
THE GLOBAL JUSTICE AND SOLIDARITY MOVEMENT AND THE WORLD SOCIAL FORUM : A BACKGROUNDER

peter waterman

The WSF is probably best identified with the recent international wave of protest known as the 'anti-globalisation movement'. While intimately interrelated with the latter, the WSF is just one emanation of this much more general phenomenon and process. How can these and their inter-relationship be best understood ?

It is possible to make a 19th-20th century comparison, with the relationship between trade unions or labour parties on the one hand and 'the labour movement' on the other. But the labour movement, whilst obviously broader and looser than any particular institution, and having international expression, consisted largely of other, primarily national, institutions (co-operatives, women's organisations, publications). The WSF is an essentially international event (or an expanding series of such). And on the other hand, we have an essentially international movement that might not even (yet ?) recognise itself as such. So we are confronted with two new social phenomena — of the period of globalisation, that are both international and global, and that have a novel relationship with each other.

The WSF — promoted by an identifiable group of Brazilian, French and other non-governmental organisations, trade unions and individuals — is itself linked organically to the more general movement. This is through an informal Forum event, known as the 'Call of Social Movements', which has been attended, and its regular declarations signed, by many WSF participant bodies (see this volume). The Call formalised itself between WSF2-3 with a Social Movements International Secretariat. But this body, or tendency, is a matter of discomfort for those within the WSF who want to see the Forum as a 'space' rather than a 'movement'.¹

The 'Global Justice and Solidarity Movement' (GJ&SM) is actually a name *proposed by* the Call, for the general wave of protest against corporate-dominated globalisation, against US-sponsored neoliberalism / neo-conservatism and war, one name for the new wave of radical-democratic protest and counter-proposition. This

The WSF : Challenging Empires

Antecedents : Critical Perspectives

'movement of movements' is marked by its network form and communication activity; a matter recognised by friends and enemies alike.² Moreover, 'it' seems to change size, shape, reach, scale, target and aims according to events. So, at one moment it might be focussed against neoliberal economic globalisation, at another against the US-led war on Iraq. This makes it even more challenging to analyse than to name.

Like any novel phenomenon, the GJ&SM is easier to characterise by what it is *not* than by what it is :

- It is *not* an international labour or socialist movement, though unions and socialists are prominently involved;
- It is *not* a 'transnational advocacy network',³ though it is much marked by the presence of international and national NGOs;
- It is *not* a reincarnation of the international protest wave following 1968, though Che Guevara icons are still popular, and it includes other clear echoes of the sixties and seventies;
- It is *not* an anarchist movement, though anarchists, autonomists and libertarians are highly active within it;
- It is *not* a nationalist or thirdworldist movement, though nationalist, thirdworldist and anti-imperialist forces and notes can be clearly identified within it;

It is, on the other hand, not too difficult to identify a rising number of processes that have *provoked* this movement. These include :

- the increasing predominance, in the international sphere, of multinational corporations and international financial institutions, along with the neoliberal policies that have been imposed on both North and the South (Table);
- The shrinking of the public sphere and reduction of State social programmes and subsidies;
- the feminisation of poverty, the commodification of women (the sex trade), the simultaneous formal endorsement and political denial of women's and sexual rights;
- de-industrialisation, unemployment and the informalisation of employment;
- the ideology of competitiveness as the court of first and last appeal;
- the undermining of market protection (primarily of weaker national economies);
- the simultaneous preaching and practical undermining of traditional structures and notions of national sovereignty;
- the simultaneous creation of new international institutions and regulations, alongside the marginalisation of the United Nations and such agencies as the International Labour Organisation (ILO);
- increasing talk of and the continuing undermining of ecological sustainability; corporate attempts to copyright genetic resources, to genetically modify foodstuffs, to commercialise them and then coerce people into buying them; the continuation and even increase of militarism, militarisation and warfare despite hopes raised by the end of the Cold War;

- the increase in globalised epidemics and threats to the climate;
- the demonisation of immigrants, asylum-seekers, and of Islam and other 'others'.

All these have dramatically raised social tensions, particularly in the South, but also in the East (the ex-Communist world) and even in such model core capitalist welfare states as Canada and Sweden. The pressures have also provoked major conservative, reactionary, religious and ethnic backlashes, of a violent and repressive nature, sometimes internationally co-ordinated.

Many identify the new protest movements of the emerging century with the North — Seattle 1999, Prague 2000, Genoa 2001, Gothenburg 2001, Barcelona 2002, Evian 2003. They also associate it with the middle classes, students and youth, who have indeed been prominent within it. But so have women, forming around 50 per cent at the World Social Forums, though this is little commented on.

But the movement cannot be limited to major protest events, nor to what has occurred since 1999. It must be traced both back and down, at least to the 'food riots' provoked by the IMF in the South of the eighties, when there were urban uprisings against the externally-imposed end of food subsidies. Widespread protests against gigantic and ecologically damaging dam projects, promoted by the World Bank and developmentalist local elites, go back to the eighties and earlier. There were major demonstrations and riots against the poll tax in Britain in 1990. Through the 1990s, there were myriad protests across the South against the euphemistically-named Structural Adjustment Policies (SAPs) in particular, and neoliberal policies more generally. And the appearance of the often corporatist, sometimes chauvinist and commonly quiescent US AFL-CIO on the anti-WTO demonstration in Seattle, was welcomed — (somewhat prematurely ?) — by the slogan "Teamsters and Turtles : Together at Last!"⁴

One major manifestation of US-initiated neoliberalism has been the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which provoked widespread protest in both Canada and Mexico. In the case of Canada, it turned an initial national-protectionist campaign into one of international solidarity, first with Mexico, then with Latin America more generally, leading to the Hemispheric Social Alliance, which included the USA. In the case of Mexico, the launching date of the NAFTA, January 1, 1994, was used for the launching also of the Zapatista movement in the severely globalised, marginalised and exploited state of Chiapas, in the South of Mexico.⁵

Initially appearing as a classical armed guerrilla movement based on the discriminated and land-hungry Mayan ethnic communities of Chiapas, the Zapatistas rapidly revealed entirely novel characteristics : an address to Mexican civil society, a high-profile internationalism, a sophisticated understanding and use of both the mass media and alternative electronic communications. All can be found in the speeches and writings of its primary spokesperson, Sub-Commander Marcos (Rafael Guillén) a university-educated non-indigene, trained in guerrilla warfare in Cuba. Activities of the Zapatistas, particularly two international *encuentros*, one in Chiapas, 1996, one in Spain, 1997, gave rise, or shape, to a new wave of internationalism. The powerful, poetic and playful words of Marcos, who switches between, or combines, popular

Mayan and Mexican idiom with the language of cosmopolitan intellectuals, enchanted a dulled world. It had a dramatic appeal on several fronts. An international Left, battered, bruised and disoriented by : the downscaling of the welfare state; the downsizing of the working class; the halting of the forward march of labour; the collapse of Eastern Communist and Southern Populist states; and the crisis of the international movements identified with such. Zapatista encounters also inspired at least two significant emanations of the movement, People's Global Action (PGA) and the WSF itself.⁶

Other major sources of, or contributors to the new movement must be mentioned particularly the rising wave of protest against unemployment, privatisation and cuts in social services gathering steam throughout the nineties, markedly in Europe and the increasing development of 'counter-expertise', concentrated in international and national NGOs which had been honed at a series of UN conferences and summits through the 1990s — notably the 1992 World Conference on Environment and Development and the 1995 UN Fourth World Conference on Women. Also, the rise of irreverent, often anarchist-tinted, direct action movements of customarily internationalist appeal, such as Reclaim the Streets in the UK. This supported the courageous, but eventually defeated Liverpool Dockers' protest against corporate attack, state legislation and union passivity in the face of such. A significant international libertarian initiative, related to this kind of national activity was that of PGA, which held meetings in Geneva, Bangalore and Cochabamba.⁷

Finally, the seventies and eighties movements which served as forerunners to the rise of the so-called New Social Movements. Considered as expressing 'identity' more than 'interest', these movements — of women, indigenous peoples, and sexual minorities, for media democratisation, on ecology and consumption — were noted in the South as well as the North. They brought to public attention hidden forms of alienation, suggested new forms of 'self-articulation' (both joining and expression). As much addressed to the transformation of civil society as of the economy or state, these movements raised issues that the major old international 'interest' movement — that of unionised labour — had long subordinated, ignored or marginalised.⁸

The rise of the 'anti-globalisation movement' did not so much re-assert 'interest' over 'identity' as surpass the alleged opposition — or even the distinction. Highlighting the increasing power of corporations over states, and of their negative impact on people and peoples — North, South, East — the movement was as much a challenge to institutionalised labour and the Left worldwide as to an international women's movement suffering severe 'ngo-isation'.⁹

It is clear, from yet another name — the 'anti-capitalist movement' — that this 'movement of movements' is as much an *aspiration* as an *actuality*, as much a *becoming* as a *being*. It has, however, passed one major test. When the terrorist attack on New York and Washington occurred on September 11, 2001, there was a stalemate in the growing movement in North America (Seattle 1999; Washington DC 2000; Quebec 2001). Yet, with the US-led wars against Afghanistan, 2002 and Iraq, 2003, a movement often considered to be primarily 'anti-corporate' morphed into the biggest international anti-war protest in history. A *New York Times* columnist stated, February 18, 2003, 'there may still be in our planet, two super-powers : the United States and world public opinion'.

A 300-strong anti-war demonstration took place even in Lima, Peru. This is a country profoundly traumatised and isolated by decades of neoliberalism, counter-insurgency and authoritarian rule, and which had — unlike neighbouring Brazil, Ecuador and Bolivia — previously revealed only marginal awareness of the new internationalist wave.¹⁰

The language of the new radical-democratic protest movements is increasingly infecting some of the 50–100-year-old international trade union organisations, such as the recently renamed Global Union Federations (GUFs). And trade unions, which have 150–200 million members worldwide, are increasingly attracted by the WSF.¹¹ The WSF has been held in Porto Alegre, Brazil, 2001–3, and is scheduled for Mumbai, India, in 2004. If the earlier mentioned protest events were frequently marked more by *opposition* than *proposition*, the Forums have not only been devoted to *counter* proposition over a remarkably wide range of social issues (with a wide range of significant collective actors). They have also demonstrated that what is shaping up is much more than a northern, or even a western hemispheric internationalism. The Forum process, moreover, has now reached take off, with national, regional and thematic forums taking place all over the world. Some of these may be independent of the WSF itself. The WSF has also become both the subject and the site of intense reflection concerning its own significance, nature and future.¹²

Names and Definitions

This movement, as suggested, has many names, these reflecting sometimes conflicting, sometimes overlapping approaches, theories, strategies and aspirations. These understandings vary from the traditional leftist, the non-traditional leftist to the innovatory, and even the insistence that this is not a movement but a 'field'. Attempts have been made to capture, or at least conceptualise the phenomenon under the rubric of 'global civil society'. The ways even sympathetic theorists and strategists try to identify groups or tendencies within the movement is revealing both of their orientation and of the novel nature of the phenomenon.¹³

Thus, Alex Callinicos from the UK, whilst admitting that the majority of its activists are *not* anti-capitalist, refers to its 'developing consciousness' as justification for calling it so. He then draws up a typology of anti-capitalism that includes the 'reactionary', 'bourgeois', 'localist', 'reformist', 'autonomist' and 'socialist' (himself identifying with a sub-category of this last type, the 'revolutionary').¹⁴

Christophe Aguiton from France, a Trotskyite of another feather, and a leading figure within the WSF, tentatively identifies three 'poles' within the global justice movement: 'Radical internationalist', 'nationalist', and 'neo-reformist'. The first looks beyond both capitalism and the nation-state, the second is a mostly-Southern response, and the third is the kind of 'global governance' tendency also strongly present within the WSF.¹⁵

Starr and Adams from the USA, who would be 'localists' in the Callinicos typology, characterise the movement as 'anti-globalisation', and identify as significant, 'modes' or 'archetypes' within it: 'radical reform', which is state-friendly; 'people's globalisation', associated with the WSF; and 'autonomy', identified with the ecological friendliness and democratic qualities of freely co-operating communities (their own).

The Portuguese researcher, Boaventura de Sousa Santos, who concentrates on the WSF, suggests its radical implications for the surpassing of traditional sociologies, Left strategies and even western epistemology. He argues that any significant new emancipatory movement cannot be understood in pre-existing terms, and proposes the necessity, in our epoch, of developing a 'sociology of absence' and a 'sociology of emergence'. This is to surpass the sociologies of the existent and apparent, and allow voice to what has been ignored or suppressed. These new sociologies are also necessary to surpass 'conservative utopias', whether of the Right or Left.

Italian Mario Pianta, considering the movement in 'global civil society' terms, divides responses to neoliberal globalisation into 'supporters of current arrangements,' 'reformists,' 'radical critics favouring another globalisation,' 'alternatives outside the mainstream', and 'nationalist rejectionists'.

What is suggestive is that, with the exception of Callinicos, none of the above uses the terminology of Left (Right or Centre) and that, in practice, each of these understandings cuts across the Left-as-we-know-it, the Left of a national-industrial-(anti-)colonial-capitalism. Whilst many activists and some internationally influential Left movements do refer *solely* to this tradition, the question of whether the GS&JM is not potentially *surpassing* traditional Left internationalism is also being raised. 'Emancipation' might seem a more appropriate term than 'Left' when discussing today the transformation of society, nature, culture, work and psychology — as well as, of course, that increasingly important but placeless place, cyberspace.¹⁶

Formation of the Movement — the Local, National, Regional and Global

Whilst some writers set up, in oppositional terms, the national and the global, the local and the global, it would seem more fruitful to see these as existing in creative tension, with each of these levels, instances or spaces informed by the other. Or at least needing to be so informed.¹⁷

If we compare the last major wave of world-wide protest symbolised by 1968, we have to recognise that the movements of that period were *parallel* rather than *linked*. Despite all the similarities, there appears to have been little direct contact or movement communication between Paris and Prague, between the European protests and uprisings and those of Dakar, Tokyo or Mexico City. Neither participant accounts nor contemporary ones seem to claim such.¹⁸

'1968' was certainly *inspired* by the Cuban Revolution (1959), the Chinese Cultural Revolution (1965), the Vietnamese resistance to the US (1960s), by the dramatic rise of the US Civil Rights Movement (1960s), by the creation of the Cuban-sponsored Tri-continental solidarity movement and the Organisation of Latin American Solidarity (1966–7). It was certainly also informed, in the literal sense, by mass media reports. But 1968 was neither organised nor co-ordinated by these. And the commercial media proved to be a predictably problematic means of movement communication.¹⁹

In so far as the movement was informed by the 'Situationist International' of that period, connected with the names of Vaneighem and Debord, this would have been in Paris rather than Prague and mostly because of such provocative new notions as 'the revolution in

everyday life'. A hoped-for 'Coming of the New International' was confined to the Third World, marked by a state-oriented 'thirdworldism' and truncated even here.²⁰

The period following 1968 can now be seen rather as revealing the crisis of the old, institutionalised, ideological, party, nationalist or bloc inter-nationalisms than as proposing an alternative kind of internationalism. What the vacuum was often filled with was a uni-directional 'First-World-Third-World' solidarity, itself sometimes conflated with state-funded 'development co-operation' projects, carried out by NGOs with an often-ambiguous autonomy from states, North or South.²¹

For a meaningful alternative internationalism to take shape, a revolution within capitalism caused by the combination of globalisation and informatisation was needed. The nature of this alternative may be at least suggested by the world's biggest and most widespread (if unsuccessful) protest demonstration, the anti-war protest of February 15–16, 2003. This had been called for at the ESF 2002 and echoed at WSF 3. The provocation here was clearly the new kind of global war launched by the most conservative powers in the North. But the co-ordination of the protest was now largely dependent on dozens of 'alternative' websites and lists. It may have been further supported by traditional anti-war and anti-imperialist elements within the movement, but it would surely have been impossible without the web.²²

The new localisms and internationalisms of the present day are inspired by the explicit or implicit recognition that 'the nation-state...is at once too large and too small for the range of real social purposes'.²³ What holds these levels, spaces, foci together, in a possibly conflictive but unavoidable tension, is the more-recent recognition, by the Zapatistas, of the necessity for "a world where many worlds fit".²⁴

Let us reflect on the spatial relations of two national cases. There has been a dramatic wave of varied social protests across South Africa in the last few years. Largely popular, non-white, poor, cross-class and multi-ethnic. As in the rather effective AIDS campaign, these movements can be seen, or presented, as local, and / or national, and / or regional (Southern African), and / or global. In much of the commentary, this kind of cross-scale referencing is quite spontaneous. To what extent such awareness exists amongst participants (or what significance a more-than-nationalist consciousness might have amongst them) remains to be investigated. But the very existence of such awareness amongst both *organisers* and *commentators* suggests a 'world of difference' from that of 1968, or of course, 1917. Its importance is indeed also witnessed in the South African case by those 'Left' politicians in power, and / or profoundly compromised with neoliberal policies, which appeal to old internationalisms against the new global movements!²⁵

India has seen similar or even greater waves of such protests over the last decade, traceable back to half a century or more. They include worker, rural, urban, regional, *adivasi* (indigenous) and *Dalit* ('untouchable'; oppressed) movements, religious and ethnic protests (often sectarian or communalist), ecological and women's movements. Over the past two decades there has been an increase in dramatic, often massive, protest demonstrations and marches, explicitly aimed against neoliberalisation, globalisation and imperialism. With the possible exception of the ecological and women's movements, and projects for regional civil society linkages, however, these have shown little

consciousness of, or significant linkage with, movements elsewhere. That this has continued till recently may not be due simply to the relative size, poverty or isolation of India but to the framing of such protests within the protest discourses of the 19th–20th century, such as socialism (of a decreasingly internationalist nature), nationalism and populism. The recently rising consciousness of, and connection with, the GJ&SM, is symbolised by the holding of the first ASF (Hyderabad 2002), and the hosting of the first WSF outside Brazil, in Mumbai, in 2004. Exceptionally, in India, the old Left has taken this initiative. Whether, at Mumbai, the clearest note will be struck by the old traditions of national subaltern protest, or the new ones of global counter-assertion — or how these will be mutually articulated — may be significant for the future of not only the WSF but for the GJ&SM in general.²⁶

Forming the Movement — Culture, Communication and Cyberspace

Distancing ourselves somewhat from current analyses, claims or prognostications concerning culture, communication or cyberspace, or aspects, of the new movement,²⁷ it is worthwhile tracing the line back to, or forward from, the old internationalisms.

Marx and Engels were excited by the communication impact of national railways and the telegraph as it became trans-European. When Lenin declared that “Cinema for us is the most important of arts”, he meant that silent film could communicate across literacy and language barriers. Twentieth century communist internationalism was sensitive to the area of communications and culture, one of its most creative spirits declaring, notably, that “communications are the nervous system of ...internationalism and human solidarity”.²⁸ In the 1920s, the Moscow-based Third International sponsored a multitude of often-innovatory cultural and communication forms, both popular and avant-garde, from Germany to India and Japan.

Leaping forward to ‘1968’, we can note the brilliant poster art, often internationalist in spirit, following the Cuban Revolution, and that generated by Paris in 1968 itself. At the same time, however, the widespread hostility of the new Left to ‘capitalist technology’ and the ‘commercial mass media’ was criticised by Enzensberger.²⁹ He argued that engagement with the electronic media would allow people to mobilise *themselves* — to become “as free as dancers, as aware as football players, as surprising as guerrillas”. From this period on we note the development of community-specific local-to-international radio, ‘guerrilla’ video groups and computer-communication experiments.³⁰

A part of the new social movements of the eighties and nineties retained, and still retains, its suspicion of computer-based ‘communications internationalism’ and of the internet and cyberspace more generally. More pragmatic spirits simply adopted and adapted each new development. And the more visionary began to see the internet not simply as a tool but as a *space* to be disputed and even as *community creating*. Amongst the most pragmatic have been the union organisations and many independent labour and socialist internationalists. Amongst the more visionary and experimental have been the Zapatistas and their supporters, some feminists and those coming out of the ‘community’, ‘alternative’ and other media movements — themselves descendents of 1968. The best-known expression is the de-centred, multi-media, Indymedia Center

which sprang to life during Seattle 1999, and which now has nodes in such unlikely places as India, Palestine, and Russia.³¹

Alongside such new internationalist media practices we see democratic international media-campaigning, itself traceable back to the thirdworldist (i.e. statist) New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO) of the seventies and eighties. Today this has a more radical-democratic or social-movement orientation. Media and cyberspace activity finds multi-faceted expression within the WSF, partly in official panels, partly in more marginal ones. It may also, however, find expression within alternative or oppositional spaces during the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS), 2003–5. Such activities within the UN system may now be seen as secondary to activity within the framework of the WSF.³²

Given their low-level of institutionalisation and of the conventional quest for political power, both the WSF and the GJ&SM have to be considered in cultural and communication terms. But whereas the Movement's protest events have been dramatically networked, and concerned with mass-media and alternative-media address, those of proposition, such as the WSF, have been rather less so, relying on such traditional (new) Left forms as the panel and the demonstration. A path-breaking exception here has been, however, the anti-fundamentalist and anti-war masks, videos, posters and hoardings of the feminist Marcosur group at WSF 2 and 3.³³

Conclusion : A Fifth International ?

A new internationalism is taking shape and place, though it might be more realistic to put this in the plural, or to distinguish it as 'the new global solidarity'. There will be argument about whether it surpasses the First-to-Fourth Internationals or provides a basis for some kind of Fifth one. However, it is also quite possible that it will reproduce the errors and failures of previous internationals. The GJ&SM has not, so far, proven to be a movement much aware of *that* history, which is also part of its *own* history — or at least of its inheritance. Those involved in such debates are, however, likely to agree that a movement that is *not* aware of its history is in danger of repeating it.³⁴

Patrick Bond's table (overleaf) may clarify positions and processes identified in the paper or provoke alternative conceptualisations of the Global Justice and Solidarity Movement.³⁵

AUGUST 2003

Peter Waterman — see 'Editors' (this volume).

(See overleaf)

Antecedents : Critical Perspectives

POLITICAL CURRENT	GLOBAL JUSTICE MOVEMENTS	THIRD WORLD NATIONALISM	POST-WASHINGTON CONSENSUS	WASHINGTON CONSENSUS	RESURGENT RIGHTWING
MAIN AGENDA	'De-globalisation' of capital (not people), 'globalisation-from-below', anti-war, anti-racism, women's liberation, ecology, indigenous rights, 'decommodification' of state services and mass-participatory democracy	Increased (but fairer) global integration, i.e., reform (not transformation) of the interstate system through debt relief, democratisation of global governance, more market access, regional Cupertino and anti-imperialism	Fix 'imperfect markets' and add 'sustainable development' to existing neoliberal framework through global state-building, while opposing US unilateralism and militarism	Neoliberalism revamped and renamed (PRSPs, HIPC and PPPs), slight provision for 'transparency' and (self)-regulation, more effective bail-out mechanisms; and general support for Empire	For petro-military imperialism, against multi-lateralism; protectionism, tariffs, subsidies, bail-outs and cronyism; racism; and reversing globalisation of people via xenophobia
INTERNAL DISPUTES	Role of the nation-state; party politics, fix-it vs. nix-it strategies for international agencies, and tactics (merits of symbolic property destruction)	Political alignments, degree of militancy vis-à-vis the North, divergent regional interests, religious differences, egos, internecine rivalries	Some look leftward (for broader alliances) and others look to the Wash. Con. (for resources and legitimacy)	Differing reactions to US imperialism, based in part upon divergent national-capitalist interests and domestic political dynamics	Disagreements over extent of imperial reach, and over how to protect national cultures and patriarchy
LEADING INSTITUTIONS	Social movements; environmental justice advocates; radical activist networks; indigenous people's and autonomist groups; some militant labour movements; a few leftwing think-tanks (eg. Focus on the Global South, Food First, Global	Self-selecting regimes (often authoritarian) : Argentina, Chile, China, Egypt, India, Iraq, Libya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestine, Russia, S. Africa, Turkey, Zimbabwe with a few — like Brazil, Cuba and Venezuela — that lean Left	WSSD, some UN agencies (eg., UNCTAD, UNICEF, UN-READ); some int'l NGOs' (eg., Care, Civicus, IUCN, Oxfam, TI); large enviro. Groups (eg., Sierra and WWF);	US State (Federal Reserve, Treasury, USAID); corporate media and big business; World Bank, IMF, WTO; elite clubs (Bilderbergers, Tri-lateral Commission, World Economic Forum); some UN agencies (UNDP,	US Republican Party populist and libertarian wings; Project for New American Century; rightwing think-tanks (AEI, Cato, CSIS, Heritage, Manhattan); the Christian Right; petro-military

Contd.

POLITICAL CURRENT	GLOBAL JUSTICE MOVEMENTS	THIRD WORLD NATIONALISM	POST-WASHINGTON CONSENSUS	WASHINGTON CONSENSUS	RESURGENT RIGHTWING
<p>LEADING INSTITUTIONS</p>	<p>Exchange, IBASE, IPS, IFG, Nader centres, TNI); leftist media / websites (eg. Indymedia, Pacifica, www.zmag.org); and sectoral or localised coalitions allied to the World Social Forum</p>	<p>(but others soft on imperialism, e.g. E.Timor, Ecuador and Eritrea); Islamic nationalism; and supportive NGOs (eg. Third World Network, Seatini)</p>	<p>big labour (eg. ICFTU and AFL-CIO); liberal foundations (eg., Carnegie, Ford, MacArthur, Mott, Open Society, Rockefeller); Columbia University Economics department; and German, Canadian and Scandinavian governments</p>	<p>Global Compact); universities and think-tanks (University of Chicago Economics department, Council on Foreign Relations, Institute of International Finance, Brookings); and most Japanese and EU governments</p>	<p>complex; CIA, FBI, Pentagon; right-wing media (eg. Fox, National Interest, Washington Times); and proto-fascist European parties, but also Israel's Likud</p>

NOTES

- ¹ Social Movements World Network website; Vargas 2003; Whitaker 2003; World Social Forum website.
- ² Arquilla and Ronfeldt 2001; Cleaver 1998; Escobar 2003; Klein 2001.
- ³ Keck and Sikkink 1998.
- ⁴ Aguiton 2003; Walton and Seddon 1994.
- ⁵ Alianza Social Continental website; Zapatista Index website.
- ⁶ de la Grange and Rico 1998; Holloway and Peláez 1998; Olesen [forthcoming]; Wahl 2002.
- ⁷ Abramsky 2001; PGA website; Reclaim the Streets website; Sweeney 1997.
- ⁸ Alvarez, Dagnino and Escobar 1998; Cohen 1985; Melucci 1989; Omvedt 1993a.
- ⁹ Alvarez et al 2002.
- ¹⁰ Ashman 2003; Boyd 2003; Callinicos 2003; Starr 2000.
- ¹¹ Aguiton 2003; Buckley 2003; International Transportworkers Federation 2002.
- ¹² Fisher and Ponniah 2003; Transnational Alternatives 2002; Sen 2003; Santos 2003; Whitaker 2002.
- ¹³ Aguiton 2001; Callinicos 2003; Crossley 2002; Glasius, Kaldor and Anheier 2002; Pianta 2001; Starr 2000; Santos 2003.
- ¹⁴ Callinicos 2003, pp 14-16.
- ¹⁵ Global Civil Society Yearbook website; Rikkilä and Patomäki 2001.
- ¹⁶ Boyd 2003; Cardon and Granjon 2003; Escobar 2003; Löwy 2003; Ngwane 2003; Waterman 2001a, b.
- ¹⁷ Massey 1991; Featherstone [forthcoming].
- ¹⁸ Ali and Watkins 1998; Carr 1998; Erickson 2002; Koning 1988, p 192.
- ¹⁹ Ali and Watkins 1998; Gitlin 1980; Koning 1988, p 192.
- ²⁰ Gerassi 1971; Vague 2000.
- ²¹ Omvedt 1993.
- ²² Ashman 2003; Boyd 2003.
- ²³ Williams 1983, p 197.
- ²⁴ EZLN 1997.
- ²⁵ Bond 2003; Cock 2003; Desai 2002; Kingsnorth 2003; Ngwane 2003; Nzimande 2003; Weekes 2002.
- ²⁶ *Desh Bachao* 2003; Dietrich and Nayak 2001; Featherstone 2002; Muricken 1999; Omvedt 1993; Sen 2003; Waterman 1982.
- ²⁷ Cyberspace after Capitalism 2003.
- ²⁸ Mariátegui 1973/1923.
- ²⁹ Enzensberger 1976.
- ³⁰ Ali and Watkins 1998; [Art-For-A-Change website](#); Suarez 2003; Waterman 1992.
- ³¹ Harcourt 1999; Hellman 2000; Indy Media website; Olesen Forthcoming [ditto]; Suarez 2003; Waterman 1992, 2001b.
- ³² Cyberspace after Capitalism 2003; ISIS 2003; Leon, Burch and Tamayo 2001; Putting People First 2003; WSF Thematic Area 3 2003.
- ³³ Articulación Feminista Marcosur website.
- ³⁴ Löwy 2003; Waterman 1992, 2001a.
- ³⁵ Buckley 2003.
- ³⁶ Starr 2003.