

und die Gewerkschaften bräuchten „ein strahlkräftiges Bild unseres Gesellschaftsentwurfs, eine gewerkschaftliche Vorstellung, einen eigenen Begriff von Wettbewerbsfähigkeit“ (176).

Bereits die knappe Skizze ausgewählter Beiträge macht deutlich: Der Sammelband bietet in einer komprimierten Form einen höchst informativen Überblick über Debatten zu arbeitspolitischen Ansätzen, wie sie derzeit in der gewerkschaftsnahen Arbeitsforschung geführt werden, über deren Rezeption in einer der beiden großen Mitgliedsgewerkschaften innerhalb des DGB und schließlich auch darüber, in welcher Weise in diesem wichtigen Feld gewerkschaftlicher Politik der Dialog zwischen gewerkschaftlicher Praxis und gewerkschaftsnaher Sozialwissenschaft geführt wird. Der Sammelband ist daher für Wissenschaftler wie Praktiker von hohem Interesse.

*Helmut Martens (Dortmund)*

Wilson, Shaun (2004): *The Struggle Over Work. Employment Alternatives in Postindustrial Societies*. Taylor & Francis Books Ltd, London/New York, ISBN: 0415305500, 256 Seiten, 115,11 €

As the current discussion on legislation on industrial relations shows again, work society fears the worst, namely an end of work. Undoubtedly, a work society without work, appears to be a society in crisis that has lost its centre, its anchorage and crucial reference point. This perspective cuts the ground from underneath any society based on work. In that sense, the debate on the relevance of work and the goal of full-employment is not new (see e.g. Hayek 1975; Gorz 1982; Offe 1984; 1985; Pixley 1993) but still more than topical.

In his book *The Struggle Over Work* (2004) Shaun Wilson promises to challenge the 'end of work' argument that was put forward most famously by Jeremy Rifkin's *The End of Work* (1995). Rifkin and others argue that technological change leads to an irreversible decline in employment. Consequently, various authors equally have since called for a less work-centred society (see e.g. Gorz 2000; Beck 2000a). *The Struggle Over Work* does not simply oppose the 'end of work' argument with an encouraging 'struggle for work!' but scrutinizes the origins and facts on which the 'end of work' argument rests. The argument that Wilson seeks to challenge is built on four assumptions: (i) technological and organiza-

tional changes are the main reason for a declining number of available jobs; (ii) the loss of work as a central concept for society and individuals finds expression in an end of labour movements; (iii) full employment as a goal is passé and unachievable; and (iv) basic income models are regarded as a way of redistributing income fairly in a post-work society.

Wilson tackles this multifaceted 'end of work' argument mainly on empirical grounds. Employment-to-population ratios do not give any clear indication for lower employment levels. Furthermore, the *British Social Attitudes Survey* of 2000 reveals that people want to work even if they receive a basic income that would give them the freedom to go without gainful employment. Moreover, the problems of the labour movement, respectively unions, are reversible. As Wilson argues, "full employment policies may still be possible if they are politically 'reinvented' and find new public support, bolstered by strengthened labour movements" (4).

The book deals with three different strategies that struggle over work. Firstly, the appeal of deregulated labour markets, or what Wilson calls the "US model" lies in the fundamental assumption that work is the best social policy, secondly, alternatives to deregulated labour markets such as basic income models, and thirdly, a renewal of the labour movement. While the US model and basic income model are widely discussed, the reader wonders throughout the discussion what the renewal of the labour movement could look like in practice. In chapter 5 Wilson gives his answer. Union power depends fundamentally on the recognition of unions in the workplace, extensive collective bargaining provisions and the right to strike. On the basis of that, Wilson proposes the renewal of the labour movement on three levels. First, on the level of organizations, "internal reforms involve reviving an 'organising culture' that emphasises workplace activism, closer links between leaders and members, and a desire to make a difference in the workplace and politics" (141). Second, on the political level organised labour has to rebuild and sell its 'voting power' harder. The other option here is "that labour movements become more 'independent' of their political allies" (153) by creating more social movementstyle politics. The third level entails what Wilson calls "grassroots unionbuilding" on the basis of informal social relationships in the workplace. Although Wilson does not go beyond these cautious suggestions, he keeps his promise and not only challenges but demystifies the too instrumental character of the 'end of work' argument. However, besides the rather cautious practical suggestions, it could be pointed out more explicitly that the 'end of

work' argument is in reality an undifferentiated 'end of work as a cost factor' argument driven by corporations and neo-liberal politics as norm-free instrumental systems of money and power. The renewal of the labour movement in that sense is an outcry for a *normative* re-conceptualization of work society in regard to the social organization of the economy, the normative understanding of work and the appropriate political channels. For the neo-liberal *Zeitgeist* does not give any voice to those who are actually involved not only in the sphere of work but increasingly in the whole of (market) society.

With the push for a renewal of social labour movements *Wilson* points out a possible way of reviving the dialogue between work, society and politics which is of vital significance for social identities, social change, and social structure. Although the suggestions leave some practical questions open, they point in the right direction and make work accessible to much needed normative discussions. This is a demand that fits well with Honneth's (1996) struggle for recognition based on a normative evaluation of work as useful contributions to society or Feenberg's (1999) "democratizing rationality".

*The Struggle Over Work* is a pointed statement that full employment with high levels of equality is still a valid goal for contemporary society. As *Wilson* puts it himself: "I believe we can still combine employment and equality. But, as always, achieving a 'jobs with equality' approach will depend on a change in industrial and political power" (170). One might add, social theorists always only offer an interpretation. Unfortunately, after the just passed IR legislation, in Australia it is more than ever up to the individual struggles over work in everyday life to prove them right or wrong.

## References

- Beck, U. (2000a): *The Brave New World Of Work*. Cambridge
- Feenberg, A. (1999): *Questioning Technology*. London
- Gorz, A. (1982): *Farewell to the working class. An essay on post-industrial socialism*. London
- Gorz, A. (2000): *Arbeit zwischen Misere und Utopie*. Frankfurt
- Hayek, A. v. (1975): *Full employment at any price?* London
- Honneth, A. (1996): *The Struggle For Recognition: The Moral Grammar Of Social Conflicts*. Cambridge
- Offe, C. (1984): *Arbeitsgesellschaft: Strukturprobleme und Zukunftsperspektiven*. Frankfurt
- Offe, C. (1985): *Work: The key sociological category?*; in: J. Keane: *Disorganized Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Oxford, 129-150
- Pixelley, J. (1993): *Citizenship and employment. Investigating post-industrial options*. Cambridge
- Rifkin, J. (1995): *The end of work*. New York
- Wilson, S. (2004): *The Struggle Over Work*. London/New York

Norbert Ebert (Sydney)

Matthias Möring-Hesse (Hg.) (2005): *Streit um die Gerechtigkeit. Themen und Kontroversen im gegenwärtigen Gerechtigkeitsdiskurs*, ISBN: 3899742117, Schwalbach/Ts., Wochenschau-Verlag, 206 Seiten, 18.80 €

Mit der Bundestagswahl 1998 ist „die Gerechtigkeitsfrage in die Gesellschaft zurückgekehrt“ zitiert *Matthias Möhring-Hesse* (S. 6) den früheren Bundestagspräsidenten W. Thierse: Der Streit um Gerechtigkeit geht nicht nur darüber, „ob die eigene Politik oder die der anderen dem Maßstab der Gerechtigkeit entspricht, sondern man streitet zugleich über diesen Maßstab“ selbst (ebd.). Gerechtigkeit als Dauergegenstand philosophischer Reflexion sei zwar, so der Herausgeber in seinem Vorwort, nach Auffassung von P. Nolte, - der aktiv an seiner Umdefinition im Diskurs der „neuen Sozialdemokratie“ beteiligt war - „ein durch gutgemeintes Dauerkneten implodierter Kernbegriff“ im aktuellen politischen Diskurs; tatsächlich aber habe der politische Streit um Gerechtigkeit an Bedeutung gewonnen, Und „wer im Streit um die Gerechtigkeit mithalten will, der muss sich in der Vielfalt dieses Streits auskennen und sich – wohl oder übel – einen Überblick verschaffen“. Der vorliegende Sammelband lädt dazu ein.

*M. Möhring-Hesse* präsentiert eine Vielzahl informativer Beiträge von Theologen, Philosophen, Soziologen und Politikwissenschaftlern. In einem ersten Block wird über veränderte Akzentsetzungen beim Gerechtigkeitsbegriff informiert. In einer zweiten Gruppe von Beiträgen geht es um Begründungen hierfür, die aus der theoretischen Debatte um Gerechtigkeit entnommen werden. Schließlich werden Verschiebungen bei den gerechtigkeitsrelevanten Themen näher behandelt. Der Herausgeber leitet jeden dieser drei, aus der Gliederung nicht sofort ersichtlichen, drei Blöcke mit gut fundierten Beiträgen ein. Auch der mit dem Thema theoretisch weniger vertraute Leser findet so z.B. in einem Aufsatz des Herausgebers einen aufschlussreichen Zugang zur Gerechtigkeitstheorie des liberalen amerikanischen Philosophen John Rawls und zu deren Interpretation aus kommunitaristischer Sicht (*Michael Walzer*) oder der eines „aristotelischen Sozialdemo-