



CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Thai Trade Union Movement in Academic Literature

In Thailand, the academic studies on labour movement are a relatively minor subject within the social sciences. Some of the reasons are: the political marginalisation of the working class, and the image of Thai society as essentially an agricultural country. Analyses of the Thai trade union movement have been provided by a wide range of approaches, assumptions, and theoretical framework. Despite this diversity, the studies of labour movement in Thailand can be chronologically classified into two groups. The first group focuses on the early history of the workers' movement before the formation of labour organizations under the 1972 Labour Protection Laws*. The second group comprises of those works emphasizing the modern trade union movement from the 1970s.

This study reviews precisely on the later group, which deal directly with the Thai labour movement in the era of modern industrialization in Thailand particularly to those studies involving the debate on the roles of trade unions in economic and social development. In academic literature, the roles of Thai workers and trade unions in the process of economic and social changes were recognized with two different views. For the first view, which is the main stream, a number of authors were disenchanted with workers historical role. Considerable efforts thus have been given to explain the failure and the weakness of organized labour to fulfill its

* Some of the examples are:

Virginia Thomson (1947), *The Labour Problems in Southeast Asia*. New York, American Book-Stratford Press.

Andrew Brown (1990), *An analysis on the Industrial Working Class and the State in Thailand: An Introductory Analysis*. MA. Thesis, The Australian National University.

Sungsidh Piriyaarsan (1988), *ประวัติศาสตร์ต่อสู้ของกรรมกรไทย* (The history of Thai workers' struggle) Bangkok: Social Research Institution, Chulalongkorn University

Kanchada Poonpanich (1989), *The Making of the Third World Workers: A Cultural Analysis of the Labour Movement in Thailand, 1920s-1950s*, Ph.D Dissertation, Bielefeld University.

Nikom Chandravithun (1972), *แรงงาน กับอุตสาหกรรมไทย* (Thai labour and industry) Bangkok: Social Science Association of Thailand

Denpong Ponglakorn (1972), *สหภาพแรงงาน* (The labour unions). Bangkok: Seng-Chiang Printing .

social and political roles. The second view is a minor perspective represented by those studies using orthodox Marxist theory to claim that the Thai labour movement is strong and characterised by a class movement. Apart from studying the role of trade unions, a number of arguments in the studies of the trade union movement, in the early 1990s, turned to focus on the suggestions for the changes of unions' ideology and strategy to a new unionism that was more concerned with social or public interests.

In many studies, the new era of modern Thai trade union movement began with the development of organized labour in the early 1970s. After being stagnant under the long military dictatorship from 1958 to 73, the period following the student led uprising on 14th October 1973 may be considered as a watershed in the history of the Thai labour movement. The democratic orientation of the political system resulted in the revival of labour organizations and the rise of various social movements.

The three years from October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 were often considered as the best years of the Thai labour movement where it achieved some degree of unity and could develop as a powerful force. A number of MA. and Ph. D theses emphasized the development of labour movement during this period. In term of the movement's goals and objectives, Samrej Zeepongsekul asserted that the labour movement was not considered to go beyond the limits of trade union actions in which major strikes did not challenge the existing values underlying class inequality (Samrej Zeepongsekul 1987: 43-40). Sungsidh Piriyaangsan also indicated that the labour movement of 1975-76 was militant but not radical since the workers did not attack the system of relations of production nor the political power (Sungsidh Piriyaangsan 1989: 252). For Sungsidh, the development of the labour movement in the early 1970s was characterized by the nature of "workers strategic group" (Sungsidh Piriyaangsan 1989: 274).

During this period, the most significant social movements were student, worker, and peasant movements. It was observed in many studies that the labour movement was influenced by a radical student movement for the expansion of its activities to link with wider political and economic issues. The student-worker collaboration led to the formation of a tripartite alliance of students, workers, and peasants (Samrej 1987:103-11, Sungsidh 1989: 144-160, Hewison and Brown 1994:501)

Even in the democratisation process, Vichote Vanno argues that, unlike workers in Latin American countries, South Korea, and the Philippines, workers and unions in Thailand have not played a significant role in the process of democratization but have rather been more dependent on the process of democratization than an independent force that caused democratization.*

While the studies of labour movement during 1973-76 emphasized the militancy of organized workers and examined whether its movement moved towards the Marxist theory of class struggle, the analyses of the post-1976 movement highlighted the decline of militant organized workers, the fragmentation of the labour movement, and the increasing unpopularity of trade unionism. However, in terms of bargaining power, the unions in state enterprises are considerably stronger than their counterparts in the private sector.

Nibhond Puapongsakorn uses the new institutional economic theories to analyze the roles of trade unions and workers, and to explain why state-enterprise unions have more bargaining powers than private-enterprise unions have. Viewing that trade union is an interest group, Nibhond asserts that the rates of unionization are related to the costs and benefit of being a union's member. The state enterprise employees have low cost of unionization but receive high benefits from their collective bargaining through trade unions. These incentive factors resulted in the high rate of unionization in state enterprises. In addition, most public enterprises are monopoly industries and their services widely effect the national economy, labour strikes in these enterprises then become an effective instrument of the union to negotiate with the government. Consequently, state enterprise union movement is strong with the high rate of unionization and high bargaining power. On the contrary, workers in the private sector are working in the small enterprises, with the lack of knowledge of labour rights and might be easily dismissed by the employer for their attempt to form a union. These are the main obstacles for private sector employees to build a strong union (Nibhond Puapongsakorn 1987: 88-93).

Nibhond's analysis, based on the neo-classical economic concepts, is however inadequate to explain the end of state-enterprise union influences after the military coup in 1991. Indeed the strong bargaining

* See Vichote Vanno (1991) *The Role of Trade Unions in the Political Development in Thailand: 1958-1986*. Ph.D. thesis, City University of New York, (cited in Brown 1997: 177)

power and the strength of trade unions without public support are not sufficient factors to guarantee the survival of trade unions. When the state enterprise unions launched the aggressive demonstrations to demand for salary increase and to protest against the government policy on privatization in 1989-90, they were seen as a self-interest group that fights for their narrow interests. Consequently, the government that came to power after the military coup in February 1991 could immediately abolish the union rights of state employees with little public sympathy. On the other hand, the unions in the private sector that are weaker than the state-enterprise unions could exist and were successful in the national campaigns for the working class benefits, with the support of some NGOs and university intellectuals.

In the other studies, the Neo-Marxist concept of state-labour-capital relations has been employed to analyze the weakness of organized workers and the decline of social awareness in the labour movement, as the consequences of government policies on economic development and industrial relations. Lae Dilokvidhyarat asserts that the industrial development and private capital accumulation in Thailand benefit only the owners of capital at the expense of the farmers and workers through the government policies on the control over food prices, wage rate, and the restriction of labour- association rights (Lae Dilokvidhyarat 1987: 298). Lae indicates that since 1960, the government has played a significant role in the capital accumulation process. The development strategy has succeeded in creating a surplus of cheap labour from the collapse of agricultural sectors and the influx of these labourers to the urban area that attracted investment (Lae Dilokvidhyarat 1993:15).

For the absent role of trade union in political and social activities, Lae views that the objectives of trade union are limited by the labour law, which does not allow trade unions to be involved in the activities outside the scope of wages, working hours, and collective bargaining methods. Such legal restriction makes the unions pay attention to only their interests but not social benefits as a whole. The public then tend to think that the unions have only a few self-oriented objectives and its demands are unintelligible for non- union members (Lae Dilokvidhyarat 1993: 25).

However, the legal restriction is not the most effective instrument to control the roles of trade unions in political and social movements. In many instances, trade unions were involved in political and social issues beyond what were stated in the labour laws without any prosecution. Of more importance is the state intervention in industrial relations through

the establishment of various tripartite bodies, which led to splits within union leadership and the weakened power of the trade union movement.

Sawalux Chaythaweeep shows that since 1972 the state has developed tactics for labour control. This development reflected a general restructuring of state-labour-capital relations. The repressive controls imposed under the authoritarian, military regimes of the 1958-73 period gave way to the development of new models of labour control, which relied less on coercion and emphasized consultation and mediation within an institutionalized tripartite arrangement where workers, employers and government were to co-operate in resolving industrial conflicts and disputes (Sawalux 1990). Hewison and Brown also argue that the establishment of tripartitism suggests a further commitment to, and institutionalization of, the separation of politics and economics as trade union struggles are seen to be restricted to wages and conditions, while broader social and political reforms are to be effected through the political system and political parties (Hewison and Brown 1994: 510).

Recently, Somsak Samukketham reinforces the idea that the Thai state has used various strategies to control labour and institutionalized labour conflicts. Somsak concludes that from 1978 to 1984, conflict and competition within and between national labour congresses were due mainly to the state's direct interventions. Subsequently, such conflict and competition were institutionalized during 1985-1990. However, after the 1991 military coup, a repressive strategy and the divide-and rule strategies were utilized to control organised workers and weaken the labour movement (Somsak Samukketham 2001).

Apart from the studies on the roles of the state within a neo-Marxist framework, the state corporatist unionism model* is used for analyzing state-labour relations in Thailand. Kittipak finds that the Thai government does not structure the labour sector in corporate ways. The government policy towards organized labour from 1958 to 1974 had been that of suppression rather than co-optation while the key to government

* State-corporatist unionism means the presence of a strong state in which unions are strictly controlled by the government in decision-making bodies. Within these state-union relations, the state is more likely to enter into collaborative arrangements and has determined the trends of trade union movement, which prevented trade unions from involvement in broader political and social issues beyond the wage and employment benefits. These trends are represented by the characters of trade unions in, for example, China, Singapore (Frenkel 1993:312-15), and Malaysia (Jomo and Todd 148:53).

control of labour movement at the national level in the 1980s appeared to be subversive infiltration (Kittipak Thavisri 1991: 207-56).

It could not be denied that the Thai state played an important role in intervening in the development of the trade union movement. However, those studies emphasizing the role of the state in encouraging conflicts and competition among the union leaders tended to ignore the internal factors within trade unions that facilitated the state to fragment the labour movement. Since the early 1980s, some national labour congresses have been accused of activity as a self-serving labour aristocracy. The leaders of these national labour unions had competed with each other for their own interests and used their status in trade unions to seek for political benefits during the periods of political crisis. A crucial question is why these trade unions with leaders who corruptly advance their own interests at the expense of the workers continue to survive until the present.

In other studies, the weakness of the trade union movement is explained in relating to the ideology of trade unionism. Sungsidh indicates that one of the important reasons why trade unions became isolated from other social forces is the limitation of trade union ideology. From 1972 up to now, Thai workers have imitated trade unionism from the Western countries. For more than two decades, trade unions in Thailand have continued their union ideology, which emphasized on the protection and expansion of their members' interests that isolated them from the awareness of the whole social interests. It is therefore difficult for the trade union movement to get support from the public (Sungsidh Piriyanangsan 1995:284).

While Sungsidh asserts that the ideology of trade unionism itself led the union to be a self-interest group, Narong Petprasert elaborates with a different view that the decline of social awareness among the union leaders was caused by the decline of socialist ideology. He indicates that the rise of radical ideology among the labour leaders during 1973-76 was caused by some political factors, i.e., the oppression under a long period of dictatorship, the people uprising and political changes, the stimulation by radical student activists, the influences of the Communist Party of Thailand (CPT), and the impact of political polarization (Narong Petprasert 1992: 194-206).

The decline of radicalism in the labour movement particularly among the white-collar workers after 1976 was the results of socialist ideological crisis in Thailand and in international countries such as: the

collapse of the CPT, and the plight of people in the Indo-China socialist countries. In addition, the rapid growth of capitalist economy and the emergence of the new Buddhist thoughts in the Thai society also led the labour movement to reject socialism and radicalism. Consequently the labour movement had changed from its initial radical stance to a more moderate one and became a conservative movement, which struggled for its own interests and neglected to help others in the society (Narong Petprasert 1992: 224).

Narong's analysis is based on the Marxist approach on classical labour movement that the decline of socialist ideology resulted in the decline of radicalism and social consciousness of the labour movement. By radicalism, Narong refers to the radical left or the political stance of the socialism (Narong 1992: 192). But, however, when we consider the NGO movements in the post- 1976 period, we can see that the actors of these movements do not commit themselves to any political ideology but focus only on strengthening of people participation in broader social issues. The NGOs could mobilize more people and increase their importance in the responsibility for many social problems. So it could be possible for the trade union movement to retain its influences and keep awareness of social interests without the ideological commitment. But, it was evident that the trade union movement in the post- 1976 period was declining in both its militancy and broad social objectives. It is thus necessary to further investigate the causes and conditions for these changes in the character of the trade union movement.

In another study, Chokchai Suttawet elaborates that, the failures of industrial relations in Thailand are caused by the obstacles arising from the Thai social culture. Since the Thai social values lack the awareness of democracy and social equality which are the basic principles of trade unionism, the interpretation of requirement of equal power between employer and union, and the international standards of basic workers' rights (Chokchai Suttawet 1994: 174) are not catered for in Thai Values. He also asserts that the lack of public recognition of unionism is the major factor stagnating the growth of unions. According to the mass media, unions in the public sector lost their credulity more than private sector unions (Chockchai Suttawet 1994:137).

However, Chokchai does not explain why the public have a more negative view on state-enterprise unions than on the unions in the private sector. In fact, public opinions turned against trade unions just after the movements of the state enterprise employees in the late 1980s. While state enterprise unions became increasing isolated forces, some parts of

unions in the private sector received more support from mass media and other social movements in their struggles for workers' interests.

Based on the analysis that Thai trade unions are isolated and lack popularity among the public, Sungsidh proposes a new model which he called "social trade unionism" to be a new ideology for Thai trade unions. Sungsidh's model on "social trade unionism" is influenced by the German "social partnership" model in the industrial relations arrangement, which believes that the conflicts in the labour relations could be solved by the co-determination of the employer and employee in the management system. By "social trade unionism", trade unions are no longer seen as an enemy of the employers but help them to increase productivity and improve industrial efficiency on the principles of co-operation, mutual trust, and exchange benefits (Sungsidh Piriya-rangsan 1995:285-287).

The "social partnership" model is a result of the long struggle of the German trade unions for a share control over the production management. There are also many differences between the German and the Thai industrial relations contexts. The social partnership model therefore could not simply apply to the Thai society.

While student and peasant movements are viewed as the significant social movements in the early 1970s that stimulated trade unions to participate in broad social issues, the emergence of a number of NGOs and grassroots organizations as the new social movements in Thailand is also mentioned as an important factor in the development of trade union movement after the 1980s. The relations between the new social movements and the labour movement were mentioned in the way that trade unions need to make alliances with these movements in order to change themselves from an isolated force to be a part of social movements and to strengthen their own power.

In the analysis of the crisis of state-enterprise unions Sungsidh suggests that the state enterprise unions should cooperate with the intellectuals, the NGOs, the cooperative movements and etc., to build up a powerful social force for the economic, political, and social reforms (Sungsidh Piriya-rangsan 1991 in Thai: 168). Lae also points out that the alliance between the trade union movement and NGOs is necessary for the struggle against the government's industrial development strategies that facilitated the over exploitation of national resources by certain privilege groups (Lae Dilogvidhyarat 1993: 2). Some union leaders also indicates that labour movement could not isolate itself from democratic

movement, instead it must join forces with other social movements to demand social justice. The more the labour movement isolated itself, the weaker it was (Somsak Kosaisuk 1994: 75).

In another study, Somsak Samukkethum asserts that since 1986 people's attention has shifted from the old issues of workers and peasants to new social problems such as: ecological damage, AIDS, and cultural conflicts. The appearances of the new social movements in the forms of various NGOs and people movements in response to these problems meet the demands of the people, especially the middle class, and make them more popular than the trade union movement. Under these new circumstances, Somsak points out that the labour movement could not be strong unless it is recognized by the public. The labour movement then needs to expand their actions to cover not only the narrow interest of union's members but to the wider benefits of the people. At community level, it is also necessary that the unions should cooperate with the NGOs to conduct social activities to solve the community's problems. For Somsak, this new trend has already appeared in some informal coordinating centers of trade unions (Somsak Samukkethum 1996: 230-236).

While most studies based their hypotheses on the weakness of Thai trade unions, lack of popularity among the public, and need to cooperate with the other social movement such as: the NGOs in order to strengthen their power, an opposite view came from Ji Ungpakorn who argues that Thai workers are not weak but have potential and actual strength. In his study on *Thailand: Class Struggles in an Era of Economic Crisis*, Ji claims that this book is an attempt at a Marxist account of the modern Thai working class in the late 1990s (Ji Ungpakorn 1999: 8). He asserts that Thai workers conducted the class struggles, which are the main factors for social progress in determining the future of society. In addition, Ji concludes that women workers are not merely weak victims of exploitation but also play an active and militant role in working class struggles. For this, Ji rejects the results of other studies that illustrated the leading roles of students, the middle class, and intellectuals in the democratic movements of October 14, 1973 and May 1992. Instead, he believes that the workers played most crucial roles in the two events.

In the analysis of trade unions' ideology Ji sees that the NGOs' penetration on labour movement is an obstacle for the independent development of trade unions in Thailand. Ji indicates that the various

labour oriented NGOs* have a significant influence on the politics of trade union leaders. To Ji, the NGOs have a commonly held belief in reforming capitalism and the workers' struggle within the law. Their ideology is influenced by the collapsed Communist Party of Thailand for the "Left Nationalism,"** the belief in the weakness, and small part of the workers in the struggling masses. When the NGOs arranged educational programs for union activists and supported labour strikes, the NGOs treated the workers as if they were victims and made them depend on the NGOs' help. In addition, Ji sees that the NGOs, with their weakness of class analysis, have left the Thai labour movement to be dominated by nationalist ideas that are at best irrelevant and at worst harmful to the interest of Thai workers (Ji Ungpakorn 1999: 42-9).

Some of the main problems in Ji's study came from his extremely strict adherence to the orthodox Marxist proletariat revolutionary theory. He concludes that the Thai labour movement is a class struggle towards the proletariat revolutionary theory, but put little effort to find enough empirical evidence to support his thesis. Since Ji deeply believes in the revolutionary potential of the working class, he does not see the roles of other classes and ignores the fact that the Thai working class is weak in terms of either organization or political consciousness. Ji also neglects to mention the important fact that the alliances among trade unions, NGOs, and intellectuals in the campaigns for labour issues created a positive impact on working-class lives. This is because he sees that such movements are only the fight for capitalist reforms but are not aimed at revolutionary changes.

In fact, during the political crises in 1976 and in 1992 the trade union movement was not a united democratic force but was characterized by the dual features of pro- and anti- democratic movements (Napaporn Ativanichayapong 1993a: 114-45). For many studies on the May 1992 event, it is observed that the organized workers played less significant roles in the street demonstration than the middle class and NGOs. It has also increasingly been recognized that traditional class analysis along Marxist lines, which focuses only on two major classes in capitalist

* The NGOs mentioned by Ji are the Arom Pongpangan Foundation, the Friend of Women Foundation, the Women Development Group, and the Young Christian Workers.

** In Ji's study, the Left Nationalism refers to the current ideas on economic development that the Thai economy could somehow turn to a self-sufficient low technology agriculture economy. It also includes the ideas of pro-national capitalists but anti-foreign capital, which Ji sees as the main political current within the organized workers during the present economic crisis.

society, is too rigid when we see the complexity of present-day capitalist societies where new social movements encompassing people of different classes are increasingly important (Sungsidh and Pasuk 1993: 27-27-28).

In summary, most academic literature on the roles of trade union movement is pervaded by a sense of disenchantment that organized workers have not lived up to academic expectations regarding their historical roles. The analyses have been formed by a range of theoretical approaches such as: neo-classical economic model, orthodox-Marxist class theory and neo-Marxist concepts, strategic-group and state-corporatist models. These studies are very informative but, however, inadequate to explain and to understand the whole picture of the Thai Trade union movement.

Apart from the comments discussed previously, there is also an absence of the intensive analysis of the recent trade union movement after 1992. Most of the research works ended at the May 1992 political events. Those studies thus do not cover the recent development of trade unions in the 1990s when new political, economic, and social environments greatly effected the labour movement. Some of these significant circumstances are the increasing importance of the middle class and of the new social movements, the political consequences of the February 1991 military coup and the May 1992 event, and the impact of economic crisis since 1997. Under these new circumstances, trade unions' collective demands turned to focus on the new issues such as women workers' rights and occupational health and safety, which could mobilise a number of workers' sympathizers from other non-labour groups but could not mobilise large numbers of trade union members as the wage-issues had been able to.

This dissertation is aimed at overcoming the limitations of the previous studies by utilizing several theories of collective action derived from different theoretical approaches to examine the characteristics of Thai trade union movement in different periods. In addition, the scope of the study covers the present period of trade union movement in order to see the changes of the characters of this movement from the past to the present.

2.2. Theoretical Concepts

The main theoretical concepts employed in this dissertation are the theories of collective actions. From voluminous theories in the studying of collective action, this study has selected three theoretical approaches to analyse the collective behaviors of Thai trade unions. The three main

approaches of trade unionism, which are relevant to the analysis of the Thai trade union movement, will be precisely discussed. The first approach is the economic perspective viewing trade union as a cartel/interest group. The second one is the Marxist (class struggle) approach in which labour movement is seen as a class movement and trade union is an instrument of the working class to struggle against the capitalist class. The last one is the so-called “new social movement” approach that the classical labour movement is viewed as the “old social movement”, but the contemporary trends of trade unionism in some countries are seen as moving towards the direction of the new social movements.

2.2.1. The Economic Rational Approach: The Self- Interest Theory

The first approach to be discussed here is the economists’ perspectives, which view trade union as an economic organisation of the interest groups. A central principle of economic theories is the operation of markets, in which buyers and sellers exchange commodities or services at a price. The hiring of labour at a specific price is a market transaction. However, economists have recognized that a worker selling his/her services is far different from a merchant selling his commodities in the way that workers deliver themselves as part of the bargain. By economics, labour market is determined by large numbers of individuals and firms. However, in many labour markets, workers make decisions collectively through a union (Reynolds 1991: 1 and 323).

The economic approach in the analysis of trade unionism began in the nineteenth century, Sidney and Beatrice Webb defined a trade union as “ a continuous association of wage earners for the purpose of maintaining or improving the conditions of their working lives” (Webbs 1920:b). The Webbs’ analysis of trade unions has much influence over the contemporary economic theories of trade unionism. In most textbooks on labour economics, the orthodox view of trade unions is that they are organizations whose purpose is to improve the material welfare of members, principally by raising wages above the competitive wage level (Booth 1995: 51)

In an enormous body of literature, there are however two different views of economists’ perspectives on the analysis of the roles of trade unionism. On one side, it is asserted that unions are frequently able to push wages above the competitive level, what is called the “ monopoly” role of trade unions. On the other side are those who believe that unions

have beneficial economic and political effects as a collective voice/institutional response of their members (Freeman and Medoff 1991: 389-90).

Conventional economics focus mostly on the economic impact of trade unionism but some economists pay attention to the explanations of why individual worker do collective action through a union. One of the most famous studies is the publication of Mancur Olson's *The Logic of Collective Action*, in 1965. Although Olson designed his theory for economic interest organizations like trade unions, its applicability was extended to other types of organizations and collective struggles.

According to Olson, the diverse types of organizations or associations exist to further the common interests of their members, labour unions are expected to strive for higher wages and better working conditions for their members, and other organizations are also supposed to work primarily for the common interests of their members. There is no purpose in having an organization when individual, unorganized action can serve the interests of the individual as well as or better than an organization would do. But when a number of individuals have a common or collective interest, they will not be able to advance the common interest at all, or will not be able to advance that interest adequately. Organization can therefore perform a function to advance the common interest of groups of individuals (Olson 1971: 6-7).

To Olson, groups of individuals with common interests will not act to achieve their common group interest. The common interests provided by the group is a public good that individuals will free ride and attempt to benefit without their own contributions. The view that groups act to serve their interests is based upon the assumption that the individuals' behavior is not altruistic but self-interest motivation. The premises of Olson's work are those of neo-classical economic assumptions: (i) social phenomena are to be explained with reference to the preference and choices of individuals; (ii) individuals act rationally to maximize their interest and minimize their cost (Scott 1990: 110).

Apart from economic incentive, Olson's study of collective action focused on the "social incentive" and the "selective incentive" that motivate people by social and psychological objectives. In general, social incentives operated only in small groups in which the members can have face-to-face contact with one another. Olson divided groups into large and small. The social incentives are important in large groups only when a large group is a federation of smaller group. In a large group, each

member is so small in relation to the total and the group is not a friendship group in which all members know each other. As a result, it would seem pointless for some members to abuse another for a selfish, anti-group action because their actions would not be decisive in any event and the persons will not be affected socially by other members. There is thus no presumption that social incentives will lead individuals in the large group to obtain a collection group. The members thus seek to maximize their personal welfare and will not act to advance their common or group interests unless there is coercion to force them to do so, or unless some selective incentives, distinct from the achievement of the common interests, are offered to the members of the groups individually (Olson 1971: 60-63).

In addition, the selective incentive theory is used to explain why organisation with leaders corruptly advance their own interests at the expense of the organisation could continue to service. An organisation that provides selective incentives can retain its membership and political power even if its leaders manage to use the power of the organisation for objectives other than those desired by the membership. This is because the members of the organisation have an incentive to continue belonging even if they disagree with the organisation's policy (Olson 1971: 132).

Other economic theorists added that many collective actions depended crucially upon the resources of small groups of dedicated individuals, the critical mass, who provided collective goods for themselves and other larger group of passive beneficiaries or free riders. The critical mass typically consisted of persons rich in resources: money, time and, above all, organisational skills. The critical mass is thus often middle-class, while the passive mass often consisted of less resourceful person from the lower classes (Udhen 1996: 236).

Economic rational theory of collective action also asserts that individuals will join an effort to provide a collective good only if the individual cost of participation does not outweigh individual benefits. The important costs are the costs of organising transactions. If transaction costs are high, the collective action will be difficult to organise. High transaction costs are caused by, for example, institution, in particular political institutions and the conflicts over the distribution of benefits and costs (Khan 2000:21).

As trade union is a type of economic interest organisation, the economic rational theory is useful to explain the collective action of trade unions, particularly when they limit their collective demands to common

interests of their members. However, trade union is also a special type of interest organisation which differs from the other types of economic interest groups such as: an employer association, a chamber of commerce, or other types of business cartel. Workers form a union on the basis that they are a disadvantaged group and need an organization to fight for better sharing of economic interest while other business interest groups have been already in the advantage position and then form an organization only to maintain their benefits or to strengthen their powers.

The union actors often affiliate within a movement, not for economic or non-economic interests but for wide spectrum of reasons. On the other wards, trade union movements in most countries often performed as part of the social movements, not for the economic purposes but, for the aims of social transformation. It is thus necessary to discuss further the other theoretical approaches, which viewed that the collective action of social movement actors cannot be explained without invoking non-economic motives such as: altruism, solidarity, or class-consciousness.

2.2.2 The Marxist Approach: The Economic Unionism and the Class Conscious Unionism

Contrary to the economists, the Marxists explain what makes individuals engage in collective action is not self-interest but the class conflict in capitalist social relations and the working class' consciousness of their class interests. Capitalism had forced the proletariat into factories where it lost the ownership of the production means but developed its class- consciousness to act collectively, and trade unions were important resources that would form working class consciousness.

In order to understand Marxist perspective on trade union, it is necessary to discuss first the Marxist concept of proletariat revolution, which is clearly stated in the 1884 Manifesto of the Communist Party.

For Marx the capitalist mode of production is, however, a historically limited phenomenon, capitalism will be destroyed because of changes which it has itself fostered as part of its development process. The leading agent that will overthrow this mode of production is the industrial proletariat or the working class, which is exploited by capital in the capitalist relations of production. This prediction was strongly stated in the most famous Marxist literature, the 1848 Manifesto of the Communist Party.

Marx proceeds to analyze this process by which the proletariat is organized into a class and involve to the political arena by the development of industry, which pulls the workers together in a great mass. Combinations of workers originally formed to bargain with the individual capitalist over wage. As the union of the workers expanded to include their whole class, their struggle became a political movement.

Meanwhile, the development of capitalism causes the classes of the pre-capitalist mode of production, the petty bourgeois, peasants, artisans, etc., to disappear into the proletariat. Class antagonisms are thus simplified into the single antagonism between the capitalists and the proletarians, and the victory of the proletariat is equally inevitable (Marx 1978: 78-9).

In addition, Marx concludes that the goal of the proletariat revolution is the abolition of modern bourgeois private property and to convert capital into common property of society as a whole. The agent of this transformation can only be the proletariat that is forming itself into a class and consequently into a political party in the course of its struggle against its immediate exploiters (Marx 1978: 76).

Although Karl Marx devoted most of his life to study of the advanced capitalist society of his days, he rarely discussed any intensive theories of trade unions. This is because on the concepts of proletariat revolution, the central leading agent of the movement is not trade union but the political party. However, Marx regarded the revolutionary potential of trade union in the certain stage of proletariat revolution while Lenin was the chief exponent of the pessimistic school. The time when Marx spoke on numerous occasions of the importance of trade union was between the 1860s and 1870s when he participated in the establishment of the International Working Men's Association. In the 1866 Geneva Congress of the International Working Men's Association, Marx undertook most detailed analysis of the position of trade unions in capitalist society and the role they would play in the transition to socialism. His perspectives can be summarized into three points.

First, Marx accounts for the origin of trade union from the class-interest conflicts between the capitalists and the workers. In the capitalist society, the contract between capital and labor is never struck on equitable terms. The only social power of the workers is their members, but the force of numbers is broken by disunion caused by their unavoidable competition among themselves (Marx 1990: 33).

Second, Marx evaluates the status of trade union towards a change in the structure of capitalist society, as a school of socialism for the working class. Since the immediate objects of trade unions are confined to everyday necessities of the workers, i.e., the wages and working hours, the struggles against capital then take place daily, right before the eyes of the workers. Trade union is therefore the school of socialism where the workers are trained to become socialists. (Bender 1986: 497)

Third, Marx expresses his view on the revolutionary role of trade unions. Apart from their original purposes, trade unions must learn to act deliberately as organizing centers of the working class in the broad interest of its complete emancipation. They must look carefully after the interest of the worst paid laborers, consider themselves as the representatives of the whole working class including the unorganized workers. (Marx 1990: 34-5)

However, other Marxists did not have the same perspective as Marx in their views on the role of trade union in social revolution. As Marx gave more importance to trade unions as "organising center of the working class" and "schools of socialism" for the workers, Lenin on the contrary viewed that "trade-unionism means the ideological enslavement of the workers by the bourgeoisie" (Lenin 1978: 41). His critics on trade unionism were mostly laid in a famous work, *What Is to Be Done?* Lenin saw that trade union consciousness could not lead the working class to social revolution because the political purpose of trade union is constrained by their day-to-day economic roles. Trade union struggle was only the struggle against their employers for better terms in the sale of their labour power within the conditions of capitalism but not for socialism. The political purpose of trade unions is constrained by their day-to-day economic roles that "*fight the employers, and strive to compete the government to pass necessary labour legislation*" The only way to transcend the economic consciousness of trade union to political revolution was by the roles of intellectuals which came from outside the working class, from the revolutionary party (Lenin 1978:31-32).

Lenin's critic on the narrow economic consciousness of trade unionism was accepted by Leon Trotsky and Antonio Gramsci. Trotsky observed that unions could be incorporated into the existing social order and turned into agents of capital (Pool 1984: 13). Gramsci also suggested that trade union is only one of the dominant institutions originated within the bourgeois society and could only function within its logic rather than to commit to the overthrowing of capitalist relation of production (Boggs 1976: 86-88).

However, Gramsci disagreed with Lenin that the organic intellectuals should develop from within the working class to complement the traditional intellectuals in the revolutionary party. Gramsci saw the need for multiple levels of leadership and initiative in which the movement message would be transmitted to the mass through a cadre of intermediate leaders. This leadership structure would produce class consciousness among the workers and convince them to act collectively in the movement (Gramsci 1971: 6-23).

Apart from Marx, Lenin, and Gramsci, another important theorist who analyzes the collective action of workers on the basis of class-consciousness is Alain Touraine. In his study on "Unionism as a Social Movement", Touraine referred the labour movement to union activity based on class-consciousness. From Touraine, there is no organic link between class-consciousness and revolution. The origins of class conscious and of the transformation of unions into a labour movement do not stem from the crisis of economic or political institutions, but, from the defensive occupational solidarity of some categories of workers against the trends of modern industrial organisation. To Touraine, the labour movement refers only to union activity based on class-consciousness. Unionism becomes a labour movement only when the workers challenge, not only for wages or amounts of political influence, but the overall system of social control of economic resources (Touraine 1986: 151-152).

However, unionism does not always result in a class-conscious labour movement. Touraine categorizes union activities into three types. First, business unionism* or economism defends labour's economic interest in the market. Second, professional or guild unionism defends workers against entrepreneurs or managers as a stratum. Finally, labour movement or class conscious unionism defends the working class interests against the capitalists who dominate the society, and propose reallocation of the resources created by industry (Touraine 1986: 153).

* The term business unionism originated in the US in the late nineteenth century when Samuel Gompers became the first president of the American Federation of Labor (AFL). Gompers and his colleagues believed that workers should not become involved in political and middle-class reform movements, since this might divided the labour movement and fragment its aims (Booth 1995:38). The establishment of the AFL thus marked the beginning of the business unionism in the sense that trade unions only fight for the interest of their members but not participate in other broader social and political issues. However, the views of business unionism are shared by many authors. For Example, Daniel De Leon referred to business unionism as the literal running of union as a business (Goldfield 1989: 49).

It is only in certain very specific situation that organised labour has been able to reach this stage of development and play a central role in the social and political process of industrial societies. A class conscious labour movement can appear when unionism is defined by the integration of three components: defense of the specific interests of workers, attack against an enemy identified through an economic situation, and active participation in the values of industrial society- faith in the positive social consequences of higher productivity (Touraine 1986: 157).

In summary, the Marxists viewed that trade union must develop to be a class-conscious movement and played a central role in the social transformation. This perspective has been challenged after the world social and economic development was marked by the growth of capitalism, the collapses of the former communist countries, and the emergence of many new forms of social movements. Some of the challenged arguments came from the Marxist theorists themselves or from the former Marxist scholars. For examples, Eric Hobsbawm asserts that the Marxist assumption that the transition from capitalism to socialism, of which the working class is the active agent, is no longer tenable (Hobsbawm 1989:73). Andre Gorz also elaborates that changes in the role of work and labour process have weakened the power of skilled industrial workers and reduced their potential as a reference point for the socialist movement. Their place has been taken by the new social movements and all those who refuse to accept the work ethic so fundamental to early capitalist societies (Gorz 1987).

While the Marxist class approach are challenged for its ability in the study of the social movements, there appearance another theoretical approach, which is also applied to the study of the trade union movement. The new social movements and the social movement unionism are the other concepts to be discussed further.

2.2.3 The New Social Movement Approach: The Social Movement Unionism Theory

The appearance of the so-called “new social movement” is a phenomenon of the changes in the world economy. In the present world, a number of social problems such as ecological degradation, human-rights violation, and nuclear proliferation, have emerged as the negative consequences of rapid industrialization. The rise of various forms of people movement, i.e., the feminist, consumer, human rights, ecological, and cultural movements, are viewed as the new social movements that can mobilize more people in the campaign for the responsibility of such

social problems. However, many social movements that are now commonly called “new”, such as the women’s movements, are not new forms of social movements, but have existed for centuries in many parts of the world. So some new social movements are old but have some new features (Fuentes and Frank 1989: 179-80).

Frank and Fuentes assert that, in the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, Liberty; Equality; and Fraternity/ Solidarity (LEF/S) have long been and remain the demands of most movements seeking social transformation. The pursuit of LEF/S has successively centered on: (i) evolutionary and liberation movements to form the state and manage state power in the quest for liberation/political democracy; (ii) labour movement as part of class struggle in the quest for equality/economic democracy; (iii) Marxist socialism in the quest for fraternity/solidarity. Each of these three historic movements, however, failed to deliver enough LEF/S. The state and its political parties have often failed to offer or guarantee liberty and political democracy. The labour movement and social democracy have failed to provide equality and economic democracy. Marxist-inspired really existing socialism often failed to guarantee liberty and equality. However, the increasing perceived failure of the three old social movements also draws the “new” other social movements into the pursuit of these same classical LEF/S demands. These new social movements appear to offer a more hopeful alternative way to pursue LEF/S (Frank and Fuentes 1990: 139-140).

- **The New and the Old Social Movements**

Theoretically, the new social movement has its roots in the rejection of the Marxist class theories, which stress the historical role of the working class in the struggle for social transformation (Phillion 1998:86). The new social movements are assumed to be the movements of the post-industrial society and the workers’ movement is placed as the central movement of industrial society. Alan Scott identifies that the new social movements are categorically distinguishable from the workers’ movement in term of aims, ideology, and organization (Scott 1990: 16-35). As a rough guide, he suggests the following definition for the meaning of social movement:

“ A social movement is a collective actor constituted by individuals who understand themselves to have common interests and, for at least some significant part of their social existence, a common identity. Social movements are distinguished from other collective actors, such as political parties and pressure groups, in that they have mass mobilization, or the threat of mobilization, as their prime source of social sanction, and hence of power. They are further distinguished from other collectivities, such as voluntary associations of clubs, in being chiefly concerned to defend or change society, or the relative position of the group in society”.

(Scott 1990: 6)

In contrast with old social movements, new social movements are primarily social or cultural in nature and only secondarily political. The workers' movement, according to Scott, was concerned with the questions of workers' rights and with gaining access for the working class into the political process through the extension of the franchise, the formation of workers' political parties, the legalization of unions, etc. While the workers' movement is seen as a political movement, new social movements are understood as first and foremost social movements and not directly political in character. Their aim is the mobilization of civil society, not the seizure of power or to challenge the state directly. New social movements are located within civil society and are little concerned to challenge the state directly (Scott 1990: 16).

Another difference between the old and the new social movements is organisational form. According to Tarrow, there are three different aspects of movement organisation: formal organisation; organisation of collective action; and mobilizing structures. The formal organisation identified its goals with the preferences of the social movement and attempted to implement those goals. The second aspect, the organisation of collective action was formed when confrontations with antagonists were carried out. In any given movement, there might be a variety of forms of organisation of collective action, ranged from temporary to formal cells, controlled by formal organisations in loose contact or completely autonomous of them. However, Tarrow argues that the most effective organisation of collective action drew on **“social networks”** in which people normally live and work, because their mutual trust and independence can easily be turned into solidarity. The third element, the mobilising structures, link leaders with the organisation of collective action. When a formal organisation appeared in a movement, its leaders attempted to develop mobilizing structures to take charge of the activities at the base. It is only when mobilising structures were internalized and

the organisation of collective action is controlled by higher-level leaders that a movement came under the domination of a single organisation (Tarrow 1995: 135-136).

The mobilisation of preexisting social networks lowers the social transaction costs of organising collective action and gathers participants together after the peak of movement is over, this is what makes possible the transformation of irregular collective action into sustainable social movements (Tarrow 1995: 22). If movement organisations have a weakness, they cultivate ties with like-minded groups and form a coalition, attempting to compensate for the weakness of their constituency base, by assembling concentrated members at strategic places and times. The major demonstrations are organised through coalitions that come together from time to time around particular issues (Tarrow 1995: 145).

Similar to Tarrow, Tourin also discusses about the “social network” as the organisational form of the new social movements. The organisations of the social movement are characterized by a “social network” that is locally based or centered on small groups; organised around specific issues; characterized by a cycle of social movement activity and mobilization. At periods of low mobilisation, the loose organisations will be formed, instead of formal organisation, that a few individuals can carry on a minimal level of movement activity. These loose organisations are often in an ad hoc working committee, around single issues. This form of organisation brings some strategic advantage to the new social movements in the collective actions are highly adaptable and flexible in response to sudden events and new issues (Scott 1990: 30-31).

Finally, new social movements attempt to bring about change through changing values and developing alternative lifestyles. The focus on symbols and identities is viewed as the source of the new social movements’ significance. It is assumed that within new social movements the attempt is made to bring about social change through challenging values and the identities of social actors rather than by more conventional and directly political action (Scott 1990: 17-18).

The key points of contrast between new social movement and the workers' movement.

	Workers' movement	New social movements
Location	Increasingly within the polity	Civil society
Aims	Political integration/ economic rights	Changes in values and lifestyle/defence of civil society
Organization	Formal/hierarchical	Network/grass roots
Medium of action	Political mobilization	Direct action/cultural innovation

Source: Alan Scott (1990), *Ideology and the New Social Movement*, London, Unwin Hyman Ltd., p. 19

Another theorist, Lauries Adkin, see the limitation on the convergence of labour and the environmental movement. Adkin views that the new social movements, particularly the environmental movement, lack the economic agenda which offers real alternative to the labour movement and have little to offer the trade unions or citizens as workers. One of the problems is the difference in the lifestyles of environmental activists and those of the industrial workers. The former tend to make the choices for quality of life while the latter have to fight for security of life (Adkin 1989: 24-25).

The above characteristics of new social movements are confined to the social movements in the First World, but not necessarily compatible with the Third World social movements. Fuentes and Frank assert that in the Third World, social movements are predominately popular/working class. Its members are much more subject to deprivation and injustice, which mobilize them in social movements. Moreover, the international and domestic burden of the economic crisis falls heavily on these low-income people as to pose serious threats to their economic survival and cultural identity. Therefore, they must mobilize to defend themselves through various forms of social movements, not for developing alternative lifestyles but for their members' survival. In other words, the class struggle in the Third World continues, but it takes or expresses itself through many social movement forms. However, these popular movements also often have some middle class leadership who offer their

services as leaders, organizers or advisers to the community and to these popular social movements (Fuentes and Frank 1989: 184-5).

Veltmeyer also provides a counterpoint to the interpretation of social movements in Latin America and points out the necessity of a class analysis of these movements. He indicates the emergence of new struggles in the countryside of many countries in Latin America, which he calls the “new peasant movements” that constitute the most dynamic forces of resistance to neo-liberal capitalism. Some of the examples are the Chiapas uprising in Mexico and the Movement of Landless Workers (MLW) in Brazil (Veltmeyer 1997: 140-56). Veltmeyer asserts that these peasants and workers have constituted themselves as a class in subjective terms, with reference to actions based on a clear awareness of themselves as a class and people, seeking to liberate themselves from the exploitative and oppressive structure of neo-liberal capitalism in its Latin American form (Veltmeyer 1997: 157).

In fact, the recent social movements in the Third World embrace the elements of both the new social movements in the First World and the class-based movement. Many forms of the social movements in the Third World are the issue movements, which are predominated by the middle class, and aimed at changing in the social values and lifestyles. They are such as: the environmental, feminist, and human rights movements. However, other emerging movements comprise the popular/ working class and have the middle class who help them to mobilise collective action for their members’ survival. The forms of movement organisations are often the networks of the people groups such as the rural poor, the women workers and the occupational patients. The class-based movements and the non-class, identity-based movements thus could not be simply separated in the analysis of the social movements in the Third world.

- The Social Movement Unionism

While some new social movement theorists tried to distinguish the new social movements from the workers’ movement, which was viewed as an old social movement, other pundits pointed out that the labour movement under the leadership of trade unions, could also become a new social movement of the contemporary world.

In the late 1980s and the early 1990s, Ronaldo Munck and Peter Waterman formulated a new model to redefine the roles of trade unions in a different way from both the economic and Marxist perspectives. By this

new concept, trade union is neither the economic self-interest organization nor a tool of proletariat revolution, but a part of (new) social movement that extends its sphere of action beyond the limited defense of the particular interest of waged workers, which they called “social movement unionism (SMU).”^{*}

For Waterman, the debate around the concept of social movement unionism has taken place since the late 1980s. These studies criticized traditional trade-union theories and strategies. All the authors have been concerned with developing a new theory and strategy, which would help unions escape the impasse, isolation, subordination, or manipulation that the old theories have led to^{**}.

This approach of trade unionism draws from the experiences of the new social movements. It is a combination of the old union movement and the new social movement, in which the theorists try to clarify the differences between trade unions and social movements while specifying condition under which they become more similar. In the study of trade union movement, the SMU is both the proposition for, and the model of the contemporary trade unionism.

According to the propositions to provoke change in the structures and procedures of the trade union movement, it is suggested that trade unions redefine their membership, demands and position in the social movement. The important propositions are several issues. First, trade unions should no longer limit their mission to the defense of waged workers, but set themselves the task of advancing their interests and rights of all workers, wage and non-wage, and those outside the workforce (DeMartino 1999:92). Second, the unions' demands should extend from the issues of wage and working conditions to the increasing role of the workers' and trade unions in the determination of policies

^{*} Waterman's article on “social movement unionism” was first published in 1993. In 1999, he updated the article and changed the term “social movement unionism” to be “new social movement unionism.” He gave a reason that a number of writers on trade unionism in the Third World misunderstood “social movement unionism” to mean an alliance between unions and local and/or national-popular communities existing primarily in the Third World. He himself was not intended to be either populist or thirdworldist (Waterman: 1999:247). However, in this study, I prefer to use the initial term of “social movement unionism” since it has a broader meaning than the new one.

^{**} This debate is mostly summarized in Peter Waterman (1991), “Social Movement Unionism” Beyond Economic and Political Union,” Working Paper, No.18, Amsterdam: International Institute for Research and Education.

relating to their works and lives (Waterman 1999: 260). Third, the trade union movement does not divorce itself from the struggles of the new social movements, but allies with them and take active roles in political and social issues as one movement among many (Moody 1998: 59, Gorz 1999: 53-4 and Waterman 1999: 260-261).

As a model to explain the characteristics of the trade union movement, Ronald Munck identifies the manner of trade union movements in the Third World countries as the social movement unionism. He asserts that in such countries as: Brazil, South Africa, India, and Poland, trade unions have developed a broader social perspective and broken politically with the "economism" which Lenin saw as the maximum objectives of trade unions (Munck 1988: 106). For Munck, the labour movement implied a certain amount of economic, political and social cohesion. The early histories of trade union in the Third World countries were often associated with nationalist movement against the colonial occupation, and its contemporary development has increasingly reached out to those sectors outside the formal proletariat movement. Trade union movements sometimes turn towards the issues of the new social movements and in other cases these new social movements turn towards them (Munck 1988: 117).

Furthermore, Moody asserts that the social movement unionism has already been born in South Africa, Brazil, South Korea, and elsewhere in the more industrialized parts of the Third World. For example, Moody indicates that, in Canada, the Canadian Auto Workers (CAW) 1996 collective bargaining program at the major auto companies is a good example representing the roles of new social movement unions. In shaping the unions' bargaining demand in a broader social direction, the CAW put forth a progressive bargaining program that would increase employment in the industry and the country, i.e., shorter work time, restrictions on outsourcing, and guaranteed job levels for the communities in which each plant was located. With this bargaining program, the unions could easily rally support from the working class of the region as well as to win public support in the communities (Moody 1998:61).

The social movement unionism model is originally formulated in the Western social context, there is, thus, a crucial question as to whether this theory has been confine to the social conditions of the Third World countries or is an appropriate model for trade unionism in these countries. For instance, Asian export-oriented industrialization are associated with cheap labour, and continuing stagnation in the bargaining power of organized workers, the low wages and low labour standards remained the

general features of industrial workers in most countries. These conditions seem to keep the unions' collective bargaining centered on the wage issues and their immediate working benefits rather than on thoughts of the long-term benefits of the working class as a whole or the wider interests of the community.

However, it could not be denied that the historical and contemporary development of trade union movements in many Third World countries have displayed some characteristics of the social movement unionism, for example, the involvement of trade unions in They also apply the concept "social movement unionism" to democratic movements against authoritarianism, the alliance between trade unions and the new social movements in that they campaign for labour and other social issues.

In summary, on the study of the trade unions and workers' collective action in Thailand, this dissertation uses the economic, Marxist, and new social movement approaches to understand the changes in the characteristics of the trade union movement. The concepts of collective action and trade unionism are applied to analyse the character of the trade union movement in different periods of its development.

A trade union itself is an economic organisation that defends the common interests of its members. However, in Thailand, the trade unions not only presented themselves as organisations that defended the common interests of their members, but also coordinated with other social movements in leading or supporting the movements that had political aims and broad social objectives beyond the particular interests of their members. In addition, the Thai trade union movement from 1972 to 2002, has not been a unique type of collective action of organised workers, but the articulated actions of more than one type of movement.

In this study, the concepts of **economic unionism** and **social movement unionism**, derive from the economic, Marxist, and new social movement theories, are two types of trade unionism identified as polar opposites in the analysis of trade union characteristics. Both the economic union and the social movement union have the economic objectives to defend the common interests of the working class, to strive for higher wages and better working conditions. The main difference between the two types of unionism is the unions' social objectives. The economic unions limit their role to collective bargaining for their members' interests and isolate themselves from the movements for broad social objectives but the social movement unions participate in the movements

for the political or the social aims beyond the defense of their members' interests. The workers' collective actions led by the economic trade unions were mainly autonomous trade union movement while the social movement unions often organised collective actions through the coalition of trade unions and other like- minded groups.

In order to examine the character of the trade union movement, the study focuses on the issues of unions' collective demands, the incentives that trade union actors used to mobilise collective action, and organisations of the workers' collective action. To explain the changes in the character of the trade union movement in the past three decades the analyses emphasise the interaction between the trade unions and three external factors: the political opportunities, the economic conditions of industrial development, and the other social movements.
