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At a time when Australian labour think-tanks are reconsidering the roadmap, this paper offers a contrast based on French labour politics, which have been evolving in quite a different fashion over the last decade or so. After providing a few insights into the French industrial relations system, particular attention is given to the alter-globalisation movement and a new born trade union Solidaires, Unitaires et Démocratiques (SUD) which altogether epitomise forces at play in France. It is suggested that if social-movement unionism is not an apparent relevant option for Australia, this is still a strategic paradigm to reckon with and be considered.

For a decade, Australian trade unions have been striving under heavy handed institutional challenges. Within such an ‘adverse’ context the ACTU has engineered and driven the counter strategies of the union movement. Their early organising campaign was pretty much a copy of the AFL-CIO initiative. Likewise, the new ACTU blueprint draws on a mix of North-American and British experiences (Forsyth, 2007) and by doing so, as this paper highlights, is keeping the strategic mindset within the same paradigmatic framework. Coincidentally, in the same period, French industrial relations have been rocked by on-going social irruptions. Back in the early 1990s, French experts were about to toll the bell for trade unions. For many, it was a dead-dog, till the first bite. The general strike of 1995, was shortly followed by another general strike in 1997 and then by successive waves of protest onwards. Whether the magnitude of this social tectonic has resulted in a reconfiguration of the landscape of French collective representation (Denis, 2002) is yet a matter of appreciation. Definitely though, something went on. A wind of passion blew across French labour politics. Is that a matter of inspiration for Australia? Perhaps. The extent to which such a revival could be branded as a ‘model’ of social movement unionism is another issue that we will discuss as a matter of concluding remark. Beforehand, we will start with a brief overview of the French industrial relations system and then focus on the new forces at play within.

Some Snapshots of French Industrial Relations

It would be beyond the scope of this paper to deliver a detailed account of French industrial relations. Instead, it may be a useful exercise to scan through the system in order to draw attention to several key points that characterise its idiosyncrasies and allow functional comparisons.

First of all, it is essential to note that the whole system of collective representation is organised along a fundamental dichotomy: the representation of collective interests, which is the exclusive realm of trade unions, thus being representative de jure of the general interest of the working class; and, the representation of individual interests, led through parallel channels, either individual (the personnel delegate versus the union delegate) or collective works councils mostly aiming at addressing workplace issues including judicial rights in case of grievance. In the abstract, this is to say that French trade unions are viewed representative de facto, whatever the weight of their membership. In addition to their statutory status, they are also in charge of overseeing the national social welfare in tandem with employers’ associations, a process known as ‘paritarism’. Despite endemic low levels of union density casting some doubt about their actual social representativeness, there has been no significant attempt so far, to alter the legitimacy of their legal status. Unlike their Australian counterparts, French trade unions have not been put on their back foot in this regard, which is of importance.

As mentioned, union density is pretty thin, well below 10% and for a large part stemming from the public sector. Is this a case of national free-riding? It has to be acknowledged while union
density is one of the lowest in Europe, union coverage is among the highest thanks to industry-based collective agreements. As a common practice, the outcomes of statutory collective bargaining with ‘representative’ trade unions are extended to all concerned via government initiated legislation, as tribunals were used under the former arbitration system in Australia. It sets a floor level of working conditions which employers are free to top up at company or plant level. So why be a member, in instrumental terms, when you will benefit from the collective anyway, especially knowing that flagging yourself as union friendly is almost anathema to job security in the unsheltered private sector? To put it in a different light, the 1.7 million registered union members are seen as a large reserve of committed activists that can offer a powerful organising leverage to germinate and fuel dissent. Or, ironically, as a union leader put it, not being bound by membership concerns may be quite handy in that you do not have to service them! Thus, there is also less chance of being drawn into self-serving corporatist logics. Instead, a broader scope to stand for the general interest is provided, although some would argue otherwise in the light of the representation gap between the public and the private sector.

This, in turn, partially explains the pattern of industrial conflicts in France. The system effectively keeps union structure away from the workplace. This may suit French employers who historically, have been fiercely hostile to trade unions, and poorly equipped for resolving industrial issues through enterprise bargaining. Hence unpredictable surges of walkouts, work stoppages and flash strikes – the frontier of collective action becoming so blurred that the label ‘social movement’ is often euphemistically used as a substitute to name what is actually a strike. Striking is the name of the game. From the ‘preventive’ strike – better strike first as a display of conviction and bargain thereafter – to the strike by proxy, i.e. a form of ‘pattern striking’ consisting in organising an industrial action in a union stronghold, like the national railway services, for the likely benefit of those, mostly in the private sector, who ‘cannot’ and from whom you seek moral allegiance and support. As strikes become contagious when the collective mood is conducive to action, it is a matter of union leadership and creative flair to seize the opportunity to raise the stake which should be fought for. This would potentially create a national spill-over with the hope of gaining the state’s regulatory arbitration or direct intervention. In this sense, as in Hyman’s typology (2005), French trade unions routinely perform the function of ‘agitators’. Bearing this in mind, with the exception of large business units, most of the French private sector is virtually union-free. Consequently, the modality of workers’ voice and participation pretty much rests upon employers’ voluntarism. As a result, in contrast with their German counterparts, French works councils are barely used beyond the legal requirements for employee information and consultation (Gumbrell-McCormick & Hyman, 2006). So, they are notoriously seen as agencies for recreational activities. Also critical is that union delegates are very often kept offsite, which tends to create a split between what is stigmatised as the rationale of the union apparatus, heralded by union delegates, and actual workplace collectives. The resulting struggle for legitimacy makes direct representation a tenuous task on a day-to-day basis (Hege & Dufour, 1995; Dufour & Hege, 2002).

Conflict-ridden pluralism is another feature of French trade unionism, comprising a traditional divide between the Communist (CGT) and the Christian-democrat (CFDT) led unions. These represent a wide ranging spectrum of interests including an enduring vein of anarcho-syndicalism. Although this ideological divide has largely lost significance over time, it does on both a discursive and practical level translate – with the risk of being Manichean – into two polarised union profiles: participation and compromise for the latter; contestation and struggle for the former. Or prosaically, there are the ones who sign and the ones who don’t. For a collective agreement to be enforced only requires the signature of one ‘representative’ union,
irrespective of the proportion of membership claimed for. It does have an inner twist: playing
the good and the ugly can create a certain bargaining leverage. However, as was recently the
case in a conflict involving temp workers in the entertainment industry, the agreement signed
by a single union representing a tiny minority of members was written off as irrelevant and did
not achieve the result of quieting down the bulk of militants successfully organised by the new
born SUD (Solidaires, Unitaires et Démocratiques) and the CGT. This conflict, among many
others, was archetypal of the new wave of militancy that gained confidence over a decade and
triggered new generation trade unionism emerging in tandem with nascent protest movements.

Catching Up the Momentum: The Revitalisation of Labour Politics

It seems reasonable to argue that the reawakening of social movements in the 1990s onwards
has created a momentum for the revitalisation of French labour politics and, as such, has
provided trade unions with a second wind. However, such a simple causal relationship must be
viewed with caution. Indeed, nothing is that straight-forward: militant intersections are not
self-obvious, nor are collective interests and identity clusters necessarily coincidental, neither
are political and institutional agenda (Le Queux, 2005), and it must be noted that trade unions
have also been in part responsible, as an organising or supporting agency, of creating such a
momentum.

The landmark 1995 and 1997 waves of national discontent owed much to what is now
identified as European negative integration although there have been many debates on the
meaning and significance of the events (Agrikoliansky & al., 2005: 233-263). When French
people were told that there was no economic and social option but one of restraint, the
overarching view was that most already had their share of hardship. Literally, this was a
popular voicing of a ‘no’ against the lack of political choice, elsewhere called ‘economic
rationalism’ but here pejoratively coined as mere ‘one-way thinking’ (la pensée unique) in a
critical stand against the unchallenged liberal ethos. Or as simply put by a street manifestant:
‘we know they may have good reasons, but these are not ours’. These social unrests thus spread
the seeds for an alternative economics and governance later translated into a matured and
influential ‘alter-globalisation’ movement.

Among the multiple hotbeds of rebellion which characterized the time (Crettiez & Sommier,
2002), was the upsurge in the ranks of the unemployed, who rallied under a new born
organisation AC!. This acronym stands for ‘together against unemployment’ but sounds like
Enough!. It aims were to drag the unemployed out of the stigma of social exclusion and
individual failure to collectively reclaim dignity and social citizenship. As a movement from
below, AC! is emblematic in many respects. By claiming a say in the allocation of social
benefits, it directly confronted the status quo of paritarism – a challenge posed by the outsiders
to labour institutions, hereby put as representative of the other side. As such, this was a wake-up
call for a class repositioning of trade unions and a redrawing of the boundaries of solidarity.
Organised labour, however, did not fail to help, with some unions, like the CGT, providing
moral support and material back-up since the early times. But in a rather laissez-faire style,
trade unions leadership let AC! take the front stage – as was also recently the case with the 2006
anti-CPE (first job contract) youth movement, which successfully mobilised large cohorts of
young people across the country and ultimately moved the government to back off and scrap
the legislation. Amazingly, it must be noted, this uprising of the unemployed spread the French
context to become one of the very first spearheads of trans-national solidarity in the newly
integrated EU, while the ETUC was still looking at the Europeanisation of industrial relations
as a daunting task. It is still active today, notably through the No Vox network, and has inspired
new waves of provocative campaigns such as *Reclaim Flexibility!* (European Social Forum, London 2004).

Crystallisation informs you of the very nature of the crystal. This analogy was used by the leading French sociologist Jean-Daniel Reynaud to explain the quintessence of collective action. So hence, the socialisation occurring in the eventful times of the 1990s highlights the organic character of a shift towards what may be seen as a return to class-based politics articulated on a counter-hegemonic discursive platform of renewed militancy. Both of these shifts were epitomised by the ascendency of the alter-globalisation movement and the burgeoning of SUD, to which we shall now turn.

**The Alter-Globalisation Movement**

In autumn 2004, the influential *Le Monde* released a special edition on the ‘inevitable alter-globalists’. This was indicative of the social magnitude of this emergent new actor as a catalyst for alternative politics at a time when social criticism seemed to have been temporary out of steam (Boltanski & Chapiello, 1999). Although the counter or alter-globalisation movement, by definition, stretches across national boundaries, it had a particular echo in France where it found fertile social ground and, notably, a powerful intellectual resonance.

The remarkable diversity that typifies the ‘alter-globalist galaxy’ (Sommier, 2003a), a ‘movement of movements’ as it has often been characterised, makes it particularly difficult to grasp. For our purpose, we shall primarily examine the few core principles of this federating social kaleidoscope, acknowledging that French trade unions and the ‘alter’ may happen to be subtly entwined in the political arena and eventually share the same layers of rank-and-file activists. Indeed, while the *Association pour la Taxation des Transactions pour l'Aide aux Citoyens* (ATTAC), relayed by the *Monde Diplomatique*, may be seen as a peak alter-globalist think-tank, it was originally sponsored by the G-10, which itself is largely a cluster of dissident trade union factions, including SUD (Agrikoliansky & al., 2005: 265-290).

‘Another world is possible!’ is a recurrent slogan that evokes the movement’s emancipatory vocation. It is necessary to look no further than the Charter of the *Porto Alegre World Social Forum* (WSF) or the ATTAC manifesto to become convinced of this. Beyond the contest of the neo-liberal ethos, the central challenge lies in a large-scale maieutic method for bringing alternatives to the fore. The originality is then that the search for alternatives takes place not *in spite of* but thanks to the absence of a model (Benasayag & Sztulwark, 2001), which is a powerful factor of integration. This may also be seen as a shared suspicion of totalising ideologies (Klein 2002). The essential point is that the discursive arsenal put in place pits itself against the ‘naturalisation’ of capitalism (Clerc, 2005: 22). Yet, if there is unanimity on the principle of the matter, this does not mean there is a consensus on the actions to be taken. Indeed, the protest movement, in what is actually rather a traditional mode, is divided between reformers and revolutionaries, and this has an impact on its relationship to the trade union movement, particularly in regards the anarchist and anarcho-syndicalist factions which are regaining vigor, reconstituting a radical pole to the left of the left, with the *Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire* (LCR). Indeed, the Evian G8 was to see one of the most impressive French anarchist processions of the 20th century (Dupuis-Déri, 2005).

A singular feature of the alter-globalists is their concern for a horizontal levelling of power, in other words for ‘globalisation from below’. This orientation has a number of sources in the anarchist tradition: the prevalence of networking arrangements, an organisation by affinity groups (Dupuis-Déri, 2003), where diversity becomes a constituting principle (Agrikoliansky...
This mistrust of representative democracy, already evident in earlier social movements (Neveu, 2002), clearly poses problems for trade unions. Nor is this surprising, when we know that the type of protest against the status quo that emerged in Europe around the early 1990s had its origins in social exclusion fuelling the Lumpenproletariat (Sommier, 2003b). This accounts for the fact that the protest movements enjoy particular support among the ranks of youth. This is the post-baby-boom generation hardest hit by the practices of ‘flexploitation’ and contingent employment. For it should not be forgotten that, according to Eurostats estimates, two-thirds of the European workers whose jobs can be classified as ‘disposable’ are under 30 years old. This is the basis of a certain return to structural materialism (Fillieule, 1996; Callinicos, 2003), in terms of both the questioning of capitalist structures and of the claims for a right to life and dignity. It is also, according to Sommier (2005: 42), a matter of the ‘artist’s malaise’, insofar as the critique is existential in its nature, expressing a feeling of oppression and the rejection of growing social control.

Overall, the new protest movements are thus seeking to create ‘the social conditions of a collective production of realistic utopias’ (Bourdieu, 2001: 40), of which the two constitutive aspects are the rejection of liberal hegemony and the promotion of democracy (Vakalousis & al., 2003). Importantly, the imperative of citizen participation is transcended by a radical humanism. In referring to the common value of social justice, this humanist impetus explains both the particularistic nature (housing, ecology, defence of the public sphere, human rights, workers’ rights, etc.) and the universal nature of the struggles. Or as the prominent socialist herald of the early 20th century Jean Jaurès was aware, materialism does not preclude idealism.

It is clear that the new protest movements have a taste for direct action, one-off spontaneous events, and surprise happenings, in which activism can express its radical and creative bent. Yet, radical behaviour and direct action are far from new phenomena. In the history of social movements and trade unionism, they have invariably been a regular feature. But in the end, rather than asking whether activism has discovered new modes of collective action, it is important to consider how it can reinvent itself through this means. Incidentally, this return to theatrical and targeted direct action is not confined to the alter-globalisation groups, as shown by the raids of the Confédération Paysanne (left-wing Farmer’s union), including the highly mediatised ravaging of a McDonald’s restaurant, or the commando actions of the Electricité et Gaz de France (EDF-GDF) trade unions: a trade unionism of ‘brawlers’ the French Prime Minister was to say, after his electricity meter had been confiscated. This displays a departure from the range of collar-and-tie trade unionism and a return to that of a ‘popular’ trade unionism, in both meanings of the term: away from a technocratic towards a rebellious and often celebratory register, in particular in the mass gatherings, that can be interpreted, perhaps, as a process of class cleansing.

Interestingly, the features of renewed militancy in France pretty much match the set of characteristics portrayed by broader research: 1) a return to protest, including forms of protest outside factories; 2) rank-and-file union networks; and 3) discourses of identity building and
solidarity (della Porta, 2004: 18). This said, whether new social movements are carrying any real weight still is a reasonable matter of contention, although the latest referendum campaign in France, which resulted in the rejection of the EU Constitutional Treaty, suggests a rich potential for a joining of forces between the trade unions and the alter-globalists.

**A New Generation Trade Unionism: SUD**

SUD emerged in the French scene of the early 1990s, in a form of independent or autonomous trade unionism, after an initial breakthrough in the Post & Telecommunication sector (SUD-PTT). Since then, SUD has grown steadily in the public sector, with also a few steps forward in the private sector. Although being of minor importance in quantitative terms, with a share of only 5% (around 80 thousands members) of the overall French trade union membership (Andolfatto & Labbé, 2006), SUD trade unions constitute a significant radical pole, in qualitative terms. Not only are they to be found in all the most combative union strongholds, such as the railways, hospitals, social and cultural services, the education sector and the metal industry, etc., but they go hand in hand with militant groups, be they the unemployed, temp workers, the alter-globalists, etc. They are also used to being at the forefront of social causes such as women’s rights, migrant’s issues or housing rights. As such, they stand in a straight line with the French anarcho-syndicalist tradition, being radical and avant-garde, rather than massive.

How to explain this backlash of radicalism? It could be argued, it is rooted in the eventful times of 1968 (Sainsaulieu, 1999). Indeed, the militant cohort of that time, lacking experience, found itself readily muted by the trade union apparatus and remained on the back-foot in a context of lessening social conflict after 1976. In twenty years time, conditions changed. This generation matured. Concurrently, in a context of membership decline, the social-liberal and consensual orientation pursued by top union leadership was increasingly challenged by the bases in the public sector (and also in the private sector). As social benefits and labour conditions were shaking under the reformist agenda, so was the trade-off for industrial peace and union power over its constituents, in quite a classic fashion (Hyman, 1991). Social struggles led by rank and file activists then spearered outside trade union control.

A few cases provide early illustrations of the genesis of SUD as a result of rank and file splits from the two major trade union confederations, the CFDT and the CGT. A wave of strikes in hospitals (1988-1989), mostly led by nurses, gave birth to an independent trade union, the CRC, which then became SUD-Health, in a scission from the CFDT. The Post Office yellow trucks strike sparked around the same time in protest against plans of privatisation. Out of this movement emerged SUD-PTT, once again in a split from the CFDT, who went on to create the SUD logo which was embraced by a number of new born independent trade unions (such as the CRC) within a federation called ‘Solidaires’. Another rank-and-file coalition, initially formed during the 1986 strike of national railways services and originally black listed by the CGT, led to SUD-Rail after the 1995 general strike in which they played a leading role. SUD-Rail subsequently conquered a first rank union electoral position winning the allegiance of the bases, as did its counterparts in the Post and hospitals.

There is an obvious connection between the rejection of a reformist agenda, social agitation and the foundation of SUD trade unions. Led by a militant generation ‘trained by and for collective action’, they form both a mix of corporatist (mostly as the result of their industry grounding, although they do display inter-professional commitments, especially through the G-10), conflictual, strongly favouring tests of strength, and grassroots trade unionism, in the way they give priority to local action and decentralised decision making (Demasin & Denis, 2005). To
which extent does it impact on SUD politics? As in many countries, the fall and demise of socialism coupled with a fragmentation and differentiation of the working class has had its ideological toll. As a consequence, in an ideological sense, contestation has become more social than political. SUD politics thus evolve in a paradigm of ‘pragmatic contestation’, geared to the fight for social and labour standards and especially the defence of universal and free public services.

This said, we must recall that SUD impulse owes much to leaders whose ideals and practises stem from the radical left. These ‘social entrepreneurs’ (Denis, 2003) hold a strong and distinctive cultural capital which they reinvest into the union and new social movements. However, new members appealed to by this union credo do not necessarily have such political luggage with them. The challenge to the SUD is therefore to pass on its militant culture. This problem of generational transfer is not unique to SUD trade unions. For many generic reasons we know, these may be less acute for SUD as it seems the intensity of interactions among militants tends to sustain a kind of organisational mould: the more interactions, the more militancy, and the other way around. Yet, if the young newcomers are catching up with SUD culture, they barely seem to innovate, either because of their lack of symbolic capital or because they’ve learnt to fit very quickly in a world driven by fast adaptation rather than counter culture.

If SUD shook up activist practices from the 1990s onwards, they are today not immune to the same set of problems that confronted their predecessors (Demasin & Denis, 2005). Beyond keeping up its militant flair, SUD is also internally challenged by the iron law of bureaucracy. There have been rising tensions between SUD-PTT officials and members about what the union agenda should be. Recent research on SUD-Rail has identified tensions among union officials. While they seek to keep close to grassroots concerns, they tend to be critical of workers’ lack of action and enter into factionalism. Nonetheless they proved successful in organising non-core workers otherwise let as outsiders (Conolly, 2007). Presently, SUD-Health is striving with internal contradictions in a contest for power over the struggle: leaders cannot agree upon the agenda to pursue, and such is the case when comes the time to strike.

In brief, after an initial growth, the SUD grass-root organisational model may be reaching its limits and SUD trade unions are now facing a process of internal differentiation. To keep things in perspective, it must also be reckoned that SUD is still of marginal size compared to the big players, the CGT and the CFDT namely, and does not have the status of social partner organisation. Nevertheless, they remain the most combative, contestation-driven and prompt to strike trade union, along side the CGT. The latest strikes in Paris during November 2007, once again proved that collective action, even from a minority flank, can be more effective than the use of sheer numbers in legitimizing direct democracy. Besides, the persistence and even rejuvenation of a moderate wing of independent trade union organisations, self-proclaimed ‘reformists’, show that the French industrial relations landscape is still one of contrast.

Social Movement Unionism Revisited: What’s in for Australia?
On both sides of the Atlantic, some of the most eminent labour market experts are calling for a revitalisation of trade union politics. Turner sees the activation of a social movement by and within the trade unions as the precondition for a democratic counterweight in an environment that is hostile in all respects: ‘ongoing global liberalisation has weighted the odds heavily against organising, bargaining and legislative success, unless such efforts are part of rank-and-file based mobilisations that attract broad social support in campaigns framed as battles for social justice’ (2005: 21). Hyman calls for a radical shift of labour politics towards ideals of social justice: ‘a language of social solidarity able to rekindle unions’ moral
legitimacy as a “sword of justice”’ (2004: 29). This is also a viewpoint shared by a number of observers (Panitch, 2001; Taylor & Mathers, 2002; Baccaro & al., 2003) who express, in various ways, the possibility that these movements probably have what it takes to instil into the trade unions the elixir of passion that seems to have dried up.

Such views, arguably, have not permeated contemporary Australian labour politics which are mostly concerned about finding the right institutional fix which makes sense in the context. So is it reasonable to ask whether, locked in institutional thinking, Australian labour politics may have, somewhat ironically, failed to address the political? Early on, it was a question of ‘organising without doctrine’ (Buchanan, 2001). Will importing another blend of Anglo-American legislation and bargaining practices then make any difference? While keeping the focus on the institutional components of industrial relations systems is a relevant way to make use of comparative analyses (Clegg, 1976), the underlying moral economy does matter (Locke & Thelen, 1995).

We are not saying that Australian labour should borrow from the French experience and consider embracing social movement unionism. Beyond the evidence of mitigated links between Australian trade unions and radical groups (Bramble & Minns, 2005), this would entail the very same pitfall. What is more, on a matter of fundamentals, revitalisation through ‘social movement unionism’ ought not to be seen as one strategic option among a range of others. This is not something to be decreed from above; it requires a social fabric. The irony, this time, is that such a thesis remains virtually unmentioned in the French context; and this, despite the de facto social reality of such actions in France. So to argue that such impetus comes from union led strategy would be an overstatement.

To some extent, it is true that French trade unionism has been thriving over the last two decades or so, which has translated into the emergence of SUD on the trade union chess board and a wave of organisation resulting in actual recruitment among radical unions (Dubois & Tixier, 2002: 27). This, however, did not take place in a context devoid of adversity. There have been many drawbacks in the gamut of struggles, as in the case of Bosh not so long ago (Catlla, 2005), which got workers to capitulate on core conditions under the threat of delocalisation. But significantly, there have been victories, and victories matter. The outcome is a growing confidence in collective action, in particular in defence of social ‘acquis’ (or the notion of acquired rights) and the sacrosanct conception of free and universal public services and social security. The notion of ‘acquis’ is critical in that, it is a historical reference to victories through social struggles so that to question these victories is inevitably conceived as a social regression and necessarily prompts new cries to battle. In the abstract, this is the mobilising force of the ‘principle of the principle’ that has once again resurfaced,echoing the long lasting humanist tradition entrenched in the French political economy: ‘a society that seeks to give people freedom has to begin by guaranteeing their existence’, in the words of Léon Blum, the socialist mentor of the early 20th century.

Rising protest is not making the unions’ job all that easier. There is an art involved in finding the right balance in the political exchange. To the frustration of many militants, unions are meant to have signed too quickly to end the late general strike over pension reform. The power for requires a power over. The problem faced by French trade unions is that the street is too strong, was the recent observation of a French labour movement analyst. Notwithstanding, noticeable trends towards increasing union diversity and decentralisation are compounded with the fact that collective action, when you look closely at it, is mostly fuelled by individual militant initiatives (Sainsaulieu, 2006). Yet, the resilience of individualism may be seen as an
antidote to sterilising models of ‘mechanical solidarity’. As well, conflict-ridden diversity and grass-root activism can be seen as examples of fecund democracy. These are no evils and a fortiori no impediment to trade union vitality, at least in the French context.
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