

choice between various forms of political organization and different styles of communication. But questions of agency can also be raised with respect to processes that take place at the international level. Indeed, as solutions to environmental problems are increasingly worked out through negotiations between states, there is a growing need for better ideas about international agency.

Goodin criticizes green activists for their preoccupation with symbols and personal life-styles, and their failure to see that a theory of agency should be independent of and subsidiary to the theory of value. It should, quite simply, be "a theory about how best to pursue the Good and the valuable, according to a distinctively green analysis of what is good and valuable" (p. 16). This is correct, and the argument should be taken to heart by all political activists. The instrumental point of view must have pride of place when it comes to translating values into practice. This is not to say that everything goes. There are good reasons to write off certain strategies, like coercion and manipulation, whatever their expediency in particular circumstances. Apart from this, however, the crucial question is how one can best win support for one's position, and unconventional ideas are not necessarily served by unconventional modes of communication.

*Raino Malnes, University of Oslo*

Flemming Mikkelsen: *Arbejdskonflikter i Skandinavien 1848-1980*. Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag, 1992, 500 pp.

Historians and political scientists have for some time studied industrial relations and industrial conflict in the Scandinavian countries. As a key to understanding both social change and social order, Mikkelsen attempts to bring together an historical/narrative tradition of industrial conflict with a more theoretical tradition.

The book, which is identical to his Ph.D. thesis, uses Charles Tilly's mobilization theory as the general theoretical framework (e.g. *From Mobilization to Revolution*, London 1978). It covers industrial conflicts in Denmark, Sweden and Norway over a time-span of nearly one and a half centuries. The emphasis is nevertheless on the period between the turn of the 20th century and the outbreak of the Second World War.

Mikkelsen defines industrial conflict as a form of collective action, or, more precisely, strategic interaction between groups defending their interests. When analyzed over a long time-span it becomes clear that structural features play an important role in both restricting and enabling collective action. By using comparative studies this becomes apparent. In the case of Denmark, the early but slower rate of industrialization leads to a more decentralized production in smaller plants. This explains some of the differences in the volume of industrial conflict between the countries, for example, why strikes in Denmark tend to be both shorter and more limited than those in Sweden.

Mikkelsen's analysis builds on an impressive compilation of both quantitative and qualitative data relating to industrial conflict in the three countries. In the period prior to 1900, the official registration of conflicts was often inaccurate, and thereby requiring reconstruction on the basis of several sources. The quality of the data improves with the onset of the 20th century. The founding of trade union and employer confederations in all the three countries at the end of the 19th century, and major conflicts in both Denmark and Sweden, are factors which promoted a more serious treatment of statistics on conflicts in the three countries.

choice between various forms of political organization and different styles of communication. But questions of agency can also be raised with respect to processes that take place at the international level. Indeed, as solutions to environmental problems are increasingly worked out through negotiations between states, there is a growing need for better ideas about international agency.

Goodin criticizes green activists for their preoccupation with symbols and personal life-styles, and their failure to see that a theory of agency should be independent of and subsidiary to the theory of value. It should, quite simply, be "a theory about how best to pursue the Good and the valuable, according to a distinctively green analysis of what is good and valuable" (p. 16). This is correct, and the argument should be taken to heart by all political activists. The instrumental point of view must have pride of place when it comes to translating values into practice. This is not to say that everything goes. There are good reasons to write off certain strategies, like coercion and manipulation, whatever their expediency in particular circumstances. Apart from this, however, the crucial question is how one can best win support for one's position, and unconventional ideas are not necessarily served by unconventional modes of communication.

*Raino Malnes, University of Oslo*

Flemming Mikkelsen: *Arbejdskonflikter i Skandinavien 1848-1980*. Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag, 1992, 500 pp.

Historians and political scientists have for some time studied industrial relations and industrial conflict in the Scandinavian countries. As a key to understanding both social change and social order, Mikkelsen attempts to bring together an historical/narrative tradition of industrial conflict with a more theoretical tradition.

The book, which is identical to his Ph.D. thesis, uses Charles Tilly's mobilization theory as the general theoretical framework (e.g. *From Mobilization to Revolution*, London 1978). It covers industrial conflicts in Denmark, Sweden and Norway over a time-span of nearly one and a half centuries. The emphasis is nevertheless on the period between the turn of the 20th century and the outbreak of the Second World War.

Mikkelsen defines industrial conflict as a form of collective action, or, more precisely, strategic interaction between groups defending their interests. When analyzed over a long time-span it becomes clear that structural features play an important role in both restricting and enabling collective action. By using comparative studies this becomes apparent. In the case of Denmark, the early but slower rate of industrialization leads to a more decentralized production in smaller plants. This explains some of the differences in the volume of industrial conflict between the countries, for example, why strikes in Denmark tend to be both shorter and more limited than those in Sweden.

Mikkelsen's analysis builds on an impressive compilation of both quantitative and qualitative data relating to industrial conflict in the three countries. In the period prior to 1900, the official registration of conflicts was often inaccurate, and thereby requiring reconstruction on the basis of several sources. The quality of the data improves with the onset of the 20th century. The founding of trade union and employer confederations in all the three countries at the end of the 19th century, and major conflicts in both Denmark and Sweden, are factors which promoted a more serious treatment of statistics on conflicts in the three countries.

Data on variations in industrial conflict between the turn of the 20th century and the outbreak of the Second World War are analyzed in relation to the trade cycle, the structure of employment and the organizational structure. Industrial conflict is also analyzed in terms of type, frequency, size, duration and geographical location. Short-term variations are largely explained by fluctuations in prices and earnings, while some of the similarities in the conflict activity between the three countries are explained by the dependence on international trade cycles.

However, there are major differences between the three countries in question. There seems to be less industrial conflict in Denmark than in Norway and Sweden. This is largely explained by higher union density and more centralized control from both the employee and employers side. The General Agreement in Denmark was established as early as 1899 – seven years prior to the first regulation of collective bargaining by law. In Sweden and Norway, on the other hand, the legal framework to minimize industrial conflict and to impose a peace obligation for the duration of an agreement was introduced first, and the first General Agreements were not concluded before the 1930s. For the period in question, Danish industrial relations is therefore characterized as more mature, by nature of its being more self-regulating. That is to say, industrial peace is self-imposed and there is a higher degree of internal organizational control.

All three Scandinavian countries experienced a significant fall in conflict activity after the Second World War. The conflict rate is now regarded as low in a European context. Two different types of explanations have been put forward to clarify this. Mikkelsen refers to an institutional school which emphasizes new mechanisms for conflict resolution, and the growth of both individual and collective labor law.

Tilly, amongst others, is an exponent of a different explanation. Tilly understands strikes as a form of political action. As the labor movement gains power through political parties, the need to take strike action as a form of political protest is reduced. The conflicts are instead transformed from the industrial to the political arena.

Mikkelsen favors the latter explanation, but sees the need for a more dynamic understanding of how political interests are shaped. Tilly's concept of interest is too structural for Mikkelsen – defined through an individual's social position. Instead, Mikkelsen emphasizes how organizations play an important role in transforming interests into collective action. The trade unions' and employer organizations' early mutual recognition, and the high degree of centralization on both sides, are some of the explanatory factors behind the pattern of industrial conflict in Scandinavia.

Mikkelsen's study of industrial conflict in Scandinavia is impressive, and deserves a wider audience than just scholars whom command the Danish language. In this respect, the study would benefit from a shorter presentation than the voluminous book Mikkelsen presents us with here. At times the treatment of quantitative and qualitative data has primarily a national historical interest, and could be omitted from a discussion of collective bargaining and industrial conflict in Scandinavia.

*Torgeir Aarvaag Stokke, Norwegian Trade Union Research Center*

Daniel Fleming (red.): *Industriell demokrati i Norden*. Lund: Arkiv Forlag, 1991, 435 pp.

This study presents the first report from a joint project on industrial democracy in the Nordic societies. It is organized as an anthology with contributions from researchers in all the five Nordic countries. The aim of the project is to compare