

Peter Waterman<sup>1</sup>

## *All in Common*

A New/Old Slogan for International  
Labour and Labour Internationalism

### The 18<sup>th</sup> Century

*They hang the man and flog the woman  
That steal the goose from off the common,  
But let the greater villain loose  
That steals the common from the goose.*  
(English folk poem, circa 1764)

### The Long 19<sup>th</sup> Century

*[T]he proletariat, the great class embracing all the producers of civilized nation[s], the class which in freeing itself will free humanity from servile toil and will make of the human animal a free being - the proletariat, betraying its instincts, despising its historic mission, has let itself be perverted by the dogma of work. Rude and terrible has been its punishment. All its individual and social woes are born of its passion for work.*

(Paul Lafargue 1893)

*Instead of the conservative motto, 'A fair day's wage for a fair day's work,' we must inscribe on our banner the revolutionary watchword, 'Abolition of the wage system.' It is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capitalism. The army of production must be organized, not only for everyday struggle with the capitalists, but also to carry on production when capitalism shall have been overthrown. By organizing industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old.*

(Preamble to the Constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World, 1905)

---

<sup>1</sup> [waterman@antenna.nl](mailto:waterman@antenna.nl), <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/glosodia>, [www.antenna.nl/~waterman/](http://www.antenna.nl/~waterman/)

Redraft of a Contribution to the Workshop on 'The Commons and Communities: A Strategic Alternative to the State-Market Nexus', European Social Forum, Florence, Italy, 7-10 November, 2002. I have been regrettably unable to respond here to the discussion there, or to pointed email comments. I would have like to have provided recent case studies that either confirm or problematise the argument. In the meantime, as I said in Florence, I declare this paper the Common Property of Humankind, in the hope that some compañer@ will shred, spindle, mutilate or – hopefully - develop the initial reflections here. The Resources go wider than references and should be of value. Particularly those referring to South Africa, which I was considering as a relevant case study. Thanks are here due to Anna Weekes, [staff1@sdcea.org.za](mailto:staff1@sdcea.org.za), who is developing a barometer of social protest in South Africa.

## The Late-20<sup>th</sup> and Early-21<sup>st</sup> Century

### ***Regular IFI [International Financial Institutions] consultations with Global Unions create an opportunity for effective change.***

*In the past year, Global Unions delegations have participated in exchanges on trade union involvement in PRSPs [Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers] and on the impact of privatisation on labour and found them to be useful... Working women and men are interested in many of the objectives that the IFIs [International Financial Institutions] state as being theirs, ranging from increased jobs that offer better security and working conditions, to higher incomes, improved social protection and quality public services. Unions will only support IFI policies if they make such improvements a reality.*

**(Global Unions 2002)**

*The expanded application of the principle of the common heritage of humankind shows the potential of this concept... Against capitalist expansionism, it proposes the idea of sustainable development; against private property and national appropriation, the idea of shared resource management, rational use and transmission to future generations; against nation-state sovereignty, the idea of trust, management by the international community...; against the hubris of the pursuit of power that so often leads to war, the idea of peaceful use; against the political economy of the modern world system, the idea of equitable redistribution of the world's wealth...'*

**(Sousa Santos 1995: 371-2).**

*[A]ready fragile prior to Enron, the legitimacy of global capitalism as the dominant system of production, distribution, and exchange will be eroded even further, even in the heartland of the system. During the halcyon days of the so-called New Economy in 2000, a Business Week survey found that 72 per cent of Americans felt that corporations had too much power over their lives. That figure is likely to be much higher now.*

**(Walden Bello 2002)**

*Despite all the attempts at privatization, it turns out that there are some things that don't want to be owned. Music, water, seeds, electricity, ideas—they keep bursting out of the confines erected around them. They have a natural resistance to enclosure, a tendency to escape, to cross-pollinate, to flow through fences, and flee out open windows.*

**(Naomi Klein 2002)**

*...Why can feminists have a revolution now, while Marxists have to wait?*

**(Gibson-Graham 1996: 251)**

### **Introduction: back to the future?**

The death of international labour's old utopias (Communist, Social-Democratic, Radical-Nationalist - even Business Unionist?) leaves the international trade union movement bereft of much more than a defensive agenda which it still believes can and must be achieved *in partnership* with capital and state. In so far as labour adopts defensive or even *militant oppositional* stances, these still leave it dependent on the practices and discourses of a dynamically-expanding, globalised and networked capitalism. This repeatedly penetrates labour's defences, shifts the

goalposts, even abandons football and the football field for computer games and cyberspace. Speaking in the name of evidently unconsulted 'working women and men', the recently re-branded Global Unions (see above) prioritise recognition by, and collaboration with, the enemy - the International Financial Institutions - over any other political aim, any other historical tradition, any other ethical principle, any alternative imaginable end. And, as far as I can see, over any measurable positive impact.

Labour needs a new ethic, vision and strategy that will not only undergird such defensive and limited actions as unions *must* take, but also enable them to act autonomously and to go on the political and moral *offensive* against aggressive global capital and the collusive inter/state instances and regimes. And then, of course, labour needs to increasingly appeal to and articulate itself with the new 'global justice and solidarity movements' that recognize an enemy when they see one and reject collaboration with such.

Slogans and banners matter.

A new labour internationalism needs to go both way back for inspiration and way forward in address. The democratic and secular trinity of the French Revolution,

***Liberty, Equality, Fraternity***

is still valid but needs updating and specifying (*Fraternity*, obviously, as *Solidarity*). The Wobblies' slogan

***Abolition of the Wage System***

and related workerist and antiwork (Paul Lafargue above) slogans, need marrying with relevant demands coming from *other* radical-democratic communities and identities. And they need specification of what follows 'abolition'. The 50-year-old slogan of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions,

***Bread, Peace and Freedom***

forgot equality and solidarity, and still bears the burden of a Cold War interpretation of 'Free Trade Unionism'. Whilst the ICFTU and its associates have been re-branding themselves as Global Unions they have left their archaic and uninspiring traditional slogan untouched. A *discussion* on a new slogan, involving working people and their allies, might help create an international labour movement fit for both immediate defence and eventual re-assertion in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Some might like to see a slogan combining

***Equality,  
Solidarity,  
Democracy,  
Useful Production,  
Sustainability,  
Peace,  
Pluralism***

...?

Each of these is today part of the meaning of the others. But I propose to prioritise, at least for discussion, this egalitarian slogan,

***Omnia Sint Communia***  
(All in Common)

Egalitarianism (called, under Communist regimes, 'petty-bourgeois egalitarianism') also needs a re-specification. It could draw on radical-democratic labour and popular tradition (see the first quotes above), and should look forward beyond capitalist globalisation, beyond *capitalism* (as implied in some of the later quotes above). I suggest re-interpreting equality in terms of the old/new principle of *the commons*. This is an old space of sharing, subsistence and rights, a new space for popular encroachment on 1) a capitalism gone cancerous and of 2) inter/state regimes that are complicit with this and/or ineffective (Branford and Rocha 2002).

Appropriately, today, the commons are understood as simultaneously local, national, regional, global and extra-terrestrial. The sky here is not the limit. The tension between the capitalist political-economy (the state-capital, hierarchy-competition, power-exploitation syndrome) and the commons clearly now includes, alongside the oceans and the sea-bed, the electro-magnetic spectrum and cyberspace (CivSoc/CPSR website; Barbrook 2002). These provide an infinite terrain for disputation and, whilst capital and state have the economic, technical, institutional, legal and administrative means for their domination, the political and ethical principles of the hegemon are being increasingly exposed as both rigid and threadbare.

Labour - national and international, North and South, East and West - *is* now increasingly confronting the privatisation of everything (Martin 1993, 2002, Public Services International Research Unit website). The unions find themselves, in these often local, momentary or partial struggles, in alliance with urban dwellers, women's movements, schoolteachers and parents, agricultural producers, indigenous peoples, the ecological and/or consumer movements, with gays, progressive professionals and technicians, with democratic cultural and communication activists. The struggle to defend *and extend* the commons, can combine these possible minorities into hypothetical majorities. It would obviously empower the labour movement if such separate, disparate, momentary, partial movements could be systematically linked by a political and ethical principle which has the function and appeal once provided by Communism, Anarchism, Social-Democracy, or Radical-Nationalism. These national-industrial socialisms/radicalisms can now be seen to have been premature, simplifying, reductionist, universalistic - and utopian in the negative sense. Utopia, however, becomes less futuristic, more familiar, if and when we recognize that capitalism is not a unitary object but a complex and contradictory one, which does not - even under globalisation - occupy all social space (Gibson-Graham 1996).

Below I will discuss the relationship between labour and the commons firstly at the international/global/general level - remembering, of course, that 'global' also means *holistic*, and that any place, space or level must today be understood in a dialectical/dialogical relation with others. But I want to start with that which the international labour movement has so evidently *lost*, largely reducing itself to the role of 'town mayor in wartime' (a Dutch pejorative for collaborating officials under the Nazi occupation), to defensive battles that have to be continually re-fought so as

to prevent further retreat, or to the repetition of archaic-romantic revolutionary-apocalyptic dogma. I want to start with Utopia, and for two reasons: 1) because

***The Future Is Not What It Used To Be***  
(graffito cited Sousa Santos 1995:479)

and 2) because

***A map of the world that does not include Utopia  
is not even worth glancing at***  
(Oscar Wilde).

Indeed, these two slogans could well accompany *Omnia Sint Communia* on the road to

## Utopia

which is actually a very nice word indeed since it means both 'nowhere' and 'good place'. It is, in other words, a desirable place that does not (yet) exist. Utopia has occupied an ambiguous position in the labour movement, ever since Marx and Engels replaced 'utopian socialism' by 'scientific socialism', whilst proposing Communism (which they hardly specified) as its necessary, desirable, inevitable alternative. With the disappearance of 'labour's utopias' (Beilharz 1992), labour internationally has lost most of its capacity to think beyond the shrinking horizons imposed on it by capitalism's expanding ones. Yet, as globalised cultural industries become increasingly central to capitalism, and increasingly occupy the 'free time' of consumers, so must the struggle to 'emancipate ourselves from mental slavery'. Here we could certainly begin with those socialists who already recognized this (Frankel 1987) or are belatedly doing so (Panitch and Leys 2000). The latter (discussed Waterman 2000), summarise their utopia thus:

1. Overcoming alienation;
2. Attenuating the division of labour;
3. Transforming consumption;
4. Alternative ways of living [the feminist one];
5. Socialising markets;
6. Planning ecologically;
7. Internationalising equality;
8. Communicating democratically;
9. Realising democracy;
10. *Omnia sint communia* [All in common]

Before considering the last of these (to which I am evidently indebted), we need to recognise the position under capitalist globalisation of

## Labour

for whom it has meant, simultaneously, the worldwide generalization and intensification of proletarianisation (loss of pre- or non-capitalist means of production) and the dramatic and

repeated de-/re-structuring of 'labour for capital' worldwide. Labour (as wage work, as class identity, in the trade-union form, as a significant partner in capitalist industrial relations, as a part of capitalist civil society) is in profound crisis. This requires – even for defence of the traditional unionized working class – a re-invention of the labour movement, including

1. recognition, as the subject of the labour movement, of all forms of labour for capital, waged or not;
2. an international campaign for the eight-hour working day (also for homekeepers), remembering that the eight-hour day was the issue of an early international working-class struggle in the later-19<sup>th</sup> century, simultaneously won and lost in following decades. A campaign for an eight - or six - hour working day would simultaneously reduce unemployment and overwork (IWW website: <http://www.iww.org/4-Hours/index.shtml>)
3. developing an international labour rights movement worldwide, inspired not by religious or liberal notion of 'decent work' (<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/dialogue/actrav/genact/employmt/decent/>, Waterman 2002a) but by the necessity, first, of 'taking labour out of competition', secondly enclosing the wage-labour system, thirdly of developing a notion of *useful work* that refers to social and ecological impact;
4. the struggle for free time against enforced work (time also freed from commoditised entertainment and leisure industries), and some contemporary equivalent of the old international/ist worker travel, sports and cultural associations;
5. working out and struggling for guaranteed basic income inter/nationally, i.e. income regardless of 'work for capitalism' (see VirGlob-SP in Resources below);
6. development of the 'solidarity economy' and 'solidarity economics';
7. development of a 'new social unionism', implying a dialectic/dialogue between:
  - movements of distinct kinds of labourer;
  - labour and other radical-democratic social movements (women, peace, culture/communication, ecology, indigenous peoples, human rights);
  - traditional and high-tech or intermediate technical/managerial sectors;
  - *struggles against* the wage-labour system with *struggles for* the resources and spaces for the support of life.

The last of these returns us to

## The commons

the experience of which has been universal amongst the poor as they have been confronted by, and resisted the imposition of, first, seigniorial/colonial types of enclosure, then the full capitalist onslaught - clock-time, work-discipline and industrial capitalism (Thompson 1974).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The International Forum on Globalisation (2002:79-104), in an extensive consideration of the matter, reminds us that this kind of experience is not so named universally. Many indigenous and Asian rural communities have concepts of nature, of human-natural equality, or inter-dependence that are nonetheless resistant to or subversive of capitalist ownership concepts. At the other end of history, the IFG proposes a concept of the 'modern commons' (97 ff). When it comes to strategy, however, the IFG position is expressed overwhelmingly in terms of *defence* of such old or new commons against privatization or monopolization. Not only does it therefore fail to problematise state ownership

Despite centuries of encroachment by capital and state (a nationalistic, elitist, bureaucratic surrogate for a 'universal people' that could have at those times only a notional existence), and despite the seductions of consumer capitalism, popular imagination can still be stirred both by the memory of the commons, and by contemporary expressions of resistance to such encroachment (indigenous peoples' movements). The revival of the notion of the commons, under globalization, comes from at least two, inter-connected, directions:

1. decades of struggle by the environmental and related movements (often of middle-class origin) for defence or extension of the commons (in terms of space and resources, whether local, national, regional, global, whether subterranean, extra-terrestrial, cyberspatial);
2. increasing popular struggles (of labour, urban, rural, indigenous and other such communities) against the increasing aggression, despoliation and depredation of neo-liberal capitalist privatization, concentration, speculation and corruption. And increasing socialist discussion of such.

Much of the first type of struggle, 'for the common heritage of humankind' (CHH), may take legalistic or bureaucratic forms. Labour/popular struggles may also still be expressed as resistance, opposition and a return to a golden (even tarnished) past of state-control. Yet discourses of the commons - and a consequent extension of all possible radical-democratic alternatives to ownership/control by capital/state - could strengthen traditional labour demands and enrich those of middle-class professionals, technicians and others.

The principle of the commons is subversive of the principles underlying 1) the modern nation-state (actually the state-defined nation) and 2) corporate capitalism. The *state-nation* depends on the principle of sovereignty, which implies state hegemony within geographical borders (and inter-state relations beyond these). It defines the human-being as a national, either as lowest common denominator or as highest common factor. Underlying corporate capitalism is the principle of private property (privatized consumption, privatized services) which, as extended to the human-being sees him/her as both individualized and property-owning - the political theory of possessive individualism (Macpherson 1962). In its extreme contemporary forms, it turns even the national citizen into a cosmopolitan consumer, and literally brands this consumer with a corporate logo (Klein 2000). So extreme - so world-embracing and world-consuming - have become the old contradictions between production and consumption, the worker as producer and the worker as consumer, producing regions and consuming regions, that the movements around/against labour and consumption and even fashion/aesthetics are now converging (Ross 1999). One US-based international solidarity movement is now producing its own anti-sweat (non-capitalist? post-capitalist?) sports clothes (No Sweat website).

My plea for the international labour movement to join its voice to both the discourse and the struggles concerning CHH, is intended to both broaden the horizons and the appeal of the

---

(except in terms of monopolization), but it fails to see the commons in expansive terms, or as a principle surpassing that of capitalism and stratification. It might be interesting to compare this radical-reformist argument with an earlier 'autonomist' one on the new enclosures (Midnight Notes 1990).

former, and to give the latter an articulation with class/popular/democratic interests and identities that it might otherwise lack.

*Broadening international labour's horizons and appeal.* Where, at present, the international trade union movement does fight privatization, this is, customarily, in terms of harm-reduction or benefit-increase. Whilst reference may be made, on the one hand, to the damage done by corporate globalisation/privatization, and, on the other hand, to a 'social interest' or 'social aspect', no challenge of principle is made to those of capital accumulation or state sovereignty. And, whilst I am unfamiliar with the full range of positions taken by the unions concerning 'the common heritage', it is customary for the international unions to tail-end projects of progressive technocrats and bureaucrats, and propose 'social partnership' solutions to problems that its 'partners' have created ('Trade Unions OK...' 1998; Unicorn Website).

*Giving 'the common heritage' a class and popular colour.* In so far as it has origins in the weaker Third World, during the Cold War, the CHH has always contained a subversive potential. The notion has many elements, including: non-appropriation, management by all peoples, international sharing of benefits, peaceful use, conservation for the future. It refers to an expanding range of overlapping areas and terrains of dispute: the oceans (surface and floor); the Antarctic; cultural artifacts and exceptional urban and natural sites; energy; food; science and technology; space, the atmosphere, the electro-magnetic spectrum, telecommunications, the Internet, genetic resources (Chemillier-Gendreau 2002; International Forum on Globalization 2002, Souza Santos 1995, Wireless Commons Manifesto 2002). Given the statist origin of the CHH, we should not be surprised that defining and empowering the 'community' - to which this past, present and future heritage might belong - is problematic. Particularly when the community of states (the hegemonically-defined 'international community'), is confronted by rich, powerful and - above all dynamic - corporations with which such states have been historically conjoined. Chemillier-Gendreau says the community to which this heritage belongs has to be invented, in terms of both its identity and its powers (which can include trusteeship alongside ownership). Her notion of a future 'people of peoples' echoes the Zapatista one of a 'world that contains many worlds', or the 'community of communities' of De Angelis (2001). At the level of principles, here, there is a pluralistic idea of overlapping communities/sovereignities. And, at least implicitly, of multiple socio-political levels, of places (geographic), spaces (socio-cultural), that exist in a dialectical and dialogical relationship with each other. Such a notion of community does not assume harmony, it simply invites us to *enclose*, and even *foreclose* on, the major sources of *disharmony* - capitalist accumulation and state hierarchy. But even if this is agreed, we still need to confront the problem of

## Linking Labour and The Commons Internationally

Whatever the history, the memory or even the desire, we have to recognise the distance that today exists between labour struggles and those around the commons, nationally and internationally. It would be easy to blame this on any half-dozen of the socialist's hand-me-down Others: the 'labour bureaucracy'; 'trade union reformism', the 'labour aristocracy', the 'Northern unions', 'trade union imperialism'. However, as US cartoon character, Pogo, once so notably said, 'I have seen the enemy and he is us'. At a seminar of the Association for Workers Liberty at the European Social Forum, Florence, November 2002, at which a draft of this paper was first presented, one young British working-class socialist said something like this:



Yes, well, we do have to remember that there was no united mass movement in defence of the commons historically, which is why they were lost, whereas organizations and parties rooted in the working class are still here and fighting. (Waterman 2002b).

This lack of historical memory and utopian imagination is compounded amongst ordinary workers. Working classes (no less than myself and my readers) have been profoundly socialised into not only working for wages but also privatized consumption, passive and vicarious entertainment, and the notion that freedom consists of choice between competing political elites, competing TV channels and annually-outdated computer and audio-visual equipment. These desires are by no means confined to working classes that can presently afford such. They dangle in front of those who can only hope to obtain them by 'proletarian shopping', riot and theft. This is nothing to be afraid of, though it is something we should feel challenged by. We have to be able to offer models of private and social consumption that are more attractive and more achievable as well as more sustainable.

Where we do find the linkage between labour and the commons being made (implicitly more often than explicitly) may be mostly at the margins. This means at the margins of the trade union organizations (campaigns for defence/extension of social services; where unionists are sacked and/or denied wage labour; where the form of relationship to capital is most ambiguous); margins of the labour movement (amongst libertarian socialists, or those working in or on cooperatives, the social economy, solidarity economies), margins of the state-nation (indigenous peoples, rural labourers, the urban poor); margins of the capitalist world system (the national economies worst affected by unemployment).

And here a parenthesis is necessary. It relates to computerized work, both at a lower and at a higher level. Routine computerized work (within travel agencies, call centres, MacDonaldis) is increasingly the lot of workers in industrialized capitalist countries. Call centres – the new sweatshops, the new putting-out system – are part of the newest international division of labour. These workers are part of the growing national and international force of contingent workers, and extremely hard to unionise in conventional ways. At the other (other?) end of the scale there are highly-skilled and creative workers, themselves often working under similar legal and employment uncertainties, even if they consider themselves professionals. Finally, there is that guerilla army of independent programmers and 'hackers' around the industry, who are committed, in multiple and complex ways, to the creation of non-commercial goods, known as 'freeware', covered by what is called 'copyleft' or given the ambiguously or temporarily non-capitalist status of 'sharewear'. Socialists and libertarians, working in or on this new kind of labour are increasingly talking of the present or future self-organisation of such work, workers and economy in terms of networked unionism, of guilds<sup>3</sup>, or of a high-tech gift economy. (Barbrook 1996a, b, Hyman 2002, Coleman 2002). There is here a complex and actually infinite field of activity which could be usefully discussed in relationship to a new kind of commons.

---

<sup>3</sup> Thus, in correspondence, Biella Coleman (for whom see Coleman 2002) insists on her 'guild' metaphor, precisely because of the ambiguously emancipatory orientation or action of her hackers.

It would be to repeat a long-standing error to divide up such initiatives and ideas into 'reformist/palliative' and 'revolutionary/emancipatory', particularly if the one is identified with virtue, the other with vice. This would be to understand these struggles and strategies ideologically (consistent with a theory/party/thinker claiming to embody truth) rather than in terms of self-education, experiment and self-empowerment (in which self-activating subjects demonstrate or determine outcomes).

The relationship between reformism-within and emancipation-from, like that between labour and the commons, can and must today be understood in terms of critical self-reflection, dialectic and dialogue. Such an understanding also means that the recovery or re-invention of the commons does not depend on one world area, one type of worker, one 'correct' type or level of struggle, one type of organization (the trade union, the labour or socialist party – or some vanguard network).<sup>4</sup>

## In-conclusion

This paper, like any set of initial reflections, raises as many questions as it answers (more answers may be suggested by the resources below). But they seem to me as good a way as any to start a global dialogue.

What, for example, does or should *omnia sint communia* actually mean? Which community? What *sort* of ownership, inalienable, usufruct, access, trusteeship?

How would we meaningfully *internationalise* equality, given that this would require either a fall in living standards in the 'rich world', or a radical transformation in the understanding and practice of consumption?

*All* in common (are the workers of the world to lose their bicycles as well as their chains)?

What are we to call this new Utopia, if not Communism? Commonism? Commonerism? It cannot be called Communism any more, or not at present. That was a utopia of the national-industrial-capitalist era. Many people and peoples are *alienated* (*pace* Marx and Engels) from 'Communism'. And the effect of its contemporary use - if not the intention of those who still use it - is to isolate them from those many others who are contributing to a reinvention of the commons.

In so far as we are talking of a process as much as a condition, a movement more than a state of affairs, why not call it by the name that preceded national industrial socialism, and call it the New Utopianism? Or the New Social Emancipation?

---

<sup>4</sup> I cannot here forget Lucho, now the owner-driver of an 'informal' taxi, in Lima, providing occasional services to the NGO for which his wife works, wistfully recalling to me his days as a Fordist factory worker, which work not only provided him with a regular income and a sense of dignity and power but also enabled or required him to become a union activist and socialist, and to be thus involved in various communities of struggle. Lucho would certainly endorse the 'reformist' demand that comes strongly out of surveys of Peruvian attitudes to regional decentralization in what has been one of the most centralized states in Latin America. Top of popular priorities in each of the newly empowered regions is work. Not 'useful work', not even 'decent work', just work.

Maybe *not* the New Utopianism, given the negative or at fantastical connotation in the popular mind.

Maybe the New Social Emancipation, which contains historical and even contemporary echoes of movements against slavery (including the waged kind), racial discrimination and patriarchy?

## Bibliography

- Barbrook, Richard. 1999a. 'The Hi-Tech Gift Economy', *Cybersociology Magazine*, No. 5, April. <http://www.cybersociology.com/>
- Barbrook, Richard. 1999b. 'Frequently Asked Questions: Digital Workers and Artisans: Get Organised': <http://www.labournet.org/1999/March/digiwork.html>.
- Barbrook, Richard. 2002. 'The Regulation of Liberty: Free Trade, Free Speech, Free Gifts on the Net.' <http://www.commoner.org.uk/04barbrook.pdf>.
- Barchiesi, Franco. 2001. 'Transnational Capital, Urban Globalisation and Cross-Border Solidarity: The Case of the South African Municipal Workers' in Peter Waterman and Jane Wills (eds), *Place, Space and the New Labour Internationalisms*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Barchiesi, Franco. 2002. 'South Africa: Popular Forms of Resistance: Interview with Franco Barchiesi, by Veronica Gago and Diego Sztulwark, *Brecha* (Montevideo), No. 876, 13.9.02. No Logo Website (in English), 17.09.02 <http://nologo.org/article.pl?sid=02/09/17/1455251&mode=thread>
- Bello, Walden. 2002. 'Capitalist Crisis and Corporate Crime', *Z Magazine*, August 7. <http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?SectionID=10&ItemID=2194>
- Bennholdt-Thomson, Veronika, Nicholas Faraclas and Claudia Von Werlhof, (eds). 2001. *There is an Alternative: Subsistence and Worldwide Resistance to Corporate Globalization*. London: Zed.
- Beilharz, Peter. 1992. *Labour's Utopias: Bolshevism, Fabianism, Social Democracy*. London: Routledge. 168 pp.
- Bollier, David. 2002. 'Reclaiming the Commons: Why We Need To Protect Our Public Resources From Private Encroachment', *Boston Review*. Summer. <http://bostonreview.mit.edu/BR27.3/bollier.html>
- Bond, Patrick and Karen Bakker. 2001. 'Blue Planet Targets Commodification of World's Water'. <http://www.zmag.org/sustainers/content/2001-07/28bond.htm>
- Bond, Patrick, et.al. (2002). *Unsustainable South Africa: Environment, Development and Social Protest*. London: Merlin Press.
- Branford, Sue and Jan Rocha. 2002. 'The MST in Historical Perspective' in *Cutting the Wire: The Story of the Landless Movement in Brazil*. London: Latin American Bureau. 305 pp.
- Chemillier-Gendreau, Monique. 2002. 'The Idea of the Common Heritage of Humankind and its Political Uses', *Constellations*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 375-89.
- Coleman, E. Gabriella. 2002. 'High-Tech Guilds in the Era of Global Capital', *Society for the Anthropology of Work*.
- De Angelis, Massimo. 2001. 'From Movement to Society'.

- <http://www.commoner.org.uk/01-3groundzero.htm>
- De Angelis, Massimo. 2002. 'Reflections on Alternatives, Commons and Communities, or Building a New World from the Bottom Up', draft submitted for discussion and in the hope to receive comments in occasion of the European Social Forum, workshop on 'Commons and Communities', Florence 7-10 November 2002. [m.deangelis@btinternet.com](mailto:m.deangelis@btinternet.com). 16 pp. Final version in <http://www.commoner.org.uk/deangelis06>.
- Desai, Ashwin. 2002. *We are the Poors - Community Struggles in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- D'Souza, Radha. 2002. 'Global Commons: But Where is the Community?'. [http://www.voiceoftheturtle.org/show\\_printer.php?aid=86](http://www.voiceoftheturtle.org/show_printer.php?aid=86)
- Dwyer, Peter. 2002. '6. South Africa under the ANC: Still Bound to the Chains of Exploitation'. Draft chapter. [P.Dwyer@uea.ac.uk](mailto:P.Dwyer@uea.ac.uk).
- Energy Project. 2002. 'Elements Of An Energy Platform For Sustainable Societies'. Transnational Institute, Amsterdam.
- Frankel, Boris. 1987. *The Post-Industrial Utopians*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 303 pp.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K. 1996. *The End of Capitalism (as we knew it): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goldman, Michael (ed). 1998. *Privatizing Nature: Political Struggles for the Global Commons*. Amsterdam: Transnational Institute. 257 pp.
- Gorz, André. 1989. 'Summary for Trade Unionists' in *A Critique of Economic Reason*. London: Verso.
- Gorz, André. 1999. 'A New Task for the Unions: The Liberation of Time from Work', in Ronaldo Munck and Peter Waterman (eds), *Labour Worldwide in the Era of Globalization: Alternative Models in the New World Order*. Houndmills: Macmillan.
- Gorz, André. 2000. *Reclaiming Work*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Haworth, Nigel and Harvie Ramsay. 1984. 'Grasping the Nettle: Problems with the Theory of International Trade Union Solidarity', in Peter Waterman (ed), *For a New Labour Internationalism*. The Hague: ILERI Foundation: pp. 60-87
- Holloway, John. 2002. *Changing the World without Taking Power*. London: Pluto.
- Holloway, John. 2002. 'Twelve Theses on Changing the World Without Taking Power'. <http://www.commoner.org.uk/04holloway2.pdf>
- Hyman, Richard. 2002. 'The International Labour Movement on the Threshold of Two Centuries: Agitation, Organisation, Bureaucracy, Diplomacy'. London School of Economics, Department of Industrial Relations.
- Independent Media Centre Philadelphia. 2002. 'Alternatives to Corporate Globalisation'. <http://phillyimc.org/article.pl?sid=01/11/23/0039242&mode=thread>
- Industrial Workers of the World. 2002. Premable to the Constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World, 1905. <http://iww.org/index.shtml>
- International Forum on Globalisation. 2002. *Alternatives to Economic Globalisation [A Better World is Possible]*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler. 268 pp.
- Kaplan, Temma. 2002. 'Uncommon Women and the Common Good: Women and Environmental Protest', in Sheila Rowbotham and Stephanie Linkogle (eds), *Women Resist Globalization: Mobilizing for Livelihood and Rights*. London: Zed. Pp. 28-45.
- Klein, Naomi. *No Logo: No Space, No Choice, No Jobs*. London: Flamingo. 490 pp.
- Klein, Naomi. 2002. 'Fences of Enclosure: Windows of Opportunity'. September 21. <http://nologo.org/article.pl?sid=02/09/21/1447253&mode=thread>

- Klein, Naomi. 2002. *Fences and Windows: Dispatches from the Frontlines of the Globalization Debate*. London: Picador.
- Künemann, Rolf. ???. 'Terms of Reference for a Human Rights Debate'. <http://www.fes.uwaterloo.ca/Research/FW/>
- Lafargue, Paul. 1989 (1893, 1907). *The Right to Be Lazy*. Chicago: Charles Kerr. <http://cat.tao.ca/dwu/lafargue-part1.html>
- Lock, Ineke. 2001. 'An Annotated Bibliography of the Commons: Compiled by Ineke C. Lock for the Globalism Project, August 2001'. [www.ualberta.ca/GLOBALISM/pdf/commonsbibliography.lnk.pdf](http://www.ualberta.ca/GLOBALISM/pdf/commonsbibliography.lnk.pdf)
- Macpherson, C.B. 1962. *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, Brendan. 1993. *In the Public Interest? Privatisation and Public Sector Reform*. London: Zed Books/Public Services International.
- Martin, Brendan. 2002. *In the Public Service*. London: Zed Books/Public Services International.
- Mayekiso, Mzwanele, et al. 1996. *Township Politics: Civic Struggles for a New South Africa*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Midnight Notes. 1990. *The New Enclosures*. *Midnight Notes*, No. 10.
- Neil, Monty, George Caffentzis and Johnny Machete. 1996(?). 'Toward the New Commons: Working Class Strategies and the Zapatistas'. <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/3843/mngcjm.html>
- Omana Reyes, Alma Cecilia and Jorge Santiago Santiago. 2002. 'The Solidarity Economy' (from, *Si Uno Come, Que Coman Todos, Economia Solidaria*. San Cristobal de las Casas (Mexico): DESMI. <http://www.globalexchange.org/campaigns/mexico/ppp/desmi.html>
- Panitch, Leo and Colin Leys (eds). 2000. *Necessary and Unnecessary Utopias*. London: Merlin and New York: Monthly Review. 283 pp.
- Prelinger, Rick. 2002. 'Yes, Information Wants to Be Free, But How's That Going to Happen: Strategies for Freeing Intellectual Property', in Joel Schalit (ed.), *The Anti-Capitalism Reader: Imagining a Geography of Opposition*. Brooklyn (NY): Akashic Books.
- Public Services International. 200?. *Public Services in a Globalised Economy: The PSI Alternative Strategy Revisited* <http://www.world-psi.org/Psi.nsf/6e53a54e88ae01c12568270037cc33/42dbe45534abf179c125686700081422?OpenDocument>
- Ross, Andrew (ed). *No Sweat: Fashion, Free Trade and the Rights of Garment Workers*. London and New York: Verso. 313 pp.
- Shiva, Vandana. 2002. *Water Wars: Pollution, Profits and Privatization*. London: Pluto. 176 pp.
- Sousa Santos, Boaventura. 1995. 'The Global Commons: Jus Humanitatis', in *Toward a New Common Sense: Law, Science and Politics in the Paradigmatic Transition*. London and New York: Routledge. Pp. 365-73.
- Sousa Santos, Boaventura and César Rodríguez. 2001. 'Introduction: Expanding the Canon of Production' (Alternative Production Systems, Reinventing Social Emancipation Project) <http://www.ces.fe.uc.pt/emancipa/research/en/ft/introprod.html>
- Starr, Amory. 2000. *Naming the Enemy: Anti-Corporate Movements Confront Globalisation*. London: Zed.
- The Commoner. 2002. 'Enclosures, Power, Commons', *The Commoner* (Special Issue), No. 4, 2002. [http://www.commoner.org.uk/previous\\_issues.htm](http://www.commoner.org.uk/previous_issues.htm)

- Thompson, Edward. 1974 (1967). 'Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism', in M. W. Flinn and T. C. Smout (eds), *Essays in Social History*. London: Oxford University Press.
- 'Trade Unions OK with Direction Taken'. 1998. *Outreach: The Voice of the NGOs at the CSD* [Commission on Sustainable Development].  
[http://csdngo.igc.org/outreach/vol2\\_3.htm](http://csdngo.igc.org/outreach/vol2_3.htm)
- Van Parijs, P. (ed.). 1992. *Arguing for Basic Income*. London: Verso.
- Wahl, Asbjørn. 2002. 'Labour and the WTO', Our World is Not for Sale Network Seminar, World Social Forum, Porto Alegre, February. 3 pp.
- Waterman, Peter. 2000. 'Is it Possible to Build Utopia in One Country?', *Biblio* (New Delhi), March-April, pp. 37-8.  
[www.ces.fe.uc.pt/emancipa/cv/gen/waterman.html](http://www.ces.fe.uc.pt/emancipa/cv/gen/waterman.html)
- Waterman, Peter. 2001a. *Globalisation, Social Movements and the New Internationalisms*. London/Washington: Continuum. 320 pp. (Paperback Edition, New Preface).
- Waterman, Peter. 2001b. 'Making the Necessary Possible'. *South African Labour Bulletin*. Vol. 25, No. 5 (October). Pp. 65-8.
- Waterman, Peter and Jane Wills (eds). 2001. *Place, Space and the New Labour Internationalisms*. Oxford: Blackwell. 300 pp. Whitfield, Dexter. 2001. *Public Services of Private Profit?*. Nottingham: Spokesman Books.
- Waterman, Peter. 2002a. 'What's Left Internationally? Reflections on the 2<sup>nd</sup> World Social Forum in Porto Alegre'. *Working Paper Series*. No. 362. Institute of Social Studies, The Hague. 38 pp. <http://groups.yahoo.com/groups/GloSoDia>.
- Waterman, Peter. 2002b. 'Globalisation from the Middle? Reflections from a Margin: The European Social Forum, Florence, November 6-10, 2002'. [Parts 1 and 2, November]  
<http://www.voiceoftheturtle.org/>
- Whitfield, Dexter. 2001a. *Public Services or Private Profit?*. Nottingham: Spokesman Books. 32 pp.
- Whitfield, Dexter. 2001b. *Public Services or Corporate Welfare: Rethinking the National State in the Global Economy*. London: Pluto.
- Widerquist, Karl. 2002. 'Perspectives on the Guaranteed Income, Part II'. (A Review of Nine Books on Guaranteed Income).
- Wireless Commons Manifesto. 2002. The Wireless Commons Manifesto.  
<http://dev.wirelesscommons.org/node.php?id=2>.
- Wood, Geof. 2001. 'South African Trade Unions in a Time of Adjustment', *Labour/Le Travail*, No. 47, The History Cooperative <http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/lt/47/06wood.html>

## Web resources

- Alternatives to Corporate Globalisation. Independent Media Center, Philadelphia  
<http://phillyimc.org/article.pl?sid=01/11/23/0039242&mode=thread>
- Centre for Public Services. [www.centre.public.org.uk](http://www.centre.public.org.uk)
- Civil Society Democracy Project (CivSoc)/Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility (CPSR). <http://www.civsoc.org>
- Creating Living Alternatives to Wage Slavery. <http://www.whywork.org/about/welcome.html>
- Creative Commons. <http://www.creativecommons.org/>
- Disenchanted Workers Union. <http://cat.tao.ca/dwu/index.html>
- FutureWork. <http://www.fes.uwaterloo.ca/Research/FW/>

Internet Democracy Project

<http://www.internetdemocracyproject.org/>

No Sweat 100% Union-Made Apparel. <http://nosweatapparel.com/sources/>

Our World is not for Sale. <http://www.ourworldisnotforsale.org/>

Public Services International Research Unit. <http://www.psiru.org>

Reinventing Social Emancipation <http://www.ces.fe.uc.pt/emancipa/en/>

Social Movements Indaba. <http://www.globalindaba.org.za/>

Tragedy of the Commons. <http://members.aol.com/trajcom/private/trajcom.htm>

The Commoner: A Web Journal for Other Values. <http://www.thecommoner.org/>

Unicorn: A Global Unions Anti-Corruption Network/La Red Sindical Global Anticorrupción.  
[corruption@psiru.org](mailto:corruption@psiru.org), <http://www.psiru.org/corruption/indexnew.asp>

VirGlob-SP. 'A Worldwide Minimum Wage? Can we globalize wages? Could they be enforced by the national Social Democratic Parties? By the Unions? By the UN? By the WLO? By the WTO?'. [List title]

[http://webxpress2.agrinet.ch/forums/virglob/dispatch.exe/ team/tHomePage/wages](http://webxpress2.agrinet.ch/forums/virglob/dispatch.exe/team/tHomePage/wages) on

<http://www.virglob-sp.org/>.

Work Questions. <http://members.aon.at/ro.neunteufel/work.htm#->>

South African web resources

<http://southafrica.indymedia.org>

[www.antieviction.org.za](http://www.antieviction.org.za)

[www.apf.org.za](http://www.apf.org.za)

[www.iol.co.za](http://www.iol.co.za)

[www.sabcnews.co.za](http://www.sabcnews.co.za)

[www.dispatch.co.za](http://www.dispatch.co.za)