducing the international wars of position in this period to simply that over capitalism and Soviet communism is inadequate. To understand how solidarities and strategies were formed and why particular labour movements chose to support the interests of certain alliances of states and capital that were seeking to maintain the legacies of and prospects for ongoing imperialism, we need to also think about the role of white supremacy, nationalism and the nation-state form in the context of international relations between unions. How were the dominant local goals and strategies for worker justice extended to thinking through the international context? In whose interests were these practices taken up and to what extent did these practices support or confront the international division of labour arising from colonialism and imperialism?

The offensives of Northern states and capital quickly moved to interests and prospects for securing new avenues for accumulation lying in securing the Global South. This meant some tensions between Northern states, for instance, between the US and the UK over British colonies, which the UK sought to retain and the US wanted access to. Northern unions for the most part followed suit, turning their attention to the South as the site of struggle. According to Windmuller, while the ICFTU and some of the major affiliates like the AFL initially gave significant funds to develop anti-communist unions in Italy and France, they soon began focusing their efforts on what they deemed to be the vulnerability of unions in the South to communism (Windmuller 1954a, 436). As Anthony Carew notes, in a rare glimpse at the debates over colonialism within the ICFTU, the tensions between states and interests of national capital were also reflected in tensions between American and British unions (Carew 1996b).

The rising power of anti-colonial movements and the impact of this climate on the politics and organization of unions within the Global South soon became a critical piece within the Cold War-era wars of position within and between unions. The politics of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism were a significant challenge to the efforts of Northern unions such as the major ICFTU to gain control, maintain or shape the direction of the labour organizations within colonies and former colonial states. The explicit anti-colonial and anti-imperialist policies of the WFTU[50] as well as the financial and political support given to many anti-colonial struggles by the states of the Soviet Bloc were a major challenge for the major ICFTU affiliates. A number of these affiliates not only lacked a critical analysis of colonialism, but like the British TUC were actively supportive of British colonialism.

---

[50] Many of these labour movements that were part of anticolonial struggles relied on and got support in various ways from the Soviet Union (Horne 1999, 456).

The colonial question was of significance because, within the terrain of struggle to win affiliates and to shape the political direction of Southern unions, many of the dominant unions were at the forefront of the anti-colonial struggle. Penny Von Eschen argues that the war weakened colonizing states and led to new challenges to colonialism and new momentum for existing struggles (Von Eschen 1997, 22). Von Eschen notes that the post-World War II period saw a rise of unions in many parts of the Global South alongside the strengthening liberation struggles and in many cases these were intertwined. An example relevant to this study is that of the case of South Africa. The formation of the South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU) in 1955 was explicitly tied to the liberation struggle and the fight against apartheid (Luckhardt and Wall 1980).[51] These unions, many of which were simultaneously social and political movements facing all kinds of violent repression, had a range of political philosophies, but as participants in wider anti-colonial struggles they tended towards a transformative politics.[52] While it is impossible to speak to the variety of strategies, goals and tactics of the labour movements that made up the vast majority of the world in this period, colonialism created a natural bridge between class struggle and anti-colonialism. The anti-colonial unions varied substantially with regards to how they understood liberation and what economic and social life should be after liberation, though many struggles had a strong anti-capitalist orientation in this period. This made for political unions that conceived themselves as not primarily organizations aiming for negotiations with the state or specific employers for groups of workers.

The interconnection between anti-colonialism and labour struggles in many parts of the Global South made labour a very important political terrain in the immediate post-World War II period, not only for labour, but also for colonizing states. This terrain was very challenging for

---

[51] SACTU was outlawed and operated in exile as the trade-union wing of the liberation struggle, building international support for the campaign of boycott, divestment and sanctions.

[52] Many unions arising as part of anti-colonial struggles saw the struggle against imperialism and colonialism as central to worker emancipation. Workers struggle therefore had to confront colonialism and imperialism.

Northern unions, which were identified by some Southern trade unionists as arms of the colonizing states. The result was a range of strategies, including more explicit wars of manoeuvre by federations such as the British TUC. It meant Northern state financial support for the activities of unions for winning affiliates and gaining control over certain unions or for building alternative unions to compete with the dominant revolutionary unions. This is exemplified by the work of the AFL and the British TUC, which engaged in ICFTU work as well as having their own independent programmes with big money from their respective states. Windmuller argues that the ICFTU had to show "concrete evidence of interest in their problems" to hold on to their affiliates in Asia and Africa (Windmuller 1954a, 437). This was a difficult balance, since ideologically and politically the major Northern affiliates were overwhelmingly aligned with their respective states and the interests of national capital and to the way these interests and strategies operated to maintain global divisions of labour borne of colonialism and imperialism.

The war of position between the two federations, as well as the tensions and differences between the strategy and tactics of the major affiliates of the ICFTU, resulted in complicated and often contradictory positions, particularly throughout the 1950s. This meant, for instance, that the ICFTU publicly opposed apartheid but would not support the liberation struggle or the SACTU because of the latter's association with the liberation struggle and, through it, with the South African Communist Party (SACP). It meant that at times they put forward an anti-colonial position in some African countries (especially in North Africa, where they hoped to challenge the influence of the WFTU affiliated to the Confédération Générale du Travail (CGT, French General Federation of Labour) while supporting imperialist interventions elsewhere, for example, their support for the Korean War (1950–1953).

Most studies of this period focus their analysis on the emerging Cold War; however, the strengthening of anti-colonial movements in this period and, along with this, anti-colonial internationalisms are not generally examined as a part of this political context.[53] John Munro, in his study of Cold War anti-colonial struggles, notes that much of the historical work on this period has "paid little attention to the overlap between the Cold War and decolonization" (Munro 2009, 43).[54] I argue that it is important to see the emerging wars of position inside international unions in this period within a larger battle of states and capital over the future of capitalist development, but also over the question of colonialism and divisions of labour based on race and nation.

Besides the military and economic strategies used by the United States and other Northern states to secure a future for capitalist development in the post-colonial and decolonizing states, there was also a need to untie capitalism from the process of racialization and white supremacist structures. Capitalism, as a route to prosperity for peoples of the South, entails a separation of ideas of development, prosperity and equality from the histories of colonialism and capitalist development. When we consider the politics of anti-colonialism within this battle, we also see within it a struggle around the racialized and nationalized divisions of labour born of imperialism and colonialism.[55] Numerous anti-colonial struggles and solidarity movements offered counter-narratives to the prosperity that could be realized through the acceptance of capitalism and the adoption of trade union models from the North. The dominant analyses put forward through anti-colonial struggles and solidarity movements supporting them made the models and philosophies put forward

---

[53] See Munro 2009; Von Eschen 1997; Prashad 2007.

[54] This omission is important and is something that should be explored further.

[55] See Kelley 2003; Von Eschen 1997; Munro 2009; Prashad 2007. While my emphasis is on the wars of position amongst unions internationally that shaped the practices of labour internationalism, this is situated in the context of manoeuvres of states and capital.

by Northern unions a hard sell in contexts of ongoing colonial rule. Operating through a politics of

liberal racelessness, the white supremacist and/or nationalist allegiances of Northern unions are

visible in the narratives of development they put forward, which omit the racialization of global class

formation.[56]

Many anti-colonial intellectuals and movements were drawing explicit connections between

white supremacy and capitalist development.[57] The connections arose out of the development of

liberation struggles and were being developed through international networks.[58] This posed a

challenge not only to imperialism and labour imperialism, but also posed a potential problem for the

legitimacy of capitalism within the context of the dominant Northern states. To illustrate the

ideological challenges posed by the colonial question, I outline some aspects of the transformative

solidarities characteristic of Pan-Africanism in the United States in the 1940s that ran counter to the

dominant labour imperialism of the AFL in this same period. Von Eshen argues that, for instance,

"trade unions and labour organizations provided the most prominent ideological and institutional

bases of Pan-Africanism in the 1940s" (1997, 45). In the case of international networks of anti-

colonial activists connected to Pan-Africanism, this included a growing critique of American

imperialism (Von Eschen 1997, 35-40) and the making of connections between capitalist

---

[56] The national and racial solidarities are also reflected in explicit alliances with colonial powers or opportunism vis-à-vis anti-colonial struggles, as in the case of the AFL. The accommodationist politics of Northern unions vis-à-vis Southern unions were underwritten by hegemonic nationalist and white-supremacist ideas about historical development that serve to erase capitalism and racialization and normalize the nation-state. I elaborate on this later in the chapter. The role of race and nation in the accommodationist tendencies of labour internationalism in the North also point us to the continued relevance of these factors in the shaping of labour internationalism in the post-Cold War period.

[57] These connections were later also developed in the work of Walter Rodney, C.L.R. James, Eduardo Galeano and many others.

[58] See Von Eschen 1997; Munro 2009. Munro explores how an anti-colonial transatlantic network developed focusing on "the political economy of imperialism, the international dimensions of capitalism and white supremacy, and the 'pitfalls of national consciousness'" (Munro 2009, 22).

development, imperialism and local experiences of racial oppression.[59] The international and historical analysis of racial injustice at root in the anti-colonial internationalisms of American Pan-Africanism for instance identified the source of oppression in the development of global white supremacist capitalism, drawing connections between white supremacist class formation in the US, the history of slavery, colonialism and the development of capitalism and imperialism.[60] This movement challenged cross-class alliances on a national and racial basis that were at the heart of labour imperialism. As such, it was both counter-hegemonic and transformative as it was an anti-imperialist movement that opposed cross-class place-based solidarities rooted in a socialized conception of global class formation.

Von Eschen also charts the demise of the international analysis of white supremacy and solidarities based on anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism in this period. She argues that this demise led to a rewriting of the problem of racial injustice during the early Cold War in liberal and nationalist terms, translating into growing acceptance of American imperialism, nationalism and anti-communism (Von Eschen 1997, 6). In the case of the Black anti-colonial solidarities and internationalism that Von Eschen examines, liberal and national analyses of white supremacy, disconnected from history and the international context, arose and came replace the internationalist thrust of the anti-colonial internationalism. The rise of the liberal and nationally oriented anti-racism is visible in a variety of approaches to racial justice that reduced racism to prejudice or discrimination rather than, being, Bannerji argues, "the very principle of the self-definition of European/Western societies" (Bannerji 1995, 46), a principle embedded in material practices, structures of everyday life, social relations and forms of consciousness. Disconnected from history

---

[59] "Architects of the politics of the African diaspora forged an identity of passions through a powerful cross-fertilization of socialist internationalism and the struggles of colonial peoples for independence" (Von Eschen 1997, 6).

[60] For instance, in the work of those on the Council on African Affairs, including Paul Robeson Alphaeus Hunton and W.E.B Du Bois (Von Eschen 1997, 35-40).

and material practices, racism becomes something that can be addressed and resolved within capitalism through a liberal rights framework made possible through the state. Munro argues that those "who remained committed to an anti-colonial internationalism of the left understood such liberal ideas as shot through with unresolvable contradiction: the impossibility of racial equality within an international economic structure to which white supremacy was inbuilt, not incidental" (Munro 2009, 36). This is a critical piece of capitalist development (Munro 2009, 36). And while this movement and the analyses it put forward were repressed and obscured, the legacy of this movement exists in the counter-current that would re-emerge in radical sections of the civil rights movement era, in parts of the American new left, and within labour in some of the ways that the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists (CBTU) would oppose the labour imperialism of the AFL-CIO. This movement shows the complexity of the field of labour internationalism, the need to go beyond economistic analyses of the Cold War terrain, and the importance in drawing out relations between race, nation and class both for thinking about the wars of position in this period and about the possibilities of transformative solidarities.

Institutional Allies and Influences

Having outlined some of the political and ideological complexities of the 1940s and the early Cold War, I now turn to some of the dominant Northern players in the international labour wars of position. These are the key political organizations allied to the CCL that shaped the political direction of its labour internationalism. I begin with the ICFTU and the major tensions between the two most dominant affiliates, the AFL and the British TUC. I then turn to the CIO, the organization the CCL was closest to organizationally and politically. Lastly, I consider the Socialist International

(SI), the international organization of social democratic parties that included the CCF and then the NDP.[61]

The ICFTU, the AFL and the British TUC

The establishment of the ICFTU represents the interests of the dominant Northern unions to develop a united front in the Cold War wars of position. The breakdown of the WFTU occurred principally over the Marshall Plan and reflected the burgeoning backing of Northern unions with the infrastructure of Bretton Woods and NATO. Besides the ideological battle to win affiliates, the ICFTU engaged in funding and politically backing the formation of anti-communist unions where they did not exist or were weak – such as in the case of the Force Ouvriére (FO) in France and the Confederazione Italiana dei Sindacati Lavoratori (CISL, Italian Confederation of Workers' Unions) in Italy[62] – and in undermining left movements and unions (Thomson and Larson 1978; Radosh 1969; Buhle 1999). The strategies to win, undermine or smash WFTU affiliated unions or to create new affiliates were constantly changing based on the power dynamics and interests of the major affiliates, their assessment of conditions, and the interests of their respective states and capital.

While designed to facilitate a united front, the ICFTU lacked firm commitment to a united front approach on the part of the major ICFTU affiliates.[63] This meant that, for instance, both the British TUC and the AFL retained their independent programmes despite their principal roles in setting up the ICFTU. The AFL and the British TUC were, therefore, only half-heartedly committed to the ICFTU project and retained and continued to build up their own independent programmes. The operations of the British TUC in the British colonies were intimately tied to the politics of the

---

[61] Most of the leadership and staff of the CCL in this period either came out of or were active members in the CCF.

[62] See Olmstead-Hughes 2011; Fillipelli 1989.

[63] Carew quotes Irving Brown (from the AFL) regarding the ICFTU, that their best strategy would be to "appear at congress as a loyal affiliate while seeking to build on the growing restiveness of Third World affiliates" (Carew 1996b, 167).

British government, and TUC members served on the colonial office's colonial labour advisory committee (Carew 1996b, 153; Davis 2000, 388). The British TUC worked to build trade unions on the British model in the British colonies; however, as Tiyambe Zeleza argues, they encouraged "the growth of economistic, apolitical trade unionism by sending 'safe' British trade union advisors to the colonies" (Zeleza 1984, 14). The involvement of the TUC with the colonial office, the substantial state funding for their international activities and their attempt to build weak and apolitical unions highlights their alignment with the interests of the state in their role in the British colonies.

The AFL meanwhile built the Free Trade Union Committee (FTUC) that engaged in CIA funded and supported anti-communist activities; it sought to build unions along the US-business union model (Olmstead-Hughes 2011; Carew 1996b, 147; Thomson and Larson 1978; Hirsch 1974; Scipes 2010a). Each of these operations was developing alongside the ICFTU, and the operations were enormous programmes in and of themselves. The independent activities of both the British TUC and the AFL were each state supported and involved a range of strategies and tactics. According to Jack Woddis (head of the International department of the British Communist Party), by 1954 the British TUC had trade union advisors (supported by the British colonial office) operating in 15 colonies with a staff of 400 (Davis 2000, 389). The operation of the AFL continued to grow through the 1950s and after the formation of the AFL-CIO grew to encompass programmes, schools and operations across the globe that were implicated in a host of imperialist projects, including their active role in the coup in Chile in 1973.[64]

The nationalist politics shaping this tension are evident in their positions vis-à-vis decolonization. The British TUC remained committed to the British Empire and to control over unions in many of the British colonies, while the AFL often espoused an anti-colonial position in an

[64] See Radosh 1969; Buhle 1999; Scipes 2010a.

effort to expand their influence as a union and for the burgeoning American Empire.[65] Mary Davis argues that the concern expressed by the British over the colonies in the interwar years was motivated by fear of the decline of the British Empire due to the rising liberation struggles, the appeal of communism and the threat of the anti-imperialism of the USSR (Davis 2000, 386). This intensified after the set-up of the ICFTU in which, as Zeleza argues, the British TUC also had to contend with the anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism of the WFTU and the AFL and then AFL-CIO's anti-colonialism in places such as Africa (Zeleza 1984, 14). And while they had previously been disinterested in the colonies and thought that there was no purpose in appearing sympathetic to anti-colonial sentiment, they were now contending with competition over their influence in the British colonies (Carew 1996b, 167; Zeleza 1984, 13).

As Anthony Carew notes, this remained a major tension within the ICFTU. This is visible in debates over strategy between the AFL and the British TUC throughout the 1950s, which led to the eventual disaffiliation of the AFL-CIO from the ICFTU in 1969 (Carew 1996b, 150).[66] Besides the conflicting approaches to the colonial question, the conflict between these most dominant affiliates of the ICFTU also had to do with their styles of anti-communism; for example, the AFL found the British TUC too soft (see Carew 1996b). And while there were significant parallels in the models of trade unionism they were promoting, the TUC's approach was and grew closer to the one of many of the other European affiliates. It is a surprise that the ICFTU managed to make it through these early years given the nationalist politics that dominated the international strategies of these two

---

[65] Kim Scipes argues that this work based on an alliance with US Empire far pre-dates the Cold War: "And while this foreign policy programme has always been a product of the labor movement itself – so it has ebbed and flowed based on internal labor movement dynamics – the U.S. Government has sought to utilize this programme to further its own interests in maintaining, if not expanding, the U.S. empire" (Scipes 2010a, xxix). As reflected in the quote of Walter Reuther (which I quote on p. 26), the AFL's but also the CIO's and later the AFL-CIO's expression of anti-colonial rhetoric was generally opportunistic, a strategy aligned with the prospects for the expansion of US interests in the Global South.

[66] Carew notes that by 1960 it did not look like the ICFTU would survive because of national, political and strategic differences within the organization (Carew 1996b, 178).

major affiliates. What emerged out of this tension and was solidified after the departure of the AFL-CIO in 1969 was the dominance of social democratic unions, mainly those from continental Europe, in the leadership of the ICFTU.

The CIO

As this social democratic hegemony within the ICFTU was developing in the early Cold War, the CCL and CIO, both steeped in the social democratic social partnership camp, sought to support the development of a united front within the ICFTU.[67] This ended with the merger of the AFL and CIO in 1956 when George Meany's AFL approach came to dominate in the newly formed federation. However, the CIO's pre-merger politics are useful for understanding the direction of the CCL, as the CCL was institutionally and politically tied to the CIO.

The CIO's approach differed from that of the AFL's more aggressive anti-communism. Walter Reuther's approach to the war of position over the South was shaped by what has been termed belly communism, or the idea that workers will turn to communism the North fails to alleviate the worst conditions (Carew 1996b, 179). He argued, "there is a revolution going on . . . of hungry men . . . the communists didn't start it. They are riding on its back . . . the communists would have people trade freedom for bread . . . In the world we are trying to help build, people can have both bread and freedom" (Carew 2003, 84). This is one of the hallmarks of the social democratic internationalism of unions in this period, which called on states to provide aid money to be used to prevent and beat back the rise of revolutionary movements in the South. Reuther worried that the AFL strategy would backfire. For instance, Carew notes that the AFL's FTUC programme in France, which was funded by the CIA, earned them a reputation for breaking political strikes, and

---

[67] And also within its regional organization in the Americas, the Organización Regional Interamericana de Trabajadores (ORIT, Inter-American Regional Workers' Organization). Between 1954 and 1956 the CCL and CIO worked very closely in ORIT and held joint seminars and meetings (LAC CLC Fond 502-501). The Canadian USWA gave large contributions to the ICFTU and ORIT.

that it was therefore ultimately ineffective in winning over workers to the ICFTU-affiliated non-communist federation they were building (Carew 2003, 86). Instead, the CIO focused on trying to build the strength of the non-communist unions (Carew 2003, 87). Like the AFL, the CIO's efforts through the ICFTU relied on state funds, and "To make it easier to disguise the source of such government funding, the ICFTU established an Educational Foundation from which its training and educational work would be financed. The Foundation was to seek grants and donations from trusts and charities, which would provide a convenient cover for other sums received from Marshall Plan channels" (Carew 2003, 87). As such, and like the AFL, they relied on state funding, but they were more inclined to win the wars of position through building alternatives rather than launching frontal attacks on communist unions.

The strategies of the CIO also reflected their social democratic ethos. Unlike the business unionism of the AFL, the CIO's philosophy of social partnership meant that they did not disavow the involvement of unions in political action (Carew 2003, 79). This relates to their assessment of the terrain of struggle, an assessment that was more adaptive to the political terrain in which they were operating than the one of the more ideologically driven AFL. Carew argues that an anti-communist labour internationalism in the European context that disavowed political action was unlikely to succeed. However, while the CIO did not disavow union political action, they also promoted a model of trade union action that they felt would make "workers collectively more self-sufficient in their place of work and so less reliant on political mobilization" (Carew 2003, 79). The CIO promoted the Marshall Plan and the aims of the plan to increase productivity in Europe while helping the non-communist unions to engage in collective bargaining to win a better share of the gains from this increased productivity (Carew 2003, 79); Carew provides evidence that they were big proponents of "productivity bargaining" (Carew 2003, 81). Productivity bargaining fit with their overall belief in social partnership and their sense of unions as means in and of themselves to secure

continued prosperity for workers, which "meant creating healthy economies, progressive social policies and a socio-economic regime in which trade unions played an integral part" (Carew 2003, 83-4). Such healthy economies would be built in tandem with the national state and capital, but labour would be a strong voice to ensure equitable distributions of the profits derived through the joint plan.

Selling Social Democracy: The Socialist International

> The eight hundred million people, who in the course of the last few years have emerged from colonial status and reached autonomy, will bring a decisive influence to bear of the future evolution of mankind. Will they allow themselves to be seduced by the mirage of communism, or will they rally to the flag of democratic socialism?
> This is the decisive question.
> –Giuseppe Saragat, Leader of the Italian Social Democratic Party
> at the Socialist International Congress in Rome, 1961 (Bose 2005, 65)

> As ruling parties in many of these countries, the social democrats could not just renounce and abandon their empires
> –Pradip K. Bose (2005, 57).

Most of the continental European affiliates of the ICFTU, the CCL and the CIO were guided by a social democratic anti-communism, and most were directly connected to their respective national social democratic political parties.[68] Therefore, the debates, policies and practices of the Socialist International, as the international body of social democratic parties, provides some insight into the developing strategy of the unions in the ICFTU that were aligned with social democratic parties. The Socialist International – an organization founded primarily by governing or opposition social democratic parties in continental Europe –was keenly interested in expanding social democratic influence in the Global South and thought that the socialist tendencies of the liberation struggles would make social democracy an appealing alternative to communism (Bose 2005, 39).

---

[68] See Saskatoon Solidarity Committee 1981; Murphy 1986; Gandall 1986; Nastovski 2014; Wahl 2004; Waterman 2001b. This contrasts with analyses of the AFL-CIO's international politics. Explanations for the labour imperialism of the AFL-CIO include American nationalism and business unionism (Scipes 2010b; Scott 1978).

Their strategy was ideological; it concerned winning over forces within liberation struggles and civil society to social democratic ideas focusing on conducting educationals, setting up schools, sponsoring students and training political cadres and trade unionists (Bose 2005, 58-62). The British, Germans and Israelis were very actively trying to develop these activities (Bose 2005, 58-62).

Pradip K. Bose argues that they came to see it as necessary to disassociate themselves with the imperialist ventures of their respective governments (which they in fact had been or still were supportive of) after the Asian regional conference in 1953, when it became clear that involvement in NATO posed a problem for their influence in the region (Bose 2005, 39). And so a few years later the SI issued a declaration denouncing colonialism generally, but refrained from naming or critiquing any colonializing state in particular and did not call for "immediate independence for all colonial and dependent nations" (Bose 2005). This speaks to the opportunism behind their weak commitment to decolonization, which was a strategic position that was not accompanied at this time by political assistance or support for liberation struggles and, in fact, they continued to be supportive of imperialist policies and practices, visible in their position on Korea (Bose 2005, 56-7).[69] The shallowness of their anti-colonial position continued to be an organizational issue with new members from the South who called on the leadership to report on and be more clearly supportive of liberation struggles (Bose 2005, 57). For instance, in 1959 Uruguay argued at the SI Congress for a strong position in support of the Algerian struggle, for expelling the French party, and for condemning Israel, Belgium and the Dutch for their pro-colonial practices (Bose 2005, 63). The SI leadership refused to even allow discussion of this position and as a result the Uruguayan party withdrew from the SI (Bose 2005, 63).

---

[69] This would shift in the late 1960s and 1970s, seen for instance in the support of some social democratic parties for the ANC (see Sellstrom 2002).

While the SI leadership strategy for selling social democracy as an alternative to revolutionary socialisms and communism entailed moments of anti-colonialism, overwhelmingly they were committed to the existing global divisions of labour rooted in the empires built by their respective states. Like the ICFTU, the SI was set up and dominated by governing or opposition parties from the Global North, and it reflected their sense of national interests, including their position vis-à-vis their colonies and former colonies as well as the imperialists ventures of national capital. The SI, which was not established until 1951, had begun to be conceived in 1946, but did not develop until 1950 and included backing NATO, the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine (Bose 2005, 33).[70] This tension between their desire to expand social democracy in the South while retaining the privileges of the North premised on social partnership on a national level reveals one of the critical contradictions in social democratic strategy in this period. Hyslop makes an important point about British Labourism that I argue applies to the contradictions in the strategy of the SI and the ICFTU and its Northern social democratic affiliates. He argues that the Labourists ultimately pursued a policy to defend "white workers' privileged access to the labour market," and so from the beginning their egalitarianism tried to reconcile a universalist philosophy with racial segregation (Hyslop 1999, 402-3). This racial segregation, produced through colonialism, slavery and imperialism, was actively upheld by the policies and practices of the dominant social democratic parties and major affiliates of the ICFTU including efforts to control former colonies, supporting decolonization as a strategy to win influence over movements, by supporting the imperialist interests of Northern states and capital and by supporting the use of the border to restrict and shape entry of Southern workers to the North.

---

[70] Bose notes that out of the 12 Western European countries that formed NATO, seven were countries that had social democratic parties in power or as majorities (Bose 2005, 37).

<u>Chapter 5</u>

The Institutionalization of Labour Internationalism in Canada, 1945-1968:
Between Labour Imperialism and Accommodationist Solidarity

The arena in which the wars of position over strategies for worker justice in Canada changed

with the onset of the Second World War and the beginning of the Cold War. Major factors in this

shift include the active smashing of communist-led unions, the consolidation of power of social

democrats within the leadership of the Canadian labour movement, and, internationally, the

emergence of new imperialist strategies and the increasing strength of anti-colonial struggles. It is in

this new political and ideological climate that the dominant strand of labour internationalism in

Canadian unions became institutionalized.

The International Comes to Prominence

The Second World War brought the international to the local in a major way. As in the early

interwar years, the war shaped a broader awareness and interest in international events and politics.

This had to do with the experiences of soldiers in the war as well as the significant impacts of the

war on economic and social life. Victor Silverman notes that the end of the war prompted many

unions in the North to think about their political role and direction, including how to relate to the

state and how to play a more significant role internationally (Silverman 2000). He argues that "the

idea of labor internationalism was reborn in several nations at the same time," and that this made it

possible to see workers as not part of exceptional national units, but as one subgroup that

participated in a worldwide process of international relations (Silverman 2000, 5).

Unlike the immediate post-World War One context, the Canadian state chose a more

conciliatory response to the demands of labour, symbolized by the introduction of a comprehensive

regulatory regime in the mid-1940s to the early 1950s. This lent considerable strength and legitimacy to the social democratic forces inside labour and to their model of union action. The conciliatory relations shaped by the actions of the state coupled with the significant heightening of national identification produced by the war and the purging of the left within labour created favourable conditions for union–state collaboration internationally.

Accommodationist Visions: The Philosophy of Social Partnership

The CCL, unlike the TLC, took on the development of an international programme by setting up an international committee and department that, while generally in line with the politics of the CIO, was independent of it. This institutionalized labour internationalism of the CCL was shaped by specific features of the interwar wars of position within labour in Canada and by the contours of Canadian class formation. In this section, I make a case for why the CCL's internationalism should be understood as situated between labour imperialism and accommodationist solidarity. I explore the complex ideological terrain that contributed to the CCL perceiving the interests of Canadian workers as aligned with the Canadian state and with the fortunes of Canadian and American capital. I begin by outlining the events that led to the formation of an institutionalized labour internationalism in this period and the basic features and political direction of this international programme.

Accommodationist Philosophies of Trade Unionism: Social Democratic Anti-Communist Internationalism

> In more and more areas of labour–management relations there is evidence of a more mature approach on both sides and the cultivation of some degree of understanding so that differences may be worked out without resort to the kind of open conflict that occurs in strikes.
> –CLC President Claude Jodoin, Charter for Tomorrow Conference/Meeting at the Canadian Club in Fredericton, 1966 (LAC CLC Fond 301-66).

As in many parts of the Global North in the early Cold War, the wars of position inside the Canadian labour movement in the interwar years were followed by the consolidation of social democratic control within the leadership of both the CCL and TLC by the mid-1950s (Abella 1973, 213; Saskatoon Solidarity Committee 1981, 15-7), symbolized by the merger to form the CLC in 1956. The wars of position over the nature of worker justice, including those on an international scale, became muted locally as social democratic hegemony emerged within the labour movement in this period. Social democracy and its philosophy of social partnership were sold as a route to worker justice and prosperity to workers locally and to workers' movements internationally. By 1953, the consolidation of social democratic hegemony inside the CCL translated into the expansion and formalization of their international work, reflected in the establishment of an international department.

The success of the strategies of the social democratic trade unionists to wrest control over the labour movement was also enabled by a range of historical factors including the war, state policies, and the strength and success of workers struggles in this period. Craig Heron notes, "by 1943 one out of every three union members was on strike" (Heron 1989, 78). The strength and confidence of workers to resist in this period was reflected in the tremendous rise in unionization rates, in strike activity, and in the actions of the state to quash workplace struggles through the legislation of an extensive framework to regulate industrial relations. This legislation, which included Order in Council PC 1003 of February, 1944, a framework for the institutionalization of labour relations similar to what had been introduced in the United States in the 1930s, lent considerable strength to the social democratic model of trade unionism. This legislation met the demand of the labour movement for recognition and security, but within a narrow frame that continued to render a whole range of union strategies and tactics illegal, such as sympathy strikes and strikes during the

tenure of a negotiated contract. The emergence of the new labour relations regime bolstered more conciliatory approaches towards capital and led to the rise of more legalistic strategies.[1]

Despite the forces that pushed the labour movement towards a more conciliatory position vis-à-vis employers and the state, the extensive influence of communist and other revolutionary socialist unionists inside the labour movement remained strong.[2] This led to the more aggressive strategy of social democratic trade and liberal union leaders against communist and other revolutionary socialists, which involved firing communist organizers, pushing out communist activists and leaders, expulsions, raids, and taking local unions under administration or working to decertify unions that had communist leanings (Abella 1973; Heron 1989). This meant substantial changes in the make-up of the organized labour movement. Besides raids and decertification efforts, in this period the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers (MMSW), the United Electrical (UE) workers, the International Fur and Leather workers (IFLWU) and the International Woodworkers of America (IWA), the biggest union in British Columbia were all expelled from the CCL (Heron 1989, 90).[3] This happened inside both the TLC and the CCL (Heron 1989, 90). Within the CCL, one union played a key role in the various purges of communist forces and in the development of the international department and committee, that is, the United Steelworkers of America (USWA) (Heron 1989, 82). Heron notes that USWA members provided "the crack troops of anti-communism in the Canadian labour movement," actively working to smash communist unions, remove organizers and replace these organizers with people from the CCF to further consolidate their majority within the CCL (Heron 1989, 82). Abella notes that at times the USWA engaged in anti-communist actions "without the sanction of the Congress" (1973, 191). In 1943, the CCL had

---

[1] See Wells 1995; Panitch and Swartz 1984.

[2] See Abella 1973.

[3] As Jerry Lembcke (1980) notes in the case of the offensive within the International Workers of America, the dominant revolutionary socialist activists in the union were Trotskyists.

officially endorsed the CCF (Muldoon 1977, 93) and by the end of 1952 the expulsions of

communists and their unions was complete (Abella 1973). A key figure in the struggle to make the

CCF the political wing of the labour movement was Charles Millard from the USWA, who became

an principal figure in the CCL's international programme and went on to serve as director of the

ICFTU in the late 1950s.[4]

These purges meant institutional control but not necessarily support from members. The

many years and success of communist organizers inside the labour movement (Heron 1989, 82)

coupled with the appeal of the strategies and tactics promoted by organizers that were anti-capitalist,

could not simply be undone and erased through institutional control alone. This meant that,

especially during the years immediately following these expulsions and decertification efforts, there

was a need to sell social democracy and build deeper consent for their vision and model of

organizing. This approach emphasized "expertise and centralized bureaucratic administration"

(Heron 1989, 89) and focused on collective bargaining as the very essence of the function of trade

unionism. Though this approach is hegemonic and normalized in the everyday practices of Canadian

unions today, it was not an easy sell in a period that was characterized by a great deal of rank-and-file

power and activity.

It is important to note that the philosophy of social partnership was weaker in Canada

compared to parts of continental western Europe. In part, this had to do with the weakness of social

democracy in Canada, which though strengthened in the immediate post-war period, never

translated into the CCF/NDP coming to power federally, unlike the social democratic parties in

many parts of continental western Europe. The alignment of many continental European

federations, with their significantly stronger social democratic parties, led in those contexts to the

institutionalization of social partnership. This is evident of the industrial relations systems of many

---

[4] See Horowitz 1968, 86; Carew 1996a; MacDowell 1988.

continental European countries which are or were more explicitly corporatist and include a variety

of mechanisms that integrate unions more directly with the state and capital. In Canada, the

philosophy of social partnership has predominately taken the form of an ideological vision and

commitment on the part of many of the key leaders and staff in the CCL and then the CLC.[5] And

like the vision of social partnership in continental Europe, the post-war pact that led to the

development of the welfare state was nationally oriented and accepted capitalism and the control of

capital over the labour process (Wahl 2004, 3).

Through the 1940s and early 1950s the victory of the social democrats in winning control

over the CCL meant the emergence of a consensus over the direction of international policies and

practices. In the Canadian context, this meant a general alignment with the policies and interests of

the Canadian state, but it also included alignment with the interests of Canadian and American

capital. In the 1940s, there was still considerable debate over international policy within the CCL. In

1947, while the CCL was a member of the WFTU, the local wars of position were already revealing

the tensions over international policy that would soon lead to disaffiliation. John Price notes that at

the 1947 CCL convention, the executive rejected a large number of resolutions submitted to the

convention that opposed Canadian foreign policy and challenged the Marshall Plan (Price 2003, 5).

By the time of the convention in 1949, the left was mostly shut out of the convention or had been

purged, and resolutions were passed to withdraw from the WFTU.

While the formalization and expansion of the international programme took a few more

years to develop, the conventions of the late 1940s, particularly between 1947 and 1949, show the

consolidation of a cohesive vision in support of the general founding policies and principles of the

---

[5] For the SSC and Michael Murphy, corporatism has been a key component of labour imperialism in Canada. For them, corporatism as a goal and strategy is connected to Canadian business unionism, which they understand as a consequence of the triumph of social democracy within the labour movement (Saskatoon Solidarity Committee 1981; Murphy 1986). For Murphy, social democracy constituted the central factor in shaping labour internationalism in Canada (Murphy 1986, i-ii).

burgeoning alliances that would characterize Canadian labour internationalism. What emerged was a programme for the development of the ICFTU, support for NATO and the Marshall Plan, and a general alignment with Canadian foreign policy (LAC CLC Fond 501-19; Price 2003, 2). The CCL sought the development of a coordinated anti-communist labour strategy under the auspices of the ICFTU and its regional organizations. This included building the ICFTU's regional activities fund to achieve these goals. The CCL's international department, set up in 1953, was principally aimed at supporting the activities of the ICFTU while it maintained other longstanding activities such as participation in the ILO. Preceded by the existence of the International Affairs Committee (IAC), the International Affairs Department (IAD), which was directed by the committee, represented the priority of the international programme and its expansion. The idea for establishing the department arose at a CCL executive meeting in November 1952 (LAC CLC Fond 501-19). The executive also decided to set up a standing committee to review the activities of the department, guide the work, report to the congress executive and make recommendations on international activities and issues (LAC CLC Fond 501-19). The initial mandate for the department was to raise funds and stimulate interest in the international programme to build up the ICFTU and fight communism (LAC CLC Fond 501-19 -4108). The objectives of the department were to:

> 1. assist/promote the ICFTU, its aims and activities; 2. to provide assistance through the ICFTU to strengthen "free trade unionism throughout the world;" 3. to engage in education activities internally; 4. encourage joint action with other bona-fide labour organizations on international questions of concern for labour; 5. prepare info for delegates of congress attending international conferences; 6. to make known to the Canadian government the views of the congress and those of the free trade union movement around the world; 7. to report to the congress and its members the attitude and stand taken by the Canadian government in inter-governmental bodies on such questions; 8. to urge the Canadian government to encourage consultation with the congress on international matters and also labour participation in national bodies dealing with these questions. (LAC CLC Fond 501-19)

The work of the CCL International department began with the goal of working to actively build consent and support of the affiliates (and the TLC) to the ICFTU programme through seminars,

articles, convention speakers and other mechanisms that funds were solicited for.[6] As with the

purges and raids of the unions that were dominated by revolutionary socialists, the USWA was the

affiliate that played the most significant role in establishing the direction of the CCL's international

committee and department (LAC CLC Fond 501). Throughout the early years of the department

and committee, the USWA played a significant role in the formation of the department and

contributed significant amounts of funding. The first staff person of the department, Martin

Levinson, came out of the CCF trade union committee and was at the IWA in the late 1940s during

the time when the social democrats were actively working to rid the IWA of revolutionary socialists;

Levinson later worked for ICFTU from 1950-1952.[7] The initial funds for Levinson's position were

provided by the USWA (LAC CLC Fond 501).

The evolving priorities and strategies of the CCL's IAC and IAD reflect the policies and

debates within the international organizations the CCL were active in and federations they were

close to, such as the CIO. For instance, in their early years the committee and department held

seminars on international affairs in Niagara Falls and then in Scarborough, events that were attended

by Walter Reuther and Serafino Romualdi who, during his time in the Organización Regional

Interamericana de Trabajadores (ORIT, Inter-American Regional Workers' Organization), carried

out very aggressive campaigns to smash militant unions in the Caribbean and Latin America (LAC

CLC Fond 502-1).[8] Beyond the CIO influence, the other participants in the Niagara session are

revealing of the political direction the CCL international programme. These participants included

---

[6] International committee files include meeting minutes discussing ways to get the TLC on board and include a letter
written by Charles Millard to the TLC encouraging their participation in the ICFTU and the regional activities fund
(LAC CLC Fond 502-1). In the early years of the department, the TLC remained disinterested. The extent of member
buy-in to efforts to raise funds and build consent requires study. However, what is clear is that though donations from
various unions and councils were very small in comparison to the funds put in by the USWA, for instance, donations did
come from a large number of locals and councils across the country.

[7] For more on the battle inside the IWA in the late 1940s, see Lembcke 1980.

[8] For more on Romualdi, Reuther's international work and the internationalism of the CIO, see Romualdi 1967; Buhle
1999; Radosh 1969; Lichtenstein 2013; Carew 1996.

representatives from the Canadian ILO and the Canadian Institute for International Affairs (CIIA), which was an organization set up by former Canadian politicians and businessmen, and had close links to the department of external affairs (LAC CLC Fond 502-1).[9]

Not surprisingly, like the CIO and unlike the AFL and the British TUC, the CCL was committed to a united-front approach to anti-communism that entailed alliances with the state, including financial support for international projects and an emphasis on aid as a means of building alternatives to revolutionary socialist and communist unions. Before Walter Reuther lost control over international work in the late 1950s, the CIO and CCL both worked to build a coordinated strategy of anti-communism within the ICFTU and ORIT (LAC CLC Fond 502-1). The CCL and CIO shared a political commitment to social democracy as a means of achieving justice for workers in North America. At the early seminars in Niagara Falls and Scarborough, the CCL urgently stressed the need to raise money and increase aid to win the fight against communism (LAC CLC Fond 502-1); specifically, they viewed government aid money as essential to the overall effort to win the labour wars of position in the South. This war of position entailed a variety of strategies, including supporting and channeling money to anti-communist unions. Battles took place where communist or revolutionary socialist anti-colonial unions were dominant as in Italy, France, and Kenya. This strategy included training trade union leaders and potential leaders on trade union strategies that reflected philosophies of social partnership. And, as I examine more closely at the end of this chapter, the emergence of development aid work as a strategy of winning the war of position in the Global South became increasingly central to the work of the new department and committee, remaining a central feature of the CLC International department until 2013.

---

[9] These politicians include Robert Borden, Conservative Prime Minister during the First World War, and Joseph Flavelle, the president of the largest pork-packing business in the British Empire who was accused of war profiteering during the First World War (www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/sir-joseph-wesley-flavelle/) For more on the CIIA, see www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/canadian-institute-of-international-affairs/, and for a sense of their orientation in this period, see Spencer (1959). The CCL became corporate members of the CIIA in 1954.

The dominant vision of internationalism that emerged within the CCL was not without tensions. Despite its overall cohesion, members of the newly formed international committee had differences in how they envisioned the work being carried out. During the early years, minutes from committee meetings reveal differences over priorities and strategy, including how to relate to the state, where to focus their energies, and what mechanisms they needed to develop to carry out their work (LAC CLC Fond 502-1). In 1954, each committee member was responsible for one of the key priority areas, which were the Colombo Plan, the first anti-communist aid programme the CCL was involved in, work in the ILO (which continued to be an important priority), NATO and the UN, the International Trade Secretariats (sectoral organizations of the ICFTU), Canadian–US relations, and the Middle East (specifically relations with and support for the Israeli Histadrut).

Between Labour Imperialism and Accommodationist Solidarities

I argue that the emerging international programme of the CCL and then the CLC can be characterized as something between accommodationist solidarity and labour imperialism. Their programme reveals an alignment with the interests of the Canadian state and Canadian and American capital abroad. This is illustrated by their support for NATO, the Marshall Plan, and Bretton Woods. It is evident in their opposition to liberation struggles, in their support for the imperialist ventures of the United States in Asia[10] and in the way that this expansion was understood as in the interests of Canadian workers. Lastly, this is seen in the way that Southern workers were framed as opportunities for and threats to the prosperity of workers in the North. As Jack Scott noted in the case of the AFL-CIO, once class-struggle unionism was smashed and capitalism accepted, unionists aligned their interests with those of capital. This put unions in the North at odds with the dominant forces of labour in the South who were predominately engaged in anti-colonial

---

[10] See Price 2003 for more on the CCL's role in Asia in the late 1940s and early 1950s.

struggles and/or who were clearly communist.[11] On the level of international activities, this meant an active role on the part of many unions in the North, including Canadian unions, to disarm the more militant labour movements that existed in the South (movements which a majority of workers in these countries were active in or identified with), by funding alternative and often weak economistic unions to compete with these unions.

While I examine the specifics of some of the early Canadian labour programmes in the next section, I begin by outlining why I argue that this programme is somewhere between accommodation and imperialism. I do so for three reasons. First, while we cannot know the intentions of all the actors involved in the making of the CCL's international programme, we know some were explicit anti-communists and were engaging in these projects very self-consciously as explicit offensives, while others may well have seen their efforts as a form of solidarity. And while intentions do not change the effect of these projects, the intention is important for understanding the deeper ideological dimensions of this work. This leads us to the second reason, which is that while both labour imperialism and accommodationist solidarity denote a politics that reinforces existing global social relations and the dominance of a specific group of workers within it (Johns 1998, 256), it is the later phenomenon of unselfconscious reinforcement that presents a greater obstacle for the possibility of transformative international labour solidarity. For this reason, I emphasize the way that these activities were understood as acts of solidarity by some of the main actors involved. Understanding the broader ideological terrain (beyond the Cold War) that contributed to this form of internationalism is imperative for developing a critical lens to international practices in the post-Cold War period at which time the history of labour imperialism was and still is generally dismissed as long dead. Therefore, I think that exploring the ideological

---

[11] For instance, the material interests and political goals of these workers' movements were directly undermined by the establishment of NATO and the Bretton Woods institutions.

terrain that enabled this work to be framed as a form of solidarity revives the relevancy of the work in this period beyond a set of historical events.

Third, while there were important counter-currents to this programme in this period, the accommodationist orientation highlights a deeper problem, that the national or regional horizons limiting solidarity goes deeper than a few leaders and staff. In *Yankee Unions, Go Home*, Jack Scott (1978a) challenges the idea that the commitment to labour imperialism in the United States constituted betrayals by staff or leaders of union principles; instead, he argues that it follows logically from the ideology of business unionism, which is built to cooperate with and support capitalism (Scott 1978a, 11). In the Canadian context, part of the consent for labour imperialism was built through the war of position for social democracy and the emerging hegemony of social democratic common sense about union action and worker justice. This arises from several aspects of Canadian social democracy, including a conciliatory orientation to capital as well as the liberal approach to worker justice and inequality.

As in the American case, the international programme cannot be reduced to a betrayal of the leadership or staff. The opportunism within the labour bureaucracy is of course a barrier to any transformative project for labour, making it little wonder that an understanding of labour imperialism as a disease of the labour leadership gained traction – especially as many leaders received perks from doing this work, including international travel, as well as power and status from participating in important international meetings. The material rewards many of these actors received through appointments to government posts or assignments to international bodies also lent credence to analyses of leadership betrayal and to theories of labour imperialism as the product of a state strategy that entailed the buying off of labour leaders.[12] While there is no evidence to rule these theories out, the data suggests, as the Saskatoon Solidarity Committee and Michael Murphy have

---

[12] An example is the appointment of Pat Conroy to the position of Canadian labour attaché in Washington (Horowitz 1968, 87).

argued, the efforts of the actors involved in developing and carrying out the labour programme of the CCL and CLC arose from their own political agendas, agendas that aligned with those of the state.

When we look at the activities of the international affairs committee and department in this period, what stands out most clearly against the idea of labour leadership betrayal is their effort to build member consent to this programme. The desire of the executive and IAC to build member consent to their programme is reflected in the agendas and discussions at IAC meetings, the early international seminars, in their efforts to fundraise for the international programme from locals and councils, and in the literature produced about international issues, including significant attention to international affairs in the federation newsletter. For instance, with the establishment of the CLC in 1956, besides numerous stand-alone pieces on specific international issues, *CLC News* included an "Around the World" column on ICFTU policies, related issues, and campaigns (LAC CLC Fond 498-5). Their efforts to win consent to their international programme meant that the leadership was open about the general politics and the direction of their work, even if not about the details.

And while there were counter-currents to this dominant institutional labour internationalism, the international affairs committee and department did have some success in winning support for their programme from sections of the membership. Support for the programme is in partly be gleaned from the lack of opposition and debate at conventions. While this might be largely attributable to Cold War repression, including the purges of revolutionary unions and unionists, this does not itself account for why there was such a lack of opposition to the international policies that could have come from those in the remaining affiliates. Consent to this programme is also evident in the successes of the IAC to fundraise. While no union contributed as much as the USWA to building the department and the ICFTU programme, there were small but wide-ranging donations for the programme, including from labour councils and various local unions. This is significant

because it points to the need to think about the deeper roots of the commitment to the programme beyond rabid anti-communist labour leaders such as Charles Millard who were designing this programme (Horowitz 1968, 86).

Outside our Community of Interests: Southern Workers as Opportunities and Threats

Canada has products for export which workers in many areas of the world require – and would be only too glad to buy. But at the moment they cannot because they just do not earn enough money.
–Minutes of the CCL International Affairs Committee, 1952
(LAC CLC Fond 301-IAD Misc. Part 1, 1943-1953)

To understand the roots of accommodationist solidarity, we need to explore the common-sense ideas underlying the CCL's international programme that shapes certain communities of interest. On a most general level, the philosophy of social partnership of the CCL produced a sense that the material interests of Canadian workers were aligned with the interests of the Canadian state and Canadian and American capital abroad. This alignment has racial and national dimensions. One way that we see the racial and national dimensions of this alignment of interests is in the way that Southern workers were often framed as other, and more specifically as being both opportunities for and a threat to the material interests of Canadian workers.

The quote that begins this chapter encapsulates some key features of the CCL's internationalism. One, that for some of these leaders, the building of or support for unions and the training of union leaders in the South to their model of trade unionism was understood as an act of solidarity. This comes out of a real belief in these strategies as a means of prosperity for these workers and a desire to raise the conditions of these workers.[13] If we remove the broader context in which these leaders were simultaneously supporting Cold-War policies and offensives against these same people and their interests and working to undermine more militant workers struggles, this orientation seems benign or even genuinely solidaristic. Hence why the other message in this quote

---

[13] This was also influenced by the belly communism thesis.

is instructive – the desire to raise wages as a means of securing a market for Canadian goods. The CCL IAC envisioned their international programme as creating the conditions for the expansion of Canadian capital, which would translate into prosperity for Canadian workers. In this sense, the South and Southern workers were understood as part of a strategy for security that warranted an alignment with the interests of Canadian capital abroad. So, like Reuther, imperialism was seen by the CCL IAC as strategy and opportunity for the security of their members.

At this time, global imperialism was being significantly reshaped. An key aspect of this reshaping was the expansion of American imperialism. American imperialist designs were signaled through the Marshall Plan, Bretton Woods, and the Truman Doctrine, ushering in the new era of American imperialism. In the case of the interests of Canadian capital, though some operations in the Caribbean and Latin America already existed, it was in the post-war period that they developed and grew.[14] And in the period in which Canadian capital began to extensively reap the profits of their imperialist operations, these profits did not translate into higher wages or stability for the working class in Canada.[15] Instead, like Post, I think we need to view the concessions made by capital in the 1940s as a product of heightened class struggle, reflecting the strength of labour and the willingness of workers to fight, rather than resulting from the profits of imperialism.[16] However, even if there were significant profits as a direct result of imperialism in this period, as Post notes, this does not in

[14] See Gordon 2010; Klassen 2009.

[15] While one could argue that these profits of the 1940s were produced through imperialism via wartime production, this however was not actually rooted in the super exploitation of southern workers. Creating a necessary correlation between the profits of imperialism and the allegiance of the more highly paid workers to imperialism is a conservative narrative, not only because it posits as inevitable this transfer, thereby erasing agency and the activity of workers, but also as a necessary correlation it leaves no option for challenging imperialism. Post also notes the role of the some of the most highly paid workers in the northern working class engaged in anti-imperialist activism. For more on this, see also Featherstone (2012).

[16] "Clearly, these 'benefits' accruing to the entire working class of the industrialized countries from imperialist investment are neither automatic nor evenly distributed. Rising profits and increased investment do not necessarily lead to higher wages for workers in the absence of effective working-class organization and struggle . . . The higher wages that workers in unionized capital-intensive industries enjoy are not gained at the expense of lower paid workers, either at home or abroad" (Post 2006).

and of itself translate into a share for workers. Rather, the share for workers was a matter of effective class struggle, and tied to class consciousness. The sense in which the interests of Canadian workers and employers are aligned – and specifically, that the prosperity of Canadian capital would provide security for Canadian workers – are hallmarks of the philosophy of social partnership and of a national horizon of interests. This alignment and sense of mutual interests with employers remains a substantial force within the Canadian labour movement today. In sum, what we see in this period is an assessment by those in the leadership of the CCL's that the interests of workers in Canada are aligned with the potential of Canadian (and sometimes also American) capital's expansion in the South.

Other as Opportunity

> Capitalism required new markets, and capital investment presupposed political stability. Western models of state formation were offered as necessary preconditions of the takeoff stage of modernizing economic development for newly decolonizing nations.
> –David Theo Goldberg (1993, 154)

The Canadian state has been the key patron of the CCL and the CLC's international programmes. The principal vehicle for their work was through development aid projects that were supported by the Canadian state. While development aid was used by the state to guard against and to actively undermine revolutionary movements, it was also aimed at creating new markets and sites for investment.[17] The CCL's support for the expansion of Canadian and American capital abroad is seen in their creation of development aid projects that supported the interests of Canadian capital, their general alignment with Canadian foreign policy aims, and their close ties to the state and Canadian capital vis-à-vis to Canadian international affairs. These relationships to the state and capital, already established through ILO meetings, were deepened in this period with burgeoning projects that the CCL initiated or participated in, like the Colombo Plan and their activities in the

---

[17] See Carty and Smith 1981; Pratt 1984, 1996a, 1996b.

Caribbean through ORIT, with the help of state funds. These relations were actively deepened by the CCL through various lobby strategies vis-à-vis the state. This included requesting that external affairs appoint labour attaches as widely as possible to provide some balance to the representation for commercial interests at the embassies, and because of the Soviet threat they needed to reach – and gather information within – the working classes abroad (Price 2003, 13).[18] When this was met with hesitancy, Charles Millard approached the commercial interest counsellor stationed at the Canadian embassy in Brussels to press him on the value of at least appointing a labour attaché to the embassy in Brussels (Price 2003, 14). Millard argued that Conroy, who had stepped down from the CCL, be appointed to this position, and in 1952 he was made labour attaché to the Canadian embassy in Washington (Price 2003, 14).[19] He also sought to deepen relations with the state on the international front by proposing a meeting with A.D. P. Heeney and Escott Reid from External Affairs and the Americans Major General Burns and MacNamara of the Department of Defense to keep them informed on international labour developments (Price 2003, 14).

Besides their close relations through the ILO, the CCL's ties to leading figures in Canadian and American companies is highlighted in their joint participation in international affairs organizations and think tanks. Early in the development of the international department, Martin Levinson consulted with American think tanks like the Brookings Institute, the Foreign Policy Association, the Council on World Affairs, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace on how to build their international programme and capacity to engage in international affairs (LAC CLC Fond 502-3). Another important organization that the newly formed CLC became a member of was the Canadian American Committee (CAC) (LAC CLC Fond 494-10). The CAC, formed in

---

[18] Price cites a letter from Pat Conroy to the under-secretary of external affairs A.D.P Heeney in 1951 arguing for the value of such a programme (LAC CLC Fond 188-22).

[19] Price notes that Conroy served in this position for twenty years.

1957, was co-sponsored by the Private Planning Association of Canada (PPAC), an organization set up by businessmen and politicians in Montréal that would eventually become the right-wing CD Howe Institute.[20] According to Robert and James Laxer, the CAC was set up as a mechanism to support Canadian and American integration (Laxer and Laxer 1977, 106). In the case of the CLC's membership in the CAC, one of the early points of coordination was on pushing for Canadian membership in the Organization of American States (OAS) (LAC CLC Fond 494-10; McFarlane 1989).[21] Lastly, the CCL and then CLC were active members in the CIIA, which like the American think tanks, influenced the politics of the department. The CCL was not only a member of the CIIA, CIIA representatives were also invited as participants in the early joint seminars on international affairs organized in conjunction with the CIO.

The CCL and then the CLC's relation to the state reinforces the more recent thesis of scholars of labour imperialism, namely that the funding relationship and other points of coordination with the state and capital were sought by the labour movement rather than imposed by the state or capital (LAC CLC Fond 502-1).[22] The CCL initiated relations with the state and sought to build closer links to the Canadian state vis-à-vis international relations. Beyond the CCL and CLC's alignment with Canadian foreign policy in support of NATO, Bretton Woods and the Korean War, they also sought a larger impact on Canadian foreign policy and bolster ICFTU projects more generally.[23] The Colombo Plan is an example of this, whereby the CCL was actually more passionately committed to the plan and its expansion than was the state, and the CCL worked

---

[20] See www.cdhowe.org/history.

[21] The push to have Canada join the Organization of American States (OAS) was also coming out of ORIT.

[22] This does not mean that we can rule out the possibility that certain leaders, staff or activists could have been on the state payroll. However, what is important here for those of us interested in thinking through the obstacles to a more militant and transformative labour movement are the ideological origins of the decision on the part of labour to seek out state funding to undermine certain workers' struggles.

[23] See Price 2003 for more on the ways the CCL aligned with American imperialism in Asia in this period.

actively to persuade the state to increase its support for the plan. In the early meetings of the CCL

International Affairs Committee, reflecting the urgency that would be reinforced at the international

seminars with the CIO, ORIT, ILO and CIIA allies, the committee discussed lobbying for more aid

to the Third World (LAC CLC Fond 502-1). At these seminars, participants discussed how an

effective strategy to obtain more "aid funding" might be to argue that this work in the Third World

would assist unemployment in Canada (LAC CLC Fond 502-1). They felt that – while their

proposals and positions were mostly amenable to the External Affairs department, and that friendly

and close relations existed – they needed to "actively try to build some public opinion on these

matters" if they were to continue to have influence (LAC CLC Fond 502-1).[24] It is noteworthy that

the members of the CCL and CLC executive and international affairs committee developed close

personal links with key state players in foreign affairs over the years of work together in the ILO and

in international programmes like the Colombo Plan and in the Caribbean.[25]

    While their work was independent of the CIO and involved coordination with the Canadian

state and close relations to Canadian capital, the CCL did also support American imperialism. In the

early Cold War, American investments in Canada were significant, reaching their height in the 1960s

(McNally 1991, 234). This meant that, though there was a national horizon of struggle vis-à-vis the

state for the expansion of social benefits, in the case of the perceived opportunities for Canadian

workers through international expansion, the significant number of American companies in Canada

translated into an alignment with both American and Canadian capital abroad. The CCL and CLC's

---

[24] For more on the alliance of policies between the CCL and the Canadian state, see Price 2003.

[25] In one letter written by Lester B. Pearson, the future prime minister then in External Affairs, to the minister of Foreign Affairs in Israel in 1949, he describes Pat Conroy, CCL vice president and one of the founding members of the ICFTU as being one of the outstanding labour leaders in Canada after having travelled with him to Israel (LAC CLC Fond 502-1). The close relations are also visible in the regular correspondence between CCL and CLC leaders and the Canadian External Affairs department as well as the appointment of numerous labour leaders to government or government-supported posts; in particular, Romeo Maione, director of the IAD in the early 1970s, appointed to head of the Canadian International Development Agency NGO section, Pat Conroy, appointed labour attaché to the United States, Joe Morris, to the board of the Bank of Canada and recipient of the Order of Canada, and Dennis McDermott, to ambassador to Ireland.

strategy was to get behind the expansion of capital in the South, and this meant getting behind US as well as Canadian capital within the wider backing of NATO and the newly established international economic institutions.[26] As Miriam Smith (1992) notes, Canadian labour understood the protection of jobs in this period as needing a continental approach rather than an economic nationalist one, translating into support for free trade policies. The CCL called on the state to institute various "measures to increase economic collaboration among countries of the free world," but the country with which they had the strongest economic connection to in this period was the United States (LAC CLC Fond 501-19). When we look at the early initiatives of the CCL, while we see a greater priority given to the interests of Canadian capital, the expansion of American capital was close behind. American workers were considered as part of the community of interest of Canadian labour.[27] Unlike Southern workers, American workers were not seen as other; American workers were constructed neither as opportunities or threats.[28]

Other as Threat

Imagine workers in Asia or Africa at an unorganized plant producing the same product as you where
wages are 25% less than yours . . . it would only be a matter of time until the under-cutting
endangered your own job.
–Excerpt from minutes of the CCL's International Affairs Committee, 1952
(LAC CLC Fond 301 File IAD Misc. Part 1 1943-1953)

---

[26] As Miriam Smith (1992) notes, Canadian labour saw the protection of jobs in this period as needing a continental approach rather than an economic nationalist one, and it included support for free trade policies. For the remainder of this chapter, when I discuss capital, this includes the interests of US capital.

[27] This is reflected in their participation in the CAC, a commitment to policies that supported American imperialism and American imperialist wars such as Korea.

[28] This sense of commonality of interest and purpose was shaped by their organizational connection but also through whiteness. The Canadian context, like that of the United States, is based on settler colonialism. This means that nationalism and nation-building is premised on colonialism, its racist violence and white supremacist narrative and socio-economic structure. And as a social order based from the outset of colonization on white supremacy, Canadian labour history, like the American, cannot be understood outside of the way nation-building and its racist premises shaped class formation. Whiteness, I argue, created a sense of a shared past and destiny that created a regional rather than strictly national community of interests that crossed class lines.

The just-quoted minutes announced a problem that the CCL's international programme would address: the vast inequalities born of global capitalist development. Besides the ideological anti-communist commitments driving some of the actors in labour imperialism in this period, communist and revolutionary movements and unions posed a threat to expansion opportunities for Canadian and American capital. The political proclivities of Southern workers in this period, many of whom were part of revolutionary movements, threatened investments and investment opportunities. For the IAC, the development of trade unions along the lines of their model was genuinely seen by some as a route to prosperity that would enable these Southern workers to become new markets for Canadian goods. If they failed, these workers conversely would be threats to the standard of living in the North. The various senses in which Southern workers have been viewed as threats underscores the accommodationist nature of the CCL's solidaristic motives.[29] The impetus here is to maintain and advance the advantage of Canadian workers, guarding an advantageous position for them in the "spatial relations of production and the spatial hierarchy within the international working class" (Johns 1998, 259-60). This impetus points to the crux of the contradictions in their approach that supported imperialism. Through their consent and active support in building the architecture of the era of American imperialism, they put in place conditions for the undoing of their social partnership. In this the CCL was not alone. Their orientation speaks more generally to the political direction of the united front within the ICFTU, where affiliates sought to build unions internationally for a variety of reasons, including to protect their own position within global divisions of labour. This was rooted in an alignment with the interests of their states and their national or regional capital blocs. The contradictory nature of what are framed as solidaristic motives is underscored by the general commitment to the building of the infrastructure for ongoing imperialist expansion. We see the reality today of this pact with imperialism, which has

---

[29] In this framework, the struggles of workers internationally are secondary to the local community of interests (which are shaped by ideas of nation but also of race).

served to expand global inequality, increase disparities, and exacerbate downward pressures on incomes as capital has been able to increase competition between workers and expand the global reserve army of labour.

Towards an Understanding of Early Cold War:
Canadian Labour Imperialism and Accommodationist Solidarities

In this last section, I will unpack and expand on some of the arguments I have made about the development of an institutionalized Canadian labour internationalism in the early Cold War. Having outlined the general contours of the CCL's emergent activity in international affairs, I now turn to some specific cases in which I will elaborate on the politics of their international programme. Here, I explore some of the specific features, tensions, and contradictions of the strategies that emerged in Kenya, South East Asia (through the Colombo Plan), the Anglo Caribbean, and the Middle East. Each case is revealing of different aspects of the CCL's programme and ideological base for certain strategies, alliances and positions. In each of these cases, following from the features of Canadian class formation and the success of social democratic forces within the CCL, I explore the role of the dominant union philosophy of social partnership and dominant ideas of race and nation that contributed to this programme.

Kenya

Africa, and specifically the Kenyan labour movement, became an important site of conflict between the WFTU, the British TUC and the AFL (and then AFL-CIO), and shows the tensions and tendencies inside the early ICFTU. Kenya in the 1950s was the site of a strong anti-colonial

sentiment represented by the Mau Mau uprising; Mau Mau was a nationalist anti-colonial movement that had mass appeal amongst sections of the working class and the peasantry.[30]

There was a belief held by intellectuals like Jack Woddis, Bob Fitch and Mary Oppenheimer, that Africa was a site with potential for working class-led liberation struggles, "in tactical as well as ideological terms, the strikes and protests of trade unions were crucially important to the liberation struggle" on that continent (Stichter 1975, 262; Frank et al 2010). And while others like Fanon were less optimistic, seeing unionized workers as opportunistic and accommodationist, the Mau Mau had a substantial following within large sections the working class (Stichter 1975, 262-63). Stichter notes that though the Mau Mau uprising is generally framed as a peasant movement, the base of the movement came not only from the peasantry and landless who squatted on European owned farms but also from among the unemployed, blue- and white-collar urban workers (Stichter 1975, 268). Urban workers were engaged mostly in support activities, with many blue-collar workers collecting funds and bringing supplies to the rebels and with some white-collar workers participating in intelligence networks in support of the Mau Mau (Stichter 1975, 268). Even after the British declared a state of emergency and arrested pro-Mau Mau trade unionists, pro-Mau Mau sentiment was estimated by some to be close to 50% of the unionized workers. This is especially high if we consider that the Mau Mau had more support amongst non-unionized and unemployed workers (Stichter 1975, 265).

The response by the British colonial government to the uprising included a union strategy that sought to prevent the rise of political unions that would potentially engage in militant general strikes, to rid the unions of nationalist, anti-colonial forces, and to build industrial unions on the

---

[30] Spurred on by landlessness, by 1953 about half of the dominant ethnic group in Kenya, the Kikuyu, were without land (Newsinger 1981, 160). Landless peasants migrated to the towns to seek work, with the result that between 1938 and 1952 the population of Nairobi doubled. The name of this movement, Mau Mau, emerged in the late 1940s and is not a Kikuyu word, but rather was coined by the British (Newsinger 1981,163). When the Mau Mau rebellion took place in 1953, General Sir George Erskine argued that over 90% of the Kikuyu supported the rebels (Newsinger 1981, 169). The rebellion came to have features of a civil war as loyalists as well as settlers were targets of the Mau Mau uprising (Newsinger 1981). For more, see Stichter 1975; Presley 1992; Branch 2009; Horne 2009.

British model, to which the British TUC played an active role in support (Stichter 1975, 270). The British colonial government worked to repress the EATUC (East African Trades Union Congress), which had led a nine-day general strike in May of 1950 that paralyzed the city (Newsinger 1981, 164).[31] Stepping up their efforts in mid-1952, several anti-Mau Mau industrial unions (which had legal status as registered trade unions) were established, as well as a new central federation, the Kenyan Federation of Registered Trade Unions (KFRTU, a precursor to the Kenyan Federation of Labour).[32] A few months later, many unionists involved in the EATUC and those who supported the Mau Mau were arrested under a state of emergency imposed by the British colonial government (Stichter 1975, 270-71); one account stated that there were over 8,000 arrests in the first 25 days of the emergency, followed by increased attacks on European property as local committees of the Mau Mau decided to fight back (Newsinger 1981, 168). The state of emergency remained in place until 1960, even though most rebels were killed by the mid-1950s, with estimates of the number of rebels killed ranging from 11,000 to 50,000 (Newsinger 1981, 180). In 1953, Tom Mboya became the head of the KFRTU. Mboya refused to denounce the Mau Mau; however, he also blocked their attempt to call a general strike in Nairobi (Stichter 1975, 273). He promoted a constitutional nationalism and abided by the call from the British to stamp out the threat of the "terrorists" (Newsinger 1981, 174, 177). The decision of the British colonial government to mix repression with reform by raising wages in 1954 bolstered the KFRTU and Mboya's position (Newsinger 1981).

---

[31] The British TUC had sought to gain influence over the EATUC, but they showed suspicion towards the TUC's motives (Zeleza 1984, 17). The TUC eventually branded them as communist aligned, even though there were only a very few who held revolutionary socialist ideas in the organization (and most of whom were arrested after the general strike), and they were not affiliated to the WFTU (Zeleza 1984, 17-18).

[32] KFRTU was set up under the auspices of the Kenya labour department in March 1953 (Newsinger 1981, 173).

Wars of Position: The Colonial Question and Competing Philosophies of Trade Unionism

The issue of Kenya shows the tensions within the strategies of the major ICFTU affiliates as they were developing their strategies in the early 1950s. Evident in the Kenyan case are the diverse strategies of that created tensions amongst the major affiliates. The different and often competing strategies, along with the importance of the colonial question in Kenya, underscores the inability to reduce the operations in Kenya to standard Cold War framing.

Reflective of their general orientation, the CCL was committed to a united front approach to the labour war of position in Kenya that meant pursuit of a strategy to win over and build unions on their model – in a fashion like that of the CIO and the major social democratic continental European affiliates in this period. While the British TUC and the AFL had their own programmes in Kenya, the ICFTU also began to send people there. One of these people was Jim Bury, a Canadian steelworker sent by the CCL to work under the ICFTU in the early 1950s (LAC CLC Fond 502-1).[33]

Tensions

The British TUC viewed Kenya as part of their sphere of influence and supported ongoing British rule there. They played a role in supporting the establishment of a trade union central to compete with the EATUC and sought actively to promote the British model of trade unionism (Zeleza 1984).[34] Though the British TUC was critical of the Americans and the ICFTU generally for promoting colonialism, in actuality they were simply more attuned to the forces on the ground in Kenya and realized that a strong pro-colonial line would be a liability against developing a presence and influence (Carew 1996b). Anthony Carew notes that the British TUC's position, its relation to

---

[33] While the archives to not contain documents outlining his activities in Kenya, the general orientation of his work can be gathered through the secondary material on the ICFTU in Kenya.

[34] They first sent someone to Kenya in 1947 to promote an economistic and apolitical philosophy of trade unionism (Zeleza 1984, 15).

the British state and actions reinforced the AFL's desire to develop a programme separate from the ICFTU in Africa (1996b).

The ICFTU, having designated Kenya as a critical site for their operations in East Africa, began their operations in Kenya in the early 1950s, and this competed with the TUC programme for influence over the direction of Kenyan trade unions (Zeleza 1984, 18).[35] This was a competition for influence (Zeleza 1984, 16). The trade union context had already been shaped in favour of developing a new ICFTU affiliate in Kenya; specifically, this was facilitated by the actions of the British TUC and the colonial government to establish anti-Mau Mau trade unions and repress the EATUC. In the case of Kenya, despite anti-colonial sentiment, there was great potential for success in cooptation because the unions were predominately made up of white-collar and skilled workers who were less inclined to militancy (Stichter 1975, 265).

The extent of anti-colonial sentiment in Kenya meant that there was also a need to more deeply win these leaders to their models of trade unionism. This was the role of the ICFTU representatives in Kenya, including Bury. However, their approaches varied and reflected their own trade union philosophies. The approach of the ICFTU was therefore multi-pronged, involving the promotion of several different models of trade unionism. And so, we see here the two main prongs of the dominant current shaping the ICFTU in this period – to build alternative models to forms of revolutionary (communist and/or anti-colonial), political trade unions and to sell social partnership.[36] The visions of social partnership being promoted by the ICFTU, in this case to the

---

[35] The British TUC blamed the ICFTU and the AFL-CIO for their failures in Kenya (Zeleza 1984, 22).

[36] Decisions around whether to engage in wars of position that were focused on coopting existing unions depended on the politics of existing unions. In the case of the CCL, they participated in both cooptation efforts and strategies to build alternative unions. The examples I look at in this dissertation mostly point to efforts to build alternative unions. Examples include CCL support for the FO and anti-communist unions in Italy like CISL. In the case of Kenya, there is an attempt to deepen the commitment to a less political trade unionism, but where the infrastructure for the federation was put in place by the British. And by the phrase dominant current, I mean the social democratic affiliates as opposed to the AFL and the British TUC who were still each half-heartedly committed to the ICFTU as the vehicle for their international work.

KFL, included the weaker Anglo versions as well as the stronger Scandinavian and Israeli models (Zeleza 1984, 21). And despite the efforts of the TUC, their model did not appeal to the KFL. Tiyambe Zeleza argues that the anti-communist trade union strategy that was most successful in Kenya was that of the Scandinavian affiliates of the ICFTU and the Israeli Histadrut's model of trade unionism (Zeleza 1984, 21). The Histadrut model, in which they were not only a trade union but had their own enterprises, appealed most to Mboya (Zeleza 1984, 21).[37] The Histadrut had the strongest version of social partnership wherein companies, trade unions and institutions providing various kinds of social services were integrated within a single organization. This form of organization arose out of the origins of the Histadrut as a vehicle for the colonization of Palestine, being foremost a mechanism for colonization rather than a trade union; it owned and operated companies designed to create a settler economy and promote settlement. The Israeli brand of corporatist trade unionism was presented and sold as a form of "socialist" trade unionism in contrast to the British, Canadian, and American models.

In the case of Kenya, and operations in Africa more generally, both the CCL and the CIO – and specifically, Charles Millard and Walter Reuther – saw themselves as working to bridge the differences between the AFL and the British TUC to establish a united ICFTU strategy (Carew 1996b, 170-172). By the mid-1950s, Millard was working at the ICFTU and supporting the development of an ICFTU regional organization in Africa, the African Regional Organization (ARO), arguing for an end to the individual programmes of the AFL and the British TUC. The CCL's commitment to work through the ICFTU was rooted in the philosophical and political affinities with the more social-democratic federations in the ICFTU, but also their political distance from AFL business unionism and their brand of anti-communism, which they saw as ineffective to

---

[37] Though the KFL sought dues check off like the Canadians and Americans rather than gather dues like the British (Zeleza 1984, 21). The British TUC eventually recognized the effectiveness of the strategies of the other ICFTU affiliates after Kenyan independence when in 1963 they provided funds to the Histadrut-run Afro-Asian Institute.

win over socialist leaning workers in much of the world in this period.[38] Bury, like others from

Northern unions, was there doing education work. The case of Kenya showed the potential of the

social-democratic approach of the Scandinavians and Israelis for success in the context of rising

anti-colonialism, since social democracy could speak to the socialist sentiments within many of these

movements.[39] In the case of Kenya, the united-front strategy meant being at odds with the British

TUC. The presence of the ICFTU in Kenya and the efforts on the part of Millard and others to set

up a regional organization reflects their distance from the position of the British TUC, which was

strongly opposed to the competition to their influence posed by the establishment of a regional

organization in Africa (Zeleza 1984, 23). Ultimately and not surprisingly, Millard and Reuther were

unsuccessful at bridging the division between the AFL and the British TUC, and with George

Meany and AFL forces gaining increasing control of the international work of the AFL-CIO, this

became an even more remote possibility.[40] The AFL-CIO would go on to breach ICFTU policy in

Kenya by providing $35,000 to build the headquarters of the Kenyan Federation of Labour, which

became an important entryway for the AFL-CIO to increase its presence in Africa (Carew 1996b,

---

[38] For more on early perceptions of the AFL approach, see Price 2003, 13. The AFL's brand of anti-communism in evident in the case of Italy, where the AFL opposed the affiliation of the social-democratic federation, the Italian Union of Labour or Unione Italiana Del Lavoro (UIL) to the ICFTU, in favour of supporting the more hardline anti-communist CISL federation, which they had contributed to building (Price 2003, 13). However, the CCL, while generally aligned with the major affiliates of the ICFTU were not consistent on this front. For instance, they also supported CISL and even provided funds to them (LAC CLC Fond 600).

[39] However, this was not merely an opportunistic assessment of the forces on the ground; I argue that it was also reflective of their belief in social partnership as a route to prosperity, which, if replicated, could yield prosperity for workers in the Third World.

[40] After the formation of the AFL-CIO, Millard was appointed director of the ICFTU (Carew 1996a, 1996b). However, Carew notes that he was chosen over the AFL choice, Irving Brown, and was seen "as a TUC stooge and as a socialist because of his CCF connection as a former MP in Ontario" (Carew 1996a, 161). This highlights the political tension in the ICFTU in reaching a coordinated anti-communist strategy with the AFL forces which found issue also with social democracy and which was more explicitly politically supportive of American capital and their interests abroad. As the CIO lost control within the AFL-CIO international profile, the CCL became increasingly aligned with the other social-democratic affiliates.

166-67).[41] The KFL became an important player in the expansion of the ICFTU's African program and, by 1959, the ICFTU and the AFL-CIO had virtual control over the Kenyan labour movement (Carew et al. 2000, 261; Zeleza 1984).

The Colonial Question

The racial and national dimensions of these wars of position are highlighted by the position of these unions vis-à-vis the colonial question. The British TUC had a very clear pro-colonial line that made them quite close to the British state, particularly when the Labour party was in power. The British TUC understood the interests of the British working class as aligned with the fortunes of the British Empire and, in the case of Kenya, argued against colonial workers receiving the same wages as those in the metropolitan centres (Zeleza 1984, 16). We see the white supremacist logic in the idea of Kenyans and Africans more generally not being fit to operate their own unions (Carew 1996b, 173) and the deep imperial affinity visible in the defeat of a resolution for Kenyan independence at the 1954 TUC convention (Zeleza 1984). However, despite their efforts, the British TUC was already losing their battle to maintain control over the Kenya labour movement. The British TUC's pro-colonial stance (Zeleza 1984, 19), alongside their involvement with the colonial office and the white supremacist orientation[42] informing their policies and actions, made their strategy unsuccessful. Despite money, the political backing of the British state,[43] and efforts to

---

[41] And then by the late 1950s, the AFL-CIO pushed for the US government to recognize the independence of African countries and to set up technical assistance programmes and send diplomatic missions to Africa, which meant the expansion of their labour imperialist work in Africa (Carew 1996b, 173). See also Richards 1999.

[42] There are many ways that this logic functioned, e.g., through ideas about responsibility for colonial regions. For instance, they framed their role as a duty to impart the wisdom their unions, models and strategies. Underlying this framework is an assumption that these models and strategies are more advanced and should be emulated. The British TUC explicitly argued that the Kenyan trade unions were not developed (Carew 1996b, 169). This white supremacist logic is also evident in the British TUC's depiction of the Mau Mau as "a retreat to barbarism" (Zeleza 1984, 19).

[43] For instance, the British TUC succeeded in getting WFTU publications banned in Kenya in 1951 and prevented Kenyan trade unionists from attending WFTU conferences (Zeleza 1984, 18).

actively remove militant trade union leaders (Zeleza 1984, 15), they could not maintain influence over the Kenya labour movement.[44]

Now, though the AFL and the ICFTU did not promote a pro-colonial line, their actual perceptions of the anti-colonial struggle were not necessarily far off from that of the British. In the Canadian case, Jim Bury echoed the hegemonic racist depictions of the Mau Mau promoted by the British state at the time; the British state presented the Mau Mau as barbaric, blood-crazed savages unable to cope with the modern world, echoing some early scholarship on the Mau Mau uprising that talked about irrationality and bestiality (Newsinger 1981, 159; Presley 1988, 505). Bury's report to the CCL IAC echoes these perceptions, calling the Mau Mau "terrorists" and arguing that they were "generating hate and bestiality" (LAC CLC Fond 502-1). Beyond identification with the British Empire, the extent of the threat thought to be posed by the Mau Mau must also be seen in relation to sympathies with the white settlers who were targets of the Mau Mau.

There are several possible reasons for the decision of the ICFTU to go into Kenya despite the disapproval of one of its major founding affiliates. First, the fear of the WFTU gaining ground given their explicit anti-colonial position. Second, an assessment of the situation and belief that the British could not maintain control given their position or their lack of legitimacy. Third, genuine anti-colonial affinities. Fourth, seeing their presence as a necessary means to build a united front in Africa. Lastly, the dominant interests of the Americans to gain influence in Africa. There are many more explanations for the distancing of the ICFTU from the British TUC and their efforts to set up a competing programme. One of these explanations that I would like to challenge is that of genuine anti-colonialism. The AFL and then AFL-CIO went the furthest of the major ICFTU affiliates in expressing sympathies for anti-colonial struggle (Carew 1996b; Richards 1999). The archives do not tell us how explicitly sympathetic Bury was to anti-colonial sentiment in his work in Kenya;

---

[44] For more on the role of the British TUC in these efforts to gain control over the Kenyan labour movement, see Zeleza 1984.

however, what we do know is that the ICFTU did not promote actively pro-colonial line. Looking at the CCL's approach to liberation struggles in Asia, which they opposed, their approach was also dependent on an assessment of forces on the ground (Price 2003). The lack of genuine support for liberation struggles on the part of the CCL in this period is underscored by their activities, which sought to oppose liberation struggles in Asia as well as their support for NATO, their silence on anti-colonial struggles. Mostly, expressions of concern over colonialism in the documents of the IAC, IAD, convention reports and newsletters focused on the horrors of French colonialism in North Africa, while on British colonialism there is silence. This is also underscored by the complete absence of the question of colonialism in the policies and priorities of the department itself.

The Kenyan case is illustrative of the competing strategies in these early years of conflict over anti-communist strategy vis-à-vis unions in the South. These differences are seen in their philosophies and models of trade unionism and on the issue of how to approach the colonial question. The Kenyan case shows the success of what the SI later recognized as an opportunity to draw upon the socialist tendencies of liberation struggles to sell social democracy as an alternative to revolution. The success of the Scandinavians and Israelis in Kenya also occurred in the context of the failure of ICFTU to build the Force Ouvrière (FO) as a serious alternative to the Confédération générale du travail (CGT) in France. This did not mean that setting up, funding, aligning with and politically supporting anti-communist organizations or movements or working to undermine communist unions ceased; but within the CCL we see a strategy that emphasized education, schools, exchanges, scholarships and the like that were aimed at winning over union leaders and activists becoming the central feature of their work. The money drawn to do this work came from the member federations of the ICFTU and their affiliates, but also importantly through their respective states via aid funding.

Development

Development aid projects became the principal vehicle for the CCL and then the CLC's participation in the international labour wars of position throughout the Cold War and beyond. Starting with the Colombo Plan in 1950, development aid projects were at the core of the CCL and CLC's international work. Here I will look at the aims guiding development aid on the part of the state and labour, key features of the logic of development, and the CCL and CLC's initial programmes in Southeast Asia and then the Caribbean. The development framework and aid mechanism provides an important lens to how Southern workers were constructed as both opportunities and threats within the underlying philosophy of social partnership that shaped a community of interests between Canadian labour, capital and the state.

Development aid emerged in a variety of Northern states in the early Cold War for a whole host of reasons.[45] While explicit anti-communist sentiment was a large part of the early rhetoric, this was not simply an ideological battle. The anti-communist framework influencing the foreign policy objectives of several Northern states, including Canada, served to justify wars of manoeuvre against anti-colonial struggles and to maintain or secure new markets and resources. In the Canadian case, commercial objectives were central from the beginning. Beating back communist and revolutionary socialist anti-colonial struggles was necessary to secure opportunities for expansion. Robert Carty and Virginia Smith note that "the drive to guarantee Western political dominance in the Third World has always been fueled by the need to secure supplies of raw materials, new markets, and investment opportunities" (Carty and Smith 1981, 41). In the case of the Canadian state, this meant that a large portion of development aid was used for large-scale infrastructure projects that would facilitate investment by American companies and, later, Canadian companies as well (Carty and Smith 1981, 42). Aid was a form of subsidy to American and Canadian capital, using public funds to

---

[45] For more on the Canadian case, see Pratt 1984, 1996a, 1996b; Barry Shaw and Oja Jay 2012; Adeleke 1996; Carty and Smith 1981; Morrison 1998.

build the infrastructure for future imperialist expansion and tying aid to the purchasing of Canadian

products and services; since the inception of Canadian aid programmes, and for much of their

existence, "80% of aid has been conditional on recipient countries buying goods and services from

Canada" (Carty and Smith 1981, 9). Meaning that recipient countries needed to use aid funds to buy

things such as Canadian-made power plant and transmission equipment, trucks, buses, tractors,

trailers, grain, and so on (see Price 2003). And so, this money was used to secure guaranteed markets

and was a form of direct government funding to these industries.

Social Partnership and Imperialism

Aside from the humanitarian motive, the basis for appeal that is most effective is the self-interest
factor.
–USWA staff meeting, 1952.
Discussion on how to raise funds for ICFTU activities
(LAC CLC Fond 501-19)

Once they accepted capitalism they necessarily got behind empire.
–Jack Scott (1978a)

It is no surprise that once labour resigned itself to capitalism, it saw development aid

programmes as in its interest. These programmes provided short-term growth and secure markets

for companies operating in Canada. Like Reuther's slogan for a bigger pie rather than a bigger share

of the existing pie, Canadian labour viewed social partnership and support for imperialist expansion

as a way to ensure prosperity without having to wage struggle. The CCL saw the future security of

Canadian workers as linked to the prosperity of Canadian and American capital and not only

consented to and legitimized the use of public funds to create infrastructure for international

expansion, but actively fought for the expansion of the programme. This was a conscious alliance.

The CCL saw the international expansion of capital as a route to security for Canadian

workers employed in a number of industries. Lobbying for Canadian state participation in the

Colombo Plan, the CCL argued that aid would "assist our unemployment situation here" (LAC CLC

Fond 502-1). Development aid held the promise of both securing jobs and guarding against low-wage competition by ensuring Canadian processing of resources drawn from these regions. This social partnership was also rooted in anxiety about the expansion of the industrial capacity of Southern countries, which "coupled with starvation wages" posed "a danger to Canadian living standards" (LAC CLC Fond 501-19).

As I explore below, the Canadian labour movement was dissatisfied with the scale of development aid and pointed to areas for expansion, which in the 1950s translated into efforts to increase funding for the Colombo Plan and to expand into the Caribbean. The CCL also used aid funds to engage in the labour wars of position in other areas of the South. State funding was not their only source; in the early days, the USWA was also a major financial backer of their international programme. As in the Kenyan case, their development aid projects, which were operated through or in conjunction with the ICFTU or its regional organizations, aimed to gain influence, to convince unions to affiliate to the ICFTU, to train leaders or potential leaders, and to build or directly fund anti-communist unions.

Accommodation: Ongoing Threats

Continued international expansion of Canadian and American capital in this period involved beating back the threat of nationalization of industries, redistribution of land, and other strategies put forward by communist and revolutionary socialist parties and liberation struggles. These were immediate and serious threats about which labour saw a role for themselves in preventing. Like the CIO, the development aid programmes the CCL and then CLC would develop in the 1950s were based on belly communism, the idea that poverty would lead to communist revolutions. Their interests in organizing were linked to their sense of self-interest, a belief that aid could help secure expansion by preventing revolutions. At the CCL's 1954 convention, the USWA delegate who

chaired the resolutions committee introduced an omnibus resolution that argued that "poverty and colonialism are the handmaiden of totalitarianism" (Price 2003, 15). And while the critique of colonialism implied in this statement could have translated into support for liberation struggles, for Conroy and Millard their anticommunism meant they often saw anti-colonial struggles as predisposed to communism (Price 2003, 1) – and so their belly communism did not include any policies or activities that opposed colonialism in this period. Their active opposition to the political agenda of many anti-colonial struggles is underscored by their affirmation of support for NATO and the establishment of the South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) at this same convention (Price 2003, 15).[46]

Belly communism was grounded in a desire to take Southern workers out of competition for jobs. But support for NATO and SEATO, and their roles in preventing the rise of revolutionary movements as well as their lack of support for anti-colonial struggles highlights that belly communism was a limited programme for raising working and living conditions. Belly communism was clearly against the direct confrontation with racialized global divisions of labour posed by many anti-colonial struggles. As Gerald Horne notes, "the anti-colonial upsurge . . . was designed to overturn the racialized system of oppression – and underdevelopment – that colonialism represented" (Horne 1999, 454).[47] And while they saw their activities as good strategies to take Southern workers out of competition, "as these former colonies became embedded into capitalism's international division of labour, women from these countries soon became the cheapest source of labour" (Carty 1999, 41).

---

[46] This was framed as necessary to protect Canada (Price 2003, 15).

[47] For more on this, see Rodney 1972; Machel 1975; Nkrumah 1968.

Development Logic: Imperialism as Solidarity?

> The crisis of international trade unionism is a direct result of the hyper-differentiation of workers along lines of race, gender, nationality, and immigration status. Yet it is also a crisis of the developmentalist logic of the U.S. labor movement's compact with the welfare state, and its own participation in the segmentation of the workforce, both within the U.S. and in the Third World.
> –Alicia Schmidt Camacho (1999, 92)

While the impetus for the CCL's international development aid programmes were sometimes explicitly framed as self-interest by the CCL and CLC, regardless of intention, development aid came to have a charitable or even solidaristic connotation. Despite the design of these development aid projects, which was meant to support the expansion of capital, the framing of development aid as charity or even solidarity has resulted in development aid becoming a legitimate mechanism for labour solidarity in the post-Cold War period.[48] The logic of development is important to unpack to understand how these efforts came to have solidaristic connotations. Thinking about the accommodationist and imperialist tendencies of the Canadian labour movement internationally means dealing ideologically with the logic of development.

Robert Carty and Virginia Smith argue that central to the logic of development is that capitalism, and how it has developed in the North, is the model for Southern development (Carty and Smith 1981, 33). They argue that this approach to aid ignores "the historical facts of colonialism and neo-colonialism" and promotes capitalist development as "*the* model for southern progress" (Carty Smith 1981, 7). The evolutionary premise behind the idea of development functions to mask the historical role of imperialism and colonialism and omits the role of neo-imperialism and neo-colonialism in creating and maintaining global divisions of labour. This means that the logic of development can only operate through an ahistorical lens or a historical narrative that, rather than

---

[48] This is not to say that has never been any development aid projects that have been useful to workers in the South; no doubt there have been. However, the overarching framework in which this work has operated and how it has been tied to the specific interests of American and Canadian capital abroad and against movements aimed at getting to the root of oppression and exploitation means that it has been designed to support the existing global division of labour.

unpacking the social, political and economic forces leading to the current contours of global inequality, looks to abstract narratives rooted in racialized ideas of knowledge, merit and skill. Alicia Schmidt Camacho argues that the logic of development is based in racialized ideas of progress and development as features possessed by the North. Whiteness is the unspoken rationality that holds this ahistorical paradigm together, and through it, a community of the developed is constructed.

The historical omissions that underlie ideas of development at once occlude the contradictions of capitalism and reinforce ideas of white supremacy. This is because without a historical analysis of capitalist development and class formation, the massive inequality of resources and social nature of the global divisions of labour arising from colonialism, slavery and imperialism are constructed as a lack of skills to develop. This framework is connected to the racial liberalism that marked Enlightenment philosophy. As Bonilla-Silva argues, liberalism represents "notions of equality, fairness, reward by merit, and freedom . . . in an *abstract decontextualized* manner" (Bonilla-Silva 2000, 189). In the European Enlightenment era, what emerged was the idea of continuous progress in the mastery of nature, in "material, moral, physical and political improvement," and in "the development of civilization, the general standards for which the West took to be its own values universalized" (Goldberg 1993, 4). These are critical features of the logic of development, embedded in a sense of the moral and cultural superiority of the West (Goldberg 1993, 166). The development framework simultaneously elevates white bodies while rendering non-white others as "uncivilized" or "undeveloped" and inherently inferior, or as "historically immature and so in principle capable of development" (Goldberg 2002, 236).[49] In the ideas and practices of development aid, we see the coming together of the broad set of ideas about whiteness arising from the European Enlightenment. The racial dimensions of development logic are not limited to the Canadian context.

---

[49] We see this for instance in Canadian foreign policy, in which even prior to the expansions of Canadian capital abroad we see discussions of the "inability of non-whites to govern themselves" (Macdonald cited in Smith 2015, 278).

This framework is a part of the making of a transnational white community in this period, which is evident in the practices and policies of the major ICFTU affiliates including the CCL and CLC.

Tutelage

> Some are groping their way towards [modernization]; still others have yet to begin in earnest the struggle to overcome their backwardness.
> –Kalmen Kaplansky on the "Problem of the Third World" (LAC Kaplansky Fond 3)

> The influence of economists, direct representatives of western capital, and of local technicians trained in the West furnished the skills necessary to rationalize control, in both senses of the term.
> –David Theo Goldberg (1993, 155)

One way we see the overarching logic of white supremacy in the core of this work is the emphasis on tutelage. Since the beginning of the CCL's labour development programme, projects were designed on the assumption that Southern unions needed to learn and replicate the model of union organization in the North. The majority of labour development projects involved forms of tutelage to potential union leaders and unions in the South (LAC CLC Fond 637-14/15). These tutelage projects aimed to sell capitalist development as a route to prosperity; in the case of the CCL and CLC and other social democratic union federations in the North, this was done through various courses on industrial relations, including management and collective bargaining. Jim Bury's presence in Kenya, for instance, was described as "giving the necessary advice on the proper running of unions" (LAC CLC Fond 502-7).

Mahmood Mamdami notes that "the rationale for colonialism was always the need for tutelage, given Africans were said to lack the capacity to build stable states and a durable law and order" (Mamdani 2001, 652). The development aid programme was often characterized as necessary to assist the primitive and undeveloped (LAC CLC Fond 502-6). This orientation to development work, emphasizing replication of methods in the North and Canadian expertise, are interspersed throughout the CLC documents on development aid projects all the way through and past the Cold

War era (LAC CLC Fond). The assumption of who has expertise is based on ideas of racial

supremacy that had underlain European colonialism.[50]

The Colombo Plan

> From the American south to Africa, from London to British Columbia, Britain's Colonial Office
> managed to globalize white supremacy on an unprecedented scale
> – John Price (2013, 632)

> [The Colombo Plan is] cheap insurance . . . to halt communism in Asia.
> –John Diefenbaker to the CBC just before the Canadian government pledged support for the plan
> (Carty and Smith 1981, 45)

While the CLC made an effort to engage in the Kenyan battle by sending Jim Bury there as

part of the broader ICFTU effort, this was a minor area of activity for the committee and

department compared to the two major development programmes of the 1950s. The major

development programmes that that CCL engaged in were the Colombo Plan and then the

Caribbean. These two areas of activity speak to a level of independence from the CIO and the way

they envisioned their international role as a white settler colony of British Empire.[51] The two main

areas aligned with those of the Canadian state, and reveal how they envisioned their strategic place

within the broader united front under the ICFTU. The CCL's sense of their strategic role is rooted

both in the social nature of Canadian class formation as a white-settler colony of the British empire,

---

[50] On ICFTU action in India and Pakistan 1954, an ICFTU executive board report stated: "My impression from India and Pakistan have convinced me that the ICFTU has a great chance to contribute to the cultural development of their members in Asia" (LAC CLC Fond 502-7).

[51] And while it is difficult to fully separate these activities from the CIO given the major affiliates were headquartered in the United States, the CCL did seek some independence. They sought to get money from the US-headquartered internationals for the CCL's contribution to the ICFTU (LAC CLC Fond 501-19). We also see the desire to create an independent programme in the efforts to build and expand the Canadian government's development aid programmes and to play a role in them.

the racial liberalism underlying labourism, and a broader sense of a transnational racial community of interests of the developed.[52]

Lester B. Pearson was the chief delegate at the Colombo Plan conference in 1950 (Carty and Smith 1981, 27). The Colombo Plan was an aid initiative set up by commonwealth countries aimed at pushing back or preventing the rise of communist movements in South and Southeast Asia (see Adeleke 1996, 2004). It was conceived as a six-year program to build capitalist economies in Asia and Canada's (Carty and Smith 1981, 28). The bulk of the over $100-million assistance from 1950–1955 was concentrated on India and Pakistan (Carty and Smith 1981, 29). The meeting which established the Colombo Plan that took place in Ceylon in 1950 did not include the United States, but was attended mostly by key commonwealth countries. By the next meeting in Sydney in the same year, the United states was invited to join the committee, and then some non-British colonies in the region began attending in 1951 (Price 2003, 11).[53] Canadian Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent saw the British Commonwealth as a bridge between East and West, and for Pearson it was a means to "relieve the United States of some of the burden of foreign aid" (Price 2003, 11). The CCL's participation in the Colombo Plan was to provide "technical and financial assistance to unions in East Asia" and, specifically, to send trade unionists to provide advice and to bring Asian trade unionists to Canada to study Canadian trade union methods (LAC CLC Fond 501-19). The explicit intention of this project, like many that would follow, was to curb the appeal of communism through aid money that supported the sale and development of a model of trade union action on the

---

[52] As Bannerji argues, Europeaness as whiteness provides Canada with its imagined community (Bannerji 2000, 64). And as Marilyn Lake argues a sense of connection across the US, Canadian, Australian and other white-settler colonies can be understood as "a global project forged in response to white colonial apprehension at the emergence of the post-colonial world" (Lake 2003, 352). Quoting Lothrop Stoddard's book *Rising Tide of Colour* (1935), "Nothing is more striking than the instinctive solidarity which binds together Australians and Afrikaners, Californians and Canadians into a 'sacred union'" (Stoddard quoted in Lake 2003, 352). Canada supported Britain and the United States in opposing the racial equality clause put forward by Japan at Versailles (Price 2013, 634). And while Stoddard argues that by the 1930s, white supremacy began to wane in Canada, the institutional infrastructure of white supremacy remained unchanged (Price 2013, 635).

[53] See Adeleke 2004 on the role of the United States that began shortly after the initial plan was established.

industrial model of Canada and the United states. And just as the Israeli and Scandinavian unions in Kenya would also do, this education sold the ideas of co-ops and other social enterprises as an alternative to revolution. They sought government funding to send CCL trade unionists to Asia to "aid in specific industries for a short-term duration" and with the ICFTU figure out a strategy to provide scholarships through the Colombo Plan for the ICFTU college in Asia (LAC CLC Fond 501-19). The meeting minutes of the IAC show a very strong commitment to the Colombo Plan. The CCL lobbied the Canadian government to provide financial and political support for the Colombo Plan and then once they did provide support they worked to get them to increase their support (LAC CLC Fond 502-1). They also expressed disappointment at the insufficiency of the Canadian government's annual contribution of $25 million in 1953 and 1954 (LAC CLC Fond 502-1).

At the 1951 CCL convention, President Aaron Mosher announced that they had undertaken to raise $50,000 to contribute to the ICFTU efforts for organization and leadership training in South East Asia and raised $40,000 by 1954 (Price 2003, 11). How much of this was coming directly from the Canadian state or the Americans through the major international affiliates is unclear. What is clear is that these amounts were far larger than anything they could solicit by appeals to unions in this period. The same year, CCL Secretary-treasurer Pat Conroy wrote to the undersecretary of the Canadian External Affairs Department arguing that labour could play a very important strategic role in the Colombo Plan: "it just does not make sense that in a battle to capture the vast masses of Asia, in particular, we have people from a comparatively high social and economic level sent to speak the language of people who may be making as low as $30.00 to $35.00 per year" (LAC CLC Fond quoted in Price 2003, 13). Ultimately, while the response from External Affairs was tentative, the CCL was identified as having an important role to play internationally (LAC CLC Fond in Price 2003, 14; Price 2003, 12). We see this in the recognition given to the CCL by Prime Minister St.

Laurent, who thanked the CCL for their participation in the Plan and for their general role in anti-communism through the ICFTU (LAC CLC Fond in Price 2003, 14; Price 2003, 12).

The CCL and Caribbean Operations

> If ORIT and ICFTU combine forces and if our affiliates, particularly in the United Kingdom, United States, Cuba and Canada, co-operated to take advantage of the groundwork laid at Port-of-Spain, I believe one can be reasonably optimistic about the future of the free labour movement in the Caribbean sector of ORIT.
> –Report by Charles Millard to the CCL International Affairs Committee April 1955[54]
> (LAC CLC Fond 502-8)

The Colombo Plan was the only bilateral assistance program the Canadian government engaged in until 1958 when they started a program with the Commonwealth Caribbean (Carty and Smith 1981, 28). The Canadian government began discussing a major aid programme for the Caribbean in 1956, when Pearson convened a conference of Caribbean leaders in Ottawa (Carty and Smith 1981, 51). The programme was then launched in 1958 and went from 10 million over five years to 10 million a year by the mid-1960s (Carty and Smith 1981, 51). Carty and Smith argue that Canada saw themselves as looking after the region and soon their aid outpaced the US and Britain in some of the Commonwealth Caribbean (Carty and Smith 1981, 52).[55]

In her study of the TUC and British Labour policy in this period, Mary Davis argues that while the greatest fears of rising communism were in South-East Asia, reflecting the urgency placed on developing the Colombo Plan, while the Caribbean was identified as a promising area for

---

[54] Millard was a member of the CCL International Affairs Committee, president of the USWA Canadian section, and became a regional director of the ICFTU.

[55] JMS Careless' conception of the "blood is thicker than water school" that dominated Canadian, Australian and New Zealand historians is useful for understanding some of the features of the transnational white identity that shaped this politics (Buckner and Bridge 2003, 78). This school "saw Canada as moving from a dominion to an independent partner alongside the British Empire, that the imperial connection was a defining feature of national" identity (Buckner and Bridge 2003, 78).

influence (Davis 2000, 388).[56] Charles Millard became a central actor in the early 1950s working to develop an ICFTU strategy for the Caribbean. As Millard's report reflects, the CCL was committed to a coordinated strategy in the Caribbean and saw the cooperation of the British and Americans as critical to this. And in the case of the Caribbean, there was some coordination between the British and the Americans, at least on the level of state intelligence gathering. This can be seen in the shared information on the labour scene gathered by both American state offices in the Caribbean, such as their office in Trinidad, their consulate in Barbados, and in the British Council in Barbados (LAC CLC Fond 502-6). The same month that Millard delivered his report on the Caribbean to the IAC, he sent a letter to Jacob Oldenbroek, then executive secretary of the ICFTU, critiquing the functioning of ORIT and arguing that there should be a Canadian posted to supervise the Caribbean work in part because he felt the AFL and CIO were doing very little to advance ICFTU interests in the region (LAC CLC Fond 502-8). Millard argued that "there are many good fellows in CADORIT [Caribbean Area Division ORIT] but I think that, for the present, someone from outside will be more effective and certainly a Canadian would have less handicaps as an outsider than someone from either the U.S. or the U.K." (LAC CLC Fond 502-8). And after the formation of the CLC in 1956, they sought to have a Canadian representative assigned to ORIT headquarters in Mexico City (LAC CLC Fond 502-2). Following from Millard's report, a proposal was raised to set up a subcommittee on the Caribbean within ORIT; Romualdi agreed but recommended that the USWA be included since they had "contributed to the activities in the region" (LAC CLC Fond 502-16).[57]

---

[56] She also argues that the TUC and the Labour party policy determined Africa as a whole to be "backward," "primitive" and unable to "stand by themselves" (Davis 2000, 388).

[57] Millard's union, the USWA, was very active on this front; it significant funds to ORIT in this period and specifically in Jamaica (LAC CLC Fond 45).

Canadian and American Capital in the Caribbean

The Caribbean to this day has a special status for the Canadian government. This relationship has included high levels of aid and significant private investment by capital.[58] By 1970, Canadian private direct investment in the Caribbean was estimated to be $435 million, more than in any other developing region (Litvak and Maule 1975, 44). The two major Canadian companies in the Caribbean discussed at these early CCL meetings were Alcan and Noranda, which would both become significant Canadian multinationals. In Guyana, Alcan accounted for more than 80% of total bauxite production (Litvak and Maule 1975, 44) – and aid played a critical role in developing the bauxite industry. B.S. Young argues that the capital needed to develop the Bauxite industry came from the Marshall Plan and was given directly to the American Reynolds company and to Jamaica Bauxites Limited, which was set up in 1943 and was owned by Canadian owned Alcan (Young 1965, 450-52). This money helped to begin the production and exportation of Bbuxite in Jamaica, which began to be shipped out in 1953 (Young 1965, 450).

Threats to the Interests of Canadian and American Capital in the Caribbean

Besides the role of aid in creating the conditions for extraction of resources in the Caribbean, the role of the Canadian state and the labour movement in the Caribbean and particularly in British Guiana was to protect these investments. In Millard's memorandum on the Caribbean, he argued that the development of a technical assistance programme was "in the interests of Canadian security. Recurrence of the events that took place in British Guiana may be more detrimental to Canadian interests than to British;" he added that Alcan Canada has "gained much from the mining of bauxite in British Guiana over the past thirty years" (LAC CLC Fond 45). Here Millard is referring to the election of Cheddi Jagan of the People's Progressive Party in 1953, later overthrown

---

[58] And the Caribbean was a major recipient of Canadian foreign aid, about $25 million in 1970, in recognition of the region's special status (Litvak and Maule 1975, 45).

by the British in a coup in 1954.[59] Jagan's party was an anti-colonial workers party that sought the nationalization of the bauxite industry. And in 1971 the fears of the Canadian state and labour were realized when a subsidiary of Alcan was nationalized in Guyana (Litvak and Maule 1975, 43).

CCL Activities

Given that one of the major areas of Canadian investment in the region was mining, it is fitting that the USWA decided to play such a significant role in the region.[60] The CCL and key affiliates actively forged projects aimed at strengthening anti-communist union forces, as in the case of the USWA, which worked in this period to strengthen the ICFTU affiliate in Jamaica (Knowles 1956, 1399). The IAC discussed the need to forge links with miners in Nicaragua who were employed by Canadian-owned Noranda and more generally in the region with aluminum workers (LAC CLC Fond 45). Unions in the Commonwealth Caribbean in this period included some industrial, some craft and some one big unions, called blanket unions (Knowles 1959, 1395; see also Joseph 1975); a popular workers' slogan at the time was "more trade unionists and fewer trade unions" (Knowles 1959, 1395). Like in many other contexts in the South in this period, workers were unconvinced of the virtues of collective bargaining as the main strategy and function of trade unionism and instead found direct political action more fruitful (Knowles 1959, 1398). William Knowles argues that the USWA hired Kenneth Sterling, who had been an organizer in Norman Manley's People's National Party, to organize Jamaica bauxite workers (Knowles 1959, 1399). He also acted as "Secretary of the National Workers Union, Secretary-Treasurer of the Caribbean Aluminum and Allied Workers, Secretary of CAD-ORIT and [was] a leader of the movement for the federation of Caribbean sugar unions, waterfront workers' unions, and the Caribbean Federation of

---

[59]For more, see Tomasek 1959; Waters and Daniels 2005; Palmer 2010; Associated Press 2011.

[60] For more on the role of Canadian mining companies, see Gordon 2010; Young 1965; Litvak and Maule 1975.

Labor" (Knowles 1959, 1399). Overall, the ICFTU and ORIT strategy in the region was successful in building up anti-communist unions.[61]

Strategic place of the CCL

The CCL's interest and role in the Caribbean began years before the Canadian government began their significant bilateral aid relationship in 1958. The members of the CCL and CLC IAC saw themselves as essential and strategic players in the Canadian Caribbean-based business interests in the region, and in their sense of their role in the ICFTU both as a bridge between the Americans and the British and as strategically situated vis-à-vis the Caribbean as part of the British commonwealth. In a memorandum written in 1954 by Millard to the department of external affairs, Millard argued that

> Canada is in a unique position: a shining example which the peoples of the British West Indies hope to follow. Despite their satisfactory record in certain territories, the British are still associated with the evils of colonialism . . . Moreover, because of our commonwealth relationships, common British traditions and similar political institutions, the Caribbean colonies are much closer to us than to the United States. Taken together, these factors give us the opportunity of playing an important role in the Caribbean area. (LAC CLC Fond 45)

For Millard, the CCL and the Canadian state could and should have a significant role in the struggle over the direction of the Caribbean colonies as a strategic player "disassociated" with colonialism. The CCL's interest and activity in the Caribbean predates that of the state. Seeing their role between that of the British and Americans, like the Colombo Plan, they understood their strategic place and basis for operations in the Caribbean in their political and cultural connection to the British Empire. Throughout the memorandum, Millard characterizes the strategic place of Canada as an enlightened member of the British Commonwealth that could serve the interests of anti-communism better than the British. He goes on to make the case that it is a Canadian duty to help "lighten the load which the British Government is now carrying" (LAC CLC Fond 45). The memorandum goes on to push

---

[61] For more, see Horne 2007; Waters and Daniels 2006.

for increased Canadian state involvement in the Caribbean and for further assistance to the labour strategy there. Millard specifically recommended the development of a technical assistance programme like the one operating as part of the Colombo Plan (LAC CLC Fond 45).

> In addition to the Canadian economic interest which are held in Latin America, there is another reason for a greater CCL participation in ORIT. Two of the main developed trade union movements in ORIT are found in the USA and in this country. ORIT must draw heavily on either of these experienced trade unionists. It is generally known that anti-American feelings in certain countries in Latin America, make it difficult for American trade unionists to operate in these areas. Whether it is justified or not, Canadians are probably more acceptable than Americans in particular countries, and could make a valuable contribution to the work of ORIT.
> –Report by Martin Levinson, Director of the CCL IAD delivered at IAC meeting 1954
> (LAC CLC Fond 502-1)

There is clearly a level of recognition that the CCL needed some level of distance from British colonialism and American imperialism to effectively build relationships and anti-communist trade unionism. Both Millard and Levinson expressed the strategic place of the CCL as capable of offsetting anti-British sentiment in the Caribbean and anti-American sentiment in Latin America. Of course, nowhere in these documents is there any critical account of why these sentiments exist, only how these sentiments factor into their strategy and how this context provides a unique role for the CCL. The perception that Canadian unionists would have greater chances for success in the Caribbean through dissociation from colonialism and imperialism has roots inside the thinking of the CCL committee, as exhibited by Millard's memorandum but also in the analyses of ICFTU and ORIT officials who pushed for greater CCL participation in ORIT.[62]

Later in 1954, Millard reported to the ICFTU executive board that the CCL could serve as a "goodwill ambassador" in the British West Indies, that it could make links between Canadian, US and Caribbean aluminum workers and could study the problem of ICFTU affiliates in Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana to strengthen their organizations. While this appears solidaristic, it

---

[62] Martin Levinson reported the suggestion that the CCL play a more significant role in ORIT to IAC members at an IAC meeting in 1954 (LAC CLC Fond 502-1).

should not be divorced from the broader war of position and the interest in promoting a certain kind of trade union model that operated in a conciliatory manner vis-à-vis capital. Millard's memorandum on the Caribbean to External Affairs helps to bring out the actual politics of the relationships being built with workers in the region. These were alliances with ICFTU affiliates or those organizations that had the potential to become ICFTU affiliates; in many contexts these unions were quite small and unrepresentative. The thin solidarity is also evident in the case of British Guiana, where the CCL was explicitly aligned with the interests of Canadian capital and did not support the interests of the majority of workers in their desire for liberation and nationalization of industries.

Common-sense Settler-Colonialism: Contradictions in Social Democratic Egalitarianism

The most substantial relationship the CCL and then the CLC has had with any other trade union federation besides the British TUC and the AFL-CIO is with the Israeli Histadrut (CLC Fond, LAC; Shurem/Histadrut Collection, CJCCC; CALI Collection, CJCCC; for more, see Nastovski 2014). The links between the Histadrut and Canadian unions and unionists that existed prior to the 1940s expanded significantly in that decade, with CCF and union activists became active in pushing for the recognition of the Israeli state (Engler 2010).[63] Through the 1940s and 1950s the relationship strengthened and began translating into projects and other activities by the early 1950s.[64] The significance of this relationship is evident in convention reports throughout the Cold War period and beyond as Histadrut representatives were invariably honoured international guests alongside those from the British TUC and the AFL-CIO, most often also addressing the convention floor.

---

[63] On November 25, 1948 the CCL issued a press release calling for full recognition of the state of Israel (LAC CLC Fond 173-46); Canada recognized Israel in December of 1948. See Hahn 2001 for more on the role of labour in shaping US policy on Israel in this same period.

[64] CLC Fond, LAC; Shurem/Histadrut Collection, CJCCC; CALI Collection, CJCCC; For more, see Nastovski 2014.

Further evidence of their close relationship can be gleaned from resolutions, the inclusion of

unconditional support for the Histadrut and Israeli state policies and practices in the international

department reports at conventions and in federation publications, in the extensive travel of

Canadian labour leaders to Israel generally on an annual basis, in donations to the Histadrut and

Histadrut projects, and in the active participation of Canadian union leaders in organizations outside

the federation aimed at supporting the Histadrut such as the Histadrut Trade Union Council.[65] While

this relationship began to decline in the 1990s, it is still visible today in the resistance against the

Palestine solidarity efforts of union activists.[66] And the Israeli flag still stands behind the officers

table at the front of the CLC convention hall.

> […]An international racial contract, which since 1948, has assigned a common interest
> between the state of Israel and powerful international political allies, while absenting the
> Palestinians as both "non-white" and stateless. The unique role of Zionism as an ideology
> that lays claim to anti-racist ideological space as a response to anti-Semitism in the history of
> Europe, the US and Canada, while at the same time advancing racialised interests of colonial
> expansion in the Middle East […](Abu-Laban and Bakan 2008, 32-33)

The relationship between the CCL/CLC and the Histadrut evolved out of the efforts of

Canadian trade unionists who worked to actively build support for Israel and through strong

institutional alliances and political ties between the CCL/CLC and the Histadrut. We need to first

situate the institutional and political ties that shaped this relationship within the international wars of

position over capitalism and racial justice, visible in the competing narratives around the

colonization of Palestine. The Histadrut and CCL/CLC were institutionally tied through the ICFTU,

and bound together by a commitment to social democracy. They came to share a similar approach

of selling social democracy as a means of combatting the pro-communist bent of many liberation

struggles and labour movements aligned with liberation struggles. The political connections between

the CCL/CLC and their similarity in approach is reflected in the membership of the CCF/NDP and

---

[65] LAC CLC Fond; Shurem/Histadrut Collection CJCCC; CALI Collection, CJCCC.

[66] See Nastovski 2014.

the Israeli Labour Party, to which each respective federation was politically aligned and through them also to the Socialist International. Like the CCL and CLC, the Histadrut was committed to coordinated effort within the ICFTU and organized projects throughout the Global South. The Histadrut also had their own international agenda regarding legitimizing their claim to Palestine (LAC CLC Fond 502-10).

The Histadrut was a valuable player in the work of the ICFTU. In 1960, the Histadrut set up an important school of anti-communism called the Afro-Asian Institute for Labor Studies and Co-operations.[67] Their strategic role, based on selling the Israeli economy as an alternative to revolution, is evident in their success in Kenya. Their prominence and level of activity can also be attributed to their close connection to the Israeli state, which like the British TUC and the AFL-CIO in this period, gave them substantial political power and resources. The connection between the Histadrut and the Israeli state goes deep. Established as a pre-state pseudo-corporatist institution for settlers in Palestine, the Histadrut has remained intertwined with the state and even more so specifically with the Labour party up until today, despite waning in the mid-1990s.[68] Though the USSR recognized Israel, the WFTU, to which Palestinian unions and most other unions in the region were affiliated to, condemned the formation of the Israeli state as form of colonization. This was an important point of difference between the two international labour federations and contributed to the strength of the WFTU in much of the Middle East.

The Histadrut's active support and involvement in the colonization of Palestine, in the context of an international war of position over anti-colonial workers' movements, created challenges for their effectiveness in the fight against communism. Countering the narrative of

---

[67] For more, see Greenstein 2009.

[68] For instance, the Histadrut–Israeli state connection remains strong in terms of individual political ties, with many important Israeli politicians and heads of state coming out of the Histadrut leadership. The Histadrut not only owned and ran companies and gave out social welfare provisions, they also had a military wing. While the military wing was eventually replaced by the Israeli Defense Forces, the other sections of the Histadrut remain, working in tandem, where one wing serves as management in some industries and another serves as the union of the workers there.

colonization coming out of the WFTU became a critical piece on its own for the Histadrut, the Israeli state and supporters. Throughout the Cold War period, the extensive institutional links between the CCL/CLC and the Histadrut were held together and built by numerous organizations. Most prominently, there was the Histadrut Trade Union Council (HTUC). The HTUC came together through the joint efforts of Canadian labour leaders, union staff and a representative from the Histadrut (CALI Collection, CJCCC). This organization sought to educate Canadian trade unionists about the state of Israel and the Histadrut and help fundraise to build schools and hospitals in Israel, which they did in part by hosting fundraising dinners honouring Canadian trade union leaders, many of whom also sat on the HTUC itself (CALI Collection, CJCCC). The HTUC also organized annual tours of Canadian trade union leaders to Israel (Histadrut/Shurem Collection, CJCCC). The extensive effort of these organizers and organizations, which in the case of HTUC had four offices across the country and several paid staff, shows the level of institutional support that grounded and maintained this relation for decades. The work of the HTUC and their allies were very effective in promoting a narrative of the Israeli state as founded on and building an egalitarian society within the Canadian labour movement.

Inside the structure of the CCL/CLC, this work was taken up most prominently by the Jewish Labour Committee (JLC), a Canadian incarnation of the American organization, which was formed by David Dubinsky as an anti-fascist organization to support trade unionists and Jews escaping from Nazi occupied territories during the war (Olmsted-Hughes 2011, 60).[69] In Canada, the JLC – and Kalmen Kaplansky in particular, who went on to become the second director of the CCL's IAD – became an important player in fighting for anti-discrimination laws in Canada (see Frager and Patrias 2013; Goutor 2011). In the work of the JLC, we see part of how support for Israel was reframed as an egalitarian project. In the context of the holocaust and the anti-Semitism

---

[69] Also see Collomp (2005) on the work of the American JLC, and Frager and Patrias (2013) for more on the Canadian JLC.

of governments like Canada, which refused entry to Jewish refugees, Israel became framed as a resolution to anti-Semitism.

> There is a great and living trade union movement in that country, just like yours. They are building trade unions like your own. And not only that, in a country which was waste, which was neglected for centuries, they also at the same time create jobs and industries and till the soil and do lots of other things which we don't have to do. They are real pioneers, fighting every day in the year, fighting the elements, fighting ignorance, fighting disease
> –Charles Millard, introducing Histadrut representative A. Miller to address the CCL Convention Floor, October 3-7, 1949
> (CCL Convention Proceedings October 3-7, 1949, 92)

The reframing of the establishment of Israel as an egalitarian project required making Palestinians absent. When we look at the relationship between the major ICFTU affiliates and the Histadrut, we see how the framing of a colonial project as an anti-racist struggle comes across as logical within societies that had been or continued to be colonizers themselves, or as in the Canadian case, were similarly built as settler colonies rooted in the displacement or genocide of the indigenous population. The CCL/CLC and Histadrut are not only connected by shared social democratic commitments, but also by a shared settler-colonial context. Similarly, they were interested in building social democratic states with redistributive measures and state ownership for the interests of the settler population. Their social democratic programmes were both premised on ideas of race and nation that functioned by omitting the indigenous population from their vision of equality and justice. Embedded in nations built through colonization, these federations accepted and reproduced the national narratives rooted in what Andrea Smith calls the logic of genocide, narratives in which colonization is reframed as pioneering and the indigenous population is erased. The nationalist framework and liberalism underlying the conceptions of racial justice that were operating in the programmes of these two federations is also visible in the way that racism, as in the case of the post-World War II reframing of US based Pan-African solidarity, was reduced to acts of discrimination in a national context. This means that racial oppression became divorced from the history of colonialism and untied from capitalist development. While not all forms of racial oppression are

rooted in these histories, to divorce these histories is to leave unproblematized the way these processes have shaped global divisions of labour and the racial dimensions of these divisions, as well as the way they have produced structures that continue to uphold them, like the nation-state form itself. As in the case of the Hyde Park rally in 1914, the solidaristic relationship between the CCL/CLC and the Histadrut was a form of accommodationist solidarity premised on white supremacist logics. This translated into the CCL/CLC's ongoing support for the colonization of Palestine.

The relationship of the CCL and then CLC with the Israeli Histadrut, unlike the relations to unions built in Kenya, Southeast Asia and the Commonwealth Caribbean, was an alliance and partnership. While the goals of the Histadrut as an organization were quite different from that of the CLC and its predecessor federations, common to both was their dominant vision of worker emancipation (Nastovski 2014). The CCL and CLC were not engaged in a war of position over the politics and direction of the Histadrut; instead, this relationship was actually a part of the CCL and CLC's local war of position for social democracy. The Histadrut and Histadrut allies did a very impressive job of framing the colonization of Palestine as not only an anti-racist project, but also as a picture of worker emancipation within the context of capitalism in the Canadian labour movement. The framing of the Israeli economy as an alternative to revolution and a model of an ideal social democratic state that could be emancipatory for workers was sold in the south and promoted inside Canadian unions. As in the broader global war of position, the relationship with the Histadrut operated as a part of the local war of position for social democracy inside Canadian unions. This was accomplished through publications, trips, projects and speeches. For instance, the *Labour in Israel* publication of the Canadian Association for Labour Israel (CALI), which was distributed to union members, extolled the virtues of the Israeli economy and the power of workers within it. The Israeli state was presented as examplary of the victories that could be borne of

alliances with the state and capital. The contribution of this work to creating social democratic common sense inside the Canadian labour movement is unclear; however, it was clearly effective in creating ongoing uncritical support for Israeli state policies for many decades.

Counter-Currents

While the actual extent of rank-and-file knowledge of support for the international programme in this period is something that is very difficult to assess. The organized opposition and alternative models of labour internationalism built in this period, in part due to the level of early Cold War repression, is scattered. It can be found in the efforts of community solidarity organizations, political parties, and within the unions expelled from the CCL. Besides these sites, there were no doubt also expressions of dissent within the affiliates of the CCL and CLC at least from members of revolutionary socialist parties. For many of these workers, the activities of the CCL IAC were in fact betrayals of their politics and sense of justice. As in the case of international solidarity in the United States in the 1940s that grew out of Pan-Africanism, these counter-tendencies included direct challenges to imperialism and labour imperialism. The extent and reach of these counter-currents requires further study. These are histories that would be very useful for thinking about the strategies of anti-imperialist international solidarity. Some studies have emerged in recent years, such as Tom Langford (2015) on the solidarity in Alberta's Crow's Nest Pass and Cynthia Wright's 2009 study of the solidarity organizing with the Cuban revolution in the early 1960s and centred on the work of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee (Wright 2009). These efforts constitute counter-currents to the dominant programme of the CCL and then CLC that developed in this period. And as I lay out in the next chapter, these counter-currents re-emerged with force in the 1970s to overtake labour imperialism and accommodationist solidarity, at least in terms of consent amongst the membership.

Conclusion

The CCL became seriously engaged in international politics in the early Cold War. They lobbied the state, sent leaders and staff abroad, and built a substantial infrastructure to maintain and expand their role in the international labour wars of position. The bulk of this work was undertaken through the mechanism of development aid and operated to support and protect the interests of Canadian and American capital. While functioning to undermine the efforts and struggles of workers in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and the Caribbean, the leaders and staff that built the CCL programme in this period saw themselves as working for and protecting the conditions of Canadian workers. This programme reflected the success of the philosophy of social partnership that came to dominate the Canadian labour movement in this period and the underlying national and racial dimensions that shaped a community of interests that would operate to support imperialism.

Chapter 6

Wars of Position Heat Up:
The Birth of CIDA, the New Left and the Worker-to-Worker Model, 1968–1989

By the late 1960s, the global political and economic landscape had shifted significantly. American imperialism (as well as resistance to it) had grown, most former colonies had won or were fighting to win liberation, and in some places anti-communist repression was beginning to soften. By the mid-1970s the fissures in the social compact of the Fordist era were becoming visible. The victories of the anti-communist battles of Western states in the 1950s and 1960s to dominate, manipulate, or crush anti-colonial movements that were aligned with the communist world meant that there were numerous newly independent states open or being opened for business. While this opening was explicitly what labour organizations like the CLC (and CCL) had fought for, it began to pose a problem for them in the 1970s as the operations of the Bretton Woods institutions to radically remake global production were starting to have more impact on the terrain of class struggle for workers in the North. The stagnation in the North following the crisis in 1973 and the birth of neoliberalism ushered in the era of accelerated "accumulation by dispossession" in both the global North and South.[1] The 1970s saw the expansion of the global reserve army of labour, and alongside this, an intensification of work and a driving down of wages and labour conditions in many locations.

Responses to the rise of neoliberalism and the remaking of conditions of work in Canada varied by union, region, and industry (Sefton MacDowell and Radforth 2006; Palmer 1992; Man 2004; Carroll and Shaw 2001; Gindin and Stanford 2003; Clark 2002; Stanford and Vosko 2004; Braedley and Luxton 2010; Fanelli and Thomas 2011). On the one hand, there were some

---

[1] As noted earlier in the dissertation, Harvey's idea of accumulation by dispossession draws from Marx's concept of primitive accumulation to theorize the accumulation resulting from the implementation of neoliberal policies (see Harvey 2003; Glassman 2006).

tremendous fight-backs in terms of strikes, political mobilizations, the development of new unions and strategies, reconstituted unions such as the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) and the CSN, and through the new militant left nationalist labour central rivalling the CLC, the Confederation of Canadian Unions (CCU), established in 1969. On the other hand, the CLC thought that they could hold onto the Fordist compact through a deepening of their social partnership with the state and capital. It is in this context that a new battle arose over the direction of labour internationalism in Canada, one characterized by the emergence of a model of international labour solidarity that sought to challenge the accommodationist politics of the CLC.

In this chapter, I explore how the institutional side of labour internationalism in Canada, represented by the work of the CLC international department, develops in this period. There were clear continuities from the previous period. For example, the CLC IAD continued to be very active in their support of Israel evident in the involvement of Canadian union leaders in local Zionist organizations like CALI and HTUC, inviting Histadrut leaders to speak at conventions,[2] and travelling to Israel on annual tours.[3] The CLC also maintained its development aid programme. In this chapter, my focus will be on the CLC's management of development aid projects which continued to be the CLC IAD's central activity and would expand tremendously in this period, ending only very recently in 2013.

The primary focus of the department on the management of development aid reflects a coalescing of the activities in the 1950s and 1960s, many of which, like the Colombo Plan, had been supported by the state on an ad hoc basis. Their orientation to the South, as a site of opportunity for what they saw as the maintenance and expansion of the material gains of workers through the social

---

[2] Histadrut leaders, staff, or representatives were invited to every convention during this period. And unlike many other international guests other than the British TUC and the AFL-CIO, they were always given time to address the convention floor (for more on this, see Nastovski 2014).

[3] See Nastovski 2014.

pact via the expansion of Canadian and American capital, continued to be a central impetus for aid. However, we also see the relation to Southern workers shift in this period from one in which they pose a threat through anti-capitalist leanings and anti-capitalist political trade unionism to a more serious concern with the threat they pose as a reserve army of labour. I situate the politics of this aid work within the shifting economic and political strategies of the CLC, one that meant a movement towards a more formal pact with capital within an explicitly nationalist framework. I then introduce the grassroots labour internationalism that develops in this period that challenges labour imperialism. I explore the roots of the "worker-to-worker" model and argue that it exemplifies transformative solidarity. My analysis draws out the strengths and limitations of this approach as a model for transformative grassroots labour internationalism.

Solidifying Alliances:
The CLC and the Birth of the Canadian International Development Agency

In 1972, CLC President Donald MacDonald was elected president of the ICFTU (LAC CLC 627-24). A loyal and active affiliate of the ICFTU for many years, the CLC had just established a more formal arrangement with the Canadian state to expand their support for ICFTU and ORIT programmes. This relationship with the newly established Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) developed in December 1969 when CIDA agreed to support the CLC's funding programme on a matching basis of 3:1 (LAC CLC Fond 392-2).[4] The CLC IAD went from a staff of one throughout the 1950s and 1960s to a large department with several staff and a very large budget made possible through funding from the Canadian aid agency. The expansion of their international programme meant that throughout the 1970s and 1980s the department was involved in a wide

---

[4] For more on the politics and development of CIDA, please see Carty and Smith 1981, Pratt 1984, 1996a, 1996b; Barry-Shaw and Oja-Jay 2012.

range of international labour development projects across every continent.[5] As the apparatus of the IAD expanded in the 1970s, this also meant that some of the CLC staff were stationed to directly manage projects abroad.

While the Canadian state had been providing funding for "technical assistance" programmes to the CCL since the Colombo Plan, this new government agency and the CLC's relationship to it afforded a more stable funding source and was the basis for substantial expansion. Over the course of the more than forty years that CIDA provided funds to the CLC IAD and later directly to some big affiliates (or the NGO's managing these projects for the affiliates), there have been hundreds of different labour development projects throughout the world. It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to specifically evaluate the diverse projects that have made up this history of development aid management.[6] To get a better sense of the general politics of these projects, one can look to the literature on the ICFTU and ORIT since this money was directed to supporting projects designed and often carried out by or with these organizations (LAC CLC Fond 600, 491- 9, 637-14).

Anti-Communism and the Globalizing of "Free Trade Unionism"

ORIT was founded in 1951 as a regional organization of the ICFTU for the Americas to strengthen free trade unionism, though as Rodriguez Garcia notes, what constitutes "free" was selectively limited, given the admission of some very conservative unions with close ties to their respective states and company unions (2004, 118).[7] ORIT had a semi-independent status from the

---

[5] Discussions of the need for expansion began in 1971, with CUPE arguing that the current director John Simonds should at least get an assistant (LAC CLC Fond 600).

[6] While my archival research did lead me to a good number of the financial records and reports on these projects, to actually evaluate and assess these projects requires a lot more research and resources.

[7] Rodriguez Garcia provides a detailed picture of the politics of ORIT. An example of their selective policy was their refusal to expel the Cuban affiliate who became loyal allies of the Batista regime that took power through a coup in 1952 (2004, 122).

ICFTU and spent much of its early years focused on wars of position against unions in Latin America that belonged to the Confederación de Trabajadores de América Latina (CTAL, Confederation of Workers in Latin America), which was set up in 1938 and included a broad spectrum of socialist- and communist party-linked as well as popular front trade unions (Rodriguez Garcia 2004, 114).[8] Though the AFL engaged in many of their labour imperialist projects through the AIFLD[9], they were also influential in the establishment and the political direction of ORIT (Rodriguez Garcia 2004).[10] Others like Anthony Carew argue that the AIFLD and ORIT became in fact so intertwined that "the two organisations became almost indistinguishable" (Carew 2002).[11]

It is important to note that despite changes in ORIT's political priorities and strategies over the years – from hard-core anti-communism of the 1960s and early 1970s to a more social democratic approach from the late 1970s on – a constant was the commitment to "'workers' education as the most important instrument to spread its ideology" (Rodriguez Garcia 2004, 126). The educational projects designed by ORIT were often created in coordination with the AIFLD, various universities, the ILO, and UNESCO, though Rodriguez Garcia argues that at times these projects were created in competition with the AIFLD. The model of trade unionism promoted was one that supported the development of collective bargaining but which saw strikes as extreme actions only to be used as a last resort (Rodriguez Garcia 2004, 127-28). However, when they were in contexts where there were strong leftist unions, they would often adopt a model that was more

---

[8] Rodriguez Garcia notes that the CTAL was already in decline in this period, and so the ORIT's fight against communism did not heat up until the Cuban revolution (Rodriguez Garcia 2004, 125-28).

[9] See Radosh 1969; Buhle 1999; Scott 1978a; Sims 1992; Scipes 2010a; Olmstead-Hughes 2011.

[10] It is important to note that in the 1960s the CIA was active in the work of ORIT (Rodriguez Garcia 2004, 127; see also Gumbrell-McCormick 2000; Scipes 2010a; Carew 1998; Olmstead-Hughes 2011).

[11] The extent to which these organizations were intertwined is important. If, as Carew notes, they were virtually indistinguishable, then the CLC's activities in this period can be said to be more directly supportive of the coups and other activities that the AIFLD were involved in throughout this period (see Radosh 1969; Hirsch 1974; Spalding 1976, 1984, 1992; Sims 1992; Buhle 1999; Scipes 2000, 2010a). An assessment of this is beyond the scope of the dissertation. For a complete picture of the politics of the CLC's ORIT projects, one would have to look at each of the projects directly and explore the minutes of ORIT in this period.

political (Rodriguez Garcia 2004, 127-28). Rodriguez Garcia argues that this strategy was very successful in spreading the model of free trade unionism and attributes this success partly to the financial support of American and Canadian unions (and some other ICFTU affiliates) (Rodriguez Garcia 2004, 127).

The CLC's decision to use CIDA funding to support projects directed through ORIT and ICFTU reflected their ongoing commitment to a united approach to the international labour wars of position. This contrasted with the tendencies toward wars of manoeuvre within the international labour movement often opted for at times by the AFL and then AFL-CIO, which by 1969 had disaffiliated from the ICFTU. The differences in the approach of the CLC and the AFL-CIO challenges the belief, held by some, that the CLC was basically an arm of the AFL-CIO in International affairs. There is no doubt they were allied in many cases, but they also differed on others. We see the tensions between the two federations in the CLC's rationale for focussing more explicitly on projects within the sphere of ORIT. In December 1969, CLC President Donald MacDonald argued that the new CIDA-matched projects should be focused within the sphere of ORIT to "offset the influence of the AIFLD in these areas" (LAC CLC Fond 491-12). This was also meant to fill the funding void that might have been created if the AFL-CIO left ORIT following their disaffiliation from the ICFTU (LAC CLC Fond 491-12). Of the five programmes the CLC committed to operate in 1971, they agreed one should be in the Caribbean and one in Mexico (to set up a school in Cuernavaca close to the ORIT headquarters in Mexico City)[12] as well as one in Anglophone Africa and two in Francophone Africa (LAC CLC Fond 600).[13]

---

[12] The Cuernavaca project entailing the establishment of an ORIT school for labour education in Cuernavaca Mexico was one of the first projects following the new arrangement with CIDA. Absent in an initial report (March 1972) on the training of 35 trade unionists is any discussion of strategies to confront employers.

[13] An example of one of these projects is the Caribbean project, which entailed bringing Caribbean students to the labour college (LAC CLC Fond 491-12).

As in the case of their projects through the Colombo Plan and within the Caribbean, the selection shows their sense of their specific place and role in the international sphere. The CLC saw themselves as having a special relationship with the English Caribbean and geographically and politically as having a special role to play as a model social democratic federation within ORIT. Explaining the principles of the CLC's international policies at a seminar in 1969, MacDonald argued that Canada wields a special influence owing to not having been

> tarred with the brush of imperialism or of exploitation of subject peoples in other lands. It is true that we are not without blemish in many respects, but the fact remains that we are acceptable where others are not, we are welcomed as advisers, as counsellors, as friends, where those of some other nations are not. (LAC CLC 491-14)[14]

As in the cases of the Colombo Plan and the Caribbean, the CLC saw and presented itself as a benign and progressive force in the global arena.

After the CIDA decision to extend funding to the CLC, the CLC sent off a letter to the ICFTU education department to notify them that they were now in a position to finance a number of workers' education projects (LAC CLC 600). We see the deep commitment to ICFTU oversight in the CLC's decision in 1970 to seek ICFTU approval for any project that had not been designed directly by the ICFTU or through ORIT (LAC CLC 600). As noted by Rodriguez Garcia, these projects generally promoted a form of economic trade unionism. The CLC supported educationals grounded in the philosophy of social partnership more akin to the approach of the major continental European affiliates, which were also closely aligned to their respective social democratic parties; the CLC can be seen as a part of the social democratic shift in ORIT in the late 1970s.[15] We

---

[14] Like the leadership in the CLC, NDP Leader David Lewis argued that Canada has "a special place of trust among the developing nations. We emerged as an independent nation almost a century before them, but we also emerged out of colonial status. We have never [had] an imperial goal or imperialistic intentions" (from Hansard quoted in Sharma 2001, 429).

[15] This philosophy of social partnership is also reflected the work of the CLC in the ILO in this period where they were pushing for the establishment of a Caribbean institute for labour studies in meetings with the department of labour and external affairs in 1969 (LAC CLC Fond 631-19). The purpose of this school was to support trade union education,

see the principles of social democracy in the types of courses that were offered in the CIDA-funded projects; for instance, courses were developed on setting up cooperatives and credit unions (LAC CLC Fond 491-12).[16] Their decision to support educationals designed within the ICFTU reflect their ongoing commitment to a united front for free trade unionism and their alignment with the social democratic federations of Europe that dominated the ICFTU after the AFL-CIO's departure (LAC CLC Fond 491-12). The CLC's political alignment with the social democratic federations in the leadership of the ICFTU in this period is also visible in the ascent of MacDonald to the presidency of the ICFTU.

The CLC's international projects were generally with unions or workers' organizations that were affiliated to the ICFTU or ones that were supported or courted by the latter or one of its regional organization like ORIT. Several projects reveal the CLC and ICFTU's continued interest in pursuing the development of rival unions in places where there were communist- or Marxist-oriented anti-colonial political trade unions and in strengthening existing anti-communist unions. This often involved promoting union practices developed by unions in the North. This is evident in projects such as those of the CLC that provided support for the CISL education institute (LAC CLC Fond 600). The approach of the CLC and other social democratic federations in this fight against communist parties or Marxist-leaning anti-colonial labour movements meant that their efforts were often channelled, as in the case of CISL, to build and support the development of economic trade unions. The CISL is a union federation that was established (with the support of ICFTU affiliates)

---

management education and government inspector training as well as "tripartite seminars on special topics" (LAC CLC Fond 631-19).

[16] The emphasis on cooperatives and credit unions in some of these early CIDA educationals also reflects the politics of Donald MacDonald who came out of the CCF and the cooperative movement in Atlantic Canada (see www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/donald-macdonald/). In discussing the relationship with CIDA, the CLC saw itself as needing to take a leadership role in setting up cooperatives and working with the churches and farmers' unions to develop a fund for worker and peasant education (LAC CLC Fond 627-24). That the IAC supported the production of bulletins and audio-visuals for use at local meetings and the giving of talks around the country to build the fund reveals their commitment to this programme (LAC CLC Fond 627-24). While not involving many members, the intention was to be transparent about what it was doing and to sell this vision of labour internationalism.

to rival the Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro (CGIL, General Italian Confederation of Labour), which is the largest trade union federation in Italy and was affiliated to the WFTU (LAC CLC Fond 600). CISL is the second largest federation in Italy today and, as with the work of ICFTU affiliates in France, was established to present a more conciliatory model of trade unionism (see Filipelli 1989; Olmsted-Hughes 2011).

The confluence of strong ideological commitments to anti-communism coupled with different philosophies of social partnership have shaped the designs of these projects has been explored in much son the ICFTU, the AFL-CIO, ORIT, AIFLD and the British TUC (Davis 2000; Van der Linden 1999; Radosh 1969; Romualdi 1967; Buhle 1999; Scipes 2010a; Rodriguez Garcia 2004). These projects need to be understood in the context of the Cold War wars of position inside certain labour movements, and within those between national union federations and within the international trade union movement.

On the whole, these projects can be understood within the politics of the ICFTU as an organization in this period. These projects represent a continuum from the CLC's involvement in the Colombo Plan in the early days of the IAD, their participation in wars of position for social democracy and their underlying belief in social partnership steeped in the white supremacist logic of development. While these projects remain rooted in the politics of anti-communism, they also arose out of a real belief by many of the members of the IAC that the expansion of the methods and strategies of Northern trade unions was an effective method and model for improving the lives of workers in the South and the North. These projects reflected a genuine belief in social partnership rather than class struggle as a philosophy and model of trade unionism that Southern workers could learn from and adopt to reach the prosperity of the North.

The belief in the need to globalize their model of trade unionism was evident in the CLC's involvement in the early labour development aid projects through the Colombo Plan and in the

Caribbean. The philosophy of social partnership shaped an approach that framed solidarity as support for the development of trade union expertise, experts and business agents that mirrored the white supremacist logics occluding the interests of capital that is evident in the rationales and rhetoric arising from the Northern states.

An ICFTU pamphlet on the international solidarity fund (that coordinated many of these projects in this period) claimed that the developing world needed "the capital and the technical know-how to climb out of the rut which they had been so long confined" (LAC CLC Fond 642). Echoing this sentiment, former CLC IAD director Kalmen Kaplansky, expressing disappointment with the poor results of the development model, argued that some Third World countries "are grouping their way towards [modernization]; still others have yet to begin in earnest the struggle to overcome their backwardness" (LAC Kaplansky Fond 3).

Underlying this analysis is a white supremacist and liberal logic that erases colonialism, as well as the historical development of capitalism and imperialism that produced and reproduces the current global divisions of labour. Central to the logic of development, as noted by Robert Carty and Virginia Smith, is that capitalism (and how capitalism has developed in the North) is the model for Southern development (Carty and Smith 1981, 33). Carty and Smith note that this approach to aid ignores "the historical facts of colonialism and neo-colonialism." The evolutionary premise behind the idea of development functions to mask the historical role of imperialism and colonialism and occlude the contradictions of capitalism while reinforcing entitlements rooted in the logic of white supremacy (Nastovski 2015).

The Threat of the Southern Worker

While there are many continuities from the early Cold War period, there are also changes in this period. For one, the emerging crisis of the social pact contributed to the increased prominence

263

of a set of underlying anxieties that also came to frame the labour development work, that of the

threat of Southern workers as a reserve army of labour. The way in which Southern workers were

framed as threats to conditions in the North was not new (and mirrors the views of Southern

workers as immigrants), but it becomes more prominent as the rationale for aid in this period. The

depiction of Southern workers as a threat to the conditions of workers in the North was present in

the discussions in the early days of the development of the IAD. Echoing its early depictions of

Southern workers as threats, the Brandt report (1980) on international development – which

involved the participation of Canadian trade unionists and which was produced by the Independent

Commission on International Development Issues (ICIDI)[17] – situated aid as a necessary means to

protect social democracy and the social welfare state (Saskatoon Solidarity Committee 1981; Murphy

1986). The Brandt report stated that "the state of poor countries 'pose a serious threat to the

international economic structures sheltering the north'" (Carty and Smith 1981, 2). Aid, therefore,

would serve as a means to ameliorate the direst of conditions to maintain the social pact and reduce

the potential threat Southern workers posed to the North. This approach included the worker

education programme coupled with a strategy to support the interests and expansion of American

and Canadian capital.

Exploring the Logic of Development:
The South as Opportunity for Strengthening the Social Pact

Romeo Maione, director of the CLC IAD from 1973 until 1975 when he was hired by

CIDA, argued in a pamphlet on internationalism to USWA District 6 members that "we are moving

into an era of 'hard core internationalism' in the sense that it's going to affect our future, our jobs,

our incomes, everything" (LAC CLC Fond 637-14; 491-10). To understand the politics of this

development work, we must situate it within the CLC's broader political and economic direction in

---

[17] It included former CLC President Joe Morris.

this period. Specifically, we need to explore how they saw themselves responding to the new realities

of the emerging practices made possible through the architecture of Bretton Woods which they had

supported. I argue that the CLC continued to see the South as an opportunity for maintaining and

securing the conditions won in the post-WWII compromise by supporting the expansion of

Canadian capital. In this period, they sought to deepen this social partnership modelled on the social

democratic union federations of Europe that had developed different versions of tripartism. This

also meant an active attempt by the CLC to deepen their relations with the state and shift more

explicitly towards an alignment with national capital.

From the early 1950s, the IAC's rationale for aid was based on the South as a market for

Canadian goods. For the IAC, this meant spreading their model of trade unionism and supporting

the expansion of American and Canadian capital. This approach parallels that of the AFL-CIO;

President George Meany argued that labour prosperity was tied not to a buy-American strategy, but

to a strategy to get the rest of the world to buy American (Frank 2000, 103).[18] Aid money was an

important mechanism for the expansion of Canadian capital. CIDA, like the aid programmes of the

Canadian state that preceded it, was primarily designed to support the interests of Canadian capital.

The new relationship with the CIDA is not surprising given the CLC's close relationship to

the state in aid projects, their correspondence with external affairs on foreign policy, and their close

relations through the ILO. The closeness is also reflected in the movement of CLC leaders and staff

into positions in the ILO and the state (Maione to CIDA; Morris to the Board of the Bank of

Canada; McDermott to Ambassador to Ireland).[19] Through the CIDA relationship, the relationship

---

[18] Dana Frank argues that this "trapped the AFL-CIO in an ideological and strategic mindset that would limit its response to those same crises" (Frank 2000, 104).

[19] What is also telling is that the CLC invited the Canadian ambassador to Mexico to the school to present certificates to the graduates (LAC CLC Fond 491-12; Hawkins 1973).

between the CLC and government grew closer as the CLC became increasingly dependent on CIDA funding to run its international programme.

In the planning of a national conference on international affairs in Niagara Falls in 1971, the IAC invited ILO and ICFTU representatives but also Mitchell Sharp who by this time had moved from minister of Trade and Commerce and minister of Finance to his post as minister of External Affairs (LAC CLC Fond 600).[20] This conference is very telling of the shifting analysis of the CLC in this period. For one, it indicates some movement away from AFL-CIO in that representatives or leaders of the international unions headquartered in the United States were not invited as guests to this conference as they once had been at a similar conference in Niagara Falls in the 1950s. Mitchell Sharp's presence reveals the CLC's interest in working alongside the state in foreign affairs. Also, Sharp's approach to Canada–US relations, which he published in 1972, is quite close to that of the CLC in this period, that is, of maintaining strong ties with the United States but also developing Canadian capital to reduce dependency on the United States.[21] Lastly, underlying this shifting policy vis-à-vis the Americans is the CLC's discussion of the rise of multinational corporations (MNC's) (LAC CLC Fond 600).

Until the 1970s, the CLC firmly supported the architecture for the new imperialism emerging in this period through the policies of the IMF, the World Bank and the GATT. This continued in activities like the CLC's membership and involvement in the Canadian Institute of International Affairs (CIIA). The CIIA, established in the 1930s, was restricted to British subjects, statesmen and business leaders, and was partly funded by the Massey Foundation and then the Rockefeller Foundation.[22] They organized meetings in Washington with Canadian and American business

---

[20] For more on Mitchell Sharp, see www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/mitchell-william-sharp/.

[21] For more, see www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/third-option/.

[22] For more, see http://cictoronto.ca/history/.

leaders, government officials and labour representatives. At the 1975 meeting in Washington,[23] intended to "promote frank and confidential exchange of info and ideas with members of governments and senior officials," focused on the views of the United States (LAC CLC Fond 627-24). Meeting participants included the presidents and CEOs of Molson, Ford Canada, Simpsons, Maclean Hunter, GM, Falconbridge, Int. Chamber of Commerce, Bell Canada, Canada Steamship Lines, Southam Press, Eldorado Nuclear, International Nickel Company of Canada, Alberta Gas Truck Line Company, Alcan, London Life Insurance, IBM, DuPont, Imperial Oil, Massey-Ferguson, and the Bank of Nova Scotia as well as the president and dean of arts of York University and the dean of social science of Laval University (LAC CLC Fond 627-24). Union participation included representatives from the CLC, the Canadian Paperworkers union, and Grace Hartman, president of CUPE (LAC CLC Fond 627-24).[24]

One notable consequence of the CLC's involvement in the CIIA was their support for Canadian participation in the Trilateral Commission (LAC CLC Fond 494-13). The trilateral commission is a right-wing corporate think tank established by David Rockefeller and some US state actors in 1973 and was made up of about 300 members, mostly international business and government figures but also including some media, academics and "conservative labor" people (Sklar 1980, 1-2; see also Gill 1991). Holly Sklar argues that the purpose of the commission was to "engineer an enduring partnership amongst the ruling classes of North America, Western Europe and Japan – hence the term "trilateral" – in order to safe-guard the interests of Western capitalism" (Sklar 1980, 2).

Despite the objectives of the Trilateral Commission, we also see a growing anxiety about the implications of these objectives for workers in the policies of the CLC. Though the expansion of

---

[23] A similar tour was organized in March 1973.

[24] In 1969, MacDonald noted that along with their projects through the ICFTU, ORIT, and the ILO, the IAC worked by giving presentations to the government, the UN and through the (LAC CLC 491-14).

Canadian and American capital had been their strategy for security since the time of the birth of the International Department, we see fissures in this approach in the 1970s. While CLC's shifts in this period remained firmly in the philosophy of social partnership, there is a move in this period towards support for protectionist policies (marking a divergence from the CLC's longstanding free trade policy).[25]

And while supporting the Canadian participation in the trilateral commission, they also sought to secure some input from trade unions in the process of the development of the argument of the MNCs. The CLC felt that their proximity to New York would allow them to participate in UN bodies to ensure trade union input in the formulation of MNC regulation, such as through the UN Commission on Transnational Corporations (UNCTC) (LAC CLC Fond 627-24). What the CLC sought was the establishment of "a MNC treaty policed by a special tripartite UN agency with a complaint structure similar to the ILO" (LAC CLC Fond 627-24).[26] The CLC thought that such policies could, for instance, get the IMF "to prepare guidelines to help governments in the task of adequately reporting financial transactions of MNC's" or to deal with tax evasion or to punish crimes of crushing unions (LAC CLC Fond 627-24).

The CLC's strategy remained firmly loyal to the architecture of Bretton Woods. It did not seek to challenge the mechanisms for the expansion of American and Canadian capital because this was still at root their principle strategy for maintaining the social pact. This is underscored by the fact that they did not, for instance, support initiatives coming from the South, such as the New

---

[25] We see this in their support in 1973 of the Burke-Hartke bill in the United States which it called "a practical way to deal with a serious economic and social problem" (LAC CLC Fond 491-12). Also, at the 1970 CLC convention, there were challenges from the floor over free trade policies and the threat of Third World competition (Smith 1992, 42). At this time the CLC secretary treasurer defended the position as best for the economy as a whole. This is important because we see that the idea of the Southern worker as threat was not something limited to the leadership and to the social democratic politicians involved in the Brandt report; but also thought and feared by members (we see this in the rise of economic nationalism in this period). His defense also shows the CLC's continued analysis in 1970 that the best interests of Canadian workers was served through the expansion of both Canadian and American capital.

[26] It is interesting to note that despite their framework of social partnership they thought that voluntary codes would be completely useless (LAC CLC Fond 627-24).

International Economic Order (NIEO). The NIEO proposal was brought forward by the non-aligned movement to challenge neo-colonialism through international financial institutions, including loans and aid that functioned to maintain global divisions of labour (Carty and Smith 1981, 33).[27]

Tripartist Dreams

The CLC was beginning to see the rise of MNCs as a potential threat unless it they could be brought into a tripartist framework and made to uphold some of the main material and social gains of the social pact. Besides their plans through the UNCTC, the CLC was also devising policy through the newly formed British-North American Committee (BNAC) set up in 1969. A document drafted by the BNAC that MacDonald signed off on in 1971 argued that the CLC must study the beneficial effects and potential dangers of the development of the multinational corporation (LAC CLC Fond 600). This document declared that "a strong and vital continuing tripartite relationship is essential to a viable world order – but such strength and vitality will only be maintained in a larger context involving many other nations than the three represented on this committee," those three being Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom (LAC CLC Fond 600).[28] In line with this, there was a meeting of Canadian ILO representatives set up for September 1975 that included several leaders and senior staff in the CLC to discuss recommendations on tripartite machinery for the upcoming ILO convention. As noted by Stephen McBride and Miriam Smith, by the mid-1970s the CLC was clearly shifting towards an explicit tripartism that had it move closer to the interests of Canadian capital from what had previously been a Keynesian framework (Smith 1992, 37). This was

---

[27] See Cox 1979.

[28] In line with the white supremacist logic that in part frames the globalizing of their model of trade unionism, this BNAC document argues for the study of the possibility of internationally linked trade unions, and that they "must involve our three countries and might develop conclusions that would be of general application throughout the world" (LAC CLC Fond 600).

a process, however, and it did not go uncontested. For instance, Smith notes that the CLC's director of research "initially felt that to break with the US would be 'committing economic suicide'" (Smith 1992, 43). Despite the resistance to change of their longstanding continental strategy, the CLC began participating in tripartite consultative exercises in a government task force (such as Blair-Carr) and sought a state-led industrial strategy that would benefit Canadian capital in alliance with labour (Smith 1992, 52). Smith notes that the aim was to help support the expansion Canadian manufacturing and increase Canadian ownership and the improvement of training and development of technology (Smith 1992, 52). And while the tripartite apparatus never developed in Canada as it did in some parts of Europe, it does reflect the CLC's changing strategy in this period and their interest in solidifying the social pact and support for the interests of Canadian capital abroad.[29]

While the CLC's shifts away from US imperialism in this period might be seen as progressive, it is important to underscore that the new orientation was no less imperialist. As noted in the work of Jerome Klassen (2007, 2009) and Todd Gordon (2010), this period saw the rise of Canadian imperialism. Gordon notes that though Canada is a sub-superpower nation this does not mean it is removed from the imperialist drive of capitalism for ever expanding markets etc…and that Canadian foreign policy is driven by the goal of creating the conditions for the successful international expansion of Canadian corporations (Gordon 2010, 10). Like US labour imperialism, the commitment of the CLC to the overall infrastructure of the IMF, the World Bank and the GATT supported forcible "liberalizing markets in the South and displacing indigenous communities . . . especially evident in the financial and mining sectors" (Gordon 2010, 10); this was a continuation of its alignment with Alcan in Guyana and Jamaica in the 1950s.[30] Aid has always been a mechanism

[29] For reasons why this did not pan out see Smith 1992 and McBride 1983. It is also important to note that corporatism was an idea promoted in the early part of the 20th century by Canadian capitalists (Heron and Siemiatycki 1998, 15).

[30] Scotia and Royal Bank each have long histories in the Caribbean. Canadian mining in Latin America, Asia pacific and Africa also has deep roots but has intensified over the last 20 to 30 years (Gordon 2010, 10).

of this expansion and a way to both subsidize this expansion through the state and to sanitize it as charitable. We need to situate aid in this overall framework of the strategy of the Canadian state in this period, a strategy which the CLC supported. As Sharma notes regarding the strategy of the Canadian state in 1969, the priority was export-led growth to make Canada more internationally competitive (Sharma 2001, 20). Unsurprisingly, CIDA fits within this overall strategy to increase international investment and Canadian exports through aid tied to the purchasing of Canadian goods. Sharma, quoting the parliamentary debates of 1969, points out that the rationale was that "such investment can make a meaningful contribution to our international development efforts and at the same time improve the competitive position of Canadian firms in world markets" (2001, 20).

It is therefore important to situate the CLC's new strategy within the philosophy of social partnership. These practices reflect a shift in terms of the sections of capital the CLC aligned with, specifically from regional to national, rather than a challenge to American imperialism as such. The CLC still sought, though somewhat more cautiously, the architecture for the new imperialism, but with a clearer focus on how Canadian capital could grow their interests within it. The CLC remained critical of the economic nationalism of the day represented by the Waffle and the emergence of the rival labour federation the CCU (LAC CLC Fond 627-24). And the CLC's strategy was one that stressed "business labour cooperation rather than a nationalism of pushing for public ownership" (Smith 1992, 55). As I discuss in the analysis of the counter-current to the CLC's internationalism in this period, the economic nationalism of parts of the left in this period were less conciliatory with capital and supported nationalization rather than tripartist management.

Aid Management

Beyond all of this, there are some serious problems with development aid as a mechanism of

solidarity.[31] I argue that there are three characteristics typical of the process of aid management that prevent it from being a transformative form of international labour solidarity: the role of the state in the design and management of aid projects; the paternalism embedded in such projects; and its limitations in building solidarity amongst workers across borders (Nastovski 2015).

One issue is that the funding relationship led to a dependency on state funding which contributed to the effectiveness of CIDA guidelines operating to restrict the nature of projects. At the level of the CLC, CIDA funding for many years made up the vast majority of the operating funds of the IAD, including for staff salaries. This meant that the wages of the staff of the international department depended on CIDA.[32] By the early 1990s, CIDA funding accounted for approximately two-thirds of all staff salaries and all other costs associated with project management, including travel, housing and living expenses (CLC Historic Materials Box 1of 2 011/C6).

The orientation and guidelines of CIDA limited the extent to which this funding could be used to challenge the activities of capital and the processes of neo-colonialism. If we understand the intention behind international labour solidarity as mutual aid in confronting exploitation, then an international programme made up primarily of the negotiation and management of state aid falls short. A CIDA-commissioned evaluation of the CLC's International Affairs Department in 1988 is revealing of the impact of the funding relationship. The report notes that "the current core program is as much a response to the availability of CIDA funding and to CIDA funding categories as it is to the CLC's perception of the needs of trade unions in developing countries" (CLC Historic Materials Box 1of 2 011/C6). Key is to note that in the early days the CLC had anticipated the problem of CIDA control over the direction of their work. At the 1971 conference on international affairs, they had proposed to CIDA that none of the monies would be used for administration, salaries or

---

[31] For more, see Baaz 2005, 2007.

[32] For more on the effects on this dependency, see Barry-Shaw and Oja-Jay 2012.

expenses of congress personnel (LAC CLC Fond 600). The influence of the state in shaping what

projects were designed and adopted was further deepened when the CLC and several its affiliates

obtained charity status for their development funds. The parameters accompanying the adoption of

charitable status meant that project design was not only shaped by CIDA's priorities of the day but

by those governing the maintenance of one's charitable designation.[33]

Besides specific aspects of the design and operation of development aid projects is the

deeper problem of how this mechanism mediates relations between workers. On a basic level, the

development framework that underlies aid projects creates neo-colonial relations of managers and

managed rather than relations forged through a confrontation of capitalism, imperialism, and

unequal social relations borne capitalist development. This mechanism has been ineffective as a

means of making international connections between workers. The relationships built between

unions via aid negotiation and management were (and remain) generally restricted to staff and/or

leaders of different unions who carry out projects and correspond with CIDA and partner unions in

the South. In the CIDA evaluation of the work of the International Affairs Department in 1988, one

of the criticisms of the department was that they did not actively involve affiliates or do internal

education (CLC Historic Materials Box 1of 2 011/C6). The aid mechanism has limited potential

because it does not draw on the power of workers to resist or to form solidaristic relationships that

can become a means of new forms of resistance. The development aid model does not organize

relationships between workers themselves in a manner to build capacity to confront capitalism and

---

[33] By the late 1980s, decisions were shaped not only by CIDA priorities but by the state's definitions of charity, i.e., what they determine to be non-political work. This translated into a practice whereby a significant portion of what was considered international solidarity work was in actuality precisely charity work or humanitarian aid and could not be channelled towards building workers' organizations and struggles internationally or anything that would be precisely aimed at class struggle, challenging imperialism and the institutions of neo-colonialism. The effectiveness of state oversight of the design and management of labour development projects is evident in the CLC's international affairs department management action plan in 1991. In this plan, they discussed the move to the adoption of charity status and argued that much of the international work was in fact of a "humanitarian nature" and so should be eligible for charity status (CLC Historic Materials Box 1 of 2 011/C6).

imperialism and so challenge nationalism and the role of the border in maintaining global divisions of labour. As such, the development aid model does not pose a real threat to the processes that sustain the power of capital to reproduce uneven landscapes.

It is in this context that the Worker-to-Worker model emerged in several unions and councils, a practice largely organized by rank and file activists. While we see the antecedents of this model in the mid-1960s on Cuba, this model develops as a strong counter-force to the CLC IAD in the 1970s.

Worker-to-Worker: A Transformative Model of Solidarity

In the 1960s, solidarity movements re-emerged inside the Canadian labour movement and became a significant force through the 1970s and 1980s. The model of grassroots international labour solidarity that union activists developed in this period is significant because it served as a transformative force. In Canada, the re-emergence of grassroots international labour solidarity and solidarity movements in the late 1960s as part of the "New Left;"[34] many of the activists at the forefront of the building of a grassroots labour internationalism in Canada came from the New Left. They became politicized and active as students or as young workers against the US invasion of Vietnam, the coup in Chile, feminist and LGBT organizations or as part of Canadian left nationalist

---

[34] While Old Left activists were always involved in doing international solidarity, for the New Left this became a very central piece of many their organizations, whether they were involved in work against US imperialism in Vietnam or supporting fledgling socialist governments and liberation struggles. In Canada, a considerable number of activists decided to enter the labour movement to develop this work. These New Left activists helped to bolster the diminished presence of old leftists whose presence in the union became marginal or entirely stamped in various locals and regions since the mid-1940s. In Canada, Roussopoulos notes that the New Left emerged with the nuclear disarmament movement in the late 1950s and was associated with the rise of student and youth activism, which focused on doing grassroots organizing (Roussopoulos 2006, 39-45). There were also strong currents in the New Left that tied the struggle against capitalism to the necessity for the liberation of women, black, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transsexual (LGBT) communities. The rise of the New Left was important in challenging the climate of repression inside and outside the labour movement and created new openings to battle the Cold War victors inside the labour movement over the direction and nature of labour internationalism.

groups like the Waffle.[35] Many of these activists became trade unionists who engaged in solidarity

work in their unions or were members or staff of solidarity organizations or NGOs that worked

with and supported solidarity efforts within the labour movement. The US invasion of Vietnam and

then the coup in Chile sparked the growth of numerous solidarity organizations across Canada. The

desire of many of these activists to make solidarity efforts an integral aspect of union work led to the

rise of international solidarity work inside the labour movement. As noted by one interviewee, some

of the central activists became union activists through international solidarity work which for was

initially "the most attractive part of trade unionism."[36]

By the 1980s, international solidarity work became particularly visible inside the labour

movement, garnering attention and support and leading to various forms of workplace and

community solidarity actions. The campaigns of the 1970s and 1980s included work for

disarmament, solidarity with Cesar Chavez's movement of migrant agricultural workers, and most

significantly solidarity work in Latin America, including Cuba (see Wright 2009), against the coup in

Chile and then the struggles in Central America, including El Salvador, Nicaragua and Guatemala,

and the struggle against South African Apartheid.

A broad number of organizations engaged in solidarity work. Central American solidarity

organizing consisted of a network of groups such as the Latin American Working Group (LAWG)

in Toronto and the British Columbia Trade Union Group (BCTUG) in Vancouver.[37] The Chilean

solidarity movement was composed of a whole array of small organizations that sprouted up across

the country, ones set up by activists from a range of political backgrounds, from faith groups to

---

[35] The Waffle was Canadian left nationalist socialist organization that worked within the NDP. They sought the nationalization of industry, were critical of American imperialism and called for limits on foreign investment in Canada (for more, see Bullen 1983; Waffle Party 1969).

[36] Union activist #2 [interviews] 2011.

[37] The numbering of these interviews do not correspond to those in my previous work (Nastovski 2014), as a result of re-organizing efforts for my dissertation. Union activist #1, #3, #4, #6 [interviews] 2011; union activist #13, #26, #27, #39, #40, #47, #49, #50 [interviews] 2012.

Chilean refugees who arrived in Canada post-coup (CLC Fond, LAC). In the case of South African apartheid, the South African Congress of Trade Unions Solidarity Committee (SACTU-SC) did the most significant work inside the labour movement.[38]

There were also organizations that did work in building solidarity inside the labour movement that worked on a number of solidarity efforts simultaneously, such as the Saskatoon Solidarity Committee, Labour World and the Saskatchewan International Labour Development Project (SILP). Augmenting this work were efforts outside the labour movement, sometimes by the same organizations as was the case for LAWG and the Saskatoon Solidarity Committee, whose work did not exclusively focus on mobilizing within the labour movement. In addition to this was the broader work happening within migrant and refugee organizations, on campuses, in religious organizations, and within broader New Left groups and left political parties.

Examining how activists in the 1970s and 1980s worked to transform labour internationalism in Canada helps to think through prospects and challenges to doing this work today. I argue that the model these activists developed, which is an example of a transformative model of solidarity, is something important to learn from. The strengths of the model lie in the way it draws from models of class struggle unionism, including its emphasis on building worker capacity and working-class power through the adoption of practices that enabled some workers to re-think their political practice. Based on interviews with union activists who organized international labour solidarity in the context of the Canadian labour movement in the 1970s and 1980s, I consider some of the specific lessons we can draw from their organizing. I begin with a discussion of the model they developed, of why and how it was transformative, and then move onto an analysis of the strengths and successes of this model followed by a few of the significant challenges and limitations.

---

[38] See Luckhardt 2006; Freeman 1997; Southall 1994; Saul 2010; Nastovski 2014. For more about the South African Congress of Trade Unions, see Luckhardt and Wall 1980.

Grassroots International Solidarity

In the late 1970s, activists based in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, engaged in building grassroots

international solidarity and sought to reflect on the problems of doing international labour solidarity

work (Saskatoon Solidarity Committee 1981). These efforts translated into the publication of *Partners*

in Imperialism: The Canadian Labour Congress and Social Democracy in the Third World in 1981, which was

available at many union conventions throughout the early 1980s. This booklet reflects the

movement that was afoot inside the Canadian labour movement in the 1970s and 1980s to develop a

different model of labour internationalism.[39]

The booklet, and the SSC which authored it, reflect this movement in several ways. One, the

booklet focused on exposing and discrediting the anti-communist politics of the CLC, the main

Canadian labour federation since 1956, and of the ICFTU, and on how their activities ran counter to

the work of numerous liberation struggles and militant worker movements internationally. Two, the

committee was active around two key areas, anti-apartheid work (including support for movements

in the frontline states of Southern Africa such as Mozambique, Tanzania and Angola[40] and struggles

in Central America, including Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala. Three, the committee

consisted of activists from a variety of political stripes on the broad left, including those coming

from the New Left, both party and non-party affiliated Marxists and Socialists, social democrats, left

nationalists, those coming out of development organizations, faith groups and emerging NGOs, and

sometimes a combination of several of these backgrounds.

---

[39] While I do discuss the Québec labour movement to give some of the broader context, I do not get into an analysis of Québec labour internationalism in this period. This is because of the substantively different climate within the Québec labour movement in this period tied to the rise of Québec left nationalism. There were also significant moves to reinvent labour internationalism in Quebec in this period. For instance, the Confédération des syndicats nationaux (CSN), a conservative Catholic union set up in 1921, made serious strides to build international solidarity as part of their reinvention as a secular and radical union in the 1960s (see Mills 2010; Guntzel 1993).

[40] The Southern African frontline states were Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe after 1980 (see www.sahistory.org.za/organisations/frontline-states).

The SSC was a microcosm of what was developing amongst groups of activists inside the labour movement across Canada in this period. Groups of workers, whether establishing formal organizations or informal networks, had been sprouting up since the late 1960s and early 1970s to create a different model of labour internationalism. Activists interested in building genuine international trade union solidarity set up organizations and adopted a variety of strategies to develop what many activists termed worker-to-worker solidarity inside their unions.[41] While these groups did not all exclusively focus on changing the nature of internationalism inside trade unions, their efforts within trade unions had the effect of becoming a significant counter-current vis-à-vis the dominant practices of labour internationalism since World War II. This was an era of hot contestation over the definition and practice of solidarity.

The work of these activists posed a challenge to the existing international practice within the labour movement, engaging in efforts aimed at member education, mobilization and action inside and outside the workplace. This included solidarity efforts aimed at combating imperialism (e.g., Vietnam), to support revolutionary movements, liberation struggles and fledgling socialist governments (e.g., Nicaragua), as well as struggles combating internal repression and fascism (e.g., Chile and Guatemala). Other struggles were a combination of these goals such as the work in support of Chile, Cuba, and Nicaragua. These solidarity efforts varied in their specific demands and in their strategies.

The Worker-to Worker Model

Key to the connection between these various actors engaging in diverse solidarity efforts was the basic model they adopted and which defined their practice: worker-to-worker solidarity. In very

---

[41] Union activist # 1, #2 and #4 2011 [interviews] 2011; union activist #21, #24, #26, #37, #39, #40, #42 and #44 [interviews] 2012.

basic terms, the worker-to-worker model focuses on building relationships across borders between workers themselves. Activists involved in this work emphasized their commitment to mobilizing solidarity amongst and between rank-and-file workers and community allies, facilitating links with trade unionists internationally, and supporting worker self-activity.[42]

Understanding the worker-to-worker model entails considering what it is not, namely, trade union diplomacy, aid, charity or anti-communist practices and policies aimed at undermining, controlling or attempting to co-opt international labour movements, parties or liberation movements and struggles. Underlying this model is a different vision of union operation that values mobilizing at the base, that asks members to take action rather than give a donation or listen to a speech of a head of another union congress.

Grassroots Labour Internationalism as Class Struggle Unionism

The dominant current shaping the "worker-to-worker" model drew from militant models of labour organizing often associated with the radical left.[43] Most of the strengths and successes of this the worker-to-worker model arose from the way it emerged from practices and ideas associated with class struggle unionism emphasizing union democracy, mobilization and politicization of the rank and file and building on a broader class basis for challenge capitalism.

Several activists I interviewed explicitly discussed the work they were doing as class struggle unionism or connected it to a wider effort to build and support more militant unions or worker

---

[42] An important document framed by this approach is the booklet produced by the newly established CUPE National International Solidarity Committee in the late 1980s. This booklet was a guide for locals and councils for setting up relationships with other unions and workers organizations at the international level.

[43] This did not mean that all those involved in building this movement identified with the radical left or with class struggle unionism. Some activists adopted this approach based on the democratic ethos of the New Left that was an important current in this era but were committed social democrats.

actions.[44] The strategies and goals following from class-struggle oriented unionism are visible in many aspects of the worker-to-worker model of internationalism. For instance, this is evident in their emphasis on rank-and-file self-activity and direct action in the practice of labour internationalism. This was part of a larger goal of building rank-and-file capacity through facilitating experiences of resistance and building relationships between workers internationally as part of a widening the horizons of possibilities of resistance.

I argue that these activities are what Gramsci would call counter-hegemonic practices. Counter-hegemonic practices are those that challenge the hegemony, or dominance and power, of the ruling class, both in terms of control over the material and political mechanisms of the society, but also the ideas that accompany and legitimize their control and justify capitalist social relations. This relates to Gramsci's wider view of revolutionary strategy represented in the ideas of war of position and war of manoeuvre. Counter-hegemony is a part of the war of position. These counter-hegemonic practices of the worker-to-worker model, which derive from class-struggle models of union action, are what make this model transformative both in the sense put forward by Featherstone (2012) and Johns (1998).[45] This orientation shaped the movements and types of struggles organizers chose to build solidarity with and the transformative impact this model of solidarity had locally via the strategies they employed. Critical to the transformative potential of this model of solidarity is the way it operated to support the goals and strategies of different international struggles that challenged the status quo of the global division of labour (and the global socio-economic status quo based on the legacies of colonialism and both past and existing imperialism.) To assess the possible transformative impact of this work on the diverse movements organizers

---

[44] Union activist #3 and #4 [interviews] 2011; union activist #14, #21, #22, #25, #40, #47 and #49 [interviews] 2012.

[45] This includes its potential to transform political landscapes, social and economic relations, the practice of certain actors themselves and the way they think through their own location, relation to others, sense of agency, and understanding of social change inclusive of what constitutes effective union strategies and tactics.

were working in solidarity with would require a much larger study. Here, I take up Featherstone's (2012) contention that solidarity efforts have the potential to be transformative of the local social and political terrain, focusing on the transformative impact of this model for Canadian workers. Specifically, what was important about this was the way this organizing was counter-hegemonic through the experiences they facilitated and the goals of their work. While classic educationals were at the core of the work, this work was also a site of counter-hegemony through an emphasis on worker-led solidarity actions and control, building relationships between workers internationally, and challenging imperialism and labour imperialism.

In the next section, I consider some of these transformative elements of the worker-to-worker model in practice. I begin with two aspects of the rank-and-file focus of the worker-to-worker model and how the experiences they facilitated were counter-hegemonic practices. The first is the emphasis on worker power and direct action; the second is the building of relationships between workers. Next I consider the anti-imperialist analysis and opposition to the labour imperialism and accommodationist solidarity of the CLC. Then I look at how the demands for worker power and control translated into the development of worker-led spaces for international solidarity within different locals and councils and provincial and national unions. Finally, I move on to an analysis of the limitations of this work.

Counter-Hegemonic Practices

The focus on building solidarity between workers – for instance, organizing solidarity amongst students or women or within the LGBT community – distinguishes this model of solidarity from others dominant at the time. Nelson Lichtenstein notes in his book *State of the Union* that the New Left in the United States turned their sights towards the working class with a focus on rank-and-file issues and organizing (Lichtenstein 2002, 170). The rank and file focus was also a feature of

currents of the Canadian New Left and became a strategy of many new organizations and parties,

ranging from Marxist autonomists to left nationalist groups like the Waffle party (Bullen 1983; High

2001, 202-3; Sangster 2006, 47).[46]

This meant that organizers specifically framed solidarity as a component of class struggle

more generally. This is visible in the analyses developed and articulated through educationals, the

emphasis of organizers on worker power and self-activity,[47] as well as the strategic place of workers

to act in solidarity within their workplaces. For example, the work of the SACTU-SC targeted the

Canadian capital and the state, and it focused on how international capital operated in South Africa

to support the apartheid system and profit from it through the racist division of labour it upheld.

Worker Power and Direct Action

The emphasis on worker self-activity highlights the way solidarity efforts can also be

practices that strengthen the local by building capacities for resistance. Part of this was the way

organizers mobilized workers to use their own strategic place and power as rank-and-file workers to

engage in solidarity efforts within the workplace. In the case of the work against South African

apartheid, the experiences of self-activity facilitated by organizers emphasized the power of workers

to engage in solidarity through direct action; this included various forms of direct action taken by

workers in grocery stores across the country as well as workplace disruptions.[48] Emphasizing self-

activity also translated into a number of workplace actions that took place between March 8 and

---

[46] Union activist #4 and #6 2011 [interviews]; union activist #7, #25 and #40 [interviews] 2012. There are numerous differences between the New Left in Canada and that in the US. One difference is the prominence of nationalism amongst the Canadian New Left. Also, the turn to the working class in the US did not translate into significant efforts at building international labour solidarity inside unions until a bit later. Johns dates the rise of significant international labour solidarity in the US as beginning in the late 1970s (Johns 1998).

[47] This approach, emanating from revolutionary left politics, posits the source of worker emancipation as laying with workers themselves and their ability to act.

[48] Union activist #1 [interview] 2011; union activist #21, #40, #42, #47, #57 and #59 [interviews] 2012.

March 15, 1986 involving postal, longshore and telecommunication workers.[49] The week of action involved workers risking their own livelihoods and subjecting themselves to possible disciplinary action for their stand in solidarity against apartheid. This is an example of a coordinated direct action that mobilized the power of workers place in the workplace, one that emphasized their collective power to engage in economic and political disruptions through their strategic location in the labour process.

The week of action is an example of solidarity mobilized at the grassroots, of winning institutional support and becoming a site for strengthening both the struggle against apartheid and the capacity to resist locally. In this way, solidarity as self-activity is itself a school of war. As Engels argued in *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (1845), the process of participating in acts of resistance are transformative because they serve as sites of learning. Featherstone, following from this idea, contends that this practice of resistance can be part of a process of politicization (Featherstone 2012, 7) by emphasizing practice about worker self-activity. In working to do this, activists challenged hegemonic ideas about union practice and the potential for resistance and change.

Another example of the way this work promoted the self-activity of workers is the way delegations to Nicaragua were organized in the Prairies and Western Canada. Members who went on delegations took on organizing the next delegation. This was a model to share the work, adding a level of sustainability. Underlining this practice was also an assumption that members would learn through these experiences and develop the confidence and skills to become organizers themselves. Solidarity as action here was a transformative process because it reframed solidarity in a way that drew links between struggles by calling on workers to rethink the nature of their own struggles and to think about their power to act in new ways.

---

[49] *Pacific Tribune*, March 5, 1986; South African Congress of Trade Unions Solidarity Newsletter 86 #2 [April] 1986; Nastovski 2014.

Building Relationships

Organizers facilitated experiences that were transformative and counter-hegemonic through efforts to the build relationships between rank-and-file workers. The Central American work emphasized solidarity through direct worker-to-worker relationships and conversations. This happened through the series of delegations to Nicaragua throughout the 1980s and through the various shop-floor meetings in Nicaragua with rank-and-file workers and leaders of the new Sandinista unions to talk about strategies and challenges of building unions within a revolutionary context.[50] These experiences operated as sites of questioning and rethinking of the common sense of business union practices.[51] Activists did this by organizing delegations, conferences and hosting and touring trade unionists across the country with the explicit intention of widening the view of members about the possibilities of worker power, about the possible tactics and strategies and goals beyond the collective agreement.[52] Committees and organizations that were doing solidarity work in the labour movement were also involved, bringing a tremendous number of international trade unionists not just to councils and locals, but even, in the case of the organizing in Prairie provinces, to workplaces themselves to facilitate conversations and relations that reached beyond even the layer of rank-and-file workers involved in the union.

An example of how this was done as a part of conscious political education is seen in the efforts of Dave Werlin, who served as president of the Alberta Federation of Labour (AFL) and who did much to support worker-to-worker solidarity. As noted by a couple of interviewees, Werlin set up an international committee in the federation and worked to bring South African and Central

---

[50] This was also true of the South African work. The SACTU-SC organized and facilitated meetings and educationals with thousands of workers across the country throughout the 1980s (Freeman 1997, 140–1, 354; Luckhardt 2006, 14; Southall 1994, 177; Saul 2010).

[51] Union activist #2, #4 [interviews] 2011; union activist #22, #40 and #59 [interviews] 2012.

[52] Features of international events themselves deepened and strengthened this organizing. For instance, the huge migration of Chilean refugees after the coup in 1973 had a major impact in many cities and towns (union activist #1 and #3 [interviews] 2011).

American activists to speak about their struggles as a means of building solidarity – but also as an opportunity to "broaden the perspective" of the membership.[53] An example of how this had impact can be seen in other interviews in which activists spoke about the impact of what they had learned through these relationships and the sharing of stories of struggle. One interviewee noted that her union adopted a host of new strategies through the relationships developed in the process of building international solidarity:

> Our bargaining has been very much influenced by what's going on internationally and what unions have won, their strategies, and how deregulation is happening. In Norway, for instance, they successfully stopped deregulation. We need to know what's going on to develop our own strategy.[54]

The relationships developed were therefore often an effective means of challenging hegemonic notions of union practice and developing new strategies through the sharing of experiences of struggle. These experiences were important for overcoming one of the big challenges when trying to build international labour solidarity, that is, the abstraction of international solidarity and workers internationally from the terrain of union struggle. Such abstraction is a product of many factors (detailed discussion of which are beyond the scope of this thesis), including the role of real physical distance as well as hegemonic ideas such as white supremacy that can function in many parts of the Global North to mediate views and relations with workers in the Global South. The latter is visible in xenophobic responses to migrant workers as well as ideas of development that posit union action in the North as more advanced or that the source of uneven development as lying with a whole range of explanations that are linked to notions of race. And so, these relationships contested notions of international solidarity as a form of charity. Charity models reinforce white supremacy because they operate under a logic that omits history and the way resources accumulated

---

[53] Union activist #2 and #4 [interviews] 2011. It is important to note that this was met with much resistance from the CLC, which saw the international as their jurisdiction.

[54] Union activist #6 [interviews] 2011.

in the Global North. It also denies mutuality by framing workers internationally as victims and power as material resources held in the Global North rather than the power of workers to act collectively.

Anti-Imperialism and Class Struggle

Following from and supporting the efforts to facilitate new politics and conceptions of struggle through experiences of worker direct action and the building of relationships is the way organizers confronted the history and reality of imperialism. Organizers explicitly drew connections between the struggle of workers and anti-imperialism, specifically that anti-imperialism is integral for the possibility of worker justice or emancipation.

In many of the campaigns, the connection between anti-imperialism and possibilities of worker justice was central, for instance, in the cases of American imperialism in Central America and imperialism and colonialism in Southern Africa. The connections organizers made resonated strongly in the Canadian context in this period because of the climate of left nationalism dominant in this era. While many of the activists engaged in developing the worker-to-worker model would not themselves identify as left nationalists, the general climate of left nationalism and its analysis of and emphasis on imperialism was part of the context in which the organizing happened. A close alignment developed between left nationalism and anti-imperialism in this period. This alignment, operating to contest imperialism and labour imperialism, is quite different from the US context where nationalism fuelled labour imperialism (Scipes 2010b). In Canada, it was the "continentalist"[55] position inside labour in this period that saw the prosperity of workers as tied to the success of American capital locally and abroad, translating into support for US imperialism. The dominant

---

[55] By "continentalist," I refer to the forces inside the labour movement that sought closer ties with the United States and US unions. I put this in quotations because like the idea of "international" unions, Canadian and American continentalism, is a misnomer since it excludes Mexico.

Canadian left nationalism of this time identified fighting American imperialism as central to the

emancipation of workers in Canada and internationally.[56]

Class and Nation

In Canada, the spike in class conflict in the mid-1960s happened at the height of American

ownership in the Canadian economy (Palmer 2009, 222). In the 1970s, nationalist sentiment fuelled

resistance to the shutdown of factories and was part of often-successful strategies to win public

support that translated into legislative changes offering some protections for workers facing plant

shutdowns (High 2001). An important part of the rise of the popularity of economic nationalism

inside the labour movement in this period had to do with its connection to militancy and its success

as part of the strategy of different workplace struggles. Steven High argues that economic

nationalism lent strength to efforts to resist plant shutdowns in the 1970s and 1980s: "The

convergence of economic nationalism and the anti-shutdown movement resulted in a fundamentally

different understanding of the issue in Canada; every time a mill or factory closed, it signalled the

negative effects of American domination over Canada" (High 2001, 212). High notes that the role of

economic nationalism as part of the analysis and strategy around plant shutdowns and other

---

[56] Unlike in the American New Left, left nationalism was a formidable force in Canadian and Québécois New Left organizations (and was also prominent amongst some old left parties) and became significant in shaping the politics of the student and labour movements in both places. The left nationalism of dominant strands of Old and New Left forces was a significant feature of the militancy of this period. The nationalist feature of the rise of the New Left in Canada and Québec meant that new leftists developed analyses distinct from those in many parts of Europe and the United States. These analyses often placed national sovereignty as critical to the overall class struggle and a prerequisite for a socialist Canada/Québec (Palmer 2009). The nationalist thrust on the left was nothing new; it had been a current in the CPC (Ryan 1975) and other Old Left formations and was common amongst other communist parties and liberation struggles around the world in this period, becoming especially pronounced after the dissolution of the Comintern. While many of the activists I interviewed would not identify as left nationalists, this was a wider significant force inside the labour movement in this period and part of certain political battles, strikes and part of internal efforts to re-vision struggle goals and possible strategies, and so on.

struggles worked to garner public support and led to legislative changes that strengthened the legal

power of Canadian workers with respect to shutdowns (High 2001, 209).[57]

Dependency Theory and Anti-Imperialism

Anti-imperialism became a part of the left nationalist analysis, particularly via dependency

theory and its emphasis on imperialism as a phenomenon that conditions work, the nature of class

struggles, and social and economic life in Canada more generally. The theory of Canada as a

dependency, Kellogg notes, developed in the 1960s and 1970s and grew out a combination of

Harold Innis' staples theory and Andre Gunder Frank's theory of dependency/underdevelopment

(Kellogg 1989, 341).[58] Gunder Frank's theory of dependency emerged from what he saw as the

conditions of the economies of the Global South. Canadian left nationalists saw Canada as similarly

subject to US imperialism and, like the Global South, Canada was "lacking a strong industrial

bourgeoisie of its own" (Gordon 2010, 15). Gordon notes that Canadian left nationalists concluded

that because of this, Canada is dependent economically on the United States (Gordon 2010, 15) and

so national independence via challenging US imperialism was critical to the possibility of a socialist

[57] This was not just limited to the level of workplace struggles; left nationalism became a substantive force in the labour movement in Canada in this era. Miriam Smith argues that the CLC shifted from continentalism to economic nationalism in the mid-1970s (Smith 1992). This happened for several reasons. One was the rise of American ownership. High notes that foreign ownership in manufacturing, mostly American, rose from 38% to 54% from 1926 to 1963 (High 2001, 201). Two, the popularity of left nationalism amongst the many New Left forces coupled with the New Left "turn to the working class" in the 1970s meant many of these activists began workplace or union organizing. Three concerns the role of international unions, still the majority in the early 1970s, in barring or intervening in Canadian strikes and other workplace actions to quell militancy as well as their sometimes undemocratic, conservative and bureaucratic structures. Joan Sangster argues that for many left labour activists, Canadian unions were smaller and more autonomous, making them potentially more militant and more democratic (Sangster 2006, 60). Many New Left activists worked within their unions to break from American unions and to support the development of Canadian unions, and some were also active in building an alternative left nationalist Canadian labour federation, the Confederation (previously Council) of Canadian Unions (CCU) (Sangster 2006, 43).

[58] According to David McNally, for Innis "the trade relation with a metropolitan centre structures the pattern of economic development in a country like Canada" because of the centrality of economic activity focused on the extraction and export of unprocessed materials to the metropolitan centre (McNally 1991). Kellogg sums up Frank's theory of the dependency relationship. Firstly, the global economic order is a set of hierarchal chains between metropolis and satellites (Kellogg 1989, 343). Secondly, central to this relation is the extraction of surplus from the satellite by the metropolis. Thirdly, as a result the satellites could never develop economically and politically to the level of the metropolis (Kellogg 1989, 343).

Canada (Kellogg 1989; Scott 1978a; McNally 1991; Gordon 2010).[59] The struggle for national sovereignty included efforts to halt American investment and to push for the nationalization of numerous industries and for the Canadianization of unions. This work involved efforts to bolster labour struggles and strengthen demands for the expansion of the social welfare state.

The adoption of this theory to describe an industrialized white-settler colony in the Global North built the idea of affinity between anti-imperialist struggles in the Global South and that of socialists in Canada. Hence, the analysis of imperialism that developed in this period created a strong basis for a sense of mutuality between workers in Canada and those workers fighting imperialism in the Global South because of the framing of a common fight against US imperialism. Chandra Mohanty, like Samora Machel, argues that solidarity is forged in terms of mutuality and recognition of common interests and is, therefore, a process of coming together to fight (Mohanty 2003, 7).[60] The connection drawn lent force to the idea of the necessity of supporting other struggles against American imperialism.

Exemplifying this connection is the series written by Jack Scott about American labour imperialism. The first book, *Yankee Unions, Go Home!* (1978a), considers US labour imperialism in the Global South.[61] The second book, *Canadian Workers, American Unions* (1978b), following from the first, specifically focuses on delegitimizing the role of US unions in Canada. For many left nationalists, the fight against US imperialism and US labour imperialism was a local struggle, but also entailed supporting similar struggles internationally.

---

[59] See Kellogg 1989 and McNally 1991for more on the problems of applying this theory to the Canadian context.

[60] However, it is important to note that for Mohanty the forging of mutuality happens across difference rather than arising from likeness (Mohanty 2003, 7). Mohanty argues for a conception of solidarity as standing with another over and against a third allows us to see solidarity as a communicative process towards constructing a basis for connection over and against differences (Mohanty 2003, 7).

[61] American labour imperialism also was part of the rationale for breaking from US unions and for developing spaces for local control over internationalism.

Challenging Labour Imperialism and Accommodationist Solidarity

> For the foreseeable future, the most concrete acts of solidarity will continue to take place
> below the level of the Congress, and often in defiance of it.
> –Marv Gandall (1986, 17)

This anti-imperialist orientation also entailed challenging US labour imperialism and the

labour imperialism and accommodationist solidarity that marked the work of the CLC. The worker-

to-worker model eclipsed and served for a time to delegitimize the authority of the CLC

international department and the vision of internationalism represented in their operations. Their

work of building a new model of labour internationalism was itself a challenge to the operations of

the CLC in that it offered an alternative to their model. However, the worker-to-worker activism

also directly took on the policies, practices and formal ties that the CLC's international department

promoted. The direct challenge they posed is symbolized by the production and distribution of the

SSC's *Partners in Imperialism*, which was met with hostility and resistance by some leaders and staff.[62]

Institutionally, from the time the CCL set up its international department in 1953, Canadian

unions made international affairs the purview of this department.[63] Resistance to this limited

jurisdiction and the ideological orientation of the department and committee existed prior to the

1970s. However, this conflict intensified in that decade when activists worked to raise the issue of

labour imperialism and change the direction of Canadian labour internationalism and how it was

operationalized. Activists involved in Central American and Southern African solidarity in this

period often confronted the CLC International Affairs Department at conventions, but also at union

---

[62] This was part of a broader challenge to business union and social democratic forces within trade unions and their strategies in this period. As one interviewee recollects about their view of the CLC's internationalism at the time, "if you don't care about changing your own world, why would you care about changing someone else's?" (Union activist #3 [interviews] 2011). The battles around international policies were intertwined with challenges to accommodationist philosophies of trade unionism happening on numerous fronts in this period.

[63] It is important to note that for some international unions, international policy was the purview of the American leadership of the union.

schools, labour council meetings, and federations of labour.[64] The nature of the battles between activists and CLC leadership and staff varied depending on the politics of the issues. For instance, the South African work was often met with more hostility and some activists engaged in solidarity work with Central American struggles noted that the climate was sometimes open enough to lobby some leaders and staff.[65]

As one interviewee notes regarding the political battles over labour internationalism in this period, the debates were "happening in union meetings around resolutions and at conventions around resolutions." Some of what activists had to confront was red-baiting, explicit efforts to shut down tours and delegations or to intervene in them, and efforts to undermine or redirect fundraising efforts of activists (CCL Convention Proceedings 1944-56; CLC Convention Proceedings 1956-88). Activists I interviewed shared many such stories. A common tactic used by CLC leadership and staff was to block resolutions by arguing that they ran contrary to CLC policy.[66] This was because many of the resolutions put forward by activists were to support unions that were not in, nor had relations with, the ICFTU, such as in the case of SACTU. This jurisdictional argument was also the go-to for CLC representatives at labour councils, schools or federation events; these representatives would try and shut down discussions and activities by arguing that international affairs are the exclusive domain of the international department.[67] The jurisdictional argument and the ones following from it, such as the importance of formal links and affiliations, operated to provide further impetus to demand more local control over international issues.

---

[64] The direct challenge to the CLC's international practices also took the form of exposing some of the problematic aspects of their policies and practices historically. The Saskatoon Solidarity Committee pamphlet is one such document that circulated amongst left circles, bookstores and between solidarity organizations and which was sold at union conventions.

[65] I cannot get into the specifics of all the conflicts and points of convergence here. For more on the nuances, see McFarlane (1989), Gandall (1986), Luckhardt (2006), Southall (1994), Freeman (1997), and Nastovski (2014).

[66] Union activist #1 and #2 [interviews] 2011; union activist #21, #22, #25, #37, #42, #45, #47, #56, #57 and #59 [interviews] 2012.

[67] Union activist #1 and #4 [interviews] 2011; union activist #57 and #59 [interviews] 2012.

The responses by organizers to these institutional barriers included direct defiance of the CLC International Department or ignoring them completely, developing grassroots support through mobilizing and educating members and local and council leadership, working to expose problematic aspects of their policies and practices, pushing for more local control, and offering an alternative model to the work of that department. Direct conflict between solidarity activists and CLC staff and leaders took place at conventions but also in council meetings and CLC educationals. It was evident in interviews that particularly in Western Canada there was a broad lack of interest and respect for the CLC in general, which translated into mostly ignoring their positions and the charting of their own policies.[68] Examples of this include the history of the Vancouver and District Labour Council (VDLC), which has a proud history of defying CLC policy. There was also the Grain Services Union (GSU), which despite pressures from various union bodies, engaged in solidarity with WFTU-affiliated Mozambiquan workers.[69] One of my interviewees recounted that during the British Miners' strike (1984-85), Dave Werlin supported bringing striking miners to Canada and touring them across the country despite the objections of the CLC, which, taking the lead from their sister federation the British, did not engage in or support solidarity efforts.[70]

Grassroots organizing was an important way that activists dealt with these institutional challenges. They sought to build power and support by going to members directly, and this meant that they had incredible reach. Organizers found space to speak or raise issues on the agendas of meetings of locals and councils, sometimes touring international union guests to meetings of local unions or to workplaces themselves. The various solidarity campaigns operated differently in how they got this done, but most involved the work of activists across the country organized either as

---

[68] Union activist #1, #2, #3 and #6 [interviews] 2011; union activist # 7, #9, #13 and #20 [interviews] 2012.

[69] Union activist #2 [interviews] 2011; union activist #22, #23 and #24 [interviews] 2012.

[70] Union activist #3 [interviews] 2011.

loose or more formal networks and organizations. This strategy required that these activists draw upon the significant capacity they had due to the commitment of community-based solidarity activists spread out throughout numerous towns and cities and also was due to the knowledge and skills of migrants and refugees.

While the International Department often got their policy papers approved at conventions, the International Department had little power to stop the core of the work of activists, which occurred at the local and workplace level. The scope and level of engagement of union members in these solidarity movements meant, for instance, that while the International Department supported the anti-Sandinista unions, they were unable politically to shut down the solidarity work extended to the new Sandinista unions or union support for these. The political backing of certain unions, like the Canadian Union of Postal Workers and the United Auto Workers Canadian Section (which became the Canadian Auto Workers [CAW] in 1984), particularly in the case of the anti-apartheid work, provided considerable strength to efforts to oppose the internationalism of the CLC.

Worker Control

The last strength of this organizing that I would like to note is how activists pushed for and won measures for democratic control over international solidarity work and decision-making in several unions. As I just noted, the organizing of activists on the worker-to-worker model had substantial reach, significantly raising the level of knowledge and engagement in international solidarity by rank-and-file workers in several unions. This led to both political and structural changes to the practice of labour internationalism in Canadian unions, including the development of international committees. The institutional spaces workers won to do rank-and-file-directed and -led international solidarity is part of the success of the struggle against the policies and practices of the CLC International

Department. This was also a part of a larger process going on in this period, resulting in the building of women's committees, anti-racism and workers of colour caucuses, and LGBT committees.

Throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s, international committees and funds were set up in federations, councils, locals, national and provincial unions, and Canadian sections of internationals. While labour councils were sites of contestation and worker-led international solidarity prior to this period, the development of committees and funds is something that arose at this time and was largely a product of the efforts of activists engaged in worker-to-worker solidarity. Committees sprung up in councils, locals, and provincial and national unions and sections of them. These new bodies ranged from very grassroots committees that were rank-and-file-based and interested in building direct worker-to-worker links through twinning projects, tours, and delegations to boards that managed CIDA-funded projects with often limited member involvement.

Some of these committees were elected and others appointed by the leadership. and they varied in their structures and mandates. For instance, some focused on development aid projects such as the SILP, which was set up to be a rank-and-file-run body to decide on and work to carry out development projects with partner unions, with matching CIDA funds. These funds, run by boards, staff and leadership and/or committees, were originally established in the dominant private sector unions and in many ways mirrored the work of the CLC International Department in that solidarity as a practice was about the negotiation and management of development aid projects. However, many of these, such as SILP which was supported by CUPE, the Saskatchewan Government and General Employees Union (SGEU), the GSU, and the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union (RWDSU), engaged in projects that ran counter to the anti-communist framework and were designed to be a part of building relationships with partner unions internationally in line with the worker-to-worker model.[71] Projects like SILP were a hybrid between

---

[71] Union activist #2 [interviews] 2011; union activist #22, #23 and #24 [interviews] 2012.

committees and funds because they developed and carried out education work and managed CIDA funded projects. Others focused on doing educational work inside their union or engaging in mobilization of workers to support various solidarity actions. The type of institutional mechanism for doing international labour solidarity that developed in specific unions is directly linked to the campaigns the core activists were involved in and their general orientation to international solidarity practice. For instance, the nature of the struggles in Central America meant that material resources were an important aspect of solidarity work. This was less prominent, for instance, in the case of the work against apartheid because, while funds were raised for SACTU, the priority was building the international campaign through boycott, divestment, and sanctions against apartheid South Africa.

The level of success organizers had in pushing back CLC control, challenging their policies and practices, and setting up spaces for worker control and decision-making over this work arose from a sense of mutuality that organizers cultivated, but also with extensive leadership support at different levels. The openness of various leaders for developing new practices of labour internationalism arose in part from institutional changes in this period.[72] This had to do with the rise of the public sector and the Canadianization of unions, which meant Canadian sections of international unions leaving their international union and forming an independent Canadian union amongst the Canadian membership.

---

[72] In some cases, the support of leadership was a significant factor in expanding the work and gaining the political capital to fight. An example of this is the work of the SACTU-SC. Winning the support of the leadership of the Canadian UAW and the Toronto CUPW local were essential for building the base, politically and materially, to carry out their work. Other groups won leadership support of certain unions and built bases within the local to do this work and to expand it to local councils and provincial federations. A further impetus for this approach was the desire to get lower and mid-level leadership to take on this work in their unions. For instance, in the case of organizing delegations to Nicaragua, local presidents or other low/mid-level leaders who were viewed as having more capacity to develop solidarity work in their locals upon return were often targeted (union activist #2 and #4 [interviews] 2011; union activist #20, #35, #37, #52, #57 and #59 [interviews] 2012).

> For Canadian unions to achieve goals of socialism, you first of all had to control your own institutions.[73]

This movement for changing unions gave rise to new unions and the renewal of unions on explicitly class-struggle models. In established international unions, this meant fighting against the conservative force of American-based leadership and staff. Many new unions were breakaways from internationals, such as the Canadian Association of Industrial, Mechanical and Allied Workers (CAIMAW), which affiliated with a new militant left nationalist labour central, the CCU, which in turn had emerged as an alternative to the CLC. Others broke away from their internationals but remained affiliated to the CLC, such as the CAW, formed in 1984 after splitting from the UAW.

Others were entirely new unions set up to organize workers traditionally neglected or ignored by much of the existing labour movement. One such union was the Service, Office and Retail Workers Union of Canada (SORWUC), a socialist feminist workers' union set up in Western Canada with the express purpose of organizing in sectors that were female dominated and unorganized (Smith 2009). Other new unions that emerged in this period were largely in the public sector and, while not established with an explicit class-struggle model of unionism, were quite militant in this period due to the nature of their struggles. These struggles took place in a context of serious state efforts to limit the ability of public sector workers to bargain and strike, and so in some cases to organize at all, these unions had to take up more militant strategies and actions. Other unions reinvented themselves in this period. One was the CSN,[74] which had historically been a conservative Catholic union that secularized and radicalized in the 1960s (see Mills 2010; Guntzel 1993). Another example of this was the CUPW (see Parrot 2005; Langford 1996; Tufts 1998).

---

[73] Union activist #5 [interviews] 2011.

[74] In English, the name of this union is the Confederation of National Trade Unions (CNTU).

Canadian left nationalism made it easier for activists to find spaces to talk to union members, find political and material support, and make institutional changes to sustain the work. The rise of Canadian unions contributed to the increased space that opened in this period to discuss and reinvent international solidarity. The new and renewed unions that came up at this time created openings to reinvent or resuscitate international labour solidarity. This climate meant new openings ideologically and structurally, creating openings for rethinking policy and taking positions independent of the CLC or US headquarters. This is because new and renewed unions were in the midst of developing their own politics, priorities and practices, and the breakaway unions were re-evaluating their past policies and practices that had been designed predominately in the United States.

Pressure was coming from below via the work of solidarity organizers, but the climate of rethinking and challenging past practice and existing structures meant that there were various unions with leaders open to these efforts to take labour internationalism in a new direction. There are many examples of leaders openly defying CLC policy and actively supporting the efforts of organizers engaged in building member-run grassroots international labour solidarity.[75] For instance, CUPW and CAW provided political and material support in the work against apartheid. This happened despite the CLC's lack of support for the ANC and outright opposition to SACTU and the SACTU Solidarity Committee. This is significant because the Canadian section of the UAW was historically a strong force inside the CLC. Other examples raised by interviewed activists was the openness of the new public sector unions and many of their leaders to building a new labour internationalism that

---

[75] An early example of this was in Québec with the CSN, where a committee was set up in 1970 to do member-run international labour solidarity.

was decentralized and member-driven and to challenging the Cold War politics of the CLC's international department.[76]

The principal strengths of the worker-to-worker model that I have outlined provide an important lens for evaluating practices of internationalism today. To what extent do these practices challenge hegemonic ideas that limit worker power and resistance? Do they address the processes that re-entrench global divisions of labour such as imperialism and neo-colonialism? And to what extent do they support the self-activity of workers and their control over international solidarity? I now turn to some of the limitations of this model and its specific manifestation in the Canadian context in the 1970s and 1980s.

Limitations and Challenges

There are almost countless challenges to doing effective transformative international labour solidarity work. A few of these are: 1. the incredible capacity needed to carry out grassroots work amongst workers spread across thousands of workplaces; 2. the number of competing struggles and possibilities for solidarity and coordination coupled with limited energy and resources; 3. hegemonic ideas of race, white supremacy, patriarchy, and nationalism; and 4. the opportunism, careerism and co-optation of some union leaders, members, and staff. Underlying this is the broader abstraction of international solidarity through hegemonic ideas, but also real physical distance and differences in politics, socio-economic climates/contexts, and in places like Canada the embedded normalization of business union practice that frames international solidarity as being at best a marginal issue within the work of the union.

Many of these challenges were at work in the development of the worker-to-worker model in Canada in this period. Here I consider three interrelated limitations of the organizing that arise

---

[76] Union activist #2, #4 and #5 [interviews] 2011; union activist #12 and #23 [interviews] 2012.

298

from the strengths and successes of the model. The first are the drawbacks and contradictions in the

economic nationalist climate, particularly the way it was a site for a strong sense of mutuality but

simultaneously operated in a tension with international solidarity by privileging the national terrain.

The second is the economistic reading of imperialism that was dominant in this period and the way

that this meant a failure to tie imperialism to racism and white supremacy, Lastly, I look at the

problem of the sustainability of this work; a major strength was the way that they could draw from a

huge number of activists to maintain it. The labour-intensive nature of this work, though, was also

part of its limitation because the number of people needed to sustain it fluctuates and is not always

available.

Limitations of Left Nationalism

> Lurking behind such protectionist policies is the utterly utopian notion that the national state can
> win decisive battles against international capital.
> –David McNally (1991, 239)

For V.I. Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, and more recent scholars of labour internationalism like

Victor Silverman, nationalism is a principal part of the failures of labour internationalism historically.

Both Luxembourg and Lenin lamented the rise of nationalism amongst socialist parties during the

First World War, seeing this as a tragic setback for working-class power; "Each universal workers'

organization, from Marx's own international workingmen's association to the world federation,

failed in the end to overcome the penetration of national interests in class concerns" (Silverman

2000, 13).

While left nationalism served for a time to support a basis for mutuality, the adoption of a

nationalist strategy for labour is at odds with internationalism in the true Marxist sense of uniting

workers transnationally, as it reinforces the use of borders to support inequalities between workers

and sustain the global division of labour. The left nationalisms of this period were primarily

economic nationalisms. Different varieties of economic nationalism have been mainstay forces within many labour movements. In Canada, economic nationalisms in the organized labour movement long pre-date the era examined here (TLC convention proceedings 1900–1956; CCL convention proceedings 1944–1956). These have been prominent amongst unionists from an array of political viewpoints and connected to various strategies for labour. The diverse strategies that follow from these economic nationalisms include direct support for the interests of one's employer, blocking immigration, promoting corporatism, working to improve the social welfare state, fighting US imperialism, and developing a national industrial plan with the aim of nationalization. There are many more strategies and various rationales connected to the different economic nationalist forces inside the organized Canadian labour movement throughout its existence.

The dominance of economic nationalism as a strategy in many unions speaks for some the contradiction of trade unions themselves and their unequal power vis-à-vis capital (Hyman 1975; Anderson 1967). This leaves workers trapped having to choose between ultimately absurd or contradictory options to win more just conditions. Economic nationalism constitutes one of these contradictory options. It translates, for instance, into the CAW fighting for government subsidies for General Motors (GM) or lobbying for their own jobs by pushing for their employers to win government contracts as seen in the Made in Canada campaign. Joan Sangster argues that the "nationalist response to capital mobility . . . consequently ended up supporting ideas that Canadian capital was somehow kinder and gentler" (Sangster 2006, 52).

Dana Frank, assessing the history of economic nationalist strategies of labour in the United States, argues that neither "free trade" nor protectionism can be strategies for the emancipation of workers (Frank 2000).[77] McNally similarly argues that economic nationalism traps us in a paradigm

---

[77] I put free trade in quotation marks because it essentially a charter for the rights of corporations and not what is classically known in economic theory as free trade.

that has no out for workers, since it is a strategy that is rooted in competition and is ultimately

ineffective in fighting the internationalized capitalist economy (McNally 1991, 233).

Some of the relevant critiques of nationalism on the left that I argue also apply to left

nationalism as a basis for building international labour solidarity include: 1. that it undermines/exists

in a tension with internationalism as a goal by ultimately privileging the national terrain, as was the

case with socialist parties during the First World War (Foreman 1998; Luxemburg 1976); 2. the way

that nationalism tends to shapes alliances with national capital, the state and their interests (Frank

2004; Gordon 2010, 16; McNally 1991; Kellogg 1989); 3. the way it reinforces the border, thereby

functioning to sustain the global division of labour shaped by practices and legacies of colonialism

and imperialism; 4. the way it obscures class antagonisms thereby serving as a barrier to

revolutionary and transformative strategies for labour.[78]

Limitations of Counter-Hegemony

While Canadian unions in this period often supported more democratic practices around

international solidarity and often created more room for more progressive policies, this was not

because there was something essentially more progressive about Canadian unions or Canadian

workers. We see this, for instance, in the fact that the CLC's anti-communist politics and practices

were not imposed by American unions; they arose from the interests and efforts of Canadian trade

unionists, many of whom were in international unions but who built a specifically Canadian anti-

communist internationalism (LAC CLC Fond; Saskatoon Solidarity Committee 1981). These

operations were locally derived or homegrown, or both, and had a specific Canadian orientation in

---

[78] Luis M. Pozo argues that nationalism is a mechanism of class accommodation in that it renders the reality of class divisions politically irrelevant by stressing the "organic" unity of dominant and dominated (2007, 55). Pozo argues that Gramsci's interest in national unity in Italy "prevented him from realizing that if the nation-people represented a hegemonic principle characteristic of bourgeois hegemony, then they could hardly form the basis for non-bourgeois hegemonic projects" (2007, 57). A similar critique was raised against Canadian left nationalism by Steve Moore and Debi Wells in 1975, who argued that nationalism only operates to obscure "antagonistic class divisions between Canadian capitalists and workers" (Kellogg 1989, 338).

terms of their sense of their international role; reflecting a more social democratic orientation than that of US labour.

The idea that a militant orientation within Canadian unions could be achieved through the eradication of American union presence prevented a deeper examination of the ideological and structural issues that also existed in Canadian unions. In this period, winning autonomy from American unions was often effective for making progressive changes inside particular unions and for supporting greater militancy.[79] However, gaining autonomy from American unions was not enough in and of itself to transform Canadian unions into more militant or progressive institutions or to institutionalize a radically different kind of programme for international labour solidarity. The movements for autonomy did create openings for the reinvention of labour internationalism in this time of left upsurge. However, the structural changes that were won were not sustainable without continuous counter-hegemonic work to maintain a radically different programme. This is because structural and organizational changes do not themselves change the underlying assumptions and hegemonic practices and ideas such as white supremacy and the developmentalist logic embedded within the dominant liberal narratives of global history. In this way, Canadian trade unionists who were interested in changing the international practices of their unions faced much of the same problems as American trade unionists.

While activists confronted important aspects of global inequality, such as the critical institutions of neo-imperialism, they did not always consider the underlying social dimensions born of the historical development of global divisions of labour. This is partly the result of dominant economistic analyses of imperialism in this period. An example of this is the lack of consideration for hegemonic ideas and practices of racism and white supremacy in the analysis, design or carrying out of international solidarity efforts. Only a handful people I interviewed thought through the role

---

[79] There are many examples of this starting from the 1960s. One example is the CAW. For more, see Gindin 1989, 1995; Yates 1990.

of race and racism in organizing international labour solidarity. This significant omission is reflective

of the lack of prominence of the question and analysis of race amongst many of the mainstream left

groups in Canada in this period. The omission of the question and priority of the question of racism

is especially interesting given the context of a racist labour market and settler-colonial context

(Bannerji 1993, 1995, 2005; Calliste 1989, 1994, 1995; Creese 1987, 1988, 2007; Creese and Wiebe

2012; Das Gupta 1996, 1999; Das Gupta, James and Maaka 2007; Dei 1996; Frager 1989, 1992;

Goutor 2007a, 2007b, 2011; Satzewich 1990, 1998, 2000, 2011; Sharma 1997, 2001, 2002, 2006a;

Thobani 2000a, 2000b, 2007), and points to deeper issues within the Canadian labour movement's

consideration of the link between exploitation and oppression.[80]

There were of course exceptions to this omission of the social dimensions of the global

division of labour and its concomitant hegemonic ideas. For instance, the anti-apartheid work

explicitly considered the relations between race and class. The effects of differences between

workers internationally in the social as well as the material spheres are important for a critical lens

for understanding how solidarity efforts can function to re-entrench uneven relations of power or

leave intact underlying ideas that support it. We therefore need to think through how the

developmentalist logic continued to operate in this period of renewal and resistance to labour

imperialism. One of the consequences of not considering the social and ideological aspects of

uneven relations is that critical underlying aspects can remain intact, such as the function of the

border or the way paternalistic relations can be reinforced through solidarity consisting primarily of

government development aid projects.

---

[80] Exceptions to this include work in the prairies that made direct connections between anti-racism, anti-colonialism and labour internationalism and the work against South African apartheid more generally (union activist #2 and #4 [interviews] 2011; union activist #16, #51 and #53).

Limitations of Sustainability and Institutionalization

One of the great challenges of this model of international labour solidarity was the labour power it required. As worker-to-worker solidarity was both labour-intensive and at times expensive, the question of sustainability was a significant underlying problem. The issues included a limited capacity of the core activists to sustain the work long-term alongside their paid work and the problem of bringing in new activists who could devote the amount of time and energy to do solidarity work, largely on a voluntary basis. The pool of available activists and their ability to provide a focused commitment to solidarity work was constantly in flux. This varied depending on what other struggles were happening locally and the availability of paid work that was suited to organizing. This meant either work that was not terribly gruelling and demanding time-wise – or as in the case of those activists who were employed in CIDA funded "Learners Centres" set up to do community education about international development – work where union international solidarity organizing could be integrated into their paid work.[81]

The difficulty of capacity coupled with an increasingly difficult climate for unions as the 1980s unfolded (Panitch and Swartz 1984; Palmer and Goldfield 2007) meant a decreasing reach. The capacity to sustain this intense level of activity was a great strength through the 1970s and 1980s but became a limitation as the pool of activists waned. Activists tackled the challenge of the amount of effort and energy needed to sustain this work through different strategies. For some, the setting up of committees and funds was the way to sustain the work; in other places, union leadership took on hiring staff to manage international affairs. In yet other places, the work simply ended sometime in the 1990s.

Forms of institutionalization in the union structures was a logical move for many and in line with efforts to gain more direct control over international solidarity by workers themselves.

---

[81] Union activist # 2 and #4 [interviews] 2011; union activist #25, #26, #27 and #41 [interviews] 2012.

However, institutionalization sometimes had the effect of changing this organizing altogether. For instance, development aid projects became the core of the work of many of the unions that do their own international solidarity work through a committee, fund, staff person or via their executive board. Development aid projects, some argued, were a way to engage in solidarity without needing large amounts of time or people; they could draw on the institutional strength of the union, for instance by hiring a staff person to manage projects. CIDA funding therefore became a pragmatic option for sustaining this work. Many factors contributed to this becoming a dominant institutional means to sustain solidarity work. Part of this had to do with where some of the activists were institutionally located, that is, in NGOs. Many activists were critical of the role of development aid and the relationship with the state (Carty and Smith 1981; Barry-Shaw and Oja-Jay 2012); however, many of these activists also received salaries from CIDA that subsidized their solidarity organizing and so they also witnessed CIDA money being used to support effective solidarity activities.

In an era of substantial left upsurge in Canadian unions, it is curious how the question of state funding did not become a significant debate or dilemma for those working to re-define international labour solidarity. As a practice, CIDA funding and development aid projects became a practical means to create and fund new union spaces and a means to more democratically carry out solidarity efforts. Activists were not blind to the problems of state funding and Canadian state interests internationally. Some of the problems include: 1. the way accepting this funding can function to legitimize the actions and interests of CIDA itself and the Canadian state; 2. how it can maintain the unevenness of power between "partner" unions and can reinforce hegemonic white supremacy; 3. the way that CIDA guidelines shape the design of solidarity projects including where these projects can take place; and 4. how projects fall short or run counter to efforts at tackling larger processes that shape exploitation and oppression. Despite reservations by some, the promise of funding and its potential to provide an institutional means of sustainability outweighed concerns.

On the level of practice, the increase in the number of funds, boards and committees that undertook union development aid projects were limited in that they minimized the role of members and member action. This is part of the contradiction inherent in the problem of sustainability. On the one hand, funding and development projects meant a higher chance of sustainability because these did not require a constant renewal of an activist base. But it is precisely this minimized need that undermines such development projects as a means of sustaining a different model of labour internationalism, particularly a model based on members engaging in solidarity action on a wide scale and building worker-to-worker relationships. The focus on the negotiation and management of development projects makes the role of rank-and-file workers in the international practices of their unions superfluous or unnecessary. This in turn undermined the new model and its transformative potential.

In this examination of efforts to build international labour solidarity in Canada, based on interviews with a wide number of activists across the country, I have shown that the movement for a new model of labour internationalism in the Canadian labour movement in the 1970s and 1980s was a significant departure from the institutionalized Cold War internationalism of the CLC. This movement provides an example of a transformative model of rank-and-file-driven and -focused international labour solidarity. The efforts of many different organizations and loose networks of union activists came together in this period to create new practices of labour internationalism based on class-struggle unionism. Activists developed practices centred on workers and worker power for acting in solidarity and were victorious in efforts to win more local control and democratic oversight regarding the direction of international solidarity work. They also strengthened direct links between unions in Canada and unions internationally as well as union relationships with community solidarity organizations. Altogether, this led to substantial institutional changes and functioned to push back the Cold War diplomacy and anti-communist development projects that became dominant in the

Canadian labour movement from the time when international departments were first set up.

This movement slowed in the late 1990s but contributed to some of the approaches and organizing practices that developed within the labour movement against NAFTA and then in terms of the anti-globalization protests. The decline of this movement was a result of numerous historical factors, including decreased capacity and incorporation into the structures of various unions, the rise of neoliberalism, and decreased union power. Some of these factors continue to shape the conditions in which labour internationalism is organized in Canada today. These include neoliberalism, uneven capitalist development, and ideological barriers such as white supremacy, racism, patriarchy, and nationalism. There are also several structural challenges that organizers faced in doing this work that continue to exist as barriers for doing international labour solidarity inside unions. Some of these structurally embedded barriers are linked to the limits of trade unions themselves and need further consideration. Examining practices of grassroots labour internationalism in more depth is critical to thinking through possibilities for transformative forms of worker solidarity and coordination across borders today.

<u>Conclusion</u>

Thinking Forward

To conclude, I would like to consider what all of this means for thinking about how we move forward in trying to build effective means of internationalizing labour power grounded in transformative forms of solidarity. Besides the various impacts of the new imperialism shaping the nature of class struggles today, this is especially timely in the Canadian context since the demise of CIDA in 2013 under the Conservative government.[1] With the end of CIDA funding, the CLC's primary role internationally as a manager of development aid funding also came to an end. This means that both the CLC's IAD and the unions that sponsor their own development projects have had to think about how to do international work in the absence of state aid funding. However, this has also created an opportunity to think about the possibilities of solidarity and coordination outside of the development aid framework. This is an important juncture. It is a critical time to reflect on the current terrain of class struggle globally, to reflect on openings for strengthening union power and confronting the way capital pits workers against each other for jobs and investment, and to reflect on how labour internationalism might play a role in shaping the strategies of workers these conditions.

Reviewing the Analysis:
Competing Traditions of Labour Internationalism in Canada through the Cold War

I begin with a summary of the dissertation and why, despite the focus on the Cold War, the issues raised here are relevant for thinking about labour internationalism in our time. I offer some

---

[1] I cannot delve into the nature of labour internationalism in the post-Cold War era; this must be left for another project. However, I can say that this era included innovative experiments in trying to develop coordinative practices, work for collaborating politically in confronting trade agreements, and the continued dominance of the development aid programme, sometimes involving outsourcing of the management of this work to allied NGOs. It has also been marked by residual ideological conflicts between revolutionary socialist activists, social democrats and business unionists. For more on some of the features of the post-Cold War period please see Nastovski 2014 and 2015.

reflections and consider the implications of different aspects of my analysis for the prospects of transformative solidarity today and for labour transformation more generally. To do this I outline a few of the principal lessons we can draw from the competing traditions that have constituted labour internationalism in Canada in the Cold War period. I end with a short overview of some of the gaps that remain.

The dissertation began by situating the challenges and prospects for labour internationalism within the developments in global political economy since the 1940s. Here, I introduced Rebecca Johns' distinction between transformative and accommodationist forms of international labour solidarity. I argued that we need to think about how to build transformative forms of international labour solidarity, that is, practices that oppose nationalism and imperialism, if we are to pose any challenge to the way capital currently operates to create competition between workers for jobs and investment. This project, however, ran up against the very contradictions inherent within unions as products of and tied to capitalism. The limitations of unions as organizations shaped and bound by the vicissitudes of the market means that we must think beyond organizational solutions to internationalizing labour power to include an analysis of the issue of class consciousness. To that end, the dissertation explored the competing practices of labour internationalism within Canada during the Cold War with a focus on class consciousness. This demanded both an analysis of class formation in Canada and an unpacking of the orientation and rationale grounding different practices and approaches to labour internationalism.

In the first chapter, I situated my discussion within the debates on labour internationalism. Due to the limited scholarship on labour internationalism in Canada, the discussion focused on the debates and issues drawn out in the work on labour internationalism more generally. I moved from this discussion to the literature on labour imperialism, focusing mainly on the work the AFL and AFL-CIO. There I outlined the dilemma of labour imperialism, arguing that the impetus for labour

imperialism has been shown to arise from within unions themselves rather than having been imposed by states. I outlined the dominant explanatory frameworks for labour imperialism, which include the labour aristocracy thesis, business unionism, social democratic anti-communism, nationalism, and racism or white supremacy. I ended with a short discussion of conceptualizations of solidarity.

In Chapter Two I outlined my methodology, which is grounded in anti-racism Marxist feminist theory. Here I introduced my theoretical approach to this history which, drawing from Gramsci, aimed to dialectically trace empire thinking within the labour movement and with attention to the tensions between the dominant historical forces. For Gramsci, going beyond the limits of economistic trade unionism means "subjecting to scrutiny 'the so-called commonsense and instinctual notions that had penetrated the workers' movement" (Annunziato 1988, 162). As such, in that chapter I traced the competing practices of labour internationalism as wars of position within the labour movement over the aims and strategies of trade union action, over capitalism itself and vis-à-vis the social nature of global divisions of labour and their local manifestations. Following from this, I outlined how I centre the social nature of class formation and relations in my analysis of the class consciousness reflected in the international labour wars of position and the local wars of position over labour internationalism.

In Chapter Three I situated the labour wars of position within some key features of Canadian class formation; specifically, I outlined the importance of Canada as a white-settler colony and highlighted the role of gender – but also of race, and whiteness in particular – in the hierarchies shaping the labour market in Canada. I argued that the way workers made sense of and confronted these local social divisions of labour helps us to make sense of how global divisions of labour were understood and confronted. To situate the labour internationalisms during the Cold War, I explored the tensions between the different politics shaping the labour movement in the interwar years. In

this period, there was heightened struggle between competing philosophies of trade unionism and this, I argued, laid the groundwork for the contests over labour internationalism that arose during the Cold War.

In Chapter Four, I provided my theoretical approach to labour internationalism, teasing out Gramsci's conception of wars of position, delving deeper into Johns' distinction between transformative and accommodationist forms of international labour solidarity, outlining the nature of the dominant competing philosophies of trade unionism at work in the Canadian context, and exploring the relevance of the labour aristocracy thesis as well as race and nation as explanatory frames. In this chapter, I situated the institutionalized labour internationalism that emerged in Canada in the early 1950s by outlining the burgeoning approaches to internationalism of the closest institutional allies to the CCL. This included the ICFTU, the AFL and British TUC, the CIO, and the SI.

Chapter Five considered the nature of the institutionalized labour internationalism that emerged in the early 1950s within the CCL. In that chapter I argued that the dominant labour internationalism that emerged in Canada in this period, that of the CCL, can be characterized as somewhere between labour imperialism and accommodationist solidarity. This is because, while some of the practices were explicitly geared to undermine certain forces within labour movement internationally and develop competing anti-communist alternatives, other efforts, while having similar effects, were sometimes framed as forms of solidarity. Through four pivotal the cases, Kenya, the Colombo Plan, the Caribbean and Palestine, I explored the way that these practices were steeped in a philosophy of social partnership and how this social partnership was related to and reflective of the nature of Canadian class formation and the dominant ideas of race and nation that emerged alongside this.

In Chapter Six, I turned my attention to the 1970s and 1980s, exploring the continuities

between the early programme of the CCL and the CLC's orientation in this period. From there, I

moved on to the rise of the New Left and the transformations inside Canadian labour that gave rise

to a significant counter-force to the internationalism of the CLC. I argued that this internationalism,

referred to by activists as "worker-to-worker," was a transformative form of international labour

solidarity that operated to challenge the logic of capital and imperialism as well as the model of

social partnership. In the chapter, I explored some of the key lessons that can be drawn from this

history regarding how to effectively build transformative solidarity as well as some of the challenges

we need to think through. Despite the challenges organizers faced, they were able to effectively build

transformative forms of solidarity by focusing on direct engagement of workers at all levels of union

activity.

The Dangers of Dismissal: Why these Histories Still Matter

Atrocities of the past now being an embarrassment . . . must be denied, minimized, or conceptually
bypassed.
–Charles W. Mills (2008, 1391)

By far the most significant challenge to taking up the lessons of this dissertation lies in the

efforts to dismiss labour internationalism and particularly imperialism and accommodationist

solidarity as irrelevant to the struggles of labour today. There are many ways this happens, some of

which I outlined throughout the dissertation.

First, arising from some left nationalist frameworks, is the dismissal of the international on

the grounds of it being abstract and disconnected from real struggle, which is locally rooted. While

all struggles and organizing happen in the place where we are, this does not itself necessitate viewing

national borders as the limits of the horizon of struggle.[2] This orientation not only misses the transformative possibilities present in solidarity organizing, as places where workers can rethink the nature of struggle, rethink strategies, and open to new ways to coordinate fight-back, but it also ends up reinforcing social partnership as the only way forward. This framework views the international as at best marginal, as the pet project of groups of left activists or, at its most cynical, as part of the public relations of the union. There is also an outright dismissal of labour internationalism that arises from business unionism, whether nationally, regionally, or workplace oriented, that sees internationalism, racism, colonialism and imperialism as outside the mandate of the union. Like the TLC in the late 1940s, this strong sectionalist orientation responds to the international with a firm mantra of local first. What is important to note and to consider is how close the stark business union response is to some on the nationalist labour left.

Second, and similar to the hostility displayed in relation to discussions of racism and sometimes still also to gender, the dark sides of solidarity are seen by some as dirty little secrets best kept quiet. The tendencies to dismiss or refuse to consider the dark sides of solidarity are even stronger today than they were when the first exposés about the British TUC and the AFL-CIO began to appear in the late 1960s. Given the level of union decline in the neoliberal era, rather than facilitating more frank discussions about such difficult dilemmas within labour history, what we have seen instead is a greater unwillingness to acknowledge a whole range of very real contradictions and dilemmas facing union organizing today. While I think that for the most part this dismissive tendency comes out of a real sense of crisis and protectiveness over unions and their future, whether coming from academics or union activists, leadership or staff, in the long run not be willing to face these issues leads us away from any chance of resuscitating unions as important sites of class

---

[2] This is augmented by the hegemonic national horizons framing of much of the scholarship on labour renewal in much of the Global North (or regional horizon in the case of discussions of movements in the European Union), which has meant that the problem of imperialism is rarely posed as a labour question.

struggle. This reluctance, I argue goes deep and is not limited to labour imperialism, racism and patriarchy, but includes a reluctance to rethink the terrain of struggle, union philosophies, and the basic features of how we organize. Today in Canada, the reluctance to radically rethink how we organize has meant an ongoing decline of unions as sites of class struggle, seen in the marked decline of strikes and the turn more and more to business union strategies that are dependent on lawyers and the courts rather than on mobilizing workers to resist.

Third, because labour imperialism goes to the heart of some of the central contradictions within unions and their alignment with national or regional blocs of capital and states, another response is to dismiss solidarity outright as having been limited to the Cold War or to a group of leaders. As I have shown, this alignment goes deeper than the proclivities or opportunism of those who developed the international programme of the CCL/CLC. This is evident in the way that the programme was rooted in class formation in Canada as a white-settler colony and the dominant ideological battles within labour in the early 20th century which predated the Cold War programme of CCL and CLC. And while the contours of labour internationalism in Canada in the 1990s and beyond needs to be critically unpacked, we see the ongoing relevance of the issues that arose during the Cold War when we examine the CLC's position in support of the coup against Hugo Chavez and their ongoing alignment with the Histadrut (see Nastovski 2014). The tendency to dismiss the dark sides of solidarity as product of and limited to the Cold War not only masks the ongoing ideological battles, but also prevents the development of a critical lens for evaluating these practices and for thinking critically about how to develop effective transformative forms of solidarity today. I argue that the various bases for the alignments of labour with national or regional blocs of states and capital remain serious obstacles for internationalizing labour power today.

Finally, we have the problem of how disconnected the international seems from the everyday life of trade union members. This disconnection, while an issue of the organization of trade unions

today, is also a question of class consciousness. In this respect, I think there is much to learn from the efforts of the activists that built worker-to-worker solidarity in the 1970s and 1980s. They were successful, for a time, in making the international clearly relevant and connected to the shop floor.

<div align="center">

Not all Internationalisms Are Made Equal:
Towards a More Critical Lens –
Confronting Imperialism, Tackling Global Divisions of Labour

</div>

Rather than consider these difficult dilemmas arising from these histories, what we find in many of the studies of labour internationalism today are footnotes or disclaimers to the historically complicated picture of labour internationalism. As a union activist, I understand the desire to move forward and to sustain, as Gramsci argued, an optimism of the will, this optimism, however, must be checked by the intellectual pessimism born of our assessment of the nature of capitalism and power of workers within it. Thinking about moving forward, it is important to sustain optimism about possibilities, but also to consider the dark sides in our assessment of potential for solidarity and coordination. As Featherstone argues, "solidarities are constructed through uneven power relations and geographies," and so activists must "develop a reflective approach to solidarity where we see practices of solidarity in this tension, as a process of working through the existence of this unevenness of power" (Featherstone 2012). This means contending with the nature and logic of capitalism and imperialism. It means thinking about the real material inequities that characterize global divisions of labour and the way they operate in the local through the border. It means considering the connection between exploitation and oppression in thinking through international labour solidarity. This is why Johns' framework, which centres imperialism and nationalism, is so important in helping us to develop a critical lens for current practices.

The history of labour internationalism in the 20th and into the 21st century is very complicated, diverse and contradictory. I argue that to do this we need to situate the current projects

aimed at internationalizing labour solidarity and power in this history and the lessons arising from it. Through analyses, such as the one I have offered in this dissertation, it is possible to develop a more critical eye for the evaluation of current efforts and prospects for international labour solidarity and coordination. As the concept of accommodationist solidarity highlights, this is not an easy task. Even in cases where the intention of unionists is solidaritic, their actions may very well reinforce and work to sustain global divisions of labour and the processes underlying them. For those of us who do think that the international is important, without a critical lens to for examining these practices we may be left with the lauding of all efforts towards internationalizing the strategies of labour, even when they translate into the globalizing of strategies arising from the philosophy of business unionism.[3] On the one hand, there might be the most amazing example of an effective transnational union merger, but it is not something that can function in and of itself to resolve the question of labour strength nor can it be replicated in across spaces irrespective of the histories and ideological terrain of specific labour movements.

And so, we need to think critically about mergers, international framework agreements and efforts to expand the scale of collective bargaining. While the current field of efforts and experiments at internationalizing labour power vary quite widely in their effectiveness in terms of specific struggles and which can sometimes be quite useful, their limitations arise from their failure to contend with the problem that extensions of scale cannot in and of themselves work to combat the structural disadvantage workers find themselves in within these strategies due to the nature of capitalism. For instance, extending collective bargaining processes internationally does not tackle the lack of enforceability of these mechanisms, the role of borders in deepening the disadvantage of

---

[3] This is part of the problem of models of international labour solidarity and coordination arising from the dominant analysis of globalization; they do not call into question the structure and strategies of business unionism nor its underlying liberal pluralism and acceptance of capitalism. Nor do they challenge the underlying global division of labour rooted in the history of colonialism, imperialism and patriarchy sustained through the policies and practices of northern states and capital.

various groups of workers, and massive increases in unemployment and informality. A global view of current conditions demands political solutions to these questions.

As Silverman argues, international corporate campaigns, for instance, may help pressure employers but "cannot substitute for nitty-gritty organizing, the building of organizational capacity at the local level, the development of skilled union activists, the commitment to struggle over the long term that makes union power" (Silverman 2010, 159-60). Silverman suggests that activists therefore need to combine local and global organizing with more effective political action (Silverman 2010, 160). In sum, to move forward effectively, we need to develop a more critical lens to the emerging experiments in internationalizing labour solidarity and power. This needs to be grounded, as was Johns' framework, in an analysis of global capitalist development, class formation and the implications of the social nature of global divisions of labour.

Lessons for Thinking Forward

Speaking of the radical forms of international labour solidarity of the early CIO, Andrew Howard argues that while the corporatism of the 1940s made this no longer tenable, "we cannot assume that the collapse of the postwar class compromise will necessarily produce an opposite trend toward renewal of class-based militancy in the foreseeable future" (Howard 1995, 379). And in fact, what we have seen, as "living and working conditions for workers in the North have deteriorated [. . .] has not been the growth of revolutionary consciousness and organization but instead the rise of reactionary ideas" (Post 2010, 4). And so in this era of neoliberal austerity, capital mobility, and the rising global reserve army of labour, while the contradictions and limitations of the historic compromise with the state and capital is increasingly difficult to occlude, what we have seen is the increased importance of thinking through the ideological underpinnings of social partnership to make sense of the limited resistance. The history of Canadian labour internationalism during the

Cold War highlights, first, the need to develop a critical lens to practices of labour internationalism; second, the need to challenge union philosophies rooted in social partnership; third, the ongoing importance of unpacking and challenging the underlying racial and national dimensions of different views of social partnership; and fourth, the need to learn from and revive transformative forms of grassroots international labour solidarity.

Social Partnership: The Path to Nowhere

The same social pact that gave the labour movement in Europe strength in the post-World War II period is that same thing that is now leading the labour movement astray.
-Asbjörn Wahl (2004, 1)

As I have shown throughout my analysis, the disarming of labour that was part of the building of social partnership between it, the state and capital in Canada in the early post World War II era helped to facilitate the infrastructure of the new imperialism that has been unmaking labour strength since the 1970s. As the social partnership has been unravelled, unions built on the philosophy of social partnership have found themselves lost, nostalgic and/or holding firmly to strategies that today no longer make sense under the reconfigurations of global capitalist production. This nostalgia is dangerous. It denies the nature of conditions of workers across the globe in this period, which while translating into social welfare for those in many Northern states, in this same period workers in the South were subject to strategies of dispossession and displacement often supported by these same states. This nostalgia is also dangerous because it does not demand a radical rethinking of union philosophies and strategies. Instead, we see the use of moral or legal arguments and strategies to plead for crumbs of the massive levels of accumulation being generated in this era, and even union support for the use of public funds to subsidize national capital to protect or to win investments for new jobs. These are the contradictions unions find themselves in; workers need to fight for their jobs, unions need to fight for these jobs, but this strategy goes

nowhere in the end because the forces of global capital make the victories short and fleeting. Ultimately these strategies do not build the capacities of workers to resist locally or to challenge the competition being fuelled between workers internationally.

Race, Nation and Social Partnership

The accommodationist tendencies of the union philosophy of social partnership and its related racial and national dimensions cannot be disregarded as the failure, sabotage or opportunism of sections of the labour leadership. This is evident today in the case of sections of the American working class who support the presidency of Donald Trump, the rise of far-right parties in Europe, the politics of Brexit, and in some of the responses within Canada to the Syrian refugee crisis or to the Temporary Foreign Workers Programme (TFWP) with nationalist and white supremacist vitriol, the ideological bases upholding various configurations of social partnership are far more deeply rooted. In the case of Trump, we see an economic nationalist politics that reinforces a sense of the moral entitlements due to the white working class. This force challenges free trade, but not from an anti-capitalist position. Trump and his supporters are not aberrations. Their framework is simply a barer expression of the racial and national dimensions that are part of the rationale of numerous strategies for national social partnerships since the rise of nationalism.[4] This current manifestation of economic nationalism in the United States is not so far from the racism and nationalism present, say, in the actions of American and Canadian autoworkers in the 1980s who smashed Japanese cars.[5] The racial and national dimensions of the alignment with national or regional blocs of states and capital is not an aberration, but rather a logical component of the sectional thinking that makes economic

---

[4] We get a clear view of the ongoing relevance of this tendency in the Canadian context today in debates on the TFWP. The responses from some unionists in Canada have highlighted the racial and national assumptions embedded in their position on the program (see Goutor and Ramsaroop 2010).

[5] For more, see Frank 2000.

nationalism make sense. And so, as I have outlined throughout the dissertation, those who want to strengthen working-class consciousness and power need to contend with the imperial thinking that produces a sense of mutuality between workers, their employers, and the state rather than moving them to confront the processes that work to support exploitative and oppressive practices that deepen global divisions of labour.

Racism, white supremacy and nationalism need to be considered in our thinking about class consciousness and the possibilities for transformative forms of solidarity. This poses challenges for some part of the revolutionary left in Canada. On the one hand, activists who were engaged in building transformative forms of solidarity did much, I would argue, to help support a response by labour to the onset of free trade that simultaneously challenged xenophobia. On the other hand, many sections of the left today are reluctant to rethink nationalism and have yet to develop a radical approach to racial justice. Although these issues are being taken up today by many younger activists, there is the problem that these activists either do not find themselves in unionized workplaces (as unionization rates have declined) or they do not see the labour movement as an important site of class struggle.

Radical Reconfigurations: Counter-Hegemony and the Building of Class Struggle Unionism

This brings us to the final point I would like to draw out from this research, and that is the need to revive class-struggle unionism, which is to make unions schools of war and sites of counter-hegemony. This project necessarily entails a confrontation with the racial and national dimensions underpinning social partnership. Otherwise, without an international and historical lens to the problem of labour, we will remain stuck in confines of social partnership while we organize where we live and work. An international lens serves to illuminate the contradictions in the union philosophy rooted in social partnership. Transformative forms of international labour solidarity are

part of the overall effort to build an international lens to the problems facing labour. As counter-hegemonic sites, experiences of transformative solidarity can shape a different conception of the terrain of struggle, while also being empowering experiences and sites that build new activists.

Gaps Remaining

Much remains to be studied in greater detail. In this dissertation, I have provided some of the broad strokes of a large historical period. There are many issues I could not address fully or at all; more needs be thought through and debated in order to assess and rethink the purpose and practice of labour internationalism and the possibilities for developing new mechanisms of international solidarity.

I will end by outlining a few different areas that demand attention. For one, it would be useful to think more deeply about the relation between the CCL's internationalism during the early Cold War and their human rights work. While I note this peripherally in a few areas of this dissertation, this would be useful to arrive at a clearer understanding of how accommodationist solidarity evolved. Second, it would be interesting to explore why the Canadian New Left did not develop a radical analysis of racial injustice. Third, following from the issues raised in this study, it would be useful to evaluate how this internationalism evolved in the 1990s until today. Fourth, understanding prospects for transformative forms of international labour solidarity also demands a closer look at how rank-and-file union workers in Canada think about international terrain as a part of the work of the union. Fifth, it would be useful to explore the connections and disconnections between anti-racist organizing and international solidarity activism inside Canadian unions today. There are also some important questions we need to consider. How do we build solidarity action that is itself an emancipatory activity, one that is anti-imperialist and aimed at challenging the reproduction of relations of inequality based on the historical development of capitalism? What does

that mean for the relationship between unions and state funding? How do we build solidarity actions that are member driven and that serve to simultaneously build local capacity rather than making more skilled managers? Addressing these questions is critical to any effort to rethink the possibilities of international labour solidarity today.

References

Abele, Frances and Davia Stasiulis. 1989. "Canada as a 'White Settler Colony: What about Natives and Immigrants." In *The New Canadian Political Economy*, edited by Wallace Clement and Glen Williams, 240-77. Kingston, ON: McGill–Queen's Press.

Abella, Irving Martin. 1973. *Nationalism, Communism and Canadian Labour.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Abella, Irving Martin and Harold Martin Troper. 1983. *None is too Many: Canada and the Jews of Europe, 1933–1948.* Toronto: Random House.

Abrams, Philip. 1982. *Historical Sociology.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Abu-Laban, Yasmeen. 1998. "Keeping 'em out: Gender, Race, and Class Biases in Canadian Immigration Policy." In *Painting the Maple: Essays on Race, Gender, and the Construction of Canada*, edited by Veronica Strong-Boag, Sherrill Grace, Avigail Eisenberg and Joan Anderson, 69-82. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Abu-Laban, Yasmeen and Abigail Bakan. 2008. The Racial Contract: Israel/Palestine and Canada. *Social Identities* 14(5): 637-660. doi: 10.1080/13504630802343481

Adeleke, Ademola. 1996. "Ties Without Strings? The Colombo Plan and the Geopolitics of International Aid, 1950–1980." PhD diss., Toronto: University of Toronto. https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/12165/1/NQ35427.pdf

———. 2004. Playing Fairy Godfather to the Commonwealth: The United States and the Colombo Plan. *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 42(3): 393-411. doi: 10.1080=1466204042000326208

Allen, Theodore. W. 1994. *The Invention of the White Race.* Vol. 1. New York: Verso.

Alvarez, Sonia E. 2000. Translating the Global Effects of Transnational Organizing on Local Feminist Discourses and Practices in Latin America. *Meridians* 1(1): 29-67. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40338427

Amadahy, Zainab, and Bonita Lawrence. 2009. "Indigenous Peoples and Black People in Canada: Settlers or Allies?" In *Breaching the Colonial Contract: Anti-Colonialism in the US and Canada*, edited by Arlo Kempf, 105–136. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Ancel, Judy. 2000. Response I: On Building an International Solidarity Movement. *Labor Studies Journal* 25 (2): 26-35. doi: 10.1177/0160449X0002500202

Anderson, Benedict R. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* Rev. ed. New York: Verso.

Anderson, Kathryn. 2003. *Weaving Relationships: Canada-Guatemala Solidarity*. Waterloo, ON: Canadian Corp. for Studies in Religion/Corporation canadienne des Sciences religeuses, Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Anderson, Kevin. 2010. *Marx at the Margins: On Nationalism, Ethnicity, and Non-Western Societies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Anderson, Perry. 1967. "The Limits and Possibilities of Trade Union Action." In *The Incompatibles: Trade Union Militancy and the Consensus*, edited by Robin Blackburn and Alexander Cockburn, 263-280. London: Penguin in association with New Left Review.

Anner, Mark. 2002. "Between Economic Nationalism and Transnational Solidarity: Labor Responses to Internationalization and Industrial Restructuring in the Americas." Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association*, Boston Marriott Copley Place, Sheraton Convention Center, Boston, August.

Anner, Mark and Peter Evans. 2004. Building Bridges Across a Double Divide: Alliances between US and Latin American Labour and NGOs. *Development in Practice* 14(1): 34-47. doi: 10.1080/0961452032000170613

Anner, Mark, Ian Greer, Marco Hauptmeier, Nathan Lillie, and Nik Winchester. 2006. The Industrial Determinants of Transnational Solidarity: Global Inter-Union Politics in Three Sectors. *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 12(1): 7-27. doi: 10.1177/0959680106061368

Annunziato, Frank R. 1988. Gramsci's Theory of Trade Unionism. *Rethinking Marxism* 1(2): 142-164. doi: 10.1080/08935698808657806

Anthias, Floya, and Nira Yuval-Davis. 2005. *Racialized Boundaries: Race, Nation, Gender, Colour and Class and the Anti-Racist Struggle*. New York: Routledge.

Arrighi, Giovanni. 2005. Hegemony Unravelling. *New Left Review* 32(March-April): 23-30. www.wildcat-www.de/dossiers/forcesoflabor/arrighi-hegemony-unravelling-2.pdf

Associated Press. 2011. "M15 Files Reveal Details of 1953 Coup that Overthrew British Guiana's Leaders." *The Guardian,* Friday 26 August. www.theguardian.com/world/2011/aug/26/mi5-files-coup-british-guiana

Arvin, Maile, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill. 2013. Decolonizing Feminism: Challenging Connections between Settler Colonialism and Heteropatriarchy. *Feminist Formations* 25 (1): 8-34. www.academia.edu/download/44035230/Arvin__Tuck__Morrill_Decolonizing_Feminism.pdf

Avery, Donald. 1979. *Dangerous Foreigners: European Immigrant Workers and Labour Radicalism in Canada, 1896–1932*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Baaz, Maria Eriksson. 2005. The Paternalism of Partnership: *A Postcolonial Reading of Identity in Development Aid.*
London: Zed Books.

———. 2007. Paternalism: the "Outside" or "Rejected Inside" of Partnership? *Glocal Times* (7).
http://130.241.16.45/ojs/index.php/gt/article/download/2531/2250

Babcock, Robert H. 1974. *Gompers in Canada: A Study in American Continentalism before the First World War.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Backhouse, Constance. 1999. *Colour-Coded: A Legal History of Racism in Canada, 1900–1950.*
Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Baines, Donna. 2001. Everyday Practices of Race, Class and Gender: Struggles, Skills, and Radical Social Work. *Journal of Progressive Human Services* 11(2): 5-27. doi:10.1300/J059v11n02_02

Balibar, Etienne. 1991. *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities.* London: Verso.

Bakan, Abigail and Yasmeen Abu-Laban. Palestinian Resistance and International Solidarity: The BDS Campaign. *Race & Class* 51(1): 29-54. doi: 10.1177/0306396809106162

Bannerji, Himani. 1993. *Returning the Gaze: Essays on Racism, Feminism and Politics.* Toronto: Sister Vision.

———. 1995. *Thinking through Essays on Feminism: Essays on Feminism, Marxism and Anti-Racism.*
Toronto: Women's Press.

———. 2000. *Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender.* Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

———. 2005. Building from Marx: Reflections on Class and Race. *Social Justice* 32(4): 144-160.
http://www.jstor.org/stable/29768341

Barry-Shaw, Nik, Yves Engler and Dru Oja-Jay. 2012. *Paved with Good Intentions: Canada's Development NGOs on the Road from Idealism to Imperialism.* Halifax: Fernwood.

Basdeo, Sahadeo. 1981. The Role of the British Labour Movement in the Development of Labour Organisation in Trinidad 1919–1929. *Social and Economic Studies* 30(3): 21-41.
www.jstor.org/stable/27861948

Bass III, George Nelson. 2012. "Organized Labor and U.S. Foreign Policy: The Solidarity Center in Historical Context." PhD diss., Miami: Florida International University.
http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1862&context=etd

Bieler, Andreas. 2005. European Integration and the Transnational Restructuring of Social Relations: The Emergence of Labour as a Regional Actor? *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 43(3): 461-484. doi:10.1111/j.0021-9886.2005.00565.x

Bieler, Andreas, Ingemar Lindberg, and Devan Pillay. 2008. *Labour and the Challenges of Globalization: What Prospects for Transnational Solidarity?* London: Pluto.

Bieler, Andreas, Ingemar Lindberg, and Werner Sauerborn. 2010. After 30 Years of Deadlock: Labour's Possible Strategies in the New Global Order. *Globalizations* 7(1): 247-260. doi: 10.1080/14747731003593653

Bieler, Andreas, Richard Higgott, and Geoffrey Underhill, eds. 2004. *Non-State Actors and Authority in the Global System.* New York: Routledge.

Bello, Walden. 2000. The Iron Cage: The World Trade Organization, the Bretton Woods Institutions, and the South. *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 11(1): 3-32. doi: 10.1080/10455750009358895

Boelhower, William Q. 1981. Antonio Gramsci's Sociology of Literature. *Contemporary Literature* 22(4): 574-599. www.jstor.org/stable/1207884

Bolaria, B. Singh, and Peter S. Li. 1988. *Racial Oppression in Canada.* Aurora, ON: Garamond.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2000. "This is a White Country:" The Racial Ideology of the Western Nations of the World-System. *Sociological Inquiry* 70(2): 188-214. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-682X.200.tb00905.x

Bonnell, Victoria E. 1980. The Uses of Theory, Concepts and Comparison in Historical Sociology. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22(2): 156-173. www.jstor.org/stable/178403

Bose, Pradip. 2005. *Social Democracy in Practice: Socialist International, 1951-2001.* Delhi, India: Authorspress.

Braedley, Susan, and Meg Luxton. 2010. *Neoliberalism and Everyday Life.* Kingston, ON: McGill–Queen's University Press.

Branch, Daniel. 2009. *Defeating Mau Mau, Creating Kenya: Counterinsurgency, Civil War, and Decolonization.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Brand, Dionne. 1999. "Black Women and Work: The Impact of Racially Constructed Gender Roles on the Sexual Division of Labour." In *Scratching the Surface: Canadian Anti-Racist Feminist Thought,* edited by Enakshi Dua and Angela Roberston, 83-96. Toronto: Women's Press.

Brand, Dionne, and Lois De Shield. 1991. *No Burden to Carry: Narratives of Black Working Women in Ontario, 1920s-1950s.* Toronto: Womens Press.

Braudel, Fernand. 1982. *Civilization and Capitalism, 15th–18th Century: The Wheels of Commerce.* Vol. 2. Translated by Sian Reynolds. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Briskin, Linda. 1980. "Domestic Labour: A Methodological Discussion." In *Hidden in the Household: Women's Domestic Labour Under Capitalism*, edited by Bonnie Fox, 135-72. Toronto: Women's Educational Press.

Brodkin, Karen. 2000. Global Capitalism: What's Race got to do with It? *American Ethnologist* 27(2): 237-256. doi: 10.1525/ae.2000.27.2.237

Buckner, P.A. and Carl Bridge. 2003. Reinventing the British World. *The Round Table* 92(368): 77-88. doi:10.1080/750456741.

Buhle, Paul. 1999. *Taking Care of Business: Samuel Gompers, George Meany, Lane Kirkland, and the Tragedy of American Labor.* New York: Monthly Review.

Bullen, John. 1983. The Ontario Waffle and the Struggle for an Independent Socialist Canada: Conflict within the NDP. *Canadian Historical Review* 64(2): 188-215. doi: 10.3138/CHR-064-02-04

Butler, Harold Beresford. 1939. *The International Labour Organization.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Callinicos, Alex. 2001. "Periodizing Capitalism and Analyzing Imperialism: Classical Marxism and Capitalist Evolution." In *Phases of Capitalist Development,* edited by Robert Albritton, 230-45. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave.

Calliste, Agnes. 1989. Canada's Immigration Policy and Domestics from the Caribbean: The Second Domestic Scheme. *Race, Class, Gender: Bonds and Barriers* (5): 133-165.

———. 1993. Race, Gender and Canadian Immigration Policy: Blacks from the Caribbean, 1900–1932. *Journal of Canadian Studies* 28(4): 131-48. http://gateway.proquest.com.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:rec:criticism:R04235553

———. 1995. The Struggle for Employment Equity by Blacks on American and Canadian Railroads. *Journal of Black Studies* 25(3): 297-317. doi:10.1177/002193479502500302

Canadian Association for Labour Israel Collection. Canadian Jewish Congress Charities Committee National Archives (CJCCC), Montréal, Québec.

Canadian Encyclopaedia Online. s.v. "Canadian Congress of Labour," http://www.thecanadianencyclopaedia.ca/en/article/canadian-congress-of-labour/

Canadian Encyclopaedia Online, s.v. "Donald MacDonald," http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/donald-macdonald/

Canadian Encyclopedia Online, s.v. "Sir Joseph Wesley Flavelle," http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/sir-joseph-wesley-flavelle/

Canadian Encyclopedia Online, s.v. "The Canadian Institute of International Affairs." http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/canadian-institute-of-international-affairs/

Canadian Labour Congress Archives. Canadian Labour Congress (CLC), Ottawa.

Canadian Labour Congress Fond, MG28-I103. Libraries and Archives Canada (LAC), Ottawa.

Canadian Labour Congress. Report of Convention Proceedings – 1956-1988. Libraries and Archives Canada, Ottawa.

Carew, Anthony. 1984. The Schism within the World Federation of Trade Unions: Government and Trade-Union Diplomacy. *International Review of Social History* 29(3): 297-335.

———. 1996a. Charles Millard, a Canadian in the International Labour Movement: A Case Study of the ICFTU 1955–61. *Labour/Le Travail* 37(37): 121-148. www.lltjournal.ca/index.php/llt/article/viewFile/5025/5894

———. 1996b. Conflict Within the ICFTU: Anti-Communism and Anti-Colonialism in the 1950s. *International Review of Social History* 41(2): 147-181. doi: 10.1017/S0020859000113859.

———. 1998. The American Labor Movement in Fizzland: The Free Trade Union Committee and the CIA. *Labor History* 39(1): 25-42. doi: 10.1080/00236679812331387276

———. 2000a. "Towards a Free Trade Union Centre: The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (1949–1972)." *The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions*, edited by Marcel van der Linden, 187-339. New York: Peter Lang.

———. 2000b. "A False Dawn: The World Federation of Trade Unions (1945–1949)." In *The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions*, edited by Marcel van der Linden, 161-184. New York: Peter Lang.

———. 2002. "Free Trade Unionism in the International Context." Paper Presented at the International Labour Movement on the Threshold of Two Centuries Conference, Stockholm, Sweden. www.arbark.se/2003/10/lectures-and-papers-international-labour-movement-workshop-oct-2002/

———. 2003. The Politics of Productivity and the Politics of Anti-Communism: American and European Labour in the Cold War. *Intelligence and National Security* 18(2): 73-91. doi: 10.1080/02684520412331306750

Carew, Anthony, Michel Dreyfus, Geert Van Goethem, Rebecca Gumbrell-McCormick and Marcel van der Linden. 2000. *The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions,* edited by Marcel van der Linden. New York: Peter Lang.

Carr, Barry. 1999. Globalization from Below: Labour Internationalism under NAFTA. *International Social Science Journal* 51(159): 49-59. http://www.academia.edu/download/31320486/Globalization_From_Below.pdf

Carr, E. H. 1946. Two Currents in World Labor. *Foreign Affairs* 25(1): 72-81. www.jstor.org/stable/20030020

Carroll, William K. 1986. *Corporate Power and Canadian Capitalism.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

———. 2009. Hegemony, Counter-Hegemony, Anti-Hegemony. *Socialist Studies/Études socialistes* 2 (2): 9-43. www.socialiststudies.com/index.php/sss/article/view/23790/17675

Carroll, William K., and Murray Shaw. 2001. Consolidating a Neoliberal Policy Bloc in Canada, 1976 to 1996. *Canadian Public Policy/Analyse de Politiques* 27(2): 195-217. www.academia.edu/download/33429081/carroll_and_shaw__consolidating_a_neoliberal_policy_bloc__2001.pdf

Carty, Linda. 1999. "The Discourse of Empire and the Social Construction of Gender." In *Scratching the Surface: Canadian Anti-Racist Feminist Thought*, edited by Enakshi Dua and Angela Robertson, 35-47. Toronto: Women's Press.

Carty, Linda, and Monisha Das Gupta. 2009. "Solidarity Work in Transnational Feminism." In *Activist Scholarship: Antiracism, Feminism and Social Change,* edited by Julia Sudbury and Margo Okazawa-Rey, 95-110. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Carty, Robert and Virginia Smith. 1981. *Perpetuating Poverty: The Political Economy of Canadian Foreign Aid.* Toronto: Between the Lines.

Castree, Noel. 2000. Geographic Scale and Grassroots Internationalism: The Liverpool Dock Dispute, 1995-98. *Economic Geography* 76(3): 272-92. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-8287.2000.tb00144.x

C.D. Howe Institute. Home page. Accessed March 2, 2015. https://www.cdhowe.org/

Chatterjee, Piya. 2009. "Transforming Pedagogies: Imagining Internationalist/Feminist/Antiracist Literacies." In *Activist Scholarship: Antiracism, Feminism and Social Change,* edited by Julia Sudbury and Margo Okazawa-Rey, 131-148. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Choudry, Aziz. 2014. Activist Research and Organizing: Blurring the Boundaries, Challenging the Binaries. *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 33(4): 472-87. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2013.867907

Choudry, Aziz and Adrian A. Smith eds. *Unfree Labour? Struggles of Migrant and Immigrant Workers in Canada.* Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Clark, David. 2002. Neoliberalism and public service reform: Canada in comparative perspective. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 35(04): 771-93. doi: 10.1017/S0008423902778438

Collombat, Thomas. 2011. "Several Souths: The Dynamics of the International Labour Movement in the Americas." PhD diss., Ottawa, ON: Carleton University. https://curve.carleton.ca/system/files/etd/2cb4808a-d495-41d1-b267-b3b18534e6a7/etd_pdf/594691038cead4b7d633be24a2af1508/collombat-severalsouthsthedynamicsoftheinternational.pdf

Collomp, Catherine. 2005. The Jewish Labor Committee, American Labor, and the Rescue of European Socialists, 1934–1941. *International Labor and Working-Class History* 68(1): 112-33. doi: 10.1017/S0147547905000220

Cooper, Frederick, and Ann Laura Stoler. 1997. *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2010. Place against Empire: Understanding Indigenous Anti-Colonialism. *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action* 4(2): 79-83. http://queens.scholarsportal.info/ojs/index.php/affinities/article/view/6141/5820

———. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cox, Robert W. 1979. Ideologies and the New International Economic Order: Reflections on some Recent Literature. *International Organization* 33(02): 257-302. www.jstor.org/stable/2706612

Creese, Gillian. 1987. Organizing against Racism in the Workplace: Chinese Workers in Vancouver before the Second World War. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 19(3): 29-40.

———. 1988. Exclusion or Solidarity? Vancouver Workers Confront The "Oriental Problem." *BC Studies* 80: 24-51. http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/bcstudies/article/download/1295/1337

———. 2007. Racializing Work/Reproducing White Privilege. In *Work in Tumultuous Times: Critical Perspectives*, edited by Shalla, Vivian, and Wallace Clement, 192-226. Kingston, ON: McGill–Queen's University Press.

Creese, Gillian, and Brandy Wiebe. 2012. "Survival Employment": Gender and Deskilling among African Immigrants in Canada. *International Migration* 50(5): 56-76. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2435.2009.00531.x

Crispo, John H. G. 1967. *The Role of International Unionism in Canada.* Washington, DC: Canadian-American Committee.

Critchlow, Donald T. 1976. Communist Unions and Racism: A Comparative Study of the Responses of United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers and the National Maritime Union to the Black Question during World War II. *Labor History* 17(2): 230-44. doi: 10.1080/00236567608584382

Dalla Costa, Mariarosa. 1972. "Women and the Subversion of the Community." In *The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community*, edited by Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James, 3rd, 21–56. Bristol, UK: Falling Wall.

Danaher, Kevin, ed. 1994. *50 Years is Enough: The Case Against the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.* Boston: South End.

Das Gupta, Tania. 1996. *Racism and Paid Work.* 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 1999. "The Politics of Multiculturalism: 'Immigrant Women' and the Canadian State.'" In *Scratching the Surface: Canadian Anti-Racist Feminist Thought*, edited by Enakshi Dua and Angela Robertson, 187-206. Toronto: Women's Press.

Das Gupta, Tania, Carl E. James and Roger C.A. Maaka. 2007. *Race and Racialization: Essential Readings.* Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Davis, Angela. 1981. *Women, Race and Class.* New York: Random House.

Davis, Mary. 2000. Labour Policy on Race and Empire: Origins and Development. *Contemporary Politics* 6(4): 383-93. doi: 10.1080/713658370

De Angelis, Massimo. D. 2000. Globalization, New Internationalism and the Zapatistas. *Capital & Class* 24(1): 9-35. doi: 10.1177/030981680007000102

Devinatz, Victor G. 2013. A Cold War Thaw in the International Working Class Movement? The World Federation of Trade Unions and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, 1967–1977. *Faculty Publications–Management and Quantitative Methods.* Paper 7. http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/fpmqm/7

Dua, Enakshi, Narda Razack, and Jody Nyasha Warner. 2005. Race, Racism, and Empire: Reflections on Canada. *Social Justice* 32(4)102: 1-10.

Dua, Enakshi, and Angela Robertson. 1999. *Scratching the Surface: Canadian Anti-Racist, Feminist Thought.* Toronto: Women's Press.

Du Bois, W.E.B. 1940. *Dusk of Dawn: An Essay Toward an Autobiography of a Race Concept.* New York: Harcourt, Brace.

———. 1989. *The Souls of Black Folk.* New York: Penguin.

Dei, George. J. 1996. Critical Perspectives in Antiracism: An Introduction. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 33(3): 247-267.

DeVault, Marjorie L. 1999. *Liberating Method: Feminism and Social Research*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Dreiling, Michael, and Ian Robinson. 1998. Union Responses to NAFTA in the US and Canada: Explaining Intra-and International Variation. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 3(2): 163-184. doi: doi:10.17813/maiq.3.2.w86063127ht4kj33

Early, Steve. 2008. "Teachers Beat SEIU Raid." *Labornotes,* October 24. http://labornotes.org/2008/10/puertorico%E2%80%99-teachers-beat-seiu-raid

Easterbrook, William Thomas, and Mel Watkins. 1984. *Approaches to Canadian Economic History: A Selection of Essays* 31. Kingston, ON: McGill–Queen's University Press.

Elbaum, Max, and Robert Seltzer. 2004. *The Labour Aristocracy: The Material Basis for Opportunism in the Labour Movement*. Newtown, Australia: Resistance Books.

Endicott, Stephen. 2012. *Raising the Workers' Flag: The Workers' Unity League of Canada, 1930–1936*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Engels, Frederich. 1845. *Condition of the Working Class in England*. www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/condition-working-class/ch10.htm

———. 1972. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*. New York: Pathfinder.

Engler, Yves. 2010. *Canada and Israel: Building Apartheid*. Brunswick Books.

Epp, Marlene, Franca Iacovetta, and Frances Swyripa. 2004. *Sisters or Strangers?: Immigrant, Ethnic, and Racialized Women in Canadian History*. 1st ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Evans, Peter. 2014. National Labor Movements and Transnational Connections: Global Labor's Evolving Architecture Under Neoliberalism. Working paper #116-14. Berkeley: University of California Berkeley: Institute for Research on Labor and Employment. September. http://escholarship.org/uc/item/87b4t45z

Fanelli, Carlo, and Mark P. Thomas. 2011. Austerity, Competitiveness and Neoliberalism Redux: Ontario Responds to the Great Recession. *Socialist Studies/Études socialistes* 7(1/2). http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/sss/article/viewFile/23614/17498

Fanon, Frantz. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove.

———. 1967. *A Dying Colonialism*. New York: Grove.

———. 2008. *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove.

Fanon, Frantz, Haakon Chevalier, and François Maspero. 1988. *Toward the African Revolution: Political Essays*. New York: Grove.

Featherstone, David. 2012. *Solidarity: Hidden Histories and Geographies of Internationalism.* London: Zed Books.

Federici, Silvia. 2011. Women, Land Struggles, and the Reconstruction of the Commons. *WorkingUSA* 14(1): 41-56. doi: 10.1111/j.1743-4580.2010.00319.x

———. 2012. Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Ferguson, Susan, and David McNally. 2014. Precarious Migrants: Gender, Race and the Social Reproduction of a Global Working Class. *Socialist Register* 51: 1-23. http://socialistregister.com.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/index.php/srv/article/view/22092#.V5a2sY6RVE4

Filippelli, Ronald L.1989. *American Labor and Postwar Italy, 1943–1953: A Study of Cold War Politics.* Standford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fletcher Jr, Bill, and Fernando Gapasin. 2008. *Solidarity Divided: The Crisis in Organized Labor and a New Path Toward Social Justice.* 1 ed. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Forman, Michael. 1998. *Nationalism and the International Labor Movement: The Idea of the Nation in Socialist and Anarchist Theory.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Foster, John Bellamy, Robert W. McChesney, and R. Jamil Jonna. 2011. The Global Reserve Army of Labor and the New Imperialism. *Monthly Review* 63(6): 1-31. http://monthlyreview.org/archives/2011/volume-63-issue-06-november-2011/

Foster, William Z. 1956. *Outline History of the World Trade Union Movement.* New York: International.

Folly, Martin H. 1988. Breaking the Vicious Circle: Britain, the United States, and the Genesis of the North Atlantic Treaty. *Diplomatic History* 12(1): 59-77. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7709.1988.tb00029.x

Fougner, Tore, and Ayça Kurtoğlu. 2011. Transnational Labour Solidarity and Social Movement Unionism: Insights from and Beyond a Women Workers' Strike in Turkey. *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 49(2): s353-s375. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8543.2010.00801.x

Frager, Ruth A. 1989. Class and Ethnic Barriers to Feminist Perspectives in Toronto's Jewish Labour Movement, 1919–1939. *Studies in Political Economy* 30: 143-65. http://resolver.scholarsportal.info/resolve/07078552/v30inone/nfp_caebtfpitjlm

———. 1992. *Sweatshop Strife: Class, Ethnicity, and Gender in the Jewish Labour Movement of Toronto, 1900-1939.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 1999. Labour History and the Interlocking Hierarchies of Class, Ethnicity, and Gender: A Canadian Perspective. *International Review of Social History* 44(2): 217-247. doi: 10.1017/S0020859099000486

Frager, Ruth, and Carmela Patrias. 2013. "Ethnic, Class and Gender Dynamics among Jewish Labour Activists and Jewish Human Rights Activists." *Canadian Jewish Studies/Études juives canadiennes* 21(1): 143-160.
http://cjs.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/cjs/article/viewFile/39914/36129

Frank, Billy, Craig Horner, and David Stewart, eds. 2010. *The British Labour Movement and Imperialism.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Scholars'.

Frank, Dana. 1998. White Working-Class Women and the Race Question. *International Labor and Working-Class History* 54: 80-102. doi: 10.1017/S0147547900006220

———. 2000. *Buy American: The Untold Story of Economic Nationalism.* Boston: Beacon.

———. 2004. Where is the History of U.S. Labor and International Solidarity? Part I: A Moveable Feast. *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas.* 1(1): 95-119.
doi: 10.1215/15476715-1-1-95

Freeman, Linda. 1997. *The Ambiguous Champion: Canada and South Africa in the Trudeau and Mulroney Years.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Fudge, Judy, and Leah F. Vosko. 2001. Gender, Segmentation and the Standard Employment Relationship in Canadian Labour Law, Legislation and Policy. *Economic and Industrial Democracy.* 22(2): 271-310. doi: 10.1177/0143831X01222005

Gagnon, Mona-Josée, Thomas Collombat, and Pierre Avignon. 2006. The International Activities of Trade Unions: A Sociohistorical Analysis Based on the Case of Quebec. *Studies in Political Economy* 78(1): 7-40.

Gajewska, Katarzyna. 2009. *Transnational Labour Solidarity: Mechanisms of Commitment to Cooperation Within the European Trade Union Movement.* London: Routledge.

Gandall, Marv. 1986. "Foreign Affairs: The CLC Abroad," *This Magazine* 19(6): 4-10.

Ghigliani, Pablo. 2005. International Trade Unionism in a Globalizing World: A Case Study of New Labour Internationalism. *Economic and Industrial Democracy 26*(3): 359-382.
doi: 10.1177/0143831X05054740

Gibbs, David N. 2001. Washington's New Interventionism: US Hegemony and Inter-Imperialist Rivalries. *Monthly Review* 53(4): 15-37.
http://www.dgibbs.faculty.arizona.edu/sites/dgibbs.faculty.arizona.edu/files/mr-03_0.pdf

Gilbert, Alan. 1978. Marx on Internationalism and War. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 7(4): 346-369.

Gill, Stephen. 1991. *American Hegemony and the Trilateral Commission.* Cambridge,: Cambridge University Press.

Gindin, Sam. 1989. Breaking Away: The Formation of the Canadian Auto Workers. *Studies in Political Economy* 29: 657-95. doi: 10.7202/050971ar

———. 1995. *The Canadian Auto Workers: The Birth and Transformation of a Union.* Toronto: James Lorimer.

Gindin, Sam, and Jim Stanford. 2003. Canadian Labour and the Political Economy of Transformation. In *Changing Canada: Political Economy as Transformation,* edited by Wallace Clement and Leah F. Vosko, 422-442. Montréal, QC: McGill–Queen's University Press.

Glassman, Jim. 2006. Primitive Accumulation, Accumulation by Dispossession, Accumulation by "Extra-Economic" Means. *Progress in Human Geography* 30(5): 608–25. doi: 10.1177/0309132506070172

Goldberg, David Theo. 1993. *Racist Culture.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

———. 2002. *The Racial State.* Maiden, MA: Blackwell.

———. 2008. Racisms without Racism. *PMLA* 123(5): 1712-1716.

Gordon, Todd. 2007. Towards an Anti-Racist Marxist State Theory: A Canadian Case Study. *Capital & Class* 31(1): 1-29. doi: 10.1177/030981680709100102

———. 2009. Canada, Empire and Indigenous People in the Americas. *Socialist Studies/Études socialistes* 2(1): 47-75. https://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/sss/article/download/23795/17680

———. 2010. *Imperialist Canada.* Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring.

———. 2011. "Military Coups are Good for Canadian Business: The Canada–Honduras Free Trade Agreement." *The Bullet.*

Gordon, Todd, and Jeffery R. Webber. 2008. Imperialism and Resistance: Canadian Mining Companies in Latin America. *Third World Quarterly* 29(1): 63-87. doi: 10.1080/01436590701726509

Goutor, David. 2005. "Drawing Different Lines of Color: The Mainstream English Canadian Labour Movement's Approach to Blacks and the Chinese, 1880-1914." *Labor* 2 (1): 55-76.

———. 2007a. *Guarding the Gates: The Canadian Labour Movement and Immigration, 1872–1934.* Vancouver, B.C.: University of British Columbia Press.

———. 2007b. Constructing the "Great Menace": Canadian Labour's Opposition to Asian Immigration, 1880–1914. *Canadian Historical Review* 88(4): 549-76. doi: 10.1177/0309132506070172

———. 2011. A Different Perspective on the "Labor Rights as Human Rights" Debate: Organized Labor and Human Rights Activism in Canada, 1939-1952. *Labor Studies Journal.* 36(3): 408-427. doi: 10.1177/0160449X11418003

Goutor, David, and Chris Ramsaroop. 2010. "No Thanksgiving for Migrant Workers." *Toronto Star.* October 8.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci.* edited by Quintin Hoare and Georffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.

Grant, John. 1992. *Blood Brothers: The Division and Decline of Britain's Trade Unions.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Greenstein, Tony. 2009. Histadrut: Israel's Racist "Trade Union." *The Electronic Intifada.* http://electronicintifada.net/content/histadrut-israels-racist-trade-union/8121

Grele, Ronald. 1975. *Envelopes of Sound: Six Practitoners Discuss the Method, Theory, and Practice of Oral History and Oral Testimony.* Chicago: Precedent.

Gumbrell-McCormick, Rebecca. 2000. "Facing New Challenges: The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (1972–1990s)." In *The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions*, edited by Marcel van der Linden, 341-517. New York: Peter Lang.

Güntzel, Ralph P. 1993. The Confédération des syndicats nationaux (CSN), the Idea of Independence, and the Sovereigntist Movement, 1960–1980. *Labour/Le Travail* 31(Spring): 145-173. http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/stable/25143672

Gupta, Partha Sarathi. 1975. *Imperialism and the British Labour Movement, 1914-1964*. London: MacMillan.

Hahn, Peter L. 2001. "The Influence of Organized Labor on U.S. Policy toward Israel, 1945-1967." In *Empire and Revolution: The United States and the Third World Since 1945*, edited by Peter L. Hahn and Heiss Mary Ann, 154-177. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press http://www.ohiostatepress.org/Books/Complete%PDFs/Hahn%20Empire/08.pdf

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2001. *Empire.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harrison, Hubert. 2001. *A Hubert Harrison Reader.* Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Harrison, James. 2008. International Labour Organization. *The International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law* 23(1):125-135. doi: 10.1163/092735208X272247.

Harrod, Jeffrey. 1972a. "Multi-National Corporations, Trade Unions and Industrial Relations: A Case Study of Jamaica." In *Transnational Industrial Relations: The Impact of Multi-National Corporations and Economic Regionalism on Industrial Relations*, edited by Hans Günter, 173-94. Toronto: Macmillan.

———. 1972b. *Trade Union Foreign Policy: A Study of British and American Trade Union Activities in Jamaica.* New York: Doubleday.

Harvey, David. 2003. The New Imperialism. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2006. *Spaces of Global Capitalism: A Theory of Uneven Geographical Development*. New York: Verso.

———. 2007a. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2007b. In What Ways Is "The New Imperialism" Really New? *Historical Materialism* 15(3): 57-70. doi: 10.1163/156920607X225870

———. 2007c. Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 610(1): 21–44. doi: 10.1177/0002716206296780

Harvey, Lee. 1990. *Critical Social Research*. Boston: Unwim Hyman.

Hawkins, Carroll. 1973. *Two Democratic Labor Leaders in Conflict: The Latin American Revolution and the Role of the Workers*. Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Heron, Craig. 1984. Labourism and the Canadian Working Class. *Labour / Le Travail* 13(Spring): 45-75.

———. 1989. *The Canadian Labour Movement: A Short History*. Toronto: Lorimer.

———. 1998. *The Workers' Revolt in Canada, 1917–1925*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Heron, Craig, and Myer Siemiatycki. 1998. "The Great War, the State, and Working-Class Canada." In *The Workers' Revolt in Canada, 1917–1925,* edited by Craig Heron, 11-42. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Herod, Andrew. 1997. *Labor as an Agent of Globalization and as a Global Agent*. Vol. 185: New York: Guilford Press.

———. 1998. *Organizing the Landscape: Geographical Perspectives on Labor Unionism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2000. Implications of Just-in-Time Production for Union Strategy: Lessons from the 1998 General Motors-United Auto Workers Dispute. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90(3): 521-547. doi: 10.1111/0004-5608.00207

———. 2001. Labor Internationalism and the Contradictions of Globalization: Or, why the Local is sometimes still Important in a Global Economy. *Antipode* 33(3): 407-426. doi: 10.1111/1467-8330.00191

———. 2003. Geographies of Labor Internationalism. *Social Science History* 27(4): 501-523.

High, Steven. 1996. Native Wage Labour and Independent Production during the "Era of Irrelevance." *Labour/Le Travail* 37(Spring): 243-264.

———. 2001. "I'll Wrap the F*** Canadian Flag Around Me": A Nationalist Response to Plant Shutdowns, 1969–1984. *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 12(1): 199-225. doi: 10.7202/031148ar

Hirsch, Fred. 1974. *An Analysis of Our AFL-CIO Role in Latin America.* San Jose, CA*:* Self-published.

Hodkinson, Stuart. 2005. Is There a New Trade Union Internationalism? The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions' Response to Globalization, 1996-2002. *Labour Capital and Society* 38(1/2): 36-65. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43158587

Holmstrom, Nancy. 1981. "Women's Work," the Family and Capitalism. *Science & Society* 45(2): 186–211. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40402313

Hopkins, Terence K., and Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein. *The Age of Transition: Trajectory of the World System, 1945-2025.* Palgrave Macmillan, 1996.

Hooks, Bell. 2000. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center.* London: Pluto.

Horne, Gerald. 1999. Race from Power: US Foreign Policy and the General Crisis of "White Supremacy." *Diplomatic History* 23(3): 437-461. doi: 10.1111/0145-2096.00176

———. 2007. *Cold War in a Hot Zone: The United States Confronts Labor and Independence Struggles in the British West Indies.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

———. 2009. *Mau Mau in Harlem?: The U.S. and the Liberation of Kenya.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Horowitz, Gad. 1968. *Canadian Labour in Politics.* Vol. 73: Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Howard, Andrew. 1995. Global Capital and Labor Internationalism in Comparative Historical Perspective: A Marxist Analysis. *Sociological Inquiry* 65(3-4): 365-394. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-682X.1995.tb00423.x

Howard, Victor. 1987. *The Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion: The Canadian Contingent in the Spanish Civil War.* Vol. 137. Kingston, ON: McGill–Queen's University Press.

Howe, Carolyn. 1986. The Politics of Class Compromise in an International Context: Considerations for a New Strategy for Labor. *Review of Radical Political Economics* 18(3): 1-22. doi: 10.1177/048661348601800301

Hunt, Gerald and David Rayside. 2000. Labor Union Response to Diversity in Canada and the United States. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society* 39(3): 401-44. doi: 10.1111/0019-8676.00174

———. 2007. *Equity, Diversity, and Canadian Labour.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hyde, Justin. 2008. "GM's 'Engine Charlie' Wilson Learned to Live with a Misquote." *Detroit Free Press,* September 14.

Hyman, Richard. 1971. *Marxism and the Sociology of Trade Unionism.* London: Pluto.

———. 1975. *Industrial Relations: A Marxist Introduction.* London: Macmillan.

———. 1999. "Imagined Solidarities: Can Trade Unions Resist Globalization?" In *Globalization and Labour Relations*, edited by Peter Leisink, 94-115. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. http://globalsolidarity.antenna.nl/hyman2.html

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

———. 2005. Shifting Dynamics in International Trade Unionism: Agitation, Organisation, Bureaucracy, Diplomacy. *Labor History* 46(2): 137-54. doi: 10.1080/00236560500080758.

———. 2011. "Trade Unions, Global Competition and Options for Solidarity." In *Global Restructuring, Labour and the Challenges for Transnational Solidarity,* edited by Andreas Bieler, and Ingemar Lindberg, 16-30. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Hyslop, Jonathan. 1999. The Imperial Working Class Makes Itself "White:" White Labourism in Britain, Australia, and South Africa before the First World War. *Journal of Historical Sociology* 12(4): 398-421. doi: 10.1111/1467-6443.00098

Iacovetta, Franca. 2000. Recipes for Democracy? Gender, Family, and Making Female Citizens in Cold War Canada. *Canadian Woman Studies* 20(2): 12-21. http://cws.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/cws/article/download/7604/6735

Iacovetta, Franca, Roberto Perin, and Angelo Principe. 2000. *Enemies Within: Italian and Other Internees in Canada and Abroad.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Innis, Harold Adams. 1933. *Problems of Staple Production in Canada.* Toronto: Ryerson Press.

———. 1999. *The Fur Trade in Canada: An Introduction to Canadian Economic History.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Jakobsen, Kjeld A. 2001. Rethinking the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and its Inter-American Regional Organization. *Antipode* 33(3): 363-383. doi: 10.1111/1467-8330.00189

Jakubowski, Lisa Marie. 1997. *Immigration and the Legalization of Racism.* Halifax, NS: Fernwood.

James, Cyril Lionel Robert, Raya Dunayevskaya, and Grace Lee Boggs. 1969. *State Capitalism and World Revolution.* Detroit: Facing Reality.

James, Cyril Lionel Robert, and Anna Grimshaw. 1992. *The C.L.R. James Reader.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Jiwani, Yasmin. 2005. The Great White North Encounters September 11: Race, Gender, and Nation in Canada's National Daily, "The Globe and Mail." *Social Justice* 32(4): 50-68.

Johns, Rebecca A. 1998. Bridging the Gap Between Class and Space: US Worker Solidarity with Guatemala. *Economic Geography* 74(3)102: 252–271. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-8287.1998.tb00115.x

Johnston, Hugh JM. 2014. *The Voyage of the Komagata Maru: The Sikh Challenge to Canada's Colour Bar.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Jones, Howard. 1997. *"A New Kind of War": America's Global Strategy and the Truman Doctrine in Greece.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Joseph, Raphael M.H. 1975. Nascent Unions: A Study of Trade Union Development and Labour Relations in the English-Speaking Caribbean with Particular Reference to Jamaica, Antigua, Trinidad and Tobago. Memorial University, Newfoundland.

Judd, Carol M. 1980. Native Labour and Social Stratification in the Hudson's Bay Company's Northern Department, 1770-1870. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 17(4): 305-14. doi: 10.1111/j.1755-618X.1980.tb00707.x

Kaplan, Lawrence S. 1993. The Monroe Doctrine and the Truman Doctrine: The Case of Greece. *Journal of the Early Republic* 13(1): 1-21. doi: 10.2307/3124186

Kaur, Rajender. 2012. The Komagata Maru in History and Literary Narrative: Cultural Memory, Representation, and Social Justice. *South Asian Popular Culture* 10(2): 151–65. doi: 10.1080/14746689.2012.682867

Kazimi, Ali. 2011. *Undesirables: White Canada and the Komagata Maru: An Illustrated History.* Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.

Kay, Tamara. 2005. Labor Transnationalism and Global Governance: The Impact of NAFTA on Transnational Labor Relationships in North America. *American Journal of Sociology* 111(3): 715-56. doi: 10.1086/497305

———. 2011. *NAFTA and the Politics of Labor Transnationalism.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kelley, Robin D. G. 2003. *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination.* Boston: Beacon.

Kellogg, Paul. 1989. State, Capital and World Economy: Bukharin's Marxism and the "Dependency/Class" Controversy in Canadian Political Economy. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 22(2): 337-362. www.jstor.org.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/stable/

Kinsman, Gary William. 1987. *The Regulation of Desire: Sexuality in Canada.* Montreal: Black Rose.

———. 1991. "Homosexuality" Historically Reconsidered Challenges Heterosexual Hegemony. *Journal of Historical Sociology* 4(2): 91-111. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6443.1991.tb00098.x

Kinsman, Gary William, and Patrizia Gentile. 2010. *The Canadian War on Queers: National Security as Sexual Regulation.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Klassen, David Jerome. 2007. "Canada, Globalization, Imperialism: Rethinking Canada's Role in a Neoliberal World." PhD diss., Toronto: York University.

———. 2009. Canada and the New Imperialism: The Economics of a Secondary Power. *Studies in Political Economy* 83(Spring): 163-190. http://spe.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/spe/article/view/6083

Klassen, Jerome, and Gregory Albo. 2013. *Empire's Ally: Canada and the War in Afghanistan.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Knowles, William H. 1959. *Trade Union Development and Industrial Relations in the British West Indies.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Kofas, Jon V. 2002. U.S. Foreign Policy and the World Federation of Trade Unions, 1944–1948. *Diplomatic History* 26(1): 21-60. doi: 10.1111/1467-7709.00299.

Kordan, Bohdan S. 2002. *Enemy Aliens, Prisoners of War: Internment in Canada During the Great War.* Montreal: McGill–Queen's University Press.

Kulchyski, Peter Keith. 2007. *The Red Indians: An Episodic, Informal Collection of Tales from the History of Aboriginal People's Struggles in Canada.* Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring.

———. 2015. Trail to Tears: Concerning Modern Treaties in Northern Canada. *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 35(1): 69-81. http://libaccess.mcmaster.ca/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1753235580?accountid=12347

Kulchyski, Peter, and Warren Bernauer. 2014. Modern Treaties, Extraction, and Imperialism in Canada's Indigenous North: Two Case Studies. *Studies in Political Economy* 93(1): 3-24. http://spe.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/spe/article/download/21330/17390

Lake, Marilyn. 2003. White Man's Country: The Trans-National History of a National Project. *Australian Historical Studies* 34(122): 346-363. doi: 10.1080/10314610308596259

Lambert, Robert and Eddie Webster. 2001. Southern Unionism and the New Labour Internationalism. *Antipode* 33(3): 337-362. doi: 10.1111/1467-8330.00188

Langford, Tom. 1996. Effects of Strike Participation on the Political Consciousness of Canadian Postal Workers. *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations* 51(3): 563-585. doi: 10.7202/051117ar

———. 2015. "International Labour Solidarity and Union Democracy: Lessons from the Crowsnest Pass, 1945–1975." Paper Presented at Annual Conference of the Canadian Sociological Association, Ottawa.

Larres, Klaus. 2002. North Atlantic Treaty Organization. *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Relations: Studies of the Principal Movements and Ideas*, 573–93. www.americanforeignrelations.com/E-N/North-Atlantic-Treaty-Organization.html

Lawrence, Bonita. 2003. Gender, Race, and the Regulation of Native identity in Canada and the United States: An Overview. *Hypatia* 18(2): 3-31. doi: 10.2979/HYP.2003.18.2.3

Laxer, James, and Robert M. Laxer. 1977. *The Liberal Idea of Canada: Pierre Trudeau and the Question of Canada's Survival.* Toronto: J. Lorimer.

Lefeber, Louis. 1989. The Socialist Experience in Greece. *International Journal of Political Economy* 19(4): 32-55. www.jstor.org/stable/40470531

Lehr, John C. 1977. The Government and the Immigrant: Perspectives on Ukrainian Block Settlement in the Canadian West. *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Etudes Ethniques au Canada* 9(2): 42-53.

Leier, Mark. 1990. *Where the Fraser River Flows: The IWW in British Columbi*a. Vancouver: New Star.

Lembcke, J. 1980. The International Woodworkers of America in British Columbia, 1942-1951. *Labour/Le Travail.* 6(Autumn): 113-48. http://www.lltjournal.ca/index.php/llt/article/viewFile/2534/2937

Lenin, Vladimir Ilich. 1940. *Left Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder.* New York: International. https://media.8ch.net/freedu/src/1459265632026.pdf

———. 1969a. *Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism.* New York: International.

———. 1969b. *What is to be Done? Burning Questions of our Movement.* New York: International.

Leroux, Darryl. 2008. Review: Sunera Thobani, Exalted Subjects: Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 33(2): 442-44. http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/stable/canajsocicahican.33.2.442

Lichtenstein, Nelson. 2013. *State of the Union: A Century of American Labor.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lipman, Pauline. 2005. Educational Ethnography and the Politics of Globalization, War, and Resistance. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 36(4): 315-328. doi:10.2307/3651359

Lipton, Charles. 1978. *The Trade Union Movement of Canada, 1827–1959.* Toronto: NC Press.

Little, Daniel. "False Consciousness." Accessed July 12, 2015.
www.personal.umd.umich.edu/~delittle/iess%20false%20consciousness%20V2.htm

Litvak, Isaiah A., and Christopher J. Maule. 1975. Nationalisation in the Caribbean Bauxite Industry. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs)* 51(1): 43-59.

Lucio, Miguel M. 2010. Dimensions of Internationalism and the Politics of the Labour Movement: Understanding the Political and Organisational Aspects of Labour Networking and Co-ordination. *Employee Relations 32*(6): 538-56. doi: 10.1108/01425451011083618

Luciuk, Lubomyr Y. 2006. *Without Just Cause: Canada's First National Internment Operations and the Ukrainian Canadians, 1914–1920*. Ukrainian Canadian Civil Liberties Association. Kingston, ON: Kashtan.

Luckhardt, Ken. 1999. "International Working Class Solidarity: From the Cold War Back to the Class War," *Briarpatch*, October.

———. 2006. "Unionists and the Anti-Apartheid Struggle: Lessons from the South African Experience," *Relay: A Socialist Project Review,* November/December. http://www.socialistproject.ca/relay/relay14.pdf

Luckhardt, Ken and Brenda Wall. 1980. *Organize or Starve: History of the South African Congress of Trade Unions*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Luxemburg, Rosa. 1976. *The National Question: Selected Writings*. New York: Monthly Review.

Luxton, Meg, and June Shirley Corman. 2001. *Getting by in Hard Times: Gendered Labour at Home and on the Job*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

MacDowell, Laurel Sefton. 1988. The Career of a Canadian Trade Union Leader: CH Millard 1937–1946. *Relations industrielles* 43(3): 609-632. doi: 10.7202/050435ar

MacDowell, Laurel Sefton, and Ian Radforth. 2006. *Canadian Working-Class History: Selected Readings*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Machel, Samora. 1975. *Mozambique, Sowing the Seeds of Revolution*. London: Committee for Freedom in Mozambique.

Mackey, Eva. 1998. *House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*. New York: Routledge.

MacShane, Denis. 1992. *International Labour and the Origins of the Cold War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mainwaring, John. 1986. *The International Labour Organization: A Canadian View*. Ottawa: Labour Canada.

Mamdani, Mahmood. 2001. Beyond Settler and Native as Political Identities: Overcoming the Political Legacy of Colonialism. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43(04): 651-64. http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/stable/2696665

Man, Guida. 2004. Gender, Work and Migration: Deskilling Chinese Immigrant Women in Canada. *Women's Studies International Forum* 27(2): 135-48. doi: 10.1016/j.wsif.2004.06.004

Manley, John. 1994. Canadian Communists, Revolutionary Unionism, and the "Third Period:" The Workers' Unity League, 1929-1935. *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association/Revue de la Société historique du Canada* 5(1): 167-94. doi: 10.7202/031078ar

———. 2002. "Communists love Canada!": The Communist Party of Canada, the "People" and the Popular Front, 1933–1939. *Journal of Canadian Studies* 36(4): 59-86.

Marshall, Judith. 2009. "Learning Democracy from North–South Worker Exchanges." In *Learning/Work: Turning Work and Lifelong Learning Inside Out,* edited by Linda Cooper and Shirley Walters, 252-69. Cape Town, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council Press.

Marshall, Judith, and Jorge Garcia-Orgales. 2005. "Building Capacity for Global Action: Steelworkers' Humanity Fund." In *Paths to Union Renewal: Canadian Experiences*, edited by Pradeep Kumar and Chris Schenk, 221-34. Calgary: Broadview.

Marx, Karl. 1990. *Capital: Volume 1: A Critique of Political Economy.* Toronto: Penguin.

Marx, Karl and Fredrich Engels. 1970. *The German Ideology.* New York: International.

McDonough, T. 1995. Lenin, Imperialism, and the Stages of Capitalist Development. *Science & Society* 59(3): 339-367. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40403507

McKay, Ian and Suzanne Morton. 1998. "The Maritimes: Expanding the Circle of Resistance." In *The Workers' Revolt in Canada, 1917–1925*, edited by Craig Heron, 43-86. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

McFarlane, Peter. 1989. *Northern Shadows: Canadians in Central America.* Toronto: Between the Lines.

McNally, David. 1991. Beyond Nationalism, Beyond Protectionism: Labour and the Canada-US Free Trade Agreement. *Capital & Class* 15(1): 233-52. doi: 10.1177/030981689104300111

———. 1999. Turbulence in the World Economy. *Monthly Review* 51(2): 38-52.

Mendoza, Breny. 2002. Transnational Feminisms in Question. *Feminist Theory* 3(3): 295-314. doi: 10.1177/146470002762492015

Mies, M. 1998. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour.* London: Zed Books.

Mills, Charles Wade. 1994. Revisionist Ontologies: Theorizing White Supremacy. *Social and Economic Studies* 43(3): 105-134. http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/stable/27865977

———. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

———. 2003. "White Supremacy as Sociopolitical System: A Philosophical Perspective." In *White Out: The Continuing Significance of Racism*, edited by Ashley W. Doane and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, 35-48. New York: Routledge.

———. 2008. Racial Liberalism. *PMLA* 123(5): 1380-1397. www.jstor.org/stable/25501942

Mills, Sean. 2010. *The Empire Within: Postcolonial Thought and Political Activism in Sixties Montreal.* Montreal: McGill–Queen's University Press.

Mills, Suzanne, and Brendan Sweeney. 2013. Employment Relations in the Neostaples Resource Economy: Impact Benefit Agreements and Aboriginal Governance in Canada's Nickel Mining Industry. *Studies in Political Economy* 91(1): 7-34. http://spe.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/spe/article/view/19965

Mitchell, Tom, and James Naylor. 1998. "The Prairies: In the Eye of the Storm." *The Workers' Revolt in Canada, 1917–1925*, edited by Craig Heron, 176-230. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Moghadam, Valentine M. 2005. *Globalizing Women: Transnational Feminist Networks*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 2003. *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books.

———. 2004. Towards an Anti-Imperialist Politics: Reflections of a Desi Feminist. *South Asian Popular Culture* 2(1): 69-73. doi: 10.1080/1474668042000210528.

Mojab, Shahrzad. 2006. Gender, Nation and Diaspora: Kurdish Women in Feminist Transnational struggles. In *Muslim Diaspora: Gender, Culture and Identity*, edited by Haideh Moghissi, 116-132. New York: Routledge.

Moody, Kim. 1997. Towards an International Social-Movement Unionism. *New Left Review* (225): 52-72. https://newleftreview-org.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/I/225/kim-moody-towards-an-international-social-movement-unionism

Moore, Steve and Debi Wells. 1975. *Imperialism and the National Question in Canada.* Toronto: Moore.

Morrison, David R. 1998. *Aid and Ebb Tide: A History of CIDA and Canadian Development Assistance*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Morton, Desmond. 1974. Sir William Otter and Internment Operations in Canada during the First World War. *Canadian Historical Review* 55(1): 32-58. doi: 10.3138/CHR-055-01-02

Munck, Ronaldo. 1988. *The New International Labour Studies: An Introduction*. London: Zed Books.

———. 2002. *Globalisation and Labour: The New "Great Transformation."* London: Zed Books.

———. 2004. *Labour and Globalisation: Results and Prospects*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

———. 2008. Globalisation and Trade Unions: Towards a Multi-Level Strategy? *Work Organisation, Labour and Globalisation* 2(1): 11-23.

———. 2010a. Marxism and Nationalism in the Era of Globalization. *Capital & Class* 34(1): 45-53. doi: 10.1177/0309816809353482.

———. 2010b. Globalization and the Labour Movement: Challenges and Responses. *Global Labour Journal* 1(2): 218-232. https://escarpmentpress.org/globallabour/article/download/1073/1129

Munro, John. 2009. "The Anticolonial Front: Cold War Imperialism and the Struggle against Global White Supremacy, 1945-1960." Phd diss., Santa Barbara, CA: University of California, Santa Barbara.

Murphy, Michael J. 1986. "The Canadian International Development Agency and the Canadian Labour Congress: A Developing Partnership." M.A. Thesis. Saskatoon, SK: University of Saskatchewan.

Nagar, Richa. 2002. Footloose Researchers, "Traveling" Theories, and the Politics of Transnational Feminist Praxis. *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 9(2): 179-186. doi: 10.1080/09663960220139699

Nastovski, Katherine. 2011. Review: AFL-CIO's Secret War against Developing Country Workers: Solidarity or Sabotage? by Kim Scipes. *Labour/Le Travail* 67 (1): 246-8. https://muse-jhu-edu.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/article/433318

———. 2013. Review: In the Interest of Democracy: The Rise and Fall of the Early Cold War Alliance Between the American Federation of Labor and the Central Intelligence Agency, by Quenby Olmsted Hughes. *Labour/Le Travail* 71(Spring): 278-80. https://muse-jhu-edu.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/article/507950

———. 2014. Workers Confront Apartheid: Comparing Canadian Labor Solidarity Campaigns against South African and Israeli Apartheid. *WorkingUSA* 17(2): 211-237. doi: 10.1111/wusa.12108

———. 2015. "Problematizing International Labour Solidarity as Development Aid." In

Last Call for Solidarity: Opportunities and Limits of Transnational Solidarity of Trade Unions and Social Movements, edited by Shuwen Bian, Sarah Bormann, Martina Hartung, Jenny Jungehülsing, and Florian Schubert, 186-200. Hamburg, Germany: VSA Verlag.

Naylor, James. 1998. Southern Ontario: Striking at the Ballot Box. In *The Workers' Revolt in Canada 1917–1925*, edited by Craig Heron, 144-75. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Naylor, Robin T. 2014. *Canada in the European Age, 1453–1919*. Kingston, ON: McGill–Queen's University Press.

Nederveen Pieterse, Jan. 2004. *Globalization or Empire?* New York: Routledge.

Ness, Immanuel ed. 2014. *New Forms of Worker Organization: The Syndicalist and Autonomist Restoration of Class-Struggle Unionism*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Ness, Immanuel. 2015. *Southern Insurgency: The Coming of the Global Working Class*. London: Pluto.

Newsinger, John. 1981. Revolt and Repression in Kenya: The "Mau Mau" Rebellion, 1952-1960. *Science & Society* 45(2): 159–85. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40402312

Neuhaus, Rolf. 1982. *International Trade Secretariats: Objectives, Organisation, Activities*. Washington, DC: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

Neuman, William Lawrence, and Karen Robson. 2012. Basics of Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. 2nd ed. Toronto: Pearson.

Ng, Roxana. 1993a. "Sexism, Racism and Canadian Nationalism." In *Returning the Gaze: Essays on Racism, Feminism and Politics*, edited by Himani Bannerji, 182-96. Toronto: Sister Vision.

———. 1993b. "Racism, Sexism, and Nation Building in Canada." In *Race, Identity and Representation in Education*, edited by Cameron McCarthy, Warren Critchlow, Greg Dimitriadis and Nadine Dolby, 50-59. New York: Routledge.

———. 2007. Garment Production in Canada: Social and Political Implications. *Studies in Political Economy* 79(1): 193-211. http://spe.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/spe/article/download/5201/2070

Nilliasca, Terri. 2011. Some Women's Work: Domestic Work, Class, Race, Heteropatriarchy, and the Limits of Legal Reform. *Michigan Journal of Race & Law* 16: 377-410. http://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1027&context=mjrl

Niosi, Jorge. 1981. *Canadian Capitalism: A Study of Power in the Canadian Business Establishment*. Toronto: Lorimer.

Nkrumah, Kwame. 1968. *The Spectre of Black Power*. London: Panaf.

O'Brien, Robert. 2000. *Contesting Global Governance: Multilateral Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oikawa, Mona. 2000. Cartographies of Violence: Women, Memory, and the Subjects of the "Internment." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 15(02): 39-69. https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/13128/1/NQ45789.pdf

Olmsted-Hughes, Quenby. 2011. *In the Interest of Democracy: The Rise and Fall of the Early Cold War Alliance between the American Federation of Labor and the Central Intelligence Agency*. Oxford: Peter Lang.

Pacific Tribune. 1986. "Unions' Actions to Embargo Apartheid." *Pacific Tribune*, March 5: 16.

Palmer, Bryan D. 1992. *Working-Class Experience: Rethinking the History of Canadian Labour, 1800– 1991*. 2nd ed. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

———. 2009. *Canada's 1960s: The Ironies of Identity in a Rebellious Era*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Palmer, Bryan D. and Michael Goldfield. 2007. Canada's Workers Movement: Uneven Developments. *Labour/Le Travail* 59(Spring): 149-77. https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/LLT/article/viewFile/5846/6851

Palmer, Colin A. 2010. *Cheddi Jagan and the Politics of Power: British Guiana's Struggle for Independence*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Panitch, Leo and Donald Swartz. 1984. Towards Permanent Exceptionalism: Coercion and Consent in Canadian Industrial Relations. *Labour/Le Travail* 13(Spring): 133-57. http://lltjournal.ca/index.php/llt/article/viewFile/2605/3008

Panitch, Leo, and Sam Gindin. 2005. Superintending Global Capital. *New Left Review* 35: 101-23. https://newleftreview.org/II/35/leo-panitch-sam-gindin-superintending-global-capital

———. 2006a. Imperialism and Global Political Economy: A Reply to Callinicos. *International Socialism* 109: 194-99. http://www.marxsite.com/panginreply.htm

———. 2006b. "Theorizing American Empire." In *Empire's Law: The American Imperial Project and the War to Remake the World*, edited by Amy Bartholomew, 22-43. Toronto: Between the Lines.

Parrot, Jean-Claude. 2005. *My Union, My Life: Jean-Claude Parrot and the Canadian Union of Postal Workers*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood.

Pasture, Patrick. 2002. A Century of International Trade Unionism. *International Review of Social History* 47(2): 277-289. doi: 10.1017/S0020859002000585.

Patrias, Carmela, and Ruth Frager. 2001. "This Is Our Country, These Are Our Rights":
        Minorities and the Origins of Ontario's Human Rights Campaigns. *Canadian Historical
        Review* 82(1): 1-35. doi: 10.3138/CHR.82.1.1

Patterson, Robert W. 2013. "'What's Good for America . . . .'" *National Review Online.* Accessed
        May 6, 2016. www.nationalreview.com/article/352429

Peck, Jamie, Nik Theodore, and Neil Brenner. 2010. Post-neoliberalism and its Malcontents.
        Antipode 41(1): 94-116.
        www.academia.edu/download/40809584/Postneoliberalism_and_its_malcontents.pdf

Perry, Jeffrey Babcock. 2013. *Hubert Harrison: The Voice of Harlem Radicalism, 1883-1918.* New York:
        Columbia University Press.

Peterson, Larry. 1981. The One Big Union in International Perspective: Revolutionary Industrial
        Unionism 1900-1925. *Labour/Le Travail* 7(Spring): 41-66.
        www.lltjournal.ca/index.php/llt/article/viewFile/2656/3059

———. 1984. Revolutionary Socialism and Industrial Unrest in the Era of the Winnipeg General
        Strike: The Origins of Communist Labour Unionism in Europe and North America.
        Labour/Le Travail 13(Spring): 115-31.
        https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/LLT/article/download/2604/3007

Petrou, Michael. 2008. *Renegades: Canadians in the Spanish Civil War.* Vancouver, BC: University of
        British Columbia Press.

Pierson, Ruth Roach, Nupur Chaudhuri, and Beth McAuley, eds. 1998. *Nation, Empire, Colony:
        Historicizing Gender and Race.* 1st ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Post, Charles. 2006. "The Myth of the Labor Aristocracy, Part One." *Against the Current.* July-
        August. https://www.solidarity-us.org/node/128

———. 2010. Exploring Working-Class Consciousness: A Critique of the Theory of the
        "Labour-Aristocracy." *Historical Materialism* 18(4): 3-38. doi: 10.1163/156920610X550596

Powers, Richard J. 1969. Containment: From Greece to Vietnam—and Back? *Political Research
        Quarterly* 22(4): 846-861. doi: 10.1177/106591296902200409

Pozo, Luis M. 2007. The Roots of Hegemony: The Mechanisms of Class Accommodation and the
        Emergence of the Nation-People. *Capital & Class* 31(1): 55-88.
        http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.575.796&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Prashad, Vijay. 2007. *The Darker Nations-A Biography of the Short-Lived Third World.* New Delhi,
        India: LeftWord.

Pratt, Cranford. 1984. Canadian Policy Towards the Third World: Basis for an Explanation. *Studies
        in Political Economy* 13(1): 27-55.
        http://spe.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/spe/article/viewFile/13301/11347

———.1996a. *Canadian International Development Assistance Policies: An Appraisal.* Kingston, ON: McGill– Queens University Press.

———.. 1996b. Competing Perspectives on Canadian Development Assistance Policies. *International Journal* 51(2): 235-258.
www.jstor.org.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/stable/40203782

Pratt, Geraldine, and Brenda Yeoh. 2003. Transnational (Counter) Topographies. *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 10(2): 159-66. doi: 10.1080/0966369032000079541

Presley, Cora Ann. 1992. *Kikuyu Women, the Mau Mau Rebellion, and Social Change in Kenya.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Price, John. 2003. Canadian Labour, the Cold War and Asia, 1945–1955. Victoria, B.C.: Centre for Asia-Pacific Initiatives.
http://www.uvic.ca/research/centres/capi/assets/docs/Price_Canadian_Labour.pdf

———. 2013. Canada, White Supremacy, and the Twinning of Empires. *International Journal* 68(4): 628-638. doi: 10.1177/0020702013510675

Puar, Jasbir K. 2007. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Radosh, Ronald. 1969. *American Labor and United States Foreign Policy.* New York: Random House.

Ramasamy, P. 2005. Labour and Globalization: Towards a New Internationalism? Labour*, Capital and Society* 38(1&2): 4-35. www.jstor.org/stable/43158586.

Ramsay, Harvie. 1997. Solidarity at Last? International Trade Unionism Approaching the Millennium. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 18(4): 503-37. doi: 10.1177/0143831X97184002

Razack, Sherene. 2002. *Race, Space, and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society.* Toronto: Between the Lines.

Richards, Yevette. 1999. Race, Gender, and Anticommunism in the International Labor Movement: The Pan-African Connections of Maida Springer. *Journal of Women's History* 11 (2): 35-59. doi: 10.1353/jowh.1999.0012

Robinson, Ian. 1993. "Economistic Unionism in Crisis: The Origins, Consequences, and Prospects of Canada–US Labour Movement Character Divergence." In *The Challenge of Restructuring: North American Labor Movements Respond,* edited by Jane Jenson and Rianne Mahon, 19-47. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

———. 1994. NAFTA, Social Unionism, and Labour Movement Power in Canada and the United States. *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations* 49(4): 657-95.
doi: 10.7202/050971ar

———. 1995. The NAFTA Labour Accord in Canada: Experience, Prospects, and Alternatives. *Connecticut Journal of International Law* 10(2): 475-531. http://www-personal.umich.edu/~eian/NAFTA_Labor_Accord.pdf

———. 2000. Neoliberal Restructuring and US Unions: Toward Social Movement Unionism? *Critical Sociology* 26(1-2): 109-138. doi: 10.1177/08969205000260010701

Roussopoulos, Dimitrios. 2007. *The New Left: Legacy and Continuity*. Montreal: Black Rose.

———. 2009. "Canada: 1968 and the New Left." In *1968: Memories and Legacies of a Global Revolt*, edited by Gassert, Philipp, and Martin Klimke, 39-45. Washington, DC: German Historical Institute.

Rousseau, Christina. "Housework and Social Subversion: Wages, Housework, and Feminist Activism in 1970s Italy and Canada." PhD diss., Toronto: York University.

Rodney, Walter. 1972. *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture.

———. 1981. *A History of the Guyanese Working People, 1881–1905*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rodriguez García, Magaly. 2008. The International Labor Organization: Past and Present. *International Labor and Working-Class History* 74(01): 225-227. doi: 10.1017/S0147547908000264

———. 2004. Free Trade-Unionism in Latin America: "Bread-and-Butter" or Political Unionism? *Historical Studies in Industrial Relations* 18: 107-134. doi: 10.3828/hsir.2004.18.3

Roediger, David. 1991. *Wages of Whiteness*. 1st ed. Verso.

Romualdi, Serafino. 1967. *Presidents and Peons: Recollections of a Labor Ambassador in Latin America*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

Ross, Stephanie. 2007. Varieties of Social Unionism: Towards a Framework for Comparison. *Just Labour: A Canadian Journal of Work and Society* 11: 16-34. http://www.academia.edu/download/33175442/Social_unionzm._Stephanie_Ross.pdf

Rosado Marzán, César F. 2000. Solidarity or Colonialism? The Polemic of "Labor Colonialism" in Puerto Rico. *WorkingUSA* 10(3): 287-299. doi: 10.1111/j.1743-4580.2007.00162.x

———. 2009. Pirates of the Caribbean: SEIU's Failed Bid in Puerto Rico. *WorkingUSA* 12(2): 235-247. doi: 10.1111/j.1743-4580.2009.00231.x

Rosenfeld, Herman and David Kidd. 2006. "CUPE 'Boycott Israel' Debate Rages On." *Monthly Review*, July 12. mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2006/kr120706.html

Rowbotham, Sheila, and Stephanie Linkogle, eds. 2001. *Women Resist Globalization: Mobilizing for Livelihood and Rights.* London: Zed Books.

Ruccio, David. 2003. "Globalization and Imperialism." *Rethinking Marxism* 15(1): 75-94. doi: 10.1080/0893569032000063592

Ryan, Oscar. 1975. *Tim Buck: A Conscience for Canada.* Toronto: Progress Books.

Ryland, Rebecca and David Sadler. 2008. Revitalising the Trade Union Movement through Internationalism: The Grassroots Perspective. *Journal of Organisational Change Management* 21 (4): 471-481. doi: 10.1108/09534810810884867

Sangster, Joan. 2006. Remembering Texpack: Nationalism, Internationalism, and Militancy in Canadian Unions in the 1970s. *Studies in Political Economy* 78: 41-66. http://spe.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/spe/article/viewFile/5211/2098

Saskatoon Solidarity Committee (SCC). 1981. *Partners in Imperialism: The Canadian Labour Congress and Social Democracy in the Third World.* Regina: Saskatoon Solidarity Committee.

Satzewich, Victor. 1990. Rethinking Post-1945 Migration to Canada: Towards a Political Economy of Labour Migration. *International Migration* 28(3): 327-346. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2435.1990.tb00480.x

———. 1998. *Racism and Social Inequality in Canada: Concepts, Controversies and Strategies of Resistance.* Toronto: Thompson Educational.

———. 2000. Whiteness Limited: Racialization and the Social Construction of "Peripheral Europeans." *Social History/Histoire* Sociale 33(66): 272-289. http://hssh.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/hssh/article/viewFile/4566/3760

———. 2011. *Racism in Canada.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Saul, John S. 2010. Two Fronts of Anti-Apartheid Struggle: South Africa and Canada. *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa* 74(1): 135-151. doi: 10.1353/trn.2010.0019.

Schiavone, Michael. 2008. *Unions in Crisis: The Future of Organized Labor in America.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Schmidt Camacho, Alicia S. 1999. On the Borders of Solidarity: Race and Gender Contradictions in the "New Voice" Platform of the AFL-CIO. *Social Justice* 26(3): 79-102. www.jstor.org/stable/29767162

Scipes, Kim. 2000. It's Time to Come Clean: Open the AFL-CIO Archives on International Labor Operations. *Labor Studies Journal* 25(2): 4-25. doi: 10.1177/0160449X0002500201

———. 2004. AFL-CIO in Venezuela: Déjà Vu All Over Again. *Labor Notes*, April 1. http://labornotes.org/2004/04/afl-cio-venezuela-d%C3%A9j%C3%A0-vu-all-over-again

———. 2005. An Unholy Alliance: The AFL-CIO and the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) in Venezuela. *Z Net* www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?sectionID=19&itemID=8268

———. 2010a. *AFL-CIO's Secret War Against Developing Country Workers: Solidarity or Sabotage?* Lanham, MD: Lexington.

———. 2010b. Why Labor Imperialism? AFL-CIO's Foreign Policy Leaders and the Developing World. *WorkingUSA 13*(4): 465-79. doi: 10.1111/j.1743-4580.2010.00306.x

———. 2014a. Building Global Labor Solidarity Today: Learning from the KMU of the Philippines. *Class, Race and Corporate Power* 2 (2) http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/classracecorporatepower/vol2/iss2/2

———. 2014b. Social Movement Unionism or Social Justice Unionism? Disentangling Theoretical Confusion within the Global Labor Movement. *Class, Race and Corporate Power* 2(3). http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/classracecorporatepower/vol2/iss3/9

Scott, Jack. 1978a. *Yankee Unions, Go Home! How the AFL Helped the U.S. Build an Empire in Latin America: Trade Unions and Imperialism in America.* Vancouver: New Star.

———. 1978b. *Canadian Workers, American Unions. Trade Unions and Imperialism in America.* Vancouver: New Star.

Seager, Allen, and David Roth. 1998. "British Columbia and the Mining West: A Ghost of a Chance." In *The Workers' Revolt in Canada,* edited by Craig Heron, 231-67. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Seccombe, Wally. 1974. The Housewife and Her Labour Under Capitalism. *New Left Review* 1(83): 3–24. https://newleftreview.org/I/83/wally-seccombe-the-housewife-and-her-labour-under-capitalism

———. 1980a. "Domestic Labour and the Working-Class Household." In *Hidden in the Household: Women's Domestic Labour Under Capitalism*, edited by Bonnie Fox, 25–99. Toronto: The Women's Press.

Sellström, Tor. 2002. *Sweden and National Liberation in Southern Africa: Solidarity and Assistance 1970–1994.* Vol. 11: Nordic Africa Institute. Accessed September 15, 2013. www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:241772/FULLTEXT01.pdf

Sharma, Nandita R. 1994. "Restructuring Society, Restructuring Lives: the Global Restructuring of Capital and Women's Paid Employment in Canada." *Socialist Studies Bulletin* 37: 18-46.

———. 1997. "Birds of Prey and Birds of Passage: The Movement of Capital and the Migration of Labour." *Labour, Capital and Society/Travail, capital et société* (April): 8-38.

———. 2000. Race, Class, Gender and the Making of Difference: The Social Organization of "Migrant Workers" in Canada. *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture & Social Justice* 24(2): 5-15. http://journals.msvu.ca/index.php/atlantis/article/viewFile/1584/1345

———. 2001. On Being Not Canadian: The Social Organization of "Migrant Workers" in Canada. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 38(4): 415-39. doi: 10.1111/j.1755-618X.2001.tb00980.x

———. 2002. Immigrant and Migrant Workers in Canada: Labour Movements, Racism and the Expansion of Globalization. *Canadian Woman Studies* 21(4): 18-25. http://cws.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/cws/article/viewFile/6545/5733

———. 2003. No Borders Movements and the Rejection of Left Nationalism. *Canadian Dimension* 37(3): 37-39.

———. 2005. Canadian Nationalism and the Making of a Global Apartheid. *Women & Environments International Magazine* 68(69): 9-12.

———. 2006a. H*ome Economics: Nationalism and the Making of "Migrant Workers" in Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 2006b. "White Nationalism, Illegality and Imperialism: Border Controls as Ideology." In *(En) Gendering the War on Terror: War Stories and Camouflaged Politics*, edited by Krista Hunt and Kim Rygiel, 121-43. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

———. 2007. "Global Apartheid and Nation-Statehood" In *Nationalism and Global Solidarities: Alternative Projections to Neoliberal Globalisation*, edited by James Goodman and Paul James, 71-89. New York: Routledge.

Shurem/Histadrut Collection. Canadian Jewish Congress Charities Committee National Archives (CJCCC), Montreal, Quebec.

Silverman, Victor. 2000. *Imagining Internationalism in American and British Labor, 1939-49*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

———. 2010. Whither or Wither Global Labour? Review Essay of Globalization and Labor: Democratizing Global Governance by Dimitris Stevis and Terry Boswell and Global Unions: Challenging Transnational Capital Through Cross-Border Campaigns by Kate Bronfenbrenner *Labour/Le Travail* 65(Summer): 149-160. www.jstor.org/stable/20798989

Sims, Beth. 1992. *Workers of the World Undermined: American Labor's Role in U.S. Foreign Policy.* Boston: South End.

Sinclair, Jim. 1992. *Crossing the Line: Canada and Free Trade with Mexico.* Vancouver: New Star.

Sklar, Holly. 1980. *Trilateralism: The Trilateral Commission and Elite Planning for World Management.* Boston: South End.

Smaller, Harry. 2009. "Soldiers in the Front Line of Battle": International Teacher Unions, the World Confederation of Organisations of the Teaching Profession, and the Cold War. *History of Education Review* 38(2): 28-42.

http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA385593702&v=2.1&u=yorku_main&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w&asid=be5d1e4ca1bd9cc39cc2e5e68c151643

Smith, Andrea. 2006. Heteropatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy. *Incite: Women of Colour Against Violence*, edited by Andrea Smith, Beth E. Richie and Julia Sudbury, 66-73. Cambridge, MA: South End.
supportblackmesa.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Three-Pillars.pdf

Smith, Adrian A. 2015. Troubling "Project Canada:" The Caribbean and the Making of "Unfree Migrant Labor." *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies/Revue canadienne des études latino-américaines et caraïbes* 40(2): 274-93. doi: 10.1080/08263663.2015.1054682

Smith, David Norman. 2013. Review: Marx at the Margins: On Nationalism, Ethnicity, and Non-Western Societies, by Kevin B. Anderson. *Rethinking Marxism* 25(1): 130-34. doi: 10.1080/08935696.2012.711107

Smith, Dorothy E. 1990. *Texts, Facts, and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling.* London: Routledge.

Smith, Miriam. 1992. The Canadian Labour Congress: From Continentalism to Economic Nationalism. *Studies in Political Economy* 38(Summer): 35-60.
http://spe.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/spe/article/viewFile/12997/9891

Southall, Roger. 1994. The Development and Delivery of "Northern" Worker Solidarity to South African Trade Unions in the 1970s and 1980s. *The Journal of Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* (32)2: 166–99.

South African History Online. *Frontline States.* Accessed October 30, 2014.
www.sahistory.org.za/organisations/frontline-states

Spalding, Hobart A. 1976. US and Latin American Labor: The Dynamics of Imperialist Control. *Latin American Perspectives* 3(1): 45-69. doi: 10.1177/0094582X7600300104

———. 1984. US Labour Intervention in Latin America: The Case of the American Institute for Free Labour Development (AIFLD). *Labour, Capital and Society/Travail, capital et société* 17(2): 136-172. www.jstor.org/stable/43171281

———. 1992. The Two Latin American Foreign Policies of the US Labor Movement: The AFL-CIO Top Brass vs. Rank-and-File. *Science & Society* 56(4): 421-439.
www.jstor.org/stable/40403300

Spencer, Robert. 1959. *Canada in World Affairs: from UN to NATO, 1946–1949.* Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Stanford, Jim, and Leah F. Vosko. 2004. *Challenging the Market: The Struggle to Regulate Work and Income*. Kingston, ON: McGill–Queen's University Press.

Stanley, Timothy J. 2011. *Contesting White Supremacy: School Segregation, Anti-Racism, and the Making of Chinese Canadians*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Stevis, Dimitris, and Terry Boswell. 1997. Labour: From National Resistance to International Politics. *New Political Economy* 2(1): 93-104. doi: 10.1080/13563469708406287

Stichter, Sharon. B. 1975. Workers, Trade Unions, and the Mau Mau Rebellion. *Canadian Journal of African Studies/Revue Canadienne des Études Africaines* 9(2): 259-275. www.jstor.org.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/stable/484083

Stoddard, Lothrop. 1935. *Clashing Tides of Colour*. New York: Scribner's.

Sudbury, Julia, and Margo Okazawa-Rey. 2015. *Activist Scholarship: Antiracism, Feminism, and Social Change*. New York: Routledge.

Sugimoto, Howard H. 1973. The Vancouver Riot and Its International Significance. *The Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 64(4): 163-74. www.jstor.org/stable/40489721

Taha, Mai. 2015. "Nation and Class Subjectivity in International Law and its Institutions in the Middle East (1919–1939)." PhD diss., Toronto: University of Toronto.

Theodore Roosevelt Center. http://www.theodorerooseveltcenter.org/Learn-About-TR/Themes/Capitalism-and-Labor/Samuel-Gompers.aspx

Thobani, Sunera. 2000a. Nationalizing Canadians: Bordering Immigrant Women in the Late Twentieth Century. *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 12: 279-312.

———. 2000b. Closing the Nation's Doors to Immigrant Women: The Restructuring of Canadian Immigration Policy. *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture & Social Justice* 24(2): 16-26. http://journals.msvu.ca/index.php/atlantis/article/download/1585/1346

———. 2007. *Exalted Subjects: Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Thomson, Don and Rodney Larson. 1978. *Where Were You, Brother? An Account of Trade Union Imperialism*. London: War on Want.

Thomson, EP. 1991. *The Making of the English Working Class*. London: Penguin.

Tomasek, Robert D. 1959. British Guiana: A Case Study of British Colonial Policy. *Political Science Quarterly* 74(3): 393–411. www.jstor.org.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/stable/2146276

Tosstorff, Reiner. 2003. Moscow versus Amsterdam: Reflections on the History of the Prointern. *Labour History Review* 68(1): 79-97. doi: 10.3828/lhr.68.1.79

Tufts, Steven. 1998. Community Unionism in Canada and Labor's (Re)Organization of Space. *Antipode* 30(3): 227–50. doi: 10.1111/1467-8330.00076

Turpel, Mary Ellen. 1993. Patriarchy and Paternalism: The Legacy of the Canadian State for First Nations Women. *Canadian Journal of Women & the Law* 6: 174-92.

Van der Linden, Marcel. 1999. Transnationalizing American Labor History. *The Journal of American History* 86(3): 1078-92. doi: 10.2307/2568606

Van Goethem, Geert. 2006. *The Amsterdam International: the world of the international federation of trade unions (IFTU), 1913–1945*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2008. "Settler Collective, Founding Violence and Disavowal: The Settler Colonial Situation." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 29(4): 363-379.

Von Eschen, Penny M. 1997. *Race against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937–1957*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Waffle Party. 1969. *Waffle Manifesto*. www.socialisthistory.ca/Docs/Waffle/WaffleManifesto.htm.

Wahl, Asbjörn. 2004. European Labor: The Ideological Legacy of the Social Pact. *Monthly Review* 55(8): 37-49. http://global-labour.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/AWahlEuropean-TUM.pdf

Walia, Harsha. 2010. Transient Servitude: Migrant Labour in Canada and the Apartheid of Citizenship. *Race & Class* 52(1): 71-84. doi: 10.1177/0306396810371766

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Centenary*. New York: Academic Press.

Walker, Cathy. 2010. "Chinese Unions." *Our Times* (February–March) 29(1): 14-17.

Waterman, Peter. 1987. The More Real Thing than Big, Big Coke: The New Internationalism. *ISS Working Paper Series/General Series* 37: 1-30. http://repub.eur.nl/pub/18818/wp37.pdf

———. 1988a. The New Internationalisms: A More Real Thing than Big, Big Coke? *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 11(3): 289-328. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40241099

———. 1989. For the Liberation of Internationalism: A Long March Through the Literatures. *Alternatives* 14(1): 5-47. doi: 10.1177/030437548901400101

———. 1993a. Internationalism is Dead! Long Live Global Solidarity. In *Global visions: Beyond the New World Order*, edited by Jeremy Brecher, John Brown Childs and Jill Cutler, 257-61. Montreal,: Black Rose.

———. 1993b. Social-Movement Unionism: A New Union Model for a New World Order? *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 16(3): 245-278. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40241259

———. 1996. Beyond Globalism and Developmentalism: Other Voices in World Politics. *Development and Change* 27(1): 165-80. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7660.1996.tb00582.x

———. 1998. The Second Coming of Proletarian Internationalism? A Review of Recent Resources. *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 4(3): 349-77. http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/26/130.html

———. 1999. The New Social Unionism: A New Union Model for a New World Order. In *Labour Worldwide in the Era of Globalization: Alternative Union Models in the New World Order*, edited by Peter Waterman and Ronaldo Munck, 247-64. http://globalsolidarity.antenna.nl/book.html

———. 2000. "Labour Internationalism in the Transition from a National/Industrial/Colonial Capitalism to an Informatised/Globalised One… and Beyond." Paper Presented at The Past and Future of International Trade Unionism Conference, 19-20 May, Ghent, Belgium.
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Peter_Waterman4/publication/228542216_Labour
_Internationalism_in_the_Transition_from_a_NationalIndustrialColonial_Capitalism_to_
an_InformatisedGlobalised_One_and_Beyond/links/54b15fc10cf2318f0f925dd8.pdf

———. 2001a. Trade Union Internationalism in the Age of Seattle. In *Place, Space and the New Labour Internationalisms*, edited by Peter Waterman and Jane Wills, 8-32. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

———. 2001b. The Problematic Past and Uncertain Future of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. *International Labor and Working-Class History* 59: 125-32. journals1.scholarsportal.info.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/details/01475479/v59inone/125_tp pauficoftu.xml

———. 2004. Adventures of Emancipatory Labour Strategy as the New Global Movement Challenges International Unionism. *Journal of World-System Research* 10(1): 217-253. http://jwsr.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/jwsr/article/download/315/327

———. 2005a. Labour and New Social Movements in a Globalising World System: The Future of the Past. *Labor History* 46(2): 195-207. http://ccs.ukzn.ac.za/files/waterman-p102.pdf

———. 2005b. The Forward March of Labour (and Unions?) Recommenced: Reflections on an Emancipatory Labour Internationalism and International Labour Studies. *Antipode* 37(2): 208-218. doi: 10.1111/j.0066-4812.2005.00486.x

———. 2008. A Trade Union Internationalism for the 21st century: Meeting the Challenges from Above, Below and Beyond. In *Labour and the Challenges of Globalization: What Prospects for Transnational Solidarity*, edited by Andreas Bieler, Ingemar Lindberg and Devan Pillay, 248-63. London: Pluto.

———. 2012. An Emancipatory Global Labour Studies is Necessary! On Rethinking the Global Labour Movement in the Hour of Furnaces. *Interface* 4(2): 317-368. www.interfacejournal.net/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Interface-4-2-Waterman.pdf

Waterman, Peter and Jane Wills eds. 2001. *Place, Space and the New Labour Internationalisms.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Waters Jr, Robert and Gordon Daniels. 2005. The World's Longest General Strike: The AFL-CIO, the CIA, and British Guiana. *Diplomatic History* 29(2): 279–307. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7709.2005.00474.x

———. 2006. "When you're Handed Money on a Platter, It's Very Hard to Say, 'Where are you getting this?'": The AFL-CIO, the CIA, and British Guiana. *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 84(4): 1075-99. doi: 10.3406/rbph.2006.5061

Weiler, P. 1981. The United States, International Labor, and the Cold War: The Breakup of the World Federation of Trade Unions. *Diplomatic History* 5 (1):1-22. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7709.1981.tb00649.x

Wells, Don. 1995. The Impact of the Postwar Compromise on Canadian Unionism: The Formation of an Auto Worker Local in the 1950s. *Labour / Le Travail* 36 (Fall): 147-173. https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/LLT/article/download/5004/5873

———. 1998a. *Building Transnational Coordinative Unionism.* Kingston, ON: Current issues series – Industrial Relations Centre Press.

———. 1998b. "Labour Solidarity goes Global." *Canadian Dimension,* 32(2): 33-37.

Worley, Matthew. 2000. The Communist International, The Communist Party of Great Britain, and the "Third Period," 1928–1932. *European History Quarterly* 30(2): 185-208. doi: 10.1177/026569140003000202

Williams, Eric Eustace. 1994. *Capitalism and Slavery.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Williamson, John. 2004. The Strange History of the Washington Consensus. *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics* 27(2): 195-206. doi: 10.2307/4538920

Wills, Jane. 1996. Geographies of Trade Unionism: Translating Traditions across Space and Time. *Antipode* 28(4): 352-378. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8330.1996.tb00531.x

———. 1998. Taking on the CosmoCorps? Experiments in Transnational Labor Organization. *Economic Geography* 74(2): 111-130. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-8287.1998.tb00108.x

Windmuller, John P. 1954a. The Stockholm Congress of the ICFTU. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 7 (3): 434-43.

———. 1954b. *American Labor and the International Labor Movement, 1940 to 1953*. Vol. 2: Ithaca: Institute of International Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University Press.

Wittner, Lawrence S. 1982. *American Intervention in Greece, 1943–1949*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 2005. *Empire of Capital*. New York: Verso.

Wright, Cynthia. 2009. "Between Nation and Empire: The Fair Play for Cuba Committees and the Making of Canada–Cuba Solidarity in the Early 1960s." In *Our Place in the Sun: Canada and Cuba in the Castro Era*, edited by Robert Anthony Wright and Lana Wylie, 96-120. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Yates, Charlotte. 1990. The Internal Dynamics of Union Power: Explaining Canadian Autoworkers' Militancy in the 1980's. *Studies in Political Economy* 31(Spring): 73-105. http://spe.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/spe/article/viewFile/13098/9986

Young, B.S., 1965. Jamaica's Bauxite and Alumina Industries. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. 55(3): 449-464. www.jstor.org/stable/2561566

Yuval-Davis, Nira. 1993. Gender and Nation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 16(4): 621-632. doi: 10.1080/01419870.1993.9993800

Zeleza, Tiyambe. 1984. Colonialism and Internationalism: The Case of the British and Kenyan Labour Movement. *Ufahamu: A Journal of African Studies*. 14(1): 9-28. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/579106x1.pdf

Zweig, Michael. 2005. Iraq and the Labor Movement: The Remarkable Story of USLAW. *New Labor Forum* 14(3): 61-7. doi: 10.1080/1095760500245284

Appendix A:
Interview Questions

Background Questions:

1. What union(s) do you come out of and how have you been active in your union?

2. What drew you to become active as a trade unionist?

3. Why did you become involved in international solidarity work?

Organizing:

4. What were the goals of the international solidarity work you were involved in?

5. What were some of the strategies and tactics of the work you did?
i.e. types of actions you engaged in.

6. In the organizing that you were/have been involved with, did/do you coordinate with groups or activists outside the labour movement? i.e. community organizations, NGO's, political parties
Or was the work focused solely within labour/amongst union activists and members?

-If yes, what groups did you work with and how did you relate to them? i.e. via a network, coalition, more informally?

-If no, why did you choose to focus on building solidarity solely within organized labour?

7. What was/is the nature of your relationship with the unions/movements you work(ed) with internationally

8. Did you work to connect your international solidarity organizing to other related local struggles? i.e. anti-colonial struggles in Canada, anti-racist, feminist struggles? Or local struggles around neoliberalism, etc…?

-If yes, how did your organizing connect to struggles locally? What kinds of links did you draw? i.e. were these links reflected in how you organized?

9. Was there a link between the international solidarity organizing you were engaged in and other struggles/organizing you were involved with within your union? i.e. around union democracy, toward greater militancy or against racism, sexism, homophobia?

10. What role if any did the Canadian International Development Agency play in the work you were involved in?

11. When you were organizing, did you find international labour organizations such as the ICFTU/ITUC, trade secretariats/global union federations helpful in your organizing? Did their work influence your organizing?

12. Did/Have the positions of the AFL-CIO on international issues influence/d the positions taken in your union? Or at the CLC?

(For those organizing in the 80s only)
How (if at all) did the strength of Canadian left nationalism within labour in the 80s influence your international solidarity work?

13. Have any political parties (or ideologies) been an important influence on why and how you organize/d?

Challenges:

14. In your opinion, how have you seen labour international solidarity work change since you were first involved? Changes/Continuities?

15. What kinds of challenges did/do you face in trying to build support and participation amongst union members?

16. Was your organizing ever met with significant resistance by leadership or staff in your union or council/federation or the congress? (how, why?)

Purpose/Vision:

17. In your experience, what has been the focus of International Solidarity in labour? i.e. Diplomatic relations? Lobbying? Policy? Projects with NGO's? Member mobilization? a combination?

18. What are your thoughts on how international solidarity can be strengthened/deepened?

Appendix B
Letter Soliciting Interviewees and List of Unions Contacted

Katherine Nastovski
Doctoral Candidate,
Department of Social and Political Thought
York University

Attn: Union or Council Executive Board

Greetings, I am writing to request your participation in research I am conducting into the history of international labour solidarity in Canada. I am a union activist who is currently working on a PhD on labour history. This winter I will be travelling across Canada to interview union activists, leaders and staff who have been active around issues of International labour solidarity. There is currently no work done on this important aspect of our history as a labour movement. In this era of globalization, solidarity with workers internationally is even more important than ever. I hope that providing this picture of our history of international solidarity will be useful to help us reflect on how we organize in the future.

I am interested in interviewing anyone in your union or council who has been active in these issues and who would like to share their experiences. The interviews would last for about half an hour to an hour and a half depending on how much detail the interviewee would like to share with me. Below is a schedule of when I plan to be in each region of the country. If there is someone from your union who is interested in being interviewed I can be reached by phone at 416-828-3851 or email at knastov@yorku.ca. If the dates that I will be in your region do not work, I can also arrange to set up an interview by phone. All the interviews will be confidential and the interviewee is free to answer only the questions they wish and may stop at any time. I greatly appreciate your help. The participation of union activists, leaders and staff are essential to making this project happen.

Calgary: December 19-21
Edmonton: December 22-28
Vancouver: December 29-January 7
Regina and Saskatoon: January 8-11
Winnipeg: January 12-15
Halifax, St. John's, NB and Charlottetown: February 6-10
Montreal: February 11-15
Ottawa: February 16-21
Sudbury and other Northern Ontario Cities: February 25-28
Toronto and Southern Ontario: (Flexible) February 28-April 1

In Solidarity,

Katherine Nastovski
Doctoral Candidate in Social and Political Thought
York University

Department of Social and Political Thought
York University

Appendix C:
Informed Consent for Research

Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research

Title of Project:
Struggles in Solidarity – Internationalism and Organized Workers in Canada

Principal Investigator: Katherine Nastovski
                                     PhD Candidate
                                     Graduate Program in Social and Political Thought
                                     York University

Advisor:
                                     Professor Himani Bannerji
                                     Sociology Department
                                     York University

Purpose of the Study:

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed. Data that I collect from these interviews will be used to inform my PhD dissertation. The purpose of this research project is to examine the history of Internationalism within the Canadian labour movement. The people interviewed for this project have been involved in the labour movement as rank and file activists, staff or in leadership positions or have worked with labour organizations in the process of building international solidarity campaigns.

Procedures to be followed:

This interview should take approximately one hour. The interview will be recorded in order to review your responses in more detail.

Statement of Confidentiality:

Your participation in this research is confidential. Confidentiality will be provided to the fullest extent possible by law. Your real name will not be used anywhere in the recording of this interview or in my interview notes. The recording of this interview and the notes I have taken will be stored and secured in a locked cabinet until the dissertation project is completed (approximately two years). After the project is completed all written notes will be shredded and recordings will be erased. Only I will have access to the recording and interview notes. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared.

Risks and Benefits of Participation:

I see these interviews contributing to a larger collective process of critical reflection of labour movement history and the history of solidarity movements. Some of the questions might make you uncomfortable due to the sensitive nature of the questions asked. All steps have been taken to minimize discomfort and you have the option to refuse to answer any question and to withdraw from the study at any time. As noted above, the identity of all participants will be kept confidential.

Right to Ask Questions:

Please feel comfortable to ask questions or raise concerns at anytime during the interview. After the interview you can contact me or my supervisor at anytime with questions or concerns about this study. Contact information can be found at the top of this form. You may also direct questions or concerns to the Social and Political Thought Graduate Program Office at York University (416 - 736 -5320), or if you have any questions about this process, or about your rights as a participant in the study, please contact the Sr. Manager & Policy Advisor for the Office of Research Ethics, 5th Floor, York Research Tower, York University (telephone 416-736-5914 or e-mail ore@yorku.ca).

Voluntary Participation:

Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. The decision not to volunteer will not influence the nature of the potential participants' relationship with the researchers, York University, or any other group associated with this project ether now, or in the future. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. The decision to stop participating , or to refuse to answer particular questions will not affect the participants' relationship with the researchers, York University, or any other group associated with the project. Refusal to take part in or withdrawing from this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits you would receive otherwise. If you choose to withdraw from the study, all data generated as a consequence of your participation shall be destroyed.

This research project has been reviewed and approved by the Human Participants Review Subcommittee, York University's Ethics Review Board and conforms to the standards of the Canadian Tri-Council Research Ethics guidelines.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to take part in this research study. If you agree to take part in this research study and the information outlined above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this form for your records.

Legal Rights and Signatures:

I _____ consent to participate in *Internationalism and Organized Workers in Canada* conducted by *Katherine Nastovski.* I have understood the nature of this project and wish to participate. I am not waiving any of my legal rights by signing this form. My signature below indicates my consent.

_____

Participant Signature   Date

_____

Person Obtaining Consent   Date

**Appendix D:
Certificate: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans**

Certificate of Completion

This is to certify that

Katherine Nastovski

has completed the Interagency Advisory Panel on Research Ethics'
Introductory Tutorial for the
Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS)

Issued On: **March 23, 2011**

Appendix E:
List of Archives Consulted

Canadian Labour Congress Archives. Canadian Labour Congress National Headquarters, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada (CLC).

Canadian Labour Congress Fond, MG28-I103. Libraries and Archives Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada (LAC CLC Fond).

Kaplansky Fond. MG30 A53. Libraries and Archives Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada (LAC Kaplanksy Fond).

Canadian Association for Labour Israel Collection (CALI). Canadian Jewish Congress Charities Committee National Archives (CJCCC), Montreal, Québec (CJCCC CALI Fond).

Histadrut/Shurem Collection. Canadian Jewish Congress Charities Committee National Archives, Montreal, Québec (CJCCC Histadrut/Shurem Fond).

International Confederation of Free Trade Unions Fond. International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, The Netherlands (IISH ICFTU Fond).

Appendix F:
Glossary

ACCL   All-Canadian Congress of Labour
AFL   American Federation of Labour
AFL-CIO   American Federation of Labour-Congress of Industrial Organizations
AIFLD   American Institute of Free Labor Development
ARO   African Regional Organization of the ICFTU
BCTUG   British Columbia Trade Union Group
BNAC   British-North American Committee
CAC   Canadian American Committee
CADORIT   Caribbean Area Division of the Inter-American Regional Workers
                Organization
CAIMAW   Canadian Association of Industrial, Mechanical and Allied Workers
CALI   Canadian Association for Labour Israel
CAW   Canadian Auto Workers
CBRE   Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees
CBTU   Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
CCF   Cooperative Commonwealth Federation
CCL   Canadian Congress of Labour
CCU   Confederation of Canadian Unions
CGIL   Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro (The General Italian
                Confederation of Labour)
CIA   Central Intelligence Agency
CIDA   Canadian International Development Agency
CIIA   Canadian Institute on International Affairs
CIO   Congress of Industrial Organizations
CISL   Confederazione Italians Sindicati Lavoratori (The Italian Confederation of
                Workers' Unions)
CLA   Chinese Labour Association
CLC   Canadian Labour Congress
CPC   Communist Party of Canada
CPU   Communist Party of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
CSN   Confédération syndicats nationaux (also known as CNTU – the
                Confederation of National Trade Unions)
CTAL   Confderacion de Trabajadoes de America Latina (Confederation of Workers
                in Latin America)
CTC   Central Trabajadores de Cuba (Workers Central Cuba)
CUPE   Canadian Union of Public Employees
CUPW   Canadian Union of Postal Workers
CWPA   Chinese Workers' Protective Association
DGB   Deutscher Gewertschaftsbund (Confederation of German Trade Unions)
EATUC   East African Trade Union Congress
FO   Force Ouvriére (General Confederation of Labour – Workers' Force)
GATT   General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

GSU	Grain Services Union
GUF's	Global Union Federation
HTUC	Histadrut Trade Union Council
IAC	International Affairs Committee (CCL/CLC)
IAD	International Affairs Department (CCL/CLC)
ICFTU	International Confederation of Free Trade Unions
ICIDI	Independent Commission on International Development Issues
IFTU	International Federation of Trade Unions
IFLWU	International Fur and Leather Workers Union
ILGWU	International Ladies Garment Workers Union
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ITUC	International Trade Union Congress
ITS's	International Trade Secretariats
JLC	Jewish Labour Committee
KFRTU	Kenyan Federation of Registered Trade Unions
KFTU	Kenyan Federation of Trade Unions (Formerly KFRTU)
KoL	Knights of Labour
LAWG	Latin American Working Group
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NDP	New Democratic Party
NED	National Endowment for Democracy
NIEAP	Non=Immigrant Employment Authorization Program
NIEO	New International Economic Order
NLI	New Labour Internationalism
OBU	One Big Union
OLI	Old Labour Internationalism
ORIT	Inter-American Regional Workers' Organization
SACP	South African Communist Party
SI	Socialist International
SILP	Saskatchewan International Development Project
RILU	Red International of Labour Unions
RWDSU	Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union
SACTU	South African Congress of Trade Unions
SACTU-SC	SACTU Solidarity Committee
SEATO	South East Asia Treaty Organization
SEIU	Service Employees International Union
SGEU	Saskatchewan Government and General Employees' Union
SORWUC	Service, Office and Retail Workers Union of Canada
SSC	Saskatoon Solidarity Committee
TCLSAC	Toronto Committee for the Liberation of Southern Africa
TFWP	Temporary Foreign Worker Program
TLC	Trades and Labour Congress
TUC	British Trades Union Congress
UAW	United Auto Workers
UE	United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America
UFCW	United Food and Commercial Workers

UIL	Unione Italiana Del Lavoro (Italian Union of Labour)
UNCTC	United Nations Commission on Transnational Corporations
UNITE-HERE	Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees – Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USW	United Steelworkers
WB	World Bank
WCL	World Congress of Labour
WFTU	World Federation of Labour
WUL	Workers Unity League
VDLC	Vancouver and District Labour Council