Union collective action, social movement unionism and worker freedom in New Zealand

Jane PARKER* and Ozan ALAKAVUKLAR**

Abstract. *Freedom of association can include the right of labour unions to take collective action in the interest of their members. In this regard, it is presumed that unions increase worker freedom. However, there is little literature on how worker freedom as self-actualization is linked to union collective action involving coalition-building with civil society. This article uses the notions of freedom according to Berlin (1969) and MacCallum (1967) to assess the meaning of such coalition-building for worker freedom. It then employs a radical democratic perspective (Laclau and Mouffe 2001) of union engagement with the Just Transition in New Zealand to explore how unions enhance worker freedom.*

Keywords: *Freedom, collective action, trade unionism, social movement, worker rights, New Zealand.*

1. Introduction

Among the identified forms of worker freedom or labour rights, those pertaining to worker–union relations examined in the literature on industrial relations focus mainly on "freedom of association". This type of freedom encompasses both individual and collective rights, which are enshrined in modern and democratic legal systems, and which are recognized as fundamental human rights by various international labour standards, and the United Nations 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Such rights frequently include: the right

* European Trade Union Institute (Brussels) and School of Management, Massey University (Auckland), email: jparker@etui.org (corresponding author); ** School of Governance, Utrecht University, email: o.n.alakavuklar@uu.nl. The authors would like to thank Dr Tzehainesh Teklè, the managing editor of the *International Labour Review* at the time of writing, and the two anonymous reviewers, for their insights on and suggestions for earlier versions of this article. The authors would also like to acknowledge our colleagues at Massey University and Utrecht University for their comments on this study, and Sam Huggard, Strategic Researcher at the E tū union in Aotearoa, New Zealand (and former Secretary at the New Zealand Council of Trade Unions), for his guidance on relevant union documents.

This article is also available in French, in *Revue internationale du Travail* 162 (1), and Spanish, in *Revista Internacional del Trabajo* 142 (1).

of individual workers to voluntarily join or leave a union; the right of unions to accept or decline a request for membership on the basis of certain criteria; and the right of unions to take collective action in the interest of their members (ILO 2018). The first of these rights concerns worker freedom, while the third involves union-centred freedom. However, unions, which act on behalf of their members, are presumed to enhance worker freedom. This paper focuses on the right of unions to engage in collective action, and on the manner in which this right is exercised by unions. We consider whether union engagement in collective action can and should be increased in order to enhance worker freedom, which is understood in this article as the capacity to self-actualize and make active life choices.

Collective action encompasses both internal and external union processes. In the literature and discussion on industrial relations and labour law, there has been a significant focus on the relationship between freedom of association as collective action and worker freedom. For example, Sidney and Beatrice Webb (1920) wrote that the most common purpose of labour unions was to maintain or improve the conditions of their members' employment, primarily through a process that they coined as "collective bargaining" (in which the collective voice of workers is represented by unions in negotiations with employers). Collective bargaining has been extensively studied as a form of externally orientated collective union activity.

However, unions are increasingly engaging in another area of externally orientated activity, namely coalition-building with other civil society actors. Such coalition-building with non-state entities and movements is mostly perceived in the literature on industrial relations as a form of survival or a revitalization strategy used by unions to reduce membership losses (Frege, Heery and Turner 2004; Engeman 2015). Furthermore, recent research, including this study, highlights the alliances forged by unions with other civil society actors in the context of social movement unionism, in order to serve the wider interests of unions and other concerned parties (see, for example, Dibben 2004; Webster 2008), and takes into account Engeman's (2015) challenge to a business unionism–social movement unionism dichotomy. In this article, we not only analyse the relationship between union functions and worker freedom, but also ask whether a radical democratic approach to such alliances will enhance worker freedom. The article is structured as follows. The second section examines different concepts of freedom, including Berlin's (1969) theory of negative and positive freedom, and MacCallum's (1967) analysis of freedom as a triadic relation. The third section looks at the application of these notions of freedom to internally and externally orientated collective union activity, while the fourth section focuses on coalition-building by unions with other civil society actors. In the fifth section, we present a case of social movement unionism in New Zealand in the context of Just Transition, and assert that it expands the dimensions of the freedom of workers, unions and other parties. We conclude in the final section by arguing that a new, radical democratic framing of social movement unionism could enhance worker freedom.

2. Concepts of freedom

2.1. Negative and positive freedom

The notions of negative and positive freedom were explored in the work of Kant, and later examined by Berlin. Negative freedom reflects the absence of constraints, and "involves an answer to the question: 'What is the area within which the subject – a person or group of persons – is or should be left to do or be what he [sic] is able to do or be, without interference by other persons?'" (Berlin 1969, 121–22). According to this concept, we have freedom to the extent that actions are available to us. Negative theorists tend to view constraints on freedom as being exclusively those created by other agents, and thus consider "unfreedom" as a social relation (Steiner 1983).

Positive freedom is the possibility or fact of taking control of one's life and realizing one's essential purpose, and "is involved in the answer to the question 'What, or who, is the source of control or interference that can determine someone to do, or be, this rather than that?'" (Berlin 1969, 121–22). While negative freedom theorists concentrate mainly on the degree to which individuals or groups suffer "interference" from external bodies, positive theorists focus on the internal elements that influence the extent to which individuals or groups act autonomously (Carter 2021, subsection 1). While negative freedom is usually attributed to individual agents, positive freedom is often seen as being achieved through a collectivity or by individuals. According to Carter: "Critics of liberalism often contest … the negative definition of liberty: they argue that the pursuit of liberty understood as self-realization or as self-determination (whether of the individual or of the collectivity) can require state intervention of a kind not normally allowed by liberals" (Carter 2021, introduction, para. 3).

Many liberals argue that positive freedom can lead to authoritarianism and repression because minority members participate in a democratic process characterized by (liberal democratic) majority rule. However, a government (or union) may try to create the conditions for its individual constituents to self-realize (this constitutes an individualist application of the concept of positive freedom). If a government acts undemocratically, it is arguably only acting rationally in line with a strategy of well-informed and "wise" leaders in the name of "freedom". As Carter (2021) notes, this approach draws on Berlin's (1969) notion of a "divided self", according to which individuals are free when their "higher", rational self (rather than their unreflecting or irrational "lower self") is in control. The approach supposes that some individuals are more rational than others, and thus know best what is in their rational interests and those of others, which enables them to compel individuals who are supposedly less rational than themselves to act rationally and thereby realize their true selves, therefore "freeing" them from their lower desires. Consequently, while negative theorists may contest the existence of a relation between an individual's freedom and desires, and instead promote a sphere of action within which an individual can pursue endeavours constrained only by respect for others, positive theorists may ask why the absence of state or group interference would guarantee an increase in freedom.

2.2. Freedom as a triadic relation

Beyond Berlin's dichotomy of positive and negative freedom notions, MacCallum (1967) argues that there is only one basic concept of freedom. The definition of this notion may vary depending on the manner in which the agent, constraints and the purposes of an agent are interpreted. His theory of freedom as a triadic relation therefore encompasses all claims concerning negative or positive freedom and leaves the interpretation of each of the three variables open.

Carter (2021) notes that there are "grey" areas in the distinction between the natural/internal constraints and the social/external constraints on an agent's freedom. Constraints can be unintentional (for example, market-oriented libertarians refer to obstacles created by "impersonal" economic forces). However, a more general viewpoint includes both intentional and unintentional constraints for which someone may be held responsible. Moreover, constraints may be categorized by source and type. The independence of constraints highlights the false dichotomy between theorists, who are seen as being in either a negative liberal or positive non-liberal camp. Furthermore, a natural/self-inflicted inability to do something may mean that a person remains free to act, or that such an inability removes their freedom to act, but does not imply that they are unfree to do so. This viewpoint endorses a "trivalent" framework, according to which there are some things that a person is neither free nor unfree to do.

In his work, Carter also discusses the importance of the notion of overall freedom, stating that:

> For some libertarian and liberal egalitarian theorists, freedom is valuable as such. This suggests that more freedom is better …, and that freedom is one of those goods that a liberal society ought to distribute in a certain way among individuals. For other liberal theorists, … all claims about maximal or equal freedom ought to be interpreted not as literal references to a scalar good called "liberty" but as elliptical references to the adequacy of lists of certain particular liberties, or types of liberties, selected on the basis of values other than liberty itself. (Carter 2021, subsection 6)

Carter (2021) also suggests that most theorists working on the measurement of freedom understand freedom as the availability of options. However, MacCallum's framework does not fully include the various possible concepts of freedom, in particular self-mastery or self-direction. His theory of a triadic relation refers only to "mere possibilities" (Carter 2021, subsection 7). The next section examines the different notions of freedom in terms of their application to internally and externally orientated collective union action.

3. Unions and possibilities of freedom

3.1. Internally orientated collective action and freedom

By acting on behalf of their members, unions demonstrate positive freedom. In theory, modern unions apply liberal (representative) and, to a lesser extent, participatory democratic principles in many of their internal activities to represent their members. It may therefore be considered that unions create the conditions for individual members to self-realize or become (more) self-

sufficient, for instance, by increasing the opportunities for members to use their voice and influence.

However, unions have been criticized, particularly by (neo)liberals and pro-market advocates, for acting in ways that apparently curb worker freedom. For instance, the majority-rule basis of much internal (liberal democratic) union decision-making does not necessarily enable a minority voice or position to be heard or prioritized so as to help all members self-actualize. This situation is exacerbated when unions do not enable members to actively influence decision-making processes or when they encounter growing membership passivity. The democratic action of many members has progressively moved towards periodic voting, away from more participatory arrangements, including membership meetings, debate, free communication, assemblies of strikers and member education (Voss 2010).

Michels' (1915) critique of liberal and participatory union approaches thus remains relevant, as it examines the likelihood of unions becoming oligarchies because of their growth, scale and consequent need for specialized officials. This division of labour can distance the rank-and-file from their leaders, which makes it difficult for them to understand their leaders' activities. Irrespective of their democratic beginnings, unions can develop into oligarchies with engorged bureaucracies (the "iron law of oligarchy"), which speaks to the fear of negative freedom concerning (increasing) union authoritarianism. However, some union scholars suggest that Michels' general law can be contested (see, for example, Fitch 2011). Adopting a positive approach, Streeck (1988, 313) observes a trade-off between efficiency and (organizational) democracy and a consequent need for oligarchic labour organizations. In line with the notion that leaders have the capacity to "know better", he argues that "too much" or the "wrong kind" of democracy has been "shown to be detrimental to the collective interest" (and thus to worker freedom), and that, in democratic interest associations, activities are not always carried out democratically.

However, in New Zealand, many unions are seeking to address the muting of minority group members within majority-rule processes. The country's peak or main institutional representative body, the New Zealand Council of Trade Unions (NZCTU), and affiliates including the Public Service Association (PSA, New Zealand's largest public sector union) and E tū (the largest private sector union) have established identity-based mechanisms for women, ethnic minority and LGBTQI+ members. For instance, E tū states that: "The governance and democratic structure of E tū is designed to allow as many opportunities as possible for members, delegates and activists to be involved in debating the issues that affect our union and contributing to the big decisions about our direction".[1] The "stretching" of liberal democratic union structures with identity-based mechanisms has sometimes been accompanied by voluntary numerical targets and quotas regarding mainstream union structures for minority groups. In accordance with the negative freedom theory, identity- and outcome-based mechanisms may remove an external constraint to the direct voice and other freedoms of individual minority members. Conversely, it could diminish their

[1] See https://www.etu.nz/democracy/.

freedom as individuals to devise other, direct means of self-actualization within the union. In line with the notion of positive freedom, these measures may increase the freedom of individual minority members via a "wise" collective within a collective.

With MacCallum's (1967) triadic freedom relationship, identity-based representative or participatory mechanisms within a liberal democratic union structure could add to the sources of overall freedom for individual minority members (that is, they could increase the availability of options for individual minority members). Whether, in practice, this translates into an increased availability of options for self-determination or self-actualization is less clear. For instance, some New Zealand unions are led by women, which may be linked to the development of "minority" or identity-based mechanisms and women's growing numerical representation in the union mainstream. However, some industrial relations scholars argue that an increased numerical representation of women and minorities does not necessarily enhance their voice or individual or group power relations in unions in which masculinist cultures predominate (Parker 2002).

The comparatively small scale of New Zealand's labour movement is significant here. Most union members (over 80 per cent) belong to the ten largest NZCTU affiliates, which is a result of union amalgamations in recent decades in order to access more resources and to wield greater influence on legislative changes. This development could be seen as an oligarchic tendency, which creates distance between union leadership processes and members while seeking workable representative democratic arrangements. However, the comparatively limited hierarchy and associated "nimbleness" of New Zealand unions, which reflect their small scale,[2] have probably counteracted any inclination to reduce voice opportunities for the rank-and-file (see Galles 2020).

More radically, a tendency to seek consensus via liberal/participatory democratic arrangements could mean that most unions reflect the current hegemonic order, based on the exclusion of the "other". Unions need adverse positions and disagreements to signify different struggles amid pluralist and inclusive democratic arrangements. The potential to enhance (the different forms of) worker freedom through additional mechanisms in a union is also ultimately constrained by the non-neutral liberal polity within which it functions. In the next section, the relationship between external orientation and the enhancement of worker freedom is discussed.

3.2. Externally orientated collective action and freedom

As noted above, externally orientated collective action by unions includes collective bargaining. This is often accompanied by collective activism by union members, and the provision of support and political leverage by unions (Wasser and Lamare 2014). Prima facie, such action supplements unions' repertoire of solidaristic options to seek greater worker freedom in economic terms (for example, through higher wages or improved working conditions), thus

[2] In 2020, New Zealand's largest unions (the PSA and E tū) had 59,476 and 55,709 members, respectively (New Zealand Companies Office 2020).

potentially enabling other types of freedom (for example, greater opportunity for worker self-actualization).

From a positive freedom perspective, union representation and negotiation of worker interests via collective bargaining and political engagement could be seen as necessary and pragmatic for enabling members to self-realize. However, negative advocates might view such intervention as a means of procuring individual freedom, particularly when negotiations involve positional approaches (such as distributive bargaining, viewed by the parties as a win–lose situation) amid growing member passivity. Positive theorists and unions might rationalize this overall strategy as a means of serving the rational interests of members and unions, thus helping the working class to break free from "false consciousness" (Allahar 2004) and the pursuit of goals that do not benefit (or free) it (Engels 1951), and creating the conditions for individual members to self-realize.

Again, for many liberals, positive freedom suggests a tendency towards authoritarianism. Furthermore, from a negative freedom perspective, the right of a union to take collective action on behalf of members may deprive individual workers of the right to bargain collectively through another union or non-union agents, thereby reducing their freedom (Galles 2020). In New Zealand, union membership is voluntary, meaning that individual workers who choose not to join a union are still free to bargain directly with their employer. The vast majority of private sector workers in the country have individual employment agreements. Overall union density in New Zealand plateaued at around 20 per cent between 2000 and 2010, but fell to 14.29 per cent by 2020 (New Zealand Companies Office 2020). In the public sector, overall union density is around 60 per cent. However, the extent to which employers agree to "pass on" superior collective employment agreement provisions to raise those in individual employment agreements to the same level is noteworthy (Bryson 2008), with implications for enhancing the freedom of all workers.

Furthermore, New Zealand's cornerstone employment statute, the Employment Relations Act 2000 (ERA), was intended to recalibrate the power relations towards workers and unions by placing an emphasis on both collective and individual bargaining arrangements. However, this shift has been muted in practice (Barnes 2005). Nevertheless, under the ERA, parties to employment agreements are required for the first time in the country's labour law history to bargain for collective agreements (including the conclusion of such agreements) in "good faith". From a positive freedom stance, the legal (state) requirement to engage in the conclusions of such bargaining agreements may help employment parties to achieve stronger bargaining-related outcomes (and, depending on what these outcomes are, freedom) for workers.

Legal changes have also been preceded by a shift in union bargaining approaches in New Zealand. Traditionally, employment relations have been underpinned by a conception of the relative powers and freedom of workers/unions and employers as mutually exclusive. However, as Pansardi (2012, 26) observes: "[I]n the case in which power and freedom are understood as properties of two different individuals [or groups] involved in a social relation … power can be exercised in ways which do not reduce, and which might even increase, the power-subject's freedom".

Indeed, collective bargaining is increasingly informed by an integrative bargaining approach that seeks to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes and to enable unions to gain influence in the workplace. This "positive-sum" approach often involves joint problem-solving by management and a union (for example, a case of worker discontent may be addressed through the negotiation of higher "efficiency wages" or changed working practices that yield higher productivity). In this context, "passing on" (see above) should occur in good faith rather than undermine collective bargaining. However, according to the concept of negative freedom, non-union members can opt to bargain individually (Barnes 2005) due to their freedom of non-association.

Another particularity of unions' externally orientated collective action for worker freedom is related to coercive action. Union-led strikes and employer-led lockouts are unique to industrial relations. While a strike may secure better outcomes from the employer for union members, it constrains an individual worker's freedom for the duration of the strike. A full strike halts production and means that union members are not free to work, thus restricting both their earning capacity (and potentially placing them in a situation of hardship) and their assumed self-development through work. In New Zealand's system of voluntary unionism, a strike can also have an impact on the freedom of non-union workers by hindering the performance of their work (for example, strike-breakers may be physically restrained by a union when seeking access to the workplace, and experience internal tension as a result of wanting to support striking colleagues yet needing to work, or by demonstrating loyalty to the employer). By attempting to continue to work, non-union members can also weaken the impact of a strike for union members, and thus prevent a potential increase in the freedom of unionists (and their own). The relevance of such situations is demonstrated by a marked increase in work stoppages in New Zealand since 2018, particularly in the public sector, which reflects the impact of the wider political economy as an external constraint on or as a facilitator of legal options for worker collective action, and by extension, worker freedom.

Freedom theorists have differing views on threats of strike and lockout actions. Steiner (1994), as a proponent of negative freedom, provides a narrow definition of constraints on freedom, considering that an agent is only unfree to carry out an action if that action is physically impossible to carry out. Thus, the threat (or certainty) of lawful strike action by a union would not make it impossible for workers to continue to work, only perhaps less desirable to do so. It is therefore not the strike threat that creates this "unfreedom", and one is not unfree until the sanction (described in the threat) is carried out. As a solution to this issue, Carter (2021, subsection 5) proposes that: "although a law [strike threat] against doing some action, *x* [working], does not remove the freedom to do *x*, it nevertheless renders physically impossible certain *combinations* of actions that include doing *x* and doing what would be precluded by the punishment". This suggests a restriction of an individual worker's *overall* negative freedom, although they do not lose the freedom to carry out any specific action taken in isolation (Carter 1999). In the following section, we build on the discussion of collective action by introducing social movement unionism and coalition-building as a strategy to enhance worker freedom.

4. Social movement unionism as a means of enhancing freedom

Many labour movements, including those in New Zealand, have reached comparatively low membership levels, which has had a negative impact on their capacity to act collectively on behalf of their members or as political conduits of (democratic) voice before the State. Consequently, unions have pursued survival and revitalization strategies. Such strategies include: restructuring (for example, amalgamations or mergers); new approaches to collective bargaining; changing political strategies; new organizing and recruitment approaches; and coalition-building with civil society actors. However, there is little consensus on what constitutes successful strategies and solutions (Parker and Alakavuklar 2018). We will now consider the least-explored of these strategies, that is, coalitions, in relation to worker freedom.

4.1. "Instrumental" coalition

Scholars provide differing definitions of union coalitions with other civil society actors. For example, the study conducted by Frege, Heery and Turner (2004) on five countries concluded that such coalitions are largely attempts by coalition partners to access resources, and are a secondary method employed by unions to support a unilateral regulation of the labour market, collective bargaining (for example, mobilization of community support for strike activity) and legal regulation. For Frege, Heery and Turner, much of the relationship between unions and civil society actors is centred around shared interests that pertain mostly to workplace matters. Their analysis suggests that instrumental coalitions have a negative impact on the nature and capacity of unions' internally *and* externally orientated collective action to enhance workers' freedom. However, della Porta (2006) emphasizes the nexus between the two orientations of collective action, stating that, due to their engagement with social movement actors in the global justice movement, unions adopt more democratic and inclusive principles that transform social relations concerning work.

Indeed, the industrial relations literature on coalitions and social movement unionism generally lacks a direct commentary on (worker) freedom, and tends to concentrate instead on strategy and coordination of action. Nevertheless, the connections between social movement unionism and freedom somewhat depend on the aims and modus operandi of the coalition partners. Insofar as a coalition involves direct action by a union and other parties, negative freedom theorists might view it as a means of enhancing worker agency and freedom. Conversely, some may see it as an external constraint on workers' self-actualization. For their part, positive freedom advocates may perceive coalitions, whether based on democratic principles or not, as a means of strengthening union numbers and clout, and as a precondition to members' self-realization. With MacCallum's triadic freedom relationship, the constraints of an instrumental coalition for members may be either intended (for example, leaders take decisions on behalf of their members) or unintended. Similarly, the available options for freedom that an instrumental coalition provides may be intended

(for example, substantive economistic outcomes) or unintended (for example, coalition parties may influence one another's internally and externally orientated modus operandi), with any ensuing increases in worker freedom being difficult to quantify.

Arguably, unions (and thus workers) and businesses cannot share an equal voice or power in capitalist relations. Unions intervene "to lessen friction and to bring justice to the relationship, not to change [its] essential nature and structure" (Katz 1951, 102). However, coalition activity involving unions and other civil society actors which functions within a capitalist polity may encounter voids within that polity, and seek to increase the relative powers (and thus freedoms) of those involved,[3] both within unions and in their interactions with other stakeholders.

4.2. Coalition beyond instrumentalism

Beyond serving union interests (for example, ensuring the survival/revival of unions, increasing their power bases, or prioritizing the pursuit of union goals such as job regulation), coalitions can also be conceived as extending the reach of externally orientated collective union activity to wider social and political change (Tattersall 2010) and thus the pursuit of goals shared by all the coalition partners. For instance, Dibben (2004) suggests that social movement unionism as a form of union alliance may involve multiple elements, including: internal grassroots democracy; reaching out to other social groups and pursuing broad social justice objectives; and combatting the excesses of international business and their neoliberal hegemony. Using these elements, she thus makes reference to internally and externally orientated collective union activity. From a more externally orientated viewpoint, Webster (2008, 253) describes an expansive version of social movement unionism as "an appeal to workers that goes beyond the employment relationship to the totality of their lives, as consumers, citizens, family members and women". However, as McAlevey (2015) observes, while scholars attribute contemporary union failure in the United States to structural factors and globalization, the decline in labour organization reflects the support of unions for "corporate campaigns and narrowly-defined, interest-based politics", thus moving them away from workers and putting them at odds with unorganized workers and the community. She also attributes the decline to a "long-term shift away from deep *organizing* and toward shallow *mobilizing*", and "the split between 'labour' and 'social movement' [hampering] what little organizing has been done" (McAlevey 2016, 2). For their part, Fletcher and Gapasin (2008) suggest that unions are likely to be ambivalent about forging links with non-labour organizations or, rather, that ideological differences may prevent consistent alliance-building, although such issues may be the same as those for which unions envisage coalitions to help to resolve (for example, concerning tensions between climate change and work).

[3] In line with the notions put forward by Marx, Harvey (2010) argues that capitalism is a ceaseless process of accumulation that searches for voids to fill and to turn into capitalized assets until a moment of crisis occurs due to a limit on expansion. From this perspective, union decline reflects the overt appropriation of labour, value and wealth during the neoliberal phase of capitalism (Harvey 2005), a process which is arguably reversible.

Furthermore, coalitions involving unions and other civil society actors on matters beyond job regulation may draw on the organizing model employed by a minority of unions in the United States, United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand in recent decades. While there is debate over the emphasis on the use of collective action for internal or external union goals (for example, Hurd 2017) and its relationship to union servicing (Fiorito 2004), facilitates union–member relations with the main aim of directly empowering members. Union officials organize members to help them act on their own behalf and empower themselves, and thus members are or become the union, collapsing the agent–external constraint relationship defined in freedom theory. This approach encourages members' self-leadership, perceived as the confidence to initiate organization with other stakeholders as broadly as possible. It is also commonly found in creative campaigning (for example, publicity stunts, direct action, demonstrations) that extends the usual repertoire of union collective action to achieve wider gains for workers and other coalition members. Furthermore, community support for campaigns can be a potential mechanism for promoting the grassroots activism of social movement unionism.

At this juncture, it is helpful to examine Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) seminal political theory on radical democracy. For them, radical democracy is not about tactical alliances or union revival, but rather agency, change, organizing and strategy, to build an inclusive counter-hegemony against dominant neoliberal discourse and practices. Hence, it represents an opportunity for unions to embrace the radical potential of social movements and collaborations in order to argue in favour of politics "from below" which challenge dominant assumptions in spheres of life driven by market forces. In industrial relations, unlike Kelly's (1998) emphasis on a leader-centred framework for action, radical democracy is more akin to mobilization theory, which is positioned "within the sphere of class action by rooting collectivism in the workplace solidarity created by the capitalist labour process" (Atzeni 2009, 6), but also encompasses collectivism in the workplace and other forms of solidarity.

Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) work thus examines different articulations and agencies of resistance as an *ongoing*, contingent and fragile hegemonic struggle (Jacobs 2018). From this perspective, despite inherent tensions, the building of alliances by unions (that is, creating chains of equivalence) with civil society groups contributes to a joint politicization of social issues. These efforts can challenge practices in order for unions, communities and societies to become more inclusive and transform power relations at organizational and social levels (Parker and Alakavuklar 2018).

Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) view of an ongoing struggle involves the non-primacy of class or other groups. For the two scholars, radical democracies should be extended to wider social relations by addressing redistribution and recognition issues through the radicalization of demands for liberty and equality in society. It is therefore not only a question of wealth redistribution (as is customary for unions), but also the recognition of other social, economic and environmental issues as a result of the externalization of the costs of capitalist development, and an interrogation of how these issues and strategies to overcome hegemonic struggles are conveyed with regard to hegemonic assumptions. As Mouffe (1989,

42) argues, "[i]t is not a matter of establishing a mere alliance between given interests but of actually modifying the very identity of these forces", with each group seeing itself "as equivalently disadvantaged by existing power relations" (Purcell 2009, 159). The dynamic egalitarianism of this "from below" approach may enable (greater) freedom for workers and others in a negative sense. For example, following the launch of a community membership scheme by Unite the Union, former leader of the British Trades Union Congress, Len McClusky, commented: "[i]t is now time for those on the margins to organise, to come together to challenge the decisions made by the elite in the interests of the few. This is the real Big Society – ordinary people organising for themselves – in action" (as cited in Holgate 2015, 432).[4] Indeed, egalitarians typically espouse a broader notion of what constitutes constraints on freedom. As Carter (2021, subsection 5) observes, they: "often call their own definition [of freedom] a positive one, in order to convey the sense that freedom requires not merely the absence of certain social relations of prevention but the presence of abilities, or what Amartya Sen has influentially called 'capabilities'". In the following section, using the framework of "Just Transition", we demonstrate how alliances can facilitate radical democratic interventions and enhance worker freedom.

5. Just Transition: An illustrative case of social movement unionism as a means of enhancing worker freedom

In New Zealand, alliance-building, either for union interests/job regulation or as a "sword of justice" (Flanders 1970) has never been a defining characteristic of unionism. While several union case studies provide limited empirical insights via qualitative assessment (see, for example, Newman and Jess 2015), a wider, mixed-method study conducted around a decade ago found that alliance-building took place in an *ad hoc* manner rather than as a part of a longer-term union strategy (Parker 2011). However, where unions had engaged, these alliances were found to be centred around workplace issues, and union informants perceived that they formed an instrumental strand of and support activity for union revival within existing democratic and political arrangements. In positive freedom terms, this constitutes externally orientated union collective action aimed primarily at serving union interests (seen as being aligned with workers' interests) if not wider coalition group interests.

Other commentaries portray unions as essentially conservative institutions (Gumbrell-McCormick and Hyman 2013) and, in the case of New Zealand, progress towards unions playing a broader role through civil society alliance-building is hindered by the uncertainty or doubts of members concerning the

[4] Holgate (2021) examines Unite's community-based organizing in the form of recruiting "non-workers" (that is, retirees, students and unemployed people) into a new section of the union. This development reflects "an understanding that the purpose of trade unionism is to advance the interests of the working-class as a whole" (Holgate 2021, 226) and, Holgate suggests, potentially rebuilds wider spaces of solidarity. While it demonstrates activity "from below", this endeavour differs from a radical democratic framing of wider-interest social movement unionism wherein working-class interests are not given primacy over other coalition parties' interests.

purpose of their union. Most members see unions mainly as bargaining agents that focus on work matters via established collective means. Therefore, many members are concerned about unions "hiving off" union resources to focus on broader issues, particularly as a result of: reduced resources amid shrinking membership; the individualization and decentralization of employment relations encouraged in labour law from the early 1990s until the adoption of the ERA; and a "culture gap" between procedurally bureaucratic and organizationally efficient unions and the modus operandi and "life-stage" of social movement allies (Tilly 1984). Union engagement in "wider" interest coalitions is thereby perceived as curtailing more union-centric goals and activity rather than enhancing freedom understood as an availability of options or possibilities (Carter 2021; MacCallum 1967).

Shorter-term economic pragmatism has meant that alliance-building in New Zealand is relatively recent (Parker and Alakavuklar 2018). However, attempts have been made by some unions to initiate alliance-building with other stakeholders as part of the Just Transition in response to a growing sense of urgency for unions to strategically broaden their purpose and relations with outside groups.[5] We will now look at the examples of the CTU and a key affiliate, which illustrate a generative relationship between the social movement unionism and notions of freedom for workers. Just Transition is a framework developed by the union movement globally which involves social interventions to secure workers' rights and livelihoods at a time when economies are shifting to sustainable production to combat climate change. Its essence, unions argue, is simple: the costs of changes needed to deliver the public a more stable climate must be spread evenly and not be borne disproportionately by workers (Galgóczi 2020).

The NZCTU is not a member of formal alliances on climate justice, unlike other peak bodies and certain New Zealand unions, such as Unite Union, which is an "observer member" of the New Zealand Climate Action Network.[6] However, to increase the stake of unions in climate policy debates – and particularly in the distributional impacts of related decisions – the NZCTU developed an agenda that produced key intervention documents: *Just Transition: A Working People's Response to Climate Change* (NZCTU 2017) and *Next Steps on Just Transition to Good, Green Jobs* (NZCTU 2019). Based on this agenda, with a longer-term perspective on a Just Transition, the NZCTU invited members, by means of a questionnaire, to give voice to the New Zealand Climate Change Commission (or *He Pou a Rangi* in Māori, the language of New Zealand's Indigenous people) concerning zero-carbon legislation,[7] and asked the New Zealand Government to take into consideration and be accountable to working families when making strategic decisions such as those related to emission reduction plans (NZCTU 2021). The NZCTU has also spoken at events held by organizations such as Greenpeace Aotearoa and the Environment and Conservation Organisations of

[5] See https://www.union.org.nz/events/nzctu-organising-conference-2019-new-pathways-to-building-power.

[6] See http://www.nzcan.org/about#members.

[7] See https://union.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Working-People-Need-a-Just-Transition-Flyer-Questionnaire.pdf.

New Zealand, and has invited climate justice speakers to its conferences. It also hosted the first-ever New Zealand Roundtable on a Just Transition to a Sustainable Economy, with support from the International Trade Union Confederation. The Roundtable was not only attended by the traditional actors in tripartite social dialogue – employers, government and unions – but also Greenpeace and Forest & Bird New Zealand, and other civil society groups such as the Anglican Diocese of Wellington.[8]

Meanwhile, many domestic environmental organizations are acutely aware that, to act on climate change, governments need to engage with civic actors that lend legitimacy to climate change action in the eyes of the public. These environmental organizations have sought union counsel on best practices for a Just Transition as an essential prerequisite for such government action (PSA 2018). In line with the theory on positive freedom perspective, these measures suggest that the freedom of workers and other parties will increase as a result of the pooling of thinking and activity of collectives (including unions). Viewing workers and other grassroots members as integral to, rather than served by, these collectives also suggests that their freedom is or may be enhanced in a negative sense through the pursuit of climate justice. From a triadic freedom perspective, such engagement indicates the creation of new sources of worker freedom.

However, a more concrete example can be found in the social-movement-unionism and alliance-building activities carried out by E tū in the context of a Just Transition. In its "Supporting a Just Transition" document, E tū (2019a) presents a social movement union-based approach, which takes into account the equal sharing of responsibilities (that is, redistribution) and the recognition of the interests of *tangata whenua* (people of the land) and other stakeholders, including "Pacific peoples affected by rising sea levels" (2019a, 2). In practical terms, with the announcement by the New Zealand Government of the end of permits for offshore oil and gas, E tū has played a critical role in developing a new strategy in the Taranaki region (the province in which most of New Zealand's oil and gas exploration and production is carried out, and where the union has members in infrastructure, engineering and extraction industries).[9] The Taranaki 2050 Roadmap, which was launched at the Taranaki Just Transition Summit (attended by former Prime Minister, Jacinda Ardern) in May 2019, was developed with E tū's regional leaders (E tū 2018; 2019b; 2019c). The Roadmap is described as "an ambitious blueprint for just transition" and "a landmark joint project involving government, workers, employers, Māori, local communities, civil society and other stakeholders" (Morgenster 2021).

Indeed, as well as being represented in the governance group of the regional entity delivering this work,[10] E tū has actively networked within the wider

[8] See https://www.union.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Just-Transition-Roundatable-Agenda-5-Oct-2018.pdf.

[9] E tū also has members in aviation, communications, community support, manufacturing and food, public and commercial services, and health and safety (E tū 2021).

[10] See https://www.taranaki.co.nz/vision-and-strategy/taranaki-2050-and-tapuae-roa/taranaki-2050/.

Taranaki community, including with environmental organizations[11] and the Māori population (E tū 2019c). A recent post by E tū indicates that the latest report by the New Zealand Climate Change Commission, *(He Pou a Rangi) Ināia tonu nei: A Low Emissions Future for Aotearoa*, "sets out a policy direction for a fair, inclusive and equitable transition for workers and their communities".[12] In the post, the union states that the advice contained in the report "covers the core components advocated by E tū for a Just Transition: proactive transition planning with all parties at the table, widely accessible education and training, dedicated support for workers in transition, and better analysing the distributional impacts of climate policies on population groups".[13] The report recognizes the call from unions and other stakeholders for a Just Transition to translate into job changes that reflect "secure, well paid, and decent work",[14] and for the need to partner with *iwi* (Māori communities), *hapū* (clans or tribes) and *whānau* (families) to ensure an equitable transition which guarantees the genuine involvement of workers and which works for Māori, and to ensure that Māori social and economic interests are protected and that the *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* (the Treaty of Waitangi, New Zealand's founding bicultural document) is upheld. While no conflicts have been reported between E tū's social movement unionism engagement with a Just Transition and the interests of the members of other coalition parties, the union is aware that key challenges remain (for example, with regard to securing investment to develop new industries or to support existing ones with a transition to a low-carbon future). As reflected in the tax reform discussions to fund the transition, E tū's engagement with the Just Transition requires "honest debate and further action" that could generate conflicts of interest in the future.[15]

E tū also plays a critical role in Southland, where the Tiwai Point Aluminium Smelter has been required to cease its operations by 2024 as part of the Just Transition strategy announced in the region in 2020. The union has adopted a similar social movement unionism-based approach with regard to the region: "This process will ensure a wider community stakeholder approach to regional economic development planning, with an emphasis on sustainable and decent work for Southlanders no matter what happens with Tiwai Point. E tū members and leaders will play an integral part in this process" (E tū 2021). E tū is thus directly involved in future plans for the region with the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE), Māori, urban community representatives and educational institutions. A wider-coalition perspective centred around the discourse of Just Transition was acknowledged by E tū representative, Anna Huffstutler, who stated: "I think it is important to bring all the stakeholders together … which will benefit everyone, including workers, businesses and the community. Everyone has to be looked after" (Girao 2021).

Through these efforts, E tū has been able to operate beyond the usual confines of unionism in New Zealand and not only engage with traditional social partners,

[11] See https://climatejusticetaranaki.wordpress.com/just-transition-community-conference/.

[12] See https://etu.nz/commission-lays-foundation-for-necessary-just-transition/.

[13] See note 12.

[14] See note 12.

[15] See note 12.

but also build alliances regarding climate action with other stakeholders by different means. Such means include co-developing new approaches to common socio-economic and environmental challenges, such as: developing agenda and roadmap documents concerning a Just Transition; participating in regional governance mechanisms in order to ensure inclusion in local decision-making processes on a Just Transition; involving local schools and teachers in the alliance building process; and establishing deeper relations with local *iwi*. These "from below" activities enhance the externally orientated collective processes carried out by the union and the other institutions with which it engages by means of "fusion" activities as part of coalition (Kelly 1998).[16] They also increase affiliation, which Heery (2018, 672) suggests is neglected in the research literature and yet is common among unions, and which is "a way in which unions play a wider social role at one-stage removed from the immediate representation of member interests". E tū's influence in these new domains implies more freedom opportunities for the union and for other coalition groups and their members. Furthermore, these forms of coalition consist of community engagement or fusion involving grassroots organizers and members. Such forms of coalition highlight a source of greater negative freedom and more freedom "possibilities" for those who are directly involved in and influence these relationships.

From a radical democratic perspective, by constructing a new meaning of the relationship between capital, labour and the environment, as signified by a Just Transition, the NZCTU and E tū have articulated new visions and an alternative political position from which the main disadvantaged parties can form a counter-hegemony designed to change current power relations. This is evidenced "on the ground" by E tū's externally orientated collective action and engagement in local processes and with communities concerning climate change-related social movement unionism.

In seeking to revise the role of unions in the environmental struggle, the NZCTU and its affiliates have been confronted by multiple opposing positions (including those of (neoliberal) capital and, to some extent, those of their members). However, a Just Transition acts to link multiple actors (such as workers, environmentalists, Indigenous communities and governance bodies, as in the case of Taranaki with the strategic involvement of E tū). These efforts have opened up a new contingent discursive space to combat the exploitation of labour and the environment by capital (Hampton 2015), in which chains of equivalence can be developed with regard to social movement unionism and alliance-building, thus enabling the implementation of and participation in a new political agenda.

Such discursive interventions offer new meaning to the struggles of unions, while aligning with other movements inevitably brings material and economic changes that have an impact on workers and workplace- and/or industry-related practices, and communities and/or environmental and community-related issues. With our case examples, there was no evidence of spontaneous, externally orientated collective action related to a Just Transition (see Kelly 1998) that could enhance workers' negative freedom and create further opportunities for workers

[16] Kelly's "fusion thesis" suggests that, rather than replacing labour, new social movements are natural allies of trade unions.

to explore their freedom (for example, through free(r) expression of their joint demands, and in accordance with their aspirations). However, McAlevey (2016) notes that different change processes (advocacy, mobilization and organization) yield different kinds and levels of victory. For McAlevey, only organization can challenge a gross inequality of power and, by implication, have the greatest positive impact on worker freedom. This kind of impact can be seen with the activities of the NZCTU and E tū, which range from channelling the voice of working families to the New Zealand Climate Change Commission to mobilizing key stakeholders in different regions with a shared strategic agenda. As a form of externally orientated collective union action, a radical democratic framing of social movement unionism suggests that there are productive tensions between the agents involved, but such coalitions can yield greater freedom for all participants. While union members have a legitimate say in future economic and environmental policies, with the involvement of other key stakeholders to advance collective interests, union bodies are adopting a strategic role to determine the pathways towards a Just Transition, particularly in the case of E tū. While it is not possible to quantify freedom or to compare it before and after the alliance-building efforts, based on the possibilities that social movement unionism can offer, there is a significant amount of potential for agency and freedom to be exercised in more and different ways at the membership, community and union level.

6. Discussion and conclusion

In this theoretical study, an illustrative case informs a discussion of how a radical democratic framing of social movement unionism offers greater possibilities for enhancing worker freedom. While the case demonstrates the relevance of freedom theories, the specific union activities examined in the illustrative case (such as report-writing, coalition-building and participation in decision-making bodies) are identified as potentially contributing to, and transforming, forms of freedom for workers, unions and other constituencies. In our analysis, we look at how unions use their right to freedom of association and whether this affects worker freedom. We show that internally and externally orientated collective actions carried out by unions are interconnected, in both conceptual and practical terms. Furthermore, the implementation of such actions is mediated by the specific regulation of worker and union behaviour, which reflects the multi-level political ideologies and cultural norms in New Zealand (Shaw 1997). Examining union collective action from different perspectives on freedom also increases the complexity of these actions within social movement unionism for a Just Transition and nuances the understanding of what constitutes worker freedom in practice. A radical democratic approach to social movement unionism was evidenced by elements of change in the outward and inward collective behaviour of some unions, therefore indicating greater freedom for workers in the sense of availability of options for self-actualization and growth, as put forward in MacCallum's triadic theory.

However, the case examples also emphasize the comparative recentness and generally low level of engagement in social movement unionism by New Zealand

unions. This challenges subsequent studies to establish a detailed, comparable measurement of the qualitative and complex capacity of unions to contribute to overall worker freedom, examined from the various different viewpoints on freedom. A related and persistent issue faced by labour movements in New Zealand and other countries is that most contemporary workers are not members of a union, even though unions have the possibility to draw on collective resources to represent worker interests more effectively than workers may do as individuals. From a negative freedom perspective, most workers have exercised their freedom to dissociate from unions, with the conscious or unconscious aim of self-actualizing or attaining (greater) economic freedom independently. In contrast, while other workers, such as on-demand workers in the gig economy, have had little opportunity (freedom) to access a union (Johnston and Land-Kazlauskas 2019), in some countries, unions are becoming more central to the protection of the interests of self-organized platform workers (Bessa et al. 2022). From a positive freedom viewpoint, workers who become or remain union members may have recognized the capacity of the collective to understand their interests and effectively negotiate on their behalf through organizing and integrative bargaining strategies. "Passing on" also complicates the influence of unions in relation to non-members.

Furthermore, New Zealand unions function within a liberal democratic polity. Due to the majority-rule basis on which unions in New Zealand operate, it is difficult for the needs and freedoms of all members to be recognized and addressed. Combined with features of industrial relations, including voluntary union membership and the legacy of decentralized, individualistic employment relationships established by the Employment Contracts Act 1991, within the context of a neoliberal economic and labour market, this setting limits the degree of worker freedom (without taking into account internal agency) that unions can attain through collective bargaining, their political role or internally orientated activities. However, annual work stoppages have risen sharply, from 5 in 2015 to a peak of 158 in 2019 (Employment NZ 2022). Some attribute this increase to the "venting" of long-held worker and union frustrations, particularly in the public sector, over inadequate upward pay mobility or lack of capacity to address the matter in the preceding decade, rather than to the amendments made to the ERA in 2018. However, it remains unclear whether the regulatory changes will result in an increase in union power and a focus on matters other than survival, and have an impact on the prevalence of social movement unionism and worker freedom.

We may therefore argue that an absolute increase in worker or union member freedom can only derive from agency that seeks a transformation of the status quo. An organizing model of unionism may sow the seeds to initiate such change through union–community coalitions. Beyond this, the alliances created between unions and civil society actors that aim to bring about wider social and political change were shown to provide additional sources of negative and positive freedom (Berlin 1969), and broader actual and possible freedom (MacCallum 1967). Furthermore, drawing on Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) work, a radical democratic framing of a social movement unionism related to a Just Transition in New Zealand indicated a basis for removing some of the constraints

on, and for the development of, opportunities for worker emancipation and power relations within the current neoliberal phase of capitalism. Our evaluation found that this was the case with the NZCTU's leadership-led strategic engagement and E tū's emphasis on direct, localized and member-driven engagement in social movement unionism in relation to a Just Transition, which were most likely facilitated by their comparatively small scale and agility. Laclau and Mouffe's model, with its focus on the non-primacy of class and conceptualization of a dynamic, continual struggle with hegemonic forces (including those pertaining to the social movement unionism parties themselves) also highlighted that externally orientated collective union action can encourage productive tensions within unions and between coalition agents, while giving work-centred interests more prominence in the struggles of other movements and vice versa. This finding aligns with Kant's conception of freedom as both an obligation and a right wherein one must treat oneself and others as ends in themselves and not merely as a means to some end, and develop oneself in the fullest sense of the meaning.[17] Although Kant's vision of morality seems predicated on individual behaviour, "there is something rather Kantian about the famous trade union slogan: 'an injury to one is an injury to all'" (Power 2012, 8).

Moreover, Laclau and Mouffe's emphasis on the radical potential of social movements and collaborations responds to an apparent limitation of MacCallum's triadic freedom relationship. While MacCallum's approach offers us a way to step out of the conceptual straitjacket of negative and positive thinking on freedom, and for whom and how freedom may be constrained, it does not encompass every possible conception of (worker) freedom. For example, the notion of self-mastery or self-direction, which implies the presence of control (the notion of freedom as an exercise rather than an opportunity), is not addressed. Yet, if union and other coalition constituents fully embrace social movement unionism by organizing themselves as leaders in action (as has been the case with the collaboration between E tū and *iwi*), this agentic behaviour with a purpose of socio-economic transformation embodies the notion of freedom as an exercise. This kind of social movement unionism builds upon the connections between internally and externally orientated union collective action. Pragmatically, however, this behaviour may be difficult to sustain or even attempt elsewhere, due to union (member) conservatism (Gumbrell-McCormick and Hyman 2013).

Assuming that "freedom is good, and more freedom is better" (Lindebaum et al. 2022, 1854), an expansive social-movement-unionism project based on radical democracy may provide more "available options" for worker freedom in the workplace and beyond. It may also address, to a certain extent, the barriers to preventing the loss of worker freedom, in concept and practice. Furthermore, the urgency of complex challenges, including climate change, which require a concerted, ongoing response, encourages a sincere contemplation of a comprehensive shift towards social movement unionism. Anything less could produce freedom-inhibiting outcomes and ultimately render redundant any focus on

[17] Liberal thinkers recognize that this requires certain constraints on individual conduct (see, for example, Mill's (1859, para. 12) oft-cited position on the "freedom to unite for any purpose not involving harm to others").

workplace concerns by unions. Negative freedom advocates may question whether more complex organizing arrangements beyond extant collective bargaining processes would increase the sources and types of external constraints on the self-determination of workers. Moreover, unions have sometimes been criticized for their exclusivity and fracturing of the shared interests of all workers (and those without work). It is thus key to examine how unions in coalitions can become more universal.

As social movement unionism can be perceived as a challenge to the fundamental purpose of protecting workers' rights, New Zealand unions are yet to exhibit a widespread foray into such forms of alliance-building. Our illustrative case suggests that, despite the differences between negative and positive freedom, as well as intended and unintended constraints, union alliances that move beyond work-centred instrumentalism bring about greater (worker) freedom. For the parties involved in a Just Transition, even informal and embryonic social movement unionism has opened a space for collective struggles, and has created possibilities to engage with socio-economic and ecological challenges, encourage citizens to take action, promote democracy and build a counter-hegemony against atomizing neoliberal practices. Such action can be observed in particular in advocacy for including working families, collaborating with key stakeholders on the ground (for example, in Taranaki and Southland) and attempting to ensure that the Government remains an accountable partner for a Just Transition. Our case illustrated both leader-centred and "from below" approaches for action, premised on collective action (see Kelly 1998), although it is too early to assess the relative presence of both approaches.

Our findings thus have preliminary implications for the organizational arrangements of unions and the design of organizing campaigns. For example, while (New Zealand) state support for union education has dwindled, the provision of such education which highlights the importance of active union membership and social movement unionism achievements may increase collective consciousness and mobilization (Parker and Alakavuklar 2018) and foster union efforts to further democratize their internally and externally orientated processes and decisions, so as to empower workers and others (McRae 2021). This exploratory work encourages subsequent studies of union collective action, coalition activity and notions of worker freedom. If social movement unionism as an expansive form of freedom of association involving collective action by unions is seen as necessary to encourage fundamental change, future work on the matter could assess how environmental factors facilitate or limit its influence on worker self-actualization. Multiple-case or survey research could evaluate who in unions drives their coalition efforts and decisions on the broad social justice goals to be pursued, the innovative strategies to be implemented to achieve those goals and to the ways in which to mobilize resources such as members. Future research could also examine how the relationships, interests and process dynamics of social movement unionism in relation to a Just Transition are evolving (for example, with regard to potential challenges for E tū concerning the investment needed to develop new industries or support existing ones to transition to a low-carbon future) and how they might be "mapped" for New Zealand's labour movement. In the context of the pandemic, it may be relevant

to examine the impact that a coalition's overall resources, areas of interest and use of technology have on its capacity to be inclusive, egalitarian and "freeing". As these suggestions demonstrate, the field is ripe for further investigation.

References

Allahar, Anton L. 2004. "False Consciousness, Class Consciousness and Nationalism". *Social and Economic Studies* 53 (1): 95–123.

Atzeni, Maurizio. 2009. "Searching for Injustice and Finding Solidarity? A Contribution to Mobilisation Theory Debate". *Industrial Relations Journal* 40 (1): 5–16.

Barnes, Ronelle. 2005. "An Analysis of Passing On in New Zealand: The Employer's Duty to Manage Concurrent Bargaining in a Mixed Workplace". *Auckland University Law Review* 11: 56–85.

Berlin, Isaiah. 1969. "Two Concepts of Liberty". In *Four Essays on Liberty*, edited by Isaiah Berlin, 118–172. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bessa, Ioulia, Simon Joyce, Denis Neumann, Mark Stuart, Vera Trappmann, and Charles Umney. 2022. "A Global Analysis of Worker Protest in Digital Labour Platforms", ILO Working Paper 70. Geneva: ILO.

Bryson, Alex. 2008. "Union Free-Riding in Britain and New Zealand". *Journal of Industrial Relations* 50 (1): 5–24.

Carter, Ian. 1999. *A Measure of Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2021. "Positive and Negative Liberty". In *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, first published on 27 February 2003, revised on 19 November 2021. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberty-positive-negative/.

della Porta, Donatella. 2006. "From Corporatist Unions to Protest Unions? On the (Difficult) Relations Between Organized Labour and New Social Movements". In *The Diversity of Democracy: Corporatism, Social Order and Political Conflict*, edited by Colin Crouch and Wolfgang Streeck, 71–98. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Dibben, Pauline. 2004. "Social Movement Unionism". In *Trade Unions and Democracy: Strategies and Perspectives*, edited by Mark Harcourt and Geoffrey Wood, 280–302. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Employment NZ. 2022. Work stoppages. https://www.employment.govt.nz/starting-employment/unions-and-bargaining/work-stoppages/.

Engels, Friedrich. 1951. "Letter to F. Mehring". In *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: Selected Works in Two, Volume II*, edited by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, 450–453. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

Engeman, Cassandra. 2015. "Social Movement Unionism in Practice: Organizational Dimensions of Union Mobilization in the Los Angeles Immigrant Rights Marches". *Work, Employment and Society* 29 (3): 444–461.

E tū. 2018. *E tū and You*. December 2018. https://www.etu.nz/issue/december-2018.

———. 2019a. "Supporting a Just Transition". *E tū and You*. https://etu.nz/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/E-t%C5%AB-Just-Transition-policy.pdf.

———. 2019b. *E tū and You* May 2019. https://www.etu.nz/issue/may-2019/.

———. 2019c. *E tū and You* August 2019. https://www.etu.nz/issue/august-2019/.

———. 2021. "Southland's Place on the Just Transition Map". *E tū and You*. September 2021. https://www.etu.nz/articles/southlands-place-on-the-just-transition-map/.

Fiorito, Jack. 2004. "Union Renewal and the Organizing Model in the United Kingdom". *Labor Studies Journal* 29 (2): 21–53.

Fitch, Robert. 2011. "What is Union Democracy?" *New Politics* 13 (2): Whole Number 50.

Flanders, Allan. 1970. *Management and Unions: The Theory and Reform of Industrial Relations*. London: Faber and Faber.

Fletcher, Bill, Jr., and Fernando Gapasin. 2008. *Solidarity Divided: The Crisis in Organized Labor and a New Path Toward Social Justice*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Frege, Carola, Edmund Heery, and Lowell Turner. 2004. "The New Solidarity? Trade Union Coalition-Building in Five Countries". In *Varieties of Unionism: Strategies for Union Revitalization in a Globalizing Economy*, edited by Carola Frege and John Kelly, 137–158. Oxford: Oxford Academic. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199270149.003.0008.

Galgóczi, Béla. 2020. "Just Transition on the Ground: Challenges and Opportunities for Social Dialogue". *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 26 (4): 367–382.

Galles, Gary M. 2020. "Unions are Clearly in the Wrong About Freedom of Association". *Foundation for Economic Education*, 20 February 2020. https://fee.org/articles/unions-are-clearly-in-the-wrong-about-freedom-of-association/.

Girao, Luisa. 2021. "Future Resilience Theme of Discussions". *Otago Daily Times*, 25 June 2021. https://www.odt.co.nz/regions/southland/future-resilience-theme-discussions.

Gumbrell-McCormick, Rebecca, and Richard Hyman. 2013. *Trade Unions in Western Europe: Hard Times, Hard Choices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hampton, Paul. 2015. *Workers and Trade Unions for Climate Solidarity: Tackling Climate Change in a Neoliberal World*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2010. *The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heery, Edmund. 2018. "Fusion or Replacement? Labour and the 'New' Social Movements". *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 39 (4): 661–680.

Holgate, Jane. 2015. "Community Organising in the UK: A 'New' Approach for Trade Unions?" *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 36 (3): 431–455.

———. 2021. "Trade Unions in the Community: Building Broad Spaces of Solidarity". *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 42 (2): 226–247.

Hurd, Richard W. 2017. "The Rise and Fall of the Organizing Model in the US". In *Trade Unions and Democracy: Strategies and Perspectives*, edited by Mark Harcourt and Geoffrey Wood, 191–210. London: Routledge.

ILO. 2018. *Freedom of Association: Compilation of Decisions of the Committee on Freedom of Association*. 6th ed. Geneva.

Jacobs, Thomas. 2018. "The Dislocated Universe of Laclau and Mouffe: An Introduction to Post-Structuralist Discourse Theory". *Critical Review* 30 (3–4): 294–315.

Johnston, Hannah, and Chris Land-Kazlauskas. 2019. *Organizing On-demand: Representation, Voice and Collective Bargaining in the Gig Economy*. Conditions of Work and Employment Series No. 94. Geneva: ILO.

Katz, Isadore. 1951. "Testimony of Isadore Katz, General Counsel, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO". In *Labor-Management Relations in the Southern Textile Industry: Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Eighty-first Congress, Second Session, Part 2*, 71–161. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

Kelly, John. 1998. R*ethinking Industrial Relations: Mobilisation, Collectivism and Long Waves*. London: Routledge.

Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. 2001. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. 2nd ed. London: Verso.

Lindebaum, Dirk, Frank den Hond, Michelle Greenwood, James A. Chamberlain, and Lynne Andersson. 2022. "Freedom, Work and Organizations in the 21st Century: Freedom for Whom and for Whose Purpose?" *Human Relations* 75 (10): 1853–1874.

MacCallum, Gerald C., Jr. 1967 "Negative and Positive Freedom". *Philosophical Review* 76 (3): 312–334.

McAlevey, Jane F. 2015. “The Crisis of New Labor and Alinsky’s Legacy: Revisiting the Role of the Organic Grassroots Leaders in Building Powerful Organizations and Movements”. *Politics & Society* 43 (3): 415–441.

———. 2016. *No Shortcuts: Organizing for Power in the New Gilded Age*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

McRae, John. 2021. “Making Transitions”. *Ako*, Summer 2021. https://akojournal.org.nz/2021/01/14/making-transitions/.

Michels, Robert. 1915. *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*. New York, NY: Hearst's International Library Company.

Mill, John Stuart. 1859. *On Liberty*. 2nd ed. London: John W. Parker and Son.

Morgenster, Sitara. 2021. “Can the Taranaki 2050 Roadmap Create a Blueprint for Just Transition and Social Dialogue in New Zealand?” *Equal Times*, 22 October 2021. https://www.equaltimes.org/can-the-taranaki-2050-roadmap#.YZuKHtDMJD8.

Mouffe, Chantal. 1989. “Radical Democracy: Modern or Postmodern?”. *Social Text* 21: 31–45.

Newman, Annabel, and Carol Jess. 2015. “Renewing New Zealand Unions: The Service and Food Workers’ Union and Living Wage Aotearoa”, Paper presented at the Labour, Employment and Work Conference, Wellington, 27–28 November 2014.

New Zealand Companies Office. 2020. *Union Membership Return Report 2020*. https://www.companiesoffice.govt.nz/all-registers/registered-unions/annual-return-membership-reports/union-membership-return-report-2020/.

NZCTU (New Zealand Council of Trade Unions). 2017. “Just Transition: A Working People’s Response to Climate Change”. Wellington. https://www.union.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/JustTransition.pdf.

———. 2019. “Next Steps on Just Transition to Good, Green Jobs”. Wellington. https://www.union.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Next-Steps-on-Just-Transition-Oct-2019.pdf.

———. 2021. “Missing Detail Essential in Government’s Emissions Reduction Plan Says CTU”. 13 October 2021. https://union.org.nz/missing-detail-essential-in-governments-emissions-reduction-plan-says-ctu/.

Pansardi, Pamela. 2012. “Power and Freedom: Opposite or Equivalent Concepts?” *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, 59 (132): 26–44.

Parker, Jane. 2002. “Women’s Groups in British Unions”. *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 40 (1): 23–48.

———. 2011. “Reaching Out for Strength Within? ‘Social Movement Unionism’ in a Small Country Setting”. *Industrial Relations Journal* 42 (4): 392–403.

Parker, Jane, and Ozan Alakavuklar. 2018. “Social Movement Unionism as Union-Civil Alliances: A Democratizing Force? The New Zealand Case”. *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations* 73 (4): 784–813.

Power, Nina. 2012. “Kant and Trade Unions”. *International Union Rights* 18 (4): 8–9.

PSA. 2018. *Working Life*. December 2018. https://www.psa.org.nz/assets/DMS/Our-Voice-To-Matau-Reo/Working-Life-December-2018/PSA-Journal-December-2018.pdf.

Purcell, Mark. 2009. “Resisting Neoliberalization: Communicative Planning or Counter-Hegemonic Movements?” *Planning Theory* 8 (2): 140–165.

Shaw, J.W. 1997. “The Role of Law in Both Encouraging and Discouraging Labour Organisation Activity”. *Labour History* 73 (November): 208–218.

Steiner, Hillel. 1983. “How Free: Computing Personal Liberty”. *Royal Institute of Philosophy Lecture Supplements* 15: 73–89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1994. *An Essay on Rights*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Streeck, Wolfgang. 1988. “Editorial Introduction”. E*conomic and Industrial Democracy* 9 (3): 307–318.

Tattersall, Amanda. 2010. *Power in Coalition: Strategies for Strong Unions and Social Change*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Tilly, Charles. 1984. "Social Movements and National Politics". In *Statemaking and Social Movements: Essays in History and Theory*, edited by Charles Bright and Susan Harding, 297–317. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Voss, Kim. 2010. "Democratic Dilemmas: Union Democracy and Union Renewal". *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research* 16 (3): 369–382.

Wasser, Michael, and J. Ryan Lamare. 2014. "Unions as Conduits of Democratic Voice for Non-Elites: Worker Politicization from the Shop Floor to the Halls of Congress". *Nevada Law Journal* 14 (2): 396–413.

Webb, Sidney, and Beatrice Webb. 1920. The *History of Trade Unionism*. Revised Edition. Extended to 1920. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Webster, Edward. 2008. "Recasting Labor Studies in the Twenty-First Century". *Labor Studies Journal* 33 (3): 249–254.