Introduction

As a lorry driver in Northampton pulls himself up into the seat of his cab on a brisk morning before sunrise, he might not seem like an international political actor. But he is. As he reverses and glances through the back window of his truck, he looks past stickers. One of them reads: ‘NO TRUCK WITH CHILE!!’

It’s a seemingly inconsequential sticker, but it articulates something very grand in concept: that workers on one side of the world could alleviate the suffering of workers living under a dictatorship on the other.

On 11 September 1973, an alliance of the Chilean Navy, Air Force, Army and police seized power after attacking the Presidential Palace in the capital, Santiago. Their supporters legitimised the coup as being a people’s rebellion against an oppressive government. In reality, they had ousted a democratically elected coalition of socialists, communists, other left radicals and some centre-aligned groups. Together, the coalition was called Unidad Popular (UP, or Popular Unity). Salvador Allende was the leader of the UP and a member of the Socialist Party of Chile; he was a Marxist who promoted socialist reforms. Trade unions had formed a strong support base for Allende’s government, and were integrated
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1 Please note: dates of archival titles are entered as written on the original source to aid identification of the document. Thus dates as a part of archival identification do not necessarily follow the academic guidelines of [day] [month] [year]. The [year] has been deleted in the citation if it is implicit within the title of the document. The titles of items in the archives had been italicised in order to aid comprehension.


firmly into sections of the administration. Popular Unity’s program of reforms was referred to as ‘la via chilena al socialismo’ (the Chilean road to socialism), a unique path towards socialism particular to the Chilean situation. This peaceful and parliamentary way was part of a wave of alternative ideas that had begun a surge of popularity throughout the world, and the eyes of the global political left had turned to the slender Latin American country and its experiment.

After coming to power, Allende implemented a platform of reforms including the nationalisation of large industries. Consequently, there was an increase in hostility towards his government from several sources: the political right wing in Chile, multinational companies with interests in Chile, landowners and even the Roman Catholic Church. Meanwhile, those more radical than Allende criticised him for idealising institutions (such as the armed forces) as ‘classless’ and ‘professional’. Allende believed that both his government and those institutions would respect the democratic process that had brought him to power. It was a fatal mistake.

The election of Allende in 1970 had been a ‘political and psychological blow’ to the United States of America. Henry Kissinger, Assistant to the American President for National Security Affairs, famously said, ‘I don’t see why we need to stand by and watch a country go communist due to the irresponsibility of its own people’. American manipulation in Chile followed years of involvement in the Vietnam War, which was also opposed by progressives, and to them Chile became another example of the evils of imperialist intervention. The actions of imperialist forces contributed to Chile’s instability and were embodied (for the international political left) by multinational companies such as International Telephone and Telegraph.

The United States invested US$8 million opposing the election of Allende, and President Richard Nixon made it clear that there was more money available to the opponents of the Allende Government. Opposition parties were funded and
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7 Ibid., 103. The United States justified its interference in Chile because of the possible snowball effect that would spread socialism throughout the Western Hemisphere. The unstable economic and political nature of Chile’s neighbouring countries gave credence to the snowball theory, and President Nixon and his security advisor, Henry Kissinger, resolved to get rid of ‘that son-of-a-bitch Allende’. Paul Jensen, *The Garotte: The United States and Chile, 1970–1973* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1988), 18–19; Nixon, as quoted in Sigmund, *The United States and Democracy in Chile*, 55.
the media was manipulated. Of course, Chileans did have their own agency, and the crisis leading up to the coup was stimulated by a strike that congested the country. The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) supported a truck drivers’ stoppage in October 1972 and again in July–August 1973, shutting down this essential transport system. Sympathetic shopkeepers, whole sectors of commerce, doctors, engineers, bankers, gas employees and lawyers later joined the drivers on strike, thereby worsening the crisis that was enveloping Chile. The impact of the boycotts on the Government was compounded by the congressional rebellion of the extreme left and right wings of the UP administration. The relationship of the Christian Democratic Party and the rest of the UP started to disintegrate under the pressure.

The time was ripe for a coup.

On the day of the military uprising, the president and a handful of supporters fortified themselves in the palace. Allende broadcast a final speech to the citizens of Chile before the radio station was bombed. He said: ‘Long live Chile! Long live the people! Long live the workers! These are my last words.’ Soon after, it was announced that the president had died during a full-scale military assault that all but flattened the Presidential Palace.

As the events recorded in this book were unfolding through the 1970s, the repression in Chile persisted. Decree 228 was put in place after the first wave of arrests, stating that the country was in a state of siege. Disappearances of citizens, summary trials and executions started and did not stop. In December 1973 Decree Law 198, which limited trade union function, was established. Within a year of the coup, the National Intelligence Directorate (DINA) was set up and the state apparatus for political oppression became permanent. During the dictatorship in Chile, 100 000 people were detained in prison and 3000 people were ‘disappeared’.
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10 Sigmund, *The United States and Democracy in Chile*, 69–70.
11 The United States had cut off formal support to all sectors of Chile except for the armed forces during Allende’s term. Military officers were trained at the School of the Americas where the syllabus included ‘counterinsurgency’ techniques and pro-United States rhetoric. A military coup was seen as the first chance of mobilising the full military detachment of Chile in 100 years. Loveman, *Chile*, 259; Sigmund, *The United States and Democracy in Chile*, 66; Chavkin, *Storm Over Chile*, 70–1; Mark Ensalaco, *Chile Under Pinochet: Recovering the Truth* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 27.
The intensity of images of these events initiated a wave of Latin American solidarity throughout the world, though radical engagement with Latin America was by no means new. Bands of men had left Britain in the 1800s to fight in Simón Bolívar’s war, and in the nineteenth century groups of Welsh settlers moved to Argentina, where they hoped to maintain their culture away from English influence. From Australia, William Lane led a socialist utopian group to settle in Paraguay, and Western engineers and other workers travelled to the southern cone of Latin America to seek their fortune in the railway and mining industries. These activities, plus their portrayal in popular fiction and media, contributed to the consistent idealisation of Latin America in the Anglophone world. Latin America was imagined as a continent full of commercial and sociopolitical opportunities for both sides of the political spectrum.

The period under study in this book falls between two important dates of post-World War II political left history: 1968 and 1989. After 1968 the topography of the left changed. New actors on the political stage emerged, such as women, gay people and students, and the Prague Spring caused many leftists to solidify their opinions against the ‘old’ left and become the ‘new’ left. The ‘old’ referred to the statist, Stalinist, Leninist approach as embodied by the USSR, which expressed itself in many ways, including through the world trade union movement. The World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) was an institutionalised and hierarchical expression of old left trade unionism. It sat opposite the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), and the two organisations represented unions on opposing sides of the Cold War.

The political ‘new left’, in contrast, could be simply defined as a movement that expressed an alternative to the Marxist-Leninist ideology of Moscow. It was, however, more complex. Peter Shipley explained the term as a ‘flag of convenience … a transmutable portmanteau, capable of changing its size and shape to accommodate all who fulfil basic qualifications of internationalism, anti-Stalinism and anti-capitalism’. The new left aimed to challenge, but not...
overthrow, the government. Accordingly, the coup in Chile shattered more than the broad front of Chilean radicals—it fuelled a firestorm of arguments over left strategy around the world.\textsuperscript{20}

New left activists tried to insert socialist ideas at the base of the new social movements of the 1960s and 1970s.\textsuperscript{21} As a consequence, the new left was popularised internationally and became associated with student rebellion, war protest and civil rights.\textsuperscript{22} These causes, and the new left along with them, were linked with the growing popularity of socialist humanism—an embodiment of romantic moralism. Phrases like these are what point towards the intense emotion of the political movements of the time, including Chile solidarity.\textsuperscript{23}

As a part of Antonio Gramsci’s ‘hegemonic project’, the new left sought to create a lens through which reality could be perceived, and so turned towards culture as a way of establishing a socialist mentality in the populace.\textsuperscript{24} This emphasis was prevalent in sections of the left in both Australia and Britain.\textsuperscript{25} So while the new left may have been politically weak in the traditional sense, it had an immense cultural vitality.\textsuperscript{26} In both Britain and Australia there were attempts to establish broad fronts, which included activists, independents, political parties, students and other groups during the 1960s and early 1970s.

The new left was, however, on the wain by the end of Allende’s government. Willie Thompson has noted that the ‘revolutionary potential’ of the political new left had dissipated by 1974; similarly Chun lists 1978 as its final year of strength.\textsuperscript{27} The political movement may have passed, but the concept of the broad front and the cultural legacy of the new left continued. Even though the boundaries of its influence will never be clear, it certainly affected Chile solidarity.

In Britain, the new left’s legacy was embodied in the growth of the student movement and the increased appearance of single-issue campaigns.\textsuperscript{28} In Australia the ideas of the new left were incorporated into a long history of militant behaviour, a history that should not be (according to Richard Gordon)

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 190.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 118.
\textsuperscript{24} Thompson, \textit{The Left in History}, 184.
\textsuperscript{25} Chun, \textit{The British New Left}, 113.
\textsuperscript{26} The Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) and the Socialist Party of Australia were not classified as new left, though both used some new left strategies. Michael Rustin, ‘The New Left as a Social Movement’, in \textit{Out of Apathy: Voices of the New Left Thirty Years On}, eds Robin Archer, Diemut Bubeck and Hanjo Glock (London: Verso, 1989), 119.
\textsuperscript{27} Thompson, \textit{The Left in History}, 197; Chun, \textit{The British New Left}, 194; see also p. 118.
\textsuperscript{28} Chun, \textit{The British New Left}, 108.
mistaken for true radicalism. Since the split of 1968, Australia’s Communist Party had been rather independent of the Soviet line; yet, it was born of the Cominform-aligned communist party, and as such, the ideas of the new left it chose to adopt were built on a continuation of the old.

How did trade unions fit into this political split between the new and the old?

Lin Chun has noted that the ideas that flowed in the 1970s are hard to catalogue as new left or non-new left, and I would argue union actions are similarly difficult to classify. Trade unions behaved like they always had: they were the product of a long history of international and extra industrial activity. In the constitutions of most unions international brotherhood and concern for society are explicit even when overt socialist rhetoric is not present and regardless of the status of union leaders of the ‘old’ or ‘new’ left. Trade unions had participated in the Spanish Civil War, the peace and disarmament movements and in actions for Indonesian independence and against the Sino–Japanese conflict.

It can be said that the solidarity movement was, in its initial stages, reactionary.

The images of the first days after the coup appeared on television screens and in newspapers around the world, burning images of the detentions and bombings into the minds of the public. The descriptions of the repression provoked an outcry from people and groups with an interest in democracy as well as socialism and justice. They mourned Allende and the fracture of the Chilean experiment and declared solidarity with the ‘Chilean people’, though often this declaration was not as inclusive as its phrasing indicated. The movement was just as much about the perception of Chile prior to the coup (the Allende years as well as a general idealisation of Latin American workers and peasants), as it was about the fate of the Chilean people during the dictatorship.

In short, the solidarity movement was as much about the perceived Chilean past as it was about its present and future. In fact, sometimes it was not about Chile at all. Peter Shipley has also noted that solidarity campaigns were ‘more pertinent to revolutionary activism at home’ than to events in other countries. Ideological conflict in the labour movement is not often presented in ‘crude
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33 Shipley, Revolutionaries in Modern Britain, 114.
self-interested terms’, but in reality unionists frequently used external issues to contest ideological themes via existing union structures. Chile’s past and present were used to aid political strategy in local internecine battles.

The coup in Chile did not cause Latin American solidarity, but it did transform the political and cultural significance of Latin American solidarity organising. The solidification of the dictatorship added a moral tone that spread the Chile issue beyond the overtly political pre-coup relationship. Soon there were blatant human rights violations to campaign against, along with a shattered socialist dream to mourn and democracy to fight for.

The Chile solidarity movement provides a window into labour movement interaction with social movements in the 1970s. It aids understanding of how networks, ideas and key individuals affect political trade union action. It supplies examples of a single-issue movement’s efforts to popularise protests around their own aims. For these reasons, and in their own right, the Chile campaigns deserve more detailed study than the casual mentions in trade union and radical histories that they have received to date, and more serious contemplation than the glorified or nostalgic memories of participants. While there are some limited works on Chile solidarity, this is the most substantial work on these campaigns thus far. In this book the trade unionists of the Chile solidarity movement take centre stage.

There have previously been three works with a focus on Chile solidarity, only two of which (both masters theses) concentrate on the British Commonwealth. Michael Wilkinson focused on British Chile and Nicaragua solidarity campaigns. He traced their achievements as lobby groups in positive and negative lobbying environments. Gustavo Martin Montenegro, a Chilean immigrant to Australia, wrote the second study in Spanish. He amassed an impressive amount of material, but does not explain or unpack the detailed workings of Australian solidarity in the text. Both of these works recognise that trade unions played a part in solidarity but do not seek to understand the actions of organisations in more depth than a general notion of left alliance.

This is a grave oversight. Trade unions were essential to the Chilean solidarity movement: throughout the dictatorship one union or another provided the
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36 See, for example: Stephen Deery, ‘Union Aims and Methods’, in *Australian Unions: An Industrial Relations Perspective*, eds Bill Ford and David Plowman (South Melbourne: Macmillan, 1983), 75.
38 Wilkinson was formerly involved in Latin American solidarity movements.
base of support for solidarity activities. Trade unionists were among the most committed individuals to the solidarity movements, and were openly courted by the Chile campaigns as likely recruits for a good cause.

This publication does not attempt to provide the reader with the history of the Chilean military regime, which eventually came to be known outside Chile as the Pinochet dictatorship. Where events in Chile are referred to, it is to accomplish a more detailed understanding of the transnational nature of the solidarity movements in question, or because the event affected decision-making or strategy within the solidarity movements in some way. Furthermore, this book does not attempt to include a detailed study of the Chilean diaspora, or a comprehensive reconstruction of political or social identities in exile. Nor does it focus on the activities of personalities in exile, such as Joan Jara and Luis Figueroa, though their movements are partially tracked. This project does not claim to uncover memory of the dictatorship, or accuse governments or businesses of mismanagement or conspiracy. Finally, it is not an attempt to understand Chilean unionism, or the pressure of the dictatorship on it.

What this work does do is bring together previously ignored and forgotten sources with newly collected testimonies to record a partial history of the Chile solidarity movement in Britain and Australia. A series of previously unrecorded or under-recorded case studies of trade union political action is provided. To do this, a mass of archival sources, newspapers, ephemera, artwork, music and oral history interviews has been employed. By describing trade union action in the movements under study, which previous scholarship has neglected, these activists, actions and organisations are rescued from the ‘enormous condescension of posterity’, as E. P. Thompson so succinctly put it in 1963.

In addition to incorporating neglected information into the historical record, this work responds to the criticism of the academic treatment of internationalism levelled by Peter Waterman and Jill Timms in 2005. ‘Case studies of international solidarity actions are so rare’, they wrote, ‘that they tend to be repeatedly reproduced, as if the references or cases speak for themselves and do not require critical examination or reinterpretation. There are few comparative, interpretive and movement-oriented studies.’

On another occasion Waterman has also noted that work on labour internationalism has been narrow, concerned with single cases and not theoretical
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39 Most Chileans do not call it a dictatorship (dictadura), but ‘the junta’ (junta) or, with a slight sense of irony, the ‘little junta’ (juntita).
in approach. John Logue is similarly disparaging of academics’ explanations of international trade union activity, which, he writes, are ad-hoc collections of leaders’ rationales, descriptions of events and casual linking to economic factors. In this publication, I have attempted to deploy and extend the work of theoreticians such as Waterman through historical reconstructions. The layered international and intra-national comparative aspects as well as the exhaustive archival research contained in these pages also go some of the way to meeting these critiques.

The field of comparative labour studies continues to grow and this publication contributes an illustrative comparison by assessing many units in relation to theory. Despite the fact that the labour movements of Britain and Australia vary substantially in terms of their size and depth of bureaucracy, age and geographical area, they still lend themselves to evaluation. The first unions in Australia were in fact branches of their British relatives, and the definition of ‘trade unions’ in Australian legislation is based on the British Trade Union Act of 1871. British radicals have looked to Australia as a new world where compulsory arbitration and the possibilities of the federal system came together in a workingman’s paradise. By the end of World War II, the labour movement in Australia had long outgrown any childlike need, yet it was not until 1968 that the Amalgamated Metal Workers’ Union officially separated from its British parent union, the Amalgamated Engineering Union. It is obvious, therefore, that growing from the strong tradition of the Tolpuddle Martyrs, the roots of Australian unionism are firmly lodged within the rich soil of British traditions.

In the 1960s and early 1970s both movements were mature and blossoming, yet the substantial divergence in the trends and styles of unionism in both countries gives life to this comparative project. The inclusion of two nations in the study also tempers the exceptionalist tendency that often plagues labour historians and trade union histories. Furthermore, laying the two movements side by

42 Peter Waterman, Globalization, Social Movements and the New Internationalisms (London: Continuum, 2001), 5.
49 Berger and Patmore, ‘Comparative Labour History in Britain and Australia’, 20.
side, including various levels of unions from workplace to peak body, enables a multilayered comparison both intra and inter national, which is very unusual and undertaken implicitly and explicitly throughout the book.

Perhaps the most well-known comparative study of Britain and Australia is Neville Kirk’s *Comrades and Cousins*. In it, Kirk focuses on the differences and similarities between national labour movements. The comparison contained in this publication differs substantially from that undertaken by Kirk. This work is bi-national, and it does compare the two nations broadly speaking, but is more intensely comparative in the cross-union and cross-activity spheres. This is due to a focus that includes low and mid-level decision-making and action in unions rather than solely those of the upper echelons.

The restricted period of the work, from 1973 to 1980, is not representative of the whole Chile movement in either country. There were two main phases of both movements and the transition between them occurred around 1980. In broad terms, the second half of the Chile solidarity movement moved towards a human rights campaign with an entirely different set of actors, and in Britain it had a feminist focus. In Australia, the second half of the movement was dominated by Chilean exiles. Consequently, trade union and labour involvement in the Chile movements changed substantially in the 1980s. It would be impossible to give adequate attention to the campaigns’ duration in one book, and for this reason I present a partial history of the movements.

It is important to note, also, that Chile actions were not just responsive activities driven by ideology, they were also influenced by the mobilising effect of rhetoric; the power play between unions, unionists and political groups; pressure or inaction from the union hierarchy; opportunities for action created by social movements; genuine concern for Chilean citizens; publicity campaigns; internationalist identity; the expectation of radical engagement; and tension between ‘bread and butter’ issues and activism. These factors will be elucidated at length through the body of this work.

I attempt to avoid a confined political narrative by illustrating these pressures in depth. Chile solidarity was more than a narrow expression of brotherhood between two groups of the working class: it was an expression of the idealism of those who wished to change their world. Chile solidarity was not isolated from other ideological movements or historical occurrences of the time. Rather, it formed part of the cluster of radical and progressive thinking of the 1970s.

50 Kirk also recently published *Labour and the Politics of Empire*. The next largest publication is probably the special issue of *Labour History*, volume 88, published in 2005.
51 Due to the same restrictions on space, this work does not include every action undertaken in solidarity with Chile.
As Robert Saunders observed about Chartism in the previous century, the Chile cause was similarly bundled together with other issues and ideology in the popular consciousness, and its identity could not be separated from those issues (imperialism, multinational companies, local political party machinations and human rights, for example).53

The pages of this book are separated by geography into two sections. Within the sections is a series of case studies, vignettes and biographical sketches. The first chapter of each half maps the organisational space in which the solidarity movement existed, populating it with its actors: trade unionists, politicians, activists, immigrants and organisations. This helps provide a prosopographic view of those involved in the movements. It is in these two chapters that the landscapes of the Chile solidarity movements are articulated. The next three chapters provide case studies of internationalist action and synthesise a repertoire of action the labour movement would undertake for remote political gain.

These six chapters are divided by type of trade union action: indirect actions organised from without, indirect actions organised from within and the final chapter of each section attends to direct industrial action. It is, of course, immediately necessary to elaborate those categories.

Trade union politics: direct and indirect action

If we consider trade unions to be a type of sectional, interest or representative pressure group, it is reasonable to assume they would have a permanent structure established to service their organisational aims.54 Professor of human resource management Stephen Deery notes that there are four general union objectives, the fourth of which is political. The first three are ‘provision of direct services to members; improved conditions of employment; [and] organisational security’.55 ‘Political or non-industrial objectives’, he writes, ‘have always been regarded as a legitimate item of trade union business although few organisations have actually resorted to the use of industrial action in the pursuit of such matters’.56

Deery puts it very clearly: the aims of Australian unions are ‘largely restricted to the negotiation of limited improvements within the framework of capitalist work relations’.57 Bob Hawke, president of the Australian Council of Trade

55 Deery, ‘Union Aims and Methods’, 63.
56 Ibid., 89.
57 Ibid., 62.
Unions (ACTU) for much of the period of the Chile solidarity movement, said ‘maximisation of gains for its members’ social as well as material gains—is the prime objective of the union movement’.\(^{58}\) A few years later, however, Hawke said:

> We have a responsibility to in fact use our own strength, our accumulated and cohesive strength in a way which will not only assist those who are directly in our ranks but also to assist those who are less fortunate and less privileged than ourselves and less able to look after their own interests.\(^{59}\)

This humanitarian sentiment underpins the international actions of trade unions and works in conjunction with the socialist ideology and romantic moralism already described.

Trade union actions with extra-industrial aims fall into two main categories: ‘direct’ (industrial) tactics and ‘indirect’ (party-political) tactics.

Direct tactics include boycotts, walk-offs, sit-ins, black bans, refusals to service or go-slow. Those strategies may be aimed at goods representative of the issue (in this case, from Chile), or a general stoppage will be signalled as having a political aim through posters, press releases, meeting attendances and leafleting (indirect actions when used alone).

Indirect tactics include political lobbying, sponsorship of parliamentarians, affiliation to political parties and forwarding of resolutions.\(^{60}\) Particularly pertinent to the Chile campaign is the indirect action of trade union involvement in social movements. Their attendance at meetings, demonstrations and speaking engagements, for example, contributed to political goals in an indirect manner.\(^{61}\) Union (direct and indirect) action for non-industrial issues, where those actions attempted to change trade union or government policy from outside the electoral framework, could be interpreted by opposition forces as a constitutional challenge.\(^{62}\) Yet the potential for disruption of internal union harmony did not stop action occurring.
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59 Bob Hawke, in Deery, ‘Union Aims and Methods’, 75.
60 It is hard to quantify the exact effects of sponsorship of parliamentarians due to the doctrine of parliamentary privacy. May, *Trade Unions and Pressure Group Politics*, 4, 28, 33; Deery, ‘Union Aims and Methods’, 87.
In order to locate union action for Chile within academic discourse it is necessary to outline the relevant abstract theoretical definitions as they have developed over time. These definitions also help to elucidate nuance in the union actions and interactions as they are revealed through the book.

I’m not going to lie: the definitions are confusing.

Over many years, historians, social scientists and theorists have laboured their points and created their own phrases. I have attempted to synthesise that below.

**Internationalism: international unionism and union internationalism**

The labour movement itself was conceived as internationalist in aim and construction and the concept of labour ‘internationalism’ first emerged from the Marxist-Leninist Internationals. Internationalism, writes Waterman, a leading scholar in the area, ‘is generally understood as a left-wing or democratic project for creating relations of solidarity between social classes, popular interests, and progressive identities, independently of, or in opposition to, the state or capital’. As a term, it has almost universally positive connotations even though it inherently places the conception of ‘nation’ above any other political unit.

Despite the supposed opposition to the state, the international labour movement was born out of socialist thought and socialist language and often supported an ideal type of state. Peak union bodies, such as the ACTU or the Trade Union Congress (Britain), could express their internationalism through their affiliation with international organisations such as the ICFTU or WFTU, which were still divided along Cold War lines in the 1970s. These organisations, literally international unions, provided national organisations with the chance to communicate, meet and organise. Such institutionalised union internationalism was easily undertaken by unions and rarely required industrial action. As already implied, it forms a part of ‘trade union internationalism’; however, it is not its only expression.

---


Trade union internationalism, as a term, covers an array of activities across all levels of unionism. First, there is international unionism as already discussed. Second, bilateral union relations, where unions develop direct links with their equivalent in other countries, also express internationalist sentiment. Frequently, though not exclusively, bilateral relations centre on industrial issues and strategy sharing and are most often clustered around an industry similarity (such as garment makers) or a singular business (such as all employees of Toyota). Still, the relationship is based on a Marxist ideal of a brotherhood of class, and the terms ‘trade union internationalism’ and ‘internationalist’ continue to carry that connection.

The third and final, at least for our purposes, expression of trade union internationalism is the engagement in local action for non-local political gain (for example, happening in Melbourne to influence Syria). This action does not necessarily require a specific union or unionist to be the object of internationalist sentiment nor does it need an industrial aim. It may be with the aim of ‘peace’, for example, or ‘the Chilean people’. When international action has political motives (that is: non-industrial aims), Marcel van der Linden writes, it is in general ‘aimed at promoting or opposing a particular political model’. Local trade union action and interaction with a social movement for non-local political gain mean this final category of internationalist expression is the most referred to in this publication.

Transnationalism

It must be said that there are more definitions in circulation, including proletarian/contemporary/labour/trade union/new labour internationalism, however, arguments towards their characterisation do not benefit this study.
It is necessary to mention, however, a currently fashionable term in academic history: transnationalism. Transnationalism was actually formed as the academic reaction to the traditional manner of approaching international relations called ‘realism’. Realism supposes that domestic and international politics are completely separate. Transnationalism argues the opposite. This idea is supported through the case studies still to come, but the term ‘transnational’ implies the carriage of something or someone across a border, and this restriction is one of the reasons it is not used exclusively in this book: actions may be international in intent only.

Many actions discussed within these pages could be classified as transnational and many of the actors most certainly were, but ‘internationalism’ was the term used by those who undertook the actions and ‘transnationalism’ is a term imposed upon the past by academics. In ideological terms, the word ‘internationalism’ meant something to them, just as it has a political connotation for us. For this reason, internationalism is employed in the main.

Just as you come to grips with internationalisms, I must add another layer of complexity, because international interactions involving trade unions are products and partners of models of union function, which are defined below.

**Industrial national unionism**

The structures of ‘traditional’ or ‘old’ international interaction are linked to what is called ‘industrial national unionism’, and adhere to a hierarchical and largely bureaucratic system focused on traditional industrial issues. The industrial national framework is the national expression from which ‘international unionism’ springs. Where it strays outside the industrial sphere, this type of internationalism tended to follow a more paternalistic aid model, promoting a structured hierarchy in unionism and politics. In general, the self-perpetuating...
bureaucracy of these organisations tended to ensure they support activities that reflect their own forms of unionism, and their internationalism has been called ‘fraternal tourism’ or ‘banquet internationalism’.\textsuperscript{77} It has been prone, to use the words of Waterman’s succinct chapter subtitle, to being confined to paternal ‘North–South internationalism’ and in the process reproduces the imagery of ‘noble savages and promised lands’.\textsuperscript{78}

In 1980, John Logue described a particular idiosyncrasy of industrial national unionism, which is perceived to be absent in the international interaction of other forms of unionism: ‘international working class solidarity becomes an independent force for continued international activity … It comes, in a way, to represent a good in itself. Born of international action, it becomes a reason for international action.’\textsuperscript{79} This is reminiscent of the well-known ‘iron law of bureaucracy’ outlined by the sociologist Robert Michels: the international tendency is self-replicating and self-supporting.

By the period of this study, however, industrial national unionism’s self-perpetuating tendency had been placed under organisational pressure due to changes in the international nature of capital. To paraphrase van der Linden, it was challenged by the formation of trading blocs (such as the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA), the proliferation and dominance of multinational (or transnational) companies and the increasing number of non-governmental organisations that took on causes that were previously on the agenda of the labour movement.\textsuperscript{80} Industrial national unionism was aligned with the old left and was not traditionally active in seeking a broad front, yet in the new conditions and with the new left, unions began to act outside the industrial national framework, as the model does not allow for the partnership of labour with social movements or other groups. This led to the theoretical development of another model of unionism.

Social movements and new social movements

The model put forward by scholars is ‘social movement unionism’, but before attempting to define the paradigm, a question arises that is outside the scope of this publication but nevertheless integral to it and the types of unionism to be described: was the Chile solidarity movement a social movement at all?\textsuperscript{81}

\textsuperscript{78} Waterman, Globalization, Social Movements and the New Internationalisms, xiii.
\textsuperscript{79} Logue, Toward a Theory of Trade Union Internationalism, 35.
\textsuperscript{80} van der Linden, ‘Proletarian Internationalism’, 122–4.
\textsuperscript{81} Wilkinson characterises the Chile Solidarity Campaign (CSC) as a ‘lobby group’. While some aspects of the CSC functioned as a political lobby group, defining it as such overlooks some rhetoric, functions and
The definition of social movements is no easy task because, again, no consensus is present in the literature. Theorist Sidney Tarrow has argued that social movements are collective challenges with common purpose, social solidarity and sustained interaction.\textsuperscript{82} Consensus—that is, unanimity in relation to the core values of the movement—has also been noted by Frank Parkin as important to social movements,\textsuperscript{83} though such broad statements could easily describe trade union organisation or even a football club.

Writing in 1974, John Wilson constructed a typology of social movements that included four types (transformative, reformative, redemptive and alternative). For Wilson, a social movement was a mindful, organised attempt to encourage or prevent change in society from outside its institutions.\textsuperscript{84} He continued to thicken his description and wrote that social movements

\begin{quote}
function to move people beyond their mundane selves to acts of bravery, savagery, and selfless charity. Animated by the injustices, sufferings, and anxieties they see around them, men and women in social movements reach beyond the customary resources of the social order to launch their own crusade against the evils of society.\textsuperscript{85}
\end{quote}

Wilson’s model is usefully expanded if we consider the work of Jan Pakulski. Pakulski argues that social movements are ‘recurrent patterns of collective activities which are partially institutionalised, value oriented and anti-systemic in their form and symbolism’.\textsuperscript{86} The Chile movement seems to fit into these definitions, even though it did not only lobby for change to occur within its host countries.\textsuperscript{87} Having said that, many commentators have acknowledged that strategies of the CSC such as liaison with rank-and-file unionists and the use and creation of culture. Michael Wilkinson, ‘The Influence of the Solidarity Lobby on British Government Policy towards Latin America: 1973–1990’ (Master of Politics diss., University of Hull, 1990).


\textsuperscript{83} Frank Parkin, \textit{Middle Class Radicalism: The Social Bases of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament} (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1968).


\textsuperscript{85} Ibid., 5.


\textsuperscript{87} The beneficiaries of the ‘lobbying’ were meant to be Chileans within Chile. Further, another question is raised about scale: how large does an organised campaign need to be in order to be called a movement—though this question is beyond the scope of this short literature review.
the phrase ‘social movement’ has been used and abused by many academics, social theoreticians, activists and the general public. Pakulski argues that the flexibility of its use and meaning is what makes the term attractive.

As the Chile campaigns specified their aims as political solidarity and change of government in Chile, it seems they fit into the paradigm of a social movement. The question then arises: were the interactions between the Chile solidarity campaigns and trade unions a form of social movement unionism? In order to answer this question in the body of the book, it is necessary to define ‘social movement unionism’.

Social movement unionism

The term social movement unionism was originally coined by Peter Waterman and later used by Kim Moody and others. This ‘new’ unionism highlighted the social responsibility of labour and allowed trade unions to create practical relationships with community groups in order to achieve their extra-industrial goals. Social movement unions do not function in an exclusively hierarchical or vertical manner, as in industrial national unionism, but also horizontally, facilitating shopfloor alliances across borders or participating in direct contact

88 For example, Verity Burgmann has stated that a social movement makes demands on the state from within society rather than from within the structures of the state. While this at first seems to be a term that could fit the Chile solidarity movement, Burgmann continues that social movements are made up of imagined communities of the ‘oppressed, disadvantaged or threatened’. Many of those involved in the Chile movement in the period under study were not personally oppressed. In terms of the creation of culture, I believe Burgmann fell into a trap of connecting union function paradigms (social movement unionism) and political strategies (new left cultural extension), which are not necessarily as intimately associated as could be assumed. Verity Burgmann, Power, Profit and Protest: Australian Social Movements and Globalisation (Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 2003). 4. There are also competing ideas on social movements: Byrne has noted that social movements are unpredictable (do not always arise where there is the greatest need), irrational (not motivated by self-interest), unreasonable (feel justified in their protest) and disorganised (deliberately refrain from organisation). As a definition, this is the least likely to let the Chile solidarity movement fit into its scope for reasons that are apparent through the body of this work. Paul Byrne, Social Movements in Britain (London: Routledge, 1997), 10–11. Cohen and Rai propose that ‘human rights social movement’ is an umbrella term that would take in indigenous rights, antiracism, anti-dictatorship and freedom campaigns. Robin Cohen and Shirin Rai, Global Social Movements: Towards a Cosmopolitan Politics’, in Global Social Movements, eds Robin Cohen and Shirin Rai (London: The Athlone Press, 2000), 1–17; John Keane, Global Civil Society? (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Pakulski, Social Movements, xiv.

89 Its flexibility also leads to opacity and subsequently attempts to specify meaning with more and still more variations of the term, like new social movements. ‘New social movements’ were founded in the 1960s culture of revolution, of anger and a sense of change being possible. New social movements were thought to be those that did not pitch their arguments for or against the state, but around the state. Thompson, The Left in History, 193.

and liaison with new left or social movement groups. Social movement unions undertake lobbying of government and regulatory agencies and also the provision of practical aid, grassroots action, delegations and campaigns to raise awareness.  

The accepted definition of social movement unionism is ‘an alliance within the class (waged/nonwaged), and/or between the class and the popular/community (workers/people, labour/nationalist)’. This straightforward explanation requires, however, more detail. The theory was developed, according to Waterman, from his experiences as an activist in the 1980s and 1990s. What is more, Waterman constructed the concept of social movement unionism as an interaction between theories, not as a direct explanation of the relationship between social movements and labour, as it has been popularly employed. Waterman came to construct social movement unionism by combining socialist trade union theory and new social movement theory of the late 1980s. It is not my intention to take part in ‘depriving’ the theorem of its ‘critical function’, but some practicality must be considered, as this work is an attempt to actually apply the abstract theories to real case studies.

Despite commonsense pointing towards social movement unionism as an adequate paradigm to explain union action in this study, it is actually interlaced with problems. First, as already mentioned, the original intent of the framework was not its application to historical events. Second, the theories and experiences from which it was constructed are from a different time period. Third, the definition Waterman used in his combination to construct social movement unionism was not ‘social movements’ (which, as already established, include the Chile solidarity movement), but ‘new social movements’. The confusing abstract underpinning these terms weakens their possible usefulness for the application to a study of labour history.

Waterman and Timms have written that despite the proliferation of theories, the intertwined and interdependent relationship between unions and social movements does not find a theoretical expression. They state that ‘the growing
presence of international unions within the global justice and solidarity movement in general ... might suggest a development in the direction of some kind of “international social movement unionism”’.

But note: they specify ‘international unions’, not unions acting internationally and not unions expressing internationalism.

There exists much material around social movement unionism, new social movement unionism, international social movement unionism, global unionism, political unionism and various other permutations. I do not intend to add to the pool of confusing acronyms. For the purposes of this study, the term social movement unionism will be used to designate an organisational form that simply allowed trade unions to create practical relationships with other community groups in order to achieve their extra-industrial goals. It is popularly considered to be diametrically opposite to and mutually exclusive of the ‘old’ industrial national unionism. The manner in which unions moved between the two styles is an inherent focus of this research and one that is left to simple explanations of ‘organic’ transformation by theorists. One of the principal findings of the research undertaken for this book is that the forms were not in fact discrete.

---

98 Ibid., 198.
99 Waterman asserts that old social movements were about religion and nation. ‘New social unionism’ implies an alliance between labour and new alternative social movements (one further theoretical and temporal step away from ‘new social movements’ and two away from ‘social movements’). Waterman, ‘The New Social Unionism’, 247. ‘Social unionism’ (an opposition to traditional unionism) attempts to secure standards for workers from within the capitalist system through a three-way partnership with state and business; social unions aim for equality and justice and socially mobilise in that direction. George de Martino, ‘The Future of the US Labour Movement in an Era of Global Economic Integration’, in Labour Worldwide in the Era of Globalization: Alternative Union Models in the New World Order, eds Ronaldo Munck and Peter Waterman (Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 1999), 85. Political unionism is where a union allies itself with a party of the left and works to support their platforms. This, in effect, would make the union and the worker passive, and does not explain the integration into a social movement. It also offers a one-dimensional political agenda that is rare in reality. Mike Press, ‘International Trade Unionism’, in Press and Thompson, Solidarity for Survival: The Don Thompson Reader on Trade Union Internationalism, eds Mike Press and Don Thompson (Nottingham: Spokesman, 1989), 24; Moody, ‘Towards an International Social-Movement Unionism’, 4.
100 Waterman noted that unions had taken on their forms based on the organisation of capital, and had retained those forms, long after capital itself had changed (here Waterman is referring to the structures of industrial national unionism). Unions, he argued, were thus unable to effectively protect their constituents. New global social movements had moved away from an organisation to a network model, which more accurately matched current trends of capital and power flow. ‘The old socialist and thirdworldist internationalisms are today little more than so many empty shells—a series of ideologically-defined, institutionalized and competing internationalisms of politicians and officials having little contact with workers or peoples.’ Waterman, ‘The New Social Unionism’, 250; see also p. 55; Waterman, ‘Trade Union Internationalism in the Age of Seattle’.
101 Perhaps there is a stepping-stone. The Chile campaigns began just as the new left was in fashion throughout the world. As elucidated in this volume, the strategies of the new left locked trade unions and social movement groups into a reinforcing cycle of support. The Chile movement was part of the ‘new wave of non-sectarian and democratic international solidarity activities’ of the 1970s that does not receive the academic attention it deserves in terms of its relationship with unions. The movements in both Australia and the United Kingdom roughly fit the ideology of the ‘new left social movements’ outlined in passing by Verity Burgmann. She noted that social movements harnessed the industrial language of the labour movement to succeed in changing the existing regime: it was the only language capitalists would understand and it
Having explored the abstract categories necessary for this study, it is important to recognise what has already been hinted at: the history that follows does not have an adequate explanation in the current theoretical literature. This book will record expressions of internationalism and I will attempt to place them within abstract paradigms, but theories or theoretical arguments over international social movement unions, new international unionism, social movement unionism or industrial national unionism will not obscure the actual history of the Chile campaigns. This work infers the usefulness of these theories is not in categorising union action but in helping to elucidate the politics of real people in often difficult situations.

The biggest point of confusion around the models previously defined arises when the attempt is made to align a union model with a type of internationalism, a definition of a social movement, an incarnation of left ideology and a type of trade union political action. The terms do not split neatly down the middle, aligning with ‘old’ and ‘new’, ‘rigid’ and ‘flexible’, ‘industrial national’ and ‘social movement’ or ‘hierarchical’ and ‘grassroots’. Where the social movement unionism and industrial national paradigms serve this publication is in providing end points between which an assumed progression occurred: bookends between which I can locate historical actions.

Trade union internationalist action borrows elements of the ideology and strategy of various models without excluding others, and unions regularly slid backwards and forwards across the progressive scale. Exploring the Chile campaigns in detail dissolves the boundaries between what have been considered finite and discrete models. This book, starting with Chapter One, brings political science models to the history, but more importantly, brings this history to light.
This text taken from No Truck with the Chilean Junta!
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