INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL STUDIES

Working Paper Series No. 286

OF SAINTS, SINNERS AND COMPAÑERAS: INTERNATIONALIST LIVES IN THE AMERICAS TODAY

Peter Waterman

February 1999

Comments are welcome and should be addressed to the author:
c/o Publications Office - Institute of Social Studies - P.O. Box 29776
2502LT The Hague - The Netherlands

The Institute of Social Studies is Europe's longest-established centre of higher education and research in development studies. Post-graduate teaching programmes range from six-week diploma courses to the PhD programme. Research at the ISS is fundamental in the sense of laying a scientific basis for the formulation of appropriate development policies. The academic work of the Institute is disseminated in the form of books, journal articles, teaching texts, monographs and working papers. The Working Paper series provides a forum for work in progress which seeks to elicit comments and generate discussion. The series includes the research of staff and visiting fellows, and outstanding research papers by graduate students.

For a list of available Working Papers and how to order them see the back of this Working Paper.

For further information contact:
Publications Office - **Institute of Social Studies** - P.O. Box 29776
2502LT The Hague - The Netherlands - FAX: +31 70 4260799
e-mail **#publication_dept@iss.nl** (Attn: Publications Assistant)

CONTENTS

Of Saints, Sinners and Compañeras: Internationalist Lives in the Americas Today

Peter Waterman

Email: p_waterman@hotmail.com

Global Solidarity Site: http://www.antenna.nl/~waterman/

Abstract

A new internationalism is shaping up in the Americas today. In response to the destructive, divisive and exploitative globalisation now dominating the landscape, a variety of movements are contri' uting to the development of some kind of hemispheric civil society. Like earlier internationalisms, the new one, too, has its active agents. At present we know even less of this new generation than we know of their forebears. Stimulating or collecting interviews or testimonies from such activists, would not only provide lively human accounts accessible to ordinary people (to whom internationalism may still be foreign or exotic). It would also provide inputs into the work of movement strategists, media activists, committed researchers. To do this effectively requires some familiarity with the history of internationalism (and its limitations), language appropriate to internationalism under conditions of globalisation, some knowledge of past and contemporary internationalist activists in the Americas. Offered here in turn are 1) the salutary case of internationalist icon, Rigoberta Menchu, 2) argument on the value of (auto)biographies in advancing a contemporary internationalism in the Americas, 3) a `critical and committed' view of globalisation, and a complex view of solidarity, along with a heuristic model of internationalist types, 4) thumbnail sketches of six individual internationalists in the Americas (1830s-1990s) and, 5) some concluding reflections on the relation between the model and these sketches. An extended bibliography and resource listing complete the paper.

For most of human history, political and military elites have directed the foreign affairs of their tribes, kingdoms and nations as they have seen fit, largely unencumbered by the concerns of the common people over whom they rule. Recent history, however, has witnessed a difficult, faltering, yet clearly perceptible, upheaval from below. In recent decades, those ideals have been amplified into a `participation revolution' around the world. From Algiers to Prague to Beijing, from Soweto to Santiago to San Francisco, ordinary people are increasingly acting on the idea that all people, and not just elites, ought to participate significantly in shaping the decisions and structures that effect their lives. This `participation revolution' has not left untouched the domain of international relations and foreign policy making - long restricted to the control of elites. (Christian Smith, *Resisting Reagan: the US Central America Peace Movement*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1996, p. xvi).

[G]rasping the flow, finding and communicating present realities that transgress nation-state imaginaries, resembles what Walter Benjamin depicted as seizing a flash in a moment of danger, a praxis for historians. The real task of the historian, Benjamin insisted, was not to relive the past by empathy, not to set the present aside in order to recover the way...it really was. Instead, Benjamin called upon historians to be cognisant of debts and danger, debts owed to the dead who had struggled and sacrificed and danger in the present. This historian realises that `even the dead *will not be safe 'without historians' active intervention, that memory of losses and sacrifices will be lost or distorted in the interests of the presently powerful, and most importantly, that memories of past struggles, the flashes seized, can become inspiration for political movements in the present and future.*(John D. Kelly, `Time and the Global: Against the Homogeneous, Empty Communities in Contemporary Social Theory', *Development and Change*, Vol. 29, 1998. Pp. 839-71).

[T]here are two ways of contributing to this moment. One is to try to analyse the past with distance. The second to break the silence. The best way of doing this - there is no other - is to speak, or at least to write. This means to present testimony. And presenting testimony is, perhaps, already writing history. Because the history that will be written by future historians will be an interpretative history, done on the basis of testimonies. That of today, that of our days, has to be, instead, a testimonial history. This is not the history of the historians; it is that of the actors, and even if this is not the most true, it is at least the most authentic.[1] (Fernando Mires, `Chile: Rompiendo el silencio' [Chile: Breaking the Silence], *Servicio Informativo ALAI*. No. 279, August 26, 1998, pp. 12-16)

---

[1] `[H]ay dos medios para contribuir a aquel momento. Una es tratar de analizar con distancia al pasado. La segunda hay que ir rompiendo el silencio. La mejor manera de hacerlo, no hay otra, es hablar; o por lo menos escribir. Es decir, dar testimonio. Y quizas, dar testimonio, ya es escribir la historia. Porque la historia que escribiran los futuros historiadores sera una historia interpretativa, hecha a base de testimonios. La de hoy, la de nuestros dias, debe ser, en cambio, una historia testimonial. Esa no es la historia de los historiadores; es la de los actores, y sino es la mas verdadera, es por lo menos la mas autentica.'

Introduction: of icons and internationalisms

I had just presented a first draft of this paper,[2] in which I had included a thumbnail sketch of 1992 Nobel Peace Laureate, Rigoberta Menchu, when a public and international controversy broke out around her. This concerned both her first book, *I, Rigoberta Menchu* (Menchu 1987) and her second one, *Crossing Borders* (Menchu 1998a). Rigoberta was, in my original paper, the one such living contemporary agent. In so far as I was arguing for research on internationalism based on either testimonies or interviews, this controversy raised complex questions about the active agents of such and how to study them.

I, Rigoberta Menchu (IRM) contributed to making this indigenous Guatemalan woman activist an international icon, and provided a part of the stimulus for US/Western European solidarity movements to propose her for the Nobel Peace Prize she was awarded in 1992. It was after this, and with her consequent international reputation, that Rigoberta became a major public figure, speaking to an indigenous, national and international audience on a range of peace, democracy, indigenous rights and related issues.

The controversy about the use/abuse of the Latin American *testimonio* actually began earlier amongst anthropologists and other academics in the US (Chronicle of Higher Education 1999, Gugelberger 1996, Lancaster 1998).[3] It passed into the public sphere with the publication of a book on Menchu and IRM by David Stoll (1998). This threw doubt on both the literal veracity of her first testimony and its claim to represent the whole indigenous Guatemalan community. Whilst, I think, treating Menchu with some respect, Stoll argues that the testimony was a product of the relationship between her, her community, the armed insurrectionary movement she then identified with, and the international peace and justice movement itself. Despite the *New York Times* press spin on the book, with Rigoberta as a 'tarnished laureate' (Rohter 1998) Stoll has also publicly stated that he considers the Rigoberta phenomenon as having contributed to the peace process within Guatemala (Fernandez Garcia 1998). This was, however, not the first controversy about the first book, since, as Stoll records, there has been a long and complex series of disputes between Rigoberta and her Venezuelan/French interviewer/editor, Elizabeth Burgos Debray, concerning both the text and the income from IRM. Since the publication in English of Rigoberta's second book, *Crossing Borders* (Menchu 1998a), another row has blown up. The co-editors of this one accused Verso Books of intellectual theft in

---

[2] This first version was addressed to a conference on 'Transnational Organising in the Americas', within the Hemispheric Dialog (HD) programme, at the University of California Santa Cruz (UCSC), December 1998. Given my own limited knowledge of and access to both the hemisphere and its internationalisms, this event provided ideas, information and stimulus to a rewrite. The conference participants, the academics of UCSC, the Bay Area (San Francisco and surrounds), and California more generally, turned out to be particularly well qualified to speak about internationalism. This may be due to California's vanguard role in globalisation, its status on the frontline between 'first' and 'third' worlds, as well as its intimate, complex and conflictive relationship with waves of Latino/a immigrants (some of whom contributed significantly to the conference). My thanks for discussions and comments, in particular, go to Sonia Alvarez, Alison Brysk, John Borrego, Eric Holt-Jimenez, Jonathon Fox, Susanne Jonas, Margaret Keck, Norma Klahn, Ronnie Lipschutz, Paul Lubeck, James O'Connell, Manuel Pastor, Juan Poblete. I am particularly indebted to my discussant, Mimi Keck (who still owes *me* a printed copy of her penetrating comments!). Jonathon Fox is one of the few people are trying to theorise this area. He also pressed me, in person and by email, to a degree that may take longer to respond to than the period I had for reconsideration. Mary Garcia Castro made a polemical attack on my paper - which she considered ahistorical, anti-communist and eurocentric - and won applause amongst Latino/a students present. A pity, since I share her political background and many of her research interests. I hope she may come to see me as an interlocutor to be talked with rather than an opponent to be condemned. Relevant writings of a number of these people can be found in the bibliography. Appreciation should also be expressed to a seminar on the revised paper at the Institute of Social Studies, January 1999, where Eric Ross reproduced, non-polemically, some of Mary's concerns.

[3] For the most-compressed imaginable summary of the issues, see Gugelberger 1998, which discusses the second book of Rigoberta precisely in terms of its differences with her first.

deliberately leaving their names not simply off the cover but out of the book as a whole.[4] Verso, however, denies any intention to mislead or misuse, explaining the matter as due to their translation having been done from a manuscript which did not carry these names, and the following failure of the copyright holders to point out any shortcoming in the English draft supplied them for commentary. They have also promised rectification (Verso 1998). The accusation of intellectual theft against Verso by Rigoberta's collaborators nonetheless suggests the sensitivity surrounding her books.

The controversy, more significantly, suggests what happens when the world's voiceless begin to find tongue, when for the first time the subaltern speaks.[5] These voices are neither innocent nor simple, nor can they be taken as *the* voice of a particular community or universe. Nor are they even *heard* without the mediation of comparatively wealthy, sophisticated or powerful Others, with their own already-developed skills, institutions and agendas - political, communicational or academic. Rigoberta has, over the years between her two books, been partially formed by the `international of goodwill' that both campaigned for and gave her the Nobel. But this is not to disparage the international solidarity movements either, or even the funding agencies largely dependent on liberal-democratic states or capitalist corporations/foundations. It is rather to recognise a turning point in the history of international solidarity movements. For, as Stoll's book reveals (though this is not his intention), these have, over the last 20-30 years, operated largely on a one-way, top-down, North/West-to-South/East axis and direction. This has been a `substitution solidarity' (see below) in which the rich/powerful/free, left/democratic/liberal movements, in the North/West, have related to the poor/weak/oppressed in the South/East. As Stoll further reveals, these solidarity movements needed such icons. And the regional/national/local movements behind the icons-to-be needed the international solidarity movements. But this was also during the period of North-South and East-West dichotomies. And that was before globalisation made us aware of the South in the North and the North in the South, or that global problems, global identities and new global social movements existed (or could exist) across, despite of, and against these increasingly blurred frontiers (Pollack 1998).

Regardless of the critique and controversy, *Crossing Borders* (CB) provides a unique contribution to an understanding of the new internationalisms. This is largely due to the manner in which it illustrates, in practical, personal and eminently readable terms, recent academic writing

---

[4] The Spanish-language original of *Crossing Borders* (Menchu 1998b) has a very different appearance. Entitled, *Rigoberta Menchu: Granddaughter of the Mayas*, it indicates the two collaborators on its front cover. It also has preliminary statements by a Spanish leader of Amnesty International, of the Uruguayan writer, Eduardo Galeano, and of one of the collaborators himself. In an acknowledgement, Rigoberta expresses her thanks to this man and his colleague. The copy I have seen was a *third* 1998 edition, which indicated, moreover, that the book had won a major Spanish prize for 'International Co-operation'. CB was thus reinforcing her iconic status within the framework of what used to be called 'development aid'.

[5] The reference here is to Spivak 1988, who suggested that s/he could not. As for the iconisation of the marginalised indigenous or outcaste third world woman, this did not begin with Rigoberta, although it might end with her. Before her there was Domitila Barrios de Chungara (Barrios 1979), a woman of the indigenous mining communities in Bolivia. After her has come Phoolan Devi, the Indian bandit leader, immortalised in what many consider to be the best Indian movie ever, *Bandit Queen*. There was, on its release, a considerable national and international controversy around this movie, with Phoolan Devi suggesting her story had been ripped-off and distorted by the Indian-British production team responsible for it. Feminists crossed swords and theories, some stating that the movie was sexually exploitative, others that it showed an independent and empowered outcaste village woman wreaking vengeance on her higher-caste rapists in a manner available to her. Yes, they did use her. Yes it is a great movie. Or - if you prefer - the other way round.

on what is variously called 'global civil society', 'the new internationalisms' or 'transnational advocacy networks' (see below). Rigoberta's CB will reach many more readers than the writing of people like Stoll or myself. If these readers now look at her and her work as my colleagues look at me and mine, this can only contribute to creating the kind of public necessary for a self-reflective and self-critical global solidarity culture.

Rigoberta, the person, her testimonies, her iconic status, it seems to me, stand at another frontier crossing - between an old inter*nationalism* (a relation between nations, nationals, nationalities, nationalisms) and the new more complex, more critical, more self-conscious global solidarities. If the case, finally, raises questions about the role and value of testimony in the creation of international or global community, it also possibly spells the end of iconisation in creating a contemporary solidarity.[6] Internationalists, it seems to me, need to see Rigoberta, as neither saint nor sinner but rather as a *compañera* (a richly ambiguous term, meaning friend, workmate, associate, sexual partner, or political comrade). It is in the light of the above that we should consider study of the new internationalists in the Americas.

Argument: a new global solidarity culture needs internationalist voices

So, this is an argument for an academic research project or programme on internationalism in the Americas. It is also an argument for a research focus that does not yet exist, but which I consider not only innovatory but also urgent. It is an argument, further, for carrying it out in a way that might encourage 1) input from such internationalists and 2) access to the output by both such people and the broader public concerned. This is not necessarily research which I will be able

---

[6] The de-iconisation may be already occurring within the 'First World-Third World movement'. This is suggested by the response to the controversy of a veteran of Dutch solidarity with Latin America, Mario Coolen (as reported in *Trouw* 1998). Coolen received Rigoberta on her first visit to Europe in 1981, and recognises the extent to which she has become entrapped both in the fame of her Nobel Prize and in the building of her own 'development empire'. At the same time, however, he defends her work - but as creating a 'corporate personality' representative of her people. And he is suspicious of the motives of Stoll. Coolen accuses him of undermining international support work for the Guatemalan *indigenas*, of creating the impression that things were not so bad for them in Guatemala, and of playing along with a familiar US strategy intended to undermine the participation of the *indigenas* in the forthcoming elections. Rigoberta herself has been reported, in the Guatemalan press, as insisting on the literal truth of IRM. The veteran Uruguayan revolutionary and writer, Galeano, has defended Rigoberta the icon and bitterly attacked Stoll for reproducing US imperial and racist attitudes (Galeano 1999). Arturo Taracena, a major actor in the creation of the first book, has broken a 16-year silence to comment critically on the roles in the controversy played by both Elizabeth Burgos Debray and David Stoll. Taracena, a Guatemalan historian, one-time revolutionary, long-time friend of Rigoberta and co-ordinator of the campaign for her Nobel, says in part: 'Rigoberta did not win the Prize only because of the book. It was because of her political organising, her leadership role and her political capacity. Rigoberta won the Nobel Prize for an entire trajectory. She was where she had to be at the right time. She was in the United Nations, in Geneva, she campaigned for human rights and for indigenous rights, not only in Guatemala, but throughout the Continent; she managed and maintained a leadership role at a global level. She came back to Guatemala, and she was captured. The Nobel wasn't given to her as a writer; besides, the book came out 10 years before she won the Prize. The Nobel Prize was a message to all of Latin America from Europe regarding the question of indigenous peoples and the construction of democracy and peace, but many people refuse to see that'. (Aceituno 1999). Grandin and Goldman (1999) comment as follows: 'perhaps Western readers expect only simplicity and naiveté from Indian women. And perhaps it was this expectation that Menchú skilfully used to publicise the wholesale slaughter being conducted by the Guatemalan military [ ] Similar to what he accuses Menchú of doing, Stoll arranges and suppresses events to support his claims. Stoll would have us believe that if not for the guerrillas, the military might not have become the most bloodthirsty killing machine in the hemisphere. Yet by reducing Guatemala's conflict to the back-and-forth sparring between the guerrillas and the military, Stoll wilfully -- or ignorantly -- misrepresents the history of Guatemalan political opposition and repression. It is unfortunate that at this moment, when truth commissions and exhumations are opening the secrets of the recent past to scrutiny, Stoll's work provides both these stereotypes with a scholarly patina'. For another well-qualified critic of Stoll's account, see Rarihokwats (1999). And for a thoughtful Peruvian journalist's evaluation of this issue, see Lauer 1999.

to carry out myself, although I would be happy to contribute. The paper is therefore meant to stimulate discussion, and, indeed, the independent research work of others. So much for motivation.

Now for the argument itself. It seems to me that any humane, varied, sustainable democratic and pluralistic notion of civil society, in and across the Americas, descends from often unrecognised predecessors, is shaped by distinct hegemonic structures and processes, but is also self-evidently dependent on certain active agents. As Christian Smith puts it in his study of the US-Central America peace movement of the 1980s:

> social movements do not consist simply of abstract structures and contexts, of impersonal forces and events. Social movements are, at bottom, real, flesh-and-blood human beings acting together to confront and disrupt. They are the collective expressions of specific people, of concrete men and women struggling together for a cause. Bringing our focus down to real, concrete human beings in this way raises a set of questions. Namely, exactly what kinds of people participated? Why did *they* tend to join or become recruited into the movement: What personal characteristics or circumstances may have predisposed them to become activists? (Smith 1996:168)[7]

To which I would add: what lessons can we draw in order to increase the active membership and effective leadership in such movements?

The case for writing about our particular movement *auto biographically* is as follows. This genre is not an art or skill confined to the academy or professional writers. Neither is the reading thereof. Auto/biography can, it seems to me, make the work of internationalist activists accessible to publics that academic, political or even journalistic writing on internationalism can hardly touch. It should be remembered - also by the internationalists themselves - that internationalist activity can seem exotic *and even suspect* to the public they hope to reach or claim to speak for. The popularisation of internationalism therefore remains a permanent challenge. In the UK recently, and possibly elsewhere, the auto/biographical literary (and TV?) genre has been going through a boom. This may be due to a widespread crisis of identity, or even a generalised

---

[7] Although not cast in terms of internationalism, the book of Christian Smith (1996) on the 1980s US movement for peace in Central America is a rare if not unique example of a serious study of internationalism and internationalists in the Americas. It is not only the most extensive such study of which I am aware: it also examines its subject in terms of social movement theory. It has, furthermore, a long chapter (169-210) examining both activists and leaders on the basis of interviews and their own writings. And it pays major attention to the moral/ethical motivation. A crucial additional element is the attention given to the movement's relationship with public discourse and the mass media. Smith's case studies concentrate on Sanctuary (mobilising 70,000 US citizens to provide sanctuary, illegally, for Central American refugees within the US) and Witness for Peace (activating some 4,000 to risk their lives by travelling to Nicaraguan war zones). These movements came from and appealed largely to religious communities in the US. He pays only peripheral attention to CISPES (Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador), and then primarily as a leftist gadfly. A pity, since giving it equal space would have required him to compare/contrast his religious and secular/leftist activists. I suspect, however, that this would not have changed his finding that this movement was one primarily of wealthy, white, university educated women and men, primarily from the human service professions. Smith's evident identification with and concentration on the moral/ethical element in this international solidarity movement nonetheless enables him to surpass the customarily aseptic analysis of US social movement theory (the only one he appears to be aware of). Moreover, he is aware of and makes us aware of contradictions within his movements. Those interested in the *next* wave of internationalism in the Americas, and want to advance such, need to read this book. I hope in the future to give it more attention than this footnote and the occasional main-text quotation. For an excellent interview-based journalistic account of one of Smith's movements, see Crittenden (1988).

loss of social meaning. This in turn may be a consequence of the increasingly fast and often brutal transition to a new neo-liberalised, globalised and networked capitalism (GNC)[8] and the consequent undermining of such (now-traditional) structures, aspirations, life-cycles or relationships as lifetime wage-work, social welfare, the family (nuclear or not), gender and generational roles, the national community, an authoritative state, life-advancing science, empowering education. In certain parts of our increasingly globalised world, the sense of loss gives rise to an enthusiastic consumptionism (often vicarious) or apathetic/sensation-seeking spectatorship, in others to mass fundamentalisms (religious, ethnic, occasionally socialist-nationalist or national-socialist). These responses have their own active bearers, whose lives or life-styles may be projected nationally and internationally. It is time to present other lives, other models, and in ways that encourage critical engagement rather than passive admiration or thoughtless emulation.

The auto/biographical genre, with its customarily chronological and narrative form, its varied possible combinations of the public and private (and questionings of such), its ethical messages or dilemmas, apparently meets a current social need. In this case it could also provide vital feedback and raw material for interested activists and researchers. And it could deliver raw materials for further processing by cartoon-book makers, academics, dramatists, radio, video, TV, designers/producers of multi-media computer works. These can, in turn, feed back to mass audiences unreachable by written work - as well, of course, to the activists, organisers and educators themselves. In so far, moreover, as the new global solidarities tend to increasingly take the form of *communications internationalisms* (see below), this project both expresses and furthers such. We may add to these arguments that suggested by Fernando Mires in the introductory quotations.[9] The implication here is, evidently, not that the historians should be silenced but that today the chorus should - and can? - speak. The words of John Kelly address the post-nationalist historian more positively. These two quotations imply a necessary and constructive dialectic between the actor/witness and the historian/researcher (who today can increasingly be the same person). The first introductory one, by Christian Smith, suggests that, today, the parameters within which the people and the historians can and should speak, are global.

I know of few writings on or by such a tivists in the Americas, whether recently or in the past. What exists may be only part of the life of a figure known or seen rather as a Traveller, a Feminist, a Communist, a Poet, a Revolutionary, a Pacifist, an *Indigena*, a Human Rights Activist. There is certainly more writing, particularly in Spanish and Portuguese, but also in English -

---

[8] This is my name for this new phenomenon. But my argument relates to that of Manuel Castells (1996-8. Reviewed Waterman Forthcoming) and to that of Felix Guattari (1998). I have only just discovered the latter item, which dates from 1991, and welcome his concept of an 'integrated global capitalism' and, particularly, his argument on the manner in which this produces a certain kind of subjectivity. It seems to me, however, that whatever capitalism proposes, it is people and peoples who dispose. An IGC can hardly produce only one subjectivity, however much it might imply or even promote such. Guattari, who died in 1992, in any case becomes one of the pioneers of what I call 'theoretically critical and socially committed globalisation theory'.

[9] It is worth noting, firstly, that Mires broke the silence on Chile just *before* the silence was broken, around Pinochet, in late 1998, secondly, that the silence was not broken by Chilean civil society but by 'a global civil society in formation'. Behind the breaking of the silence lies the persistent activity of not only a Spanish judge but numerous internationalist activists, both within states and within civil society more generally. Who are or were they? What were their motivations? How did or do they see the creation of an effective and principled supranational human rights regime?

including that sometimes forgotten America in the non-hispanic Caribbean.[10] More bibliographical work would expand such databases on internationalism as may already exist.[11] The same possibility and necessity exists for audio-visual materials and computer websites.

Relation to the literature

This current paper is obviously inspired by my recent book (Waterman 1998a), as well as other work of my own dealing with labour internationalism or alternative international communication and culture (see Global Solidarity Site in resources below). Whilst there is an increasing amount of other work to be drawn on,[12] I will try to suggest, as briefly as possible, the relevance of my own.

My book addresses itself to the three elements of its title: globalisation, social movements and the new internationalisms. *Globalisation* is understood in terms of a globalised networked capitalism (GNC), a period marked by

> *high* or *radical* modernity, characterised further as that of a *complex high-risk globalised information capitalism*. Globalisation must be understood as multi-determined: by the market, surveillance, militarisation, industrialism, patriarchy, technocracy, informatism, racism, etc. (Waterman 1998a:203)

The globalisation and informatisation of capitalism is further understood as providing the conditions necessary for an internationalism Marx thought already existed in 1848!

---

[10] I am thinking of the Pan-Africanists, Marcus Garvey, George Padmore and C.L.R. James (Appiah and Gates 1997, Buhle, Buhle and Garvey 1992).

[11] A search of books and journals in both academic and general bookshops in Lima, December 1998-January 1999, however, revealed but one (exceptionally) relevant item. Nor were either bookshop owners or left intellectuals able to advise me concerning my interest. Indeed, the only other book I could find on a new internationalism was on the successful international campaign against landmines, and that was in English. The search continues.

[12] There is, for example: 1) *historical* work by James Billington (1980), which ' a many fascinating and relevant insights on revolutionary internationalists (not only 19th century, not solely European, and not only male); 2) recent *theoretical* work of: Manuel Castells (1996-8) concerning social movements in a globalised and networked society; by David Harvey (1996) on space, place, the necessary movement of protest from workplace to community; by Boaventura de Sousa Santos (1995) on the continuing necessity for and changed character of utopias; by Meyer and Geschiere (1998) revealing the extent to which globalisation has its own history (or requires a rethinking of such) and is expressed and experienced in complex and different ways in multiple locales; by Archibugi, Held and Koehler (1998) on 'cosmopolitan democracy' (the political/institutional aspect of civilising global - and national - society); by Zillah Eisenstein (1998) on globalisation, cyberspace and transnational virtual sisterhoods; 3) by John French and colleagues (French, Cowie and Littlehale 1994) on the past and present of *union internationalism* in the Americas; by Kim Moody (1997) on both official and unofficial labour internationalism in the Americas and more widely; and by Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello (1994), pioneers of a new labour and community internationalism in the US; 4) by Sonia Alvarez (1998) on *feminism and internationalism* in Latin America and other contributions to the same volume on cultural politics (Alvarez, Dagnino and Escobar (1998); 5) by Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink (1998) on *'transnational advocacy networks'*, and several related others (Fox and Brown 1998, Lipschutz 1996, Lynch 1998, Smith, Chatfield and Pagnucco 1997); 6) by Martin Manalansan IV (1997) and Aaron Pollack (1998) *on political and epistemological differences within between global(ised) movements*; 7) by John Gerassi (1971) for its expression of nationalist-populist *Third World internationalism*, Burbach and Nunez 1987a, b) for a pioneering attempt to update this, and Fernando Mires (1991) for the crisis of internationalism in general and its Third World variant in particular; 8) by Allen Hunter (1995) and NACLA Report (1995) on the *complexities of contemporary internationalisms in the US*; 9) by Gustavo Lins Ribeiro (1998) *on political activism and cyberspace* in general, and by Wendy Harcourt (1999) on that of women in particular. Other items are mentioned in the body of the paper, in footnotes or in the bibliography.

The *social movement* that Marx considered the bearer of human emancipation was, however, the proletariat of the industrialised capitalist world. This working class later spread internationally but became less internationalist with the development of the industrial(ising) nation state, a liberal-democratic/state-collectivist/populist polity, social services, and nationalism/chauvinism/imperialism. It has also become increasingly socially differentiated and dispersed, both nationally and internationally. Whilst labour internationalism is slowly beginning to revive, the major international(ist) social movements of our day are rather those concerning human rights, peace, women, ecology, indigenous peoples.

The *new internationalisms* must therefore be thought of in the plural, with no ontological or teleological privilege granted to one of them. The new internationalisms can be thought of in terms of *a global solidarity* movement - meaning one addressed to the increasing number of global problems produced by a GNC. In so far as the new international(ist) social movements operate largely in network form, address themselves to the provision of concealed or limited information, to the creation of new meanings about that which is available, and work largely through both broadcast and narrowcast media (particularly the internet), they can also be considered *communication internationalisms*. Such new international(ist) social movements provide the main (not sole) force for the creation of some kind of global civil society. A GCS is itself understood as in conflict with both statism and capitalism, as well as with patriarchy, racism, fundamentalism, militarism and environmental destruction.

Finally a word about *solidarity* in the light of a complex, globalised and informatised capitalism. I have already mentioned the necessity for a more complex or multifaceted understanding. Such an understanding could, I think, be profoundly liberating (Waterman 1998a:235-8):

> *Identity* or identity creation is what commonly underlies socialist calls for international solidarity, usually in reference to oppressed and divided classes or categories in opposition to powerful and united oppressors (capitalists, imperialists). By itself, however, an *Identity Solidarity* can be reductionist and self-isolating, excluding unalikes. In so far as the identity is oppositional, it is a negative quality, often determined by the nature and project of the enemy or opponent (as with much traditional socialist internationalism).
>
> *Substitution* implies standing up, or in, for a weaker or poorer other. This is how international solidarity has been usually understood amongst Development Co-operators and `First-World Third-Worldists'. By itself, however, a *Substitution Solidarity* can lead to substitutionism (acting and speaking for the other), and it can permit the reproduction of existing inequalities. This is a criticism of Development Co-operation, which may function to create a single community of guilt and moral superiority within `donor countries', whilst creating or reproducing further feelings of dependency and/or resentment in countries where social crises have evidently been worsening.
>
> *Complementarity* suggests the provision of that which is missing, and therefore an exchange of different desired qualities. A *Complementary Solidarity* would mean that what was moving in each direction could differ but be equally valued

by participants in the transaction. In so far as it meant that some kind of physical goods (cash, equipment, political support) were mostly moving in one direction and that some kind of moral or emotional goods (expressions of appreciation and gratitude) were mostly being received, we could be involved in an `unequal exchange' of a problematic character.

Reciprocity suggests mutual interchange, care, protection and support. It could be taken as *the* definition of the new global solidarity. Global *Reciprocity Solidarity*, however, could be understood as a principle of equal exchange, in which (as with states) one is exchanging political equivalents, or (as with capitalists) on the basis of calculated economic advantage. And it could therefore imply that one would defend the rights of others only if, or in expectation of, reciprocation by the other.

Affinity suggests mutual appreciation or attraction, and therefore a relationship of mutual respect and support, in which what is sought, appreciated or valued by each party is shared. Affinity would seem to have more to do with values, feelings and friendship. An *Affinity Solidarity* would seem to allow for global linkages within or between ideologies or movements, including between people without contact but acting in the same spirit. In so far as it approximates friendship, it would seem to be inevitably particular, if not particularistic.

Restitution suggests the putting right of a past wrong, the recognition of historical responsibility, a `solidarity with the past', a solidarity across time rather than space. A *Restitution Solidarity* comes close, however, to inter-governmental war reparations, with the consequent danger of buying off guilt.

The value of such an differentiated understanding would seem to be the following: 1) that it is multi-faceted and complex; 2) that each type holds part of the meaning and that each is only part of the meaning; 3) that it is subversive of simple binary or (r)evolutionary oppositions between bad and good, old and new, material and moral solidarity; 4) that it enables critique of partial or one-sided solidarities; 5) that it could be developed into a research instrument, permitting, for example, surveys of the meaning(s) of solidarity for those involved. The last point seems entirely relevant to the proposed project.

The argument of my book is intended to be simultaneously conceptual, analytical and persuasive. Whilst it does not pretend to be or to proclaim a universal truth, it is certainly intended to stimulate a global dialogue, to contribute to a global solidarity culture, and thus lead to giving contemporary internationalisms more shape and impact. It must be recognised that this argument relates to but may be in tension with a number of others likewise concerned with what one might call `humanitarian/ecological political action across borders' or the `civilising of global society'. I will mention here only the argument of the Brazilian scholar/activist, Mary Garcia Castro (1998). She 1) mentions her long-time collaboration with a Caribbean/Latin American confederation of household workers, 2) that she did not realise until very recently that during 16 years of research and activism in the Americas she was `transnational' or `getting global', 3) that she is still moved by the old internationalist utopia but prefers to think of its `proletariat' in the original Roman sense of the lowest or propertyless, class, 4) considers problematic the notion of

`an internationalist project against the State, or against the political economy', particularly when those supposedly involved may be only networking for specific goals and may not consider themselves to be part of an internationalist project, 5) recognises the existence, in Latin America, of a `proxy internationalist project', represented by certain left-oriented organisations or groups. I have no serious problem with most of this argument. I also understand how even someone of socialist background could (given the disuse or disrepute into which the old internationalisms have fallen) be unaware of their transnational or global position or role. My only point of difference, I think, would be that I do not see how one could ever develop an internationalist project, or even a `proxy' one, without a historical view, a new conceptualisation, and a strategy for achieving the kind of mass internationalism she seems to favour! `Transnational', or `transnational organising' - terms much used at the conference Mary and I both attended (as well as by other democratic academics and activists in the US and UK) - would seem a poor term by comparison. If it refers to a movement (migration and/or a social one), to experience or activity across a border, or several borders, then `transnational' may be an unobjectionable descriptor. But its relationship to any social theory or social movement - past or present - is obscure. It contains no socially/sociologically critical or politically/culturally transformatory implication. Nor does it provide any self-reflective light that could shine on either mass or middle-class internationalisms. `The new internationalisms', `new global solidarity' and `global solidarity culture' are attempts to express precisely these missing elements. In Mary's terms, they might represent a `proxy internationalism'. But I do not see how one could turn either an academic conceptualisation or a political/intellectual elite project into one serving `the wretched of the earth' without at least offering, upfront, but for discussion, something that might give them a new view of the world and encouragement in acting effectively within and against it.[13] Improvements to or alternatives to such an understanding are, of course, not only expected but invited.

Questions of method: questioning methods

Perhaps more important for those intending to either do narrative auto/biographies, or systematic interviewing, would be

- examples of auto/biographies, diaries or memoirs[14] (not necessarily exemplary ones - they could usefully include those of US `trade union imperialists'),

---

[13] An excess of modesty has not been a marked characteristic of the Left over the last 200 years. So perhaps one should welcome the caution shown here. I suspect, however, that this modesty represents a certain retreat in the face of neo-liberal triumph - and of not-unrelated post-modernist attacks on all generalisations and universalisms (except its own). Whilst often claiming to speak for the Other, or to allow the Other to speak, post-modernism actually prevents Others talking with other Others and creating new (and renewable) universalisms allowing and even encouraging difference! All respect to those, in the belly of both the neo-liberal and post-modern beasts, who are prepared to turn the tool of deconstruction onto a school that is deeply debilitating of any attempt to move beyond the particular (each with its own infinite particularisms). See here one of a series of powerful but sensitive critiques by social movement specialist Barbara Epstein (1998).

[14] I have just (re)discovered a collection of interviews with US *internacionalistas* (this was the local name for them) working in Nicaragua during the Sandinista period (Ridenour 1986). I still have to work this into my argument since they would seem to undermine my typology just below. They could, I suppose, be considered latter-day *agitators*, but only if this term is stretched so as to allow for propaganda-of-the-deed, since they were mostly providing technical expertise (and were even excluded from political participation). They could, thus, be seen as descendants of the International Brigades that committed themselves to the Spanish Revolution during the Civil War. Like the *brigadistas*, they risked their lives in the struggle against foreign-sponsored counter-revolutionaries. They should also be considered in relation to two other categories: 1) the missionaries who often carry out technical roles in the countries they are sent to (there were many church people amongst the *internacionalistas*); and 2) the

- socio-historical methodology (particularly that of oral history),[15]
- interview techniques (relevant or adaptable interview schedules?)[16] and tools (audio- and videotape?).

For the first, one could start with auto/biographies, published either in English, Spanish/Portuguese - sometimes, possibly, in all three. The advantage of published work is that it is evidently already in the public sphere and therefore open to public scrutiny and critique. This material does not require the negotiation of a relationship with the person concerned. The problems with published work are, of course, many and familiar. These works obviously represent particular (self-)presentations, requiring considerable background knowledge for their evaluation. They may not themselves be focussed on the internationalist activities or their subjects: indeed, the subjects may not even see such activity *as* internationalism.

I have, further, a major question in my mind[17] about whether it is possible to deal, in one study, with both the icons of internationalism (such as Che Guevara and Rigoberta Menchu) and its unknown soldiers or officers. The answer must be: yes, no and maybe. In so far as we are here dealing with virgin territory, I feel that we need, initially, a map indicating the main features of the terrain. Or - to change metaphors - the major voices that are either speaking or can be found and encouraged to speak. We are not dealing, as does Smith (1996) with a well-established international solidarity movement, or a number of social movement organisations, with membership lists, publications, collections of news clippings, coverage in the media, leaders who have themselves written, and a certain number of existing studies. The internationalist voices that I have so far found or heard, *tend* to be those from earlier generations and those of people who could be considered icons. In so far as this piece is intended only to encourage or provoke research, I will leave this matter open for further consideration of interested readers and putative researchers.

A heuristic model: agitators, agents and communicators

To stimulate the thought of both myself and others I want to suggest that the active agents of the new internationalisms in the Americas, as elsewhere, are no longer the internationalist *agitators* of the 19th century (preaching, organising and leading the national-democratic or social revolution wherever they happened to be). Nor are they the internationalist *agents* of the 20th century (the overt or covert representatives of nation-states or state-oriented political parties and organisations). They are, primarily, *communicators* (communicating internationalism to,

---

development cooperators (*cooperantes*) who often identify with the countries, movements or people amongst whom they work but who are customarily confined to technical roles. Ridenour himself is a *communicator*, and one who combines identification with both of his subjects (the *internacionalistas* and the Nicaraguan revolution) with a certain critical distance. Ridenour also allows his interviewees to express or reveal contradictions of or with Nicaragua and in their own positions or personalities. The book certainly reveals the strengths of this kind of work for communicating internationalism.

[15] The handbook of Valerie Yow (1994) is of particular interest because of its class and gender sensitivity.

[16] Smith (1996) employs multiple methods in his study of the US Central America peace movement of the 1980s. These include various survey instruments. Although he explains his methodology, he does not provide us with copies of his survey or interview questions.

[17] Planted by Jonathon Fox, to whom are due my reluctant thanks.

networking with, and thus facilitating internationalism by and between specific social sectors or movements).[18]

Although largely drawn from European history and contemporary experience, this typology has, I would like to hope, some more general value. It could, perhaps, be argued that these types refer to three *aspects* of internationalism rather than three *phases*. I have no doubt that this is the case. The predominance of a certain *type*, however, surely relates to three successive phases of capitalist and state-national history. These are those of 1) early industrial and nation-state development, 2) the generalisation of such, and 3) the current one of a globalised and informatised capitalism. Whilst an argument can, I think, be mounted for this as an empirical/historical statement, I am here proposing it more as a heuristic device (stimulating, inspirational) for examining, through biographies and autobiographies, the lives of internationalists in the Americas. Let me expand.

The first two types - the *agitator* and the *agent* - are implicitly recognised by Eric Hobsbawm (1988). The third is my own. Speaking primarily of Europe and the 19th century, Hobsbawm identifies as his first type:

> a small body of men and women to whom the states and the nation(alities) to which they belonged were genuinely irrelevant, the future revolution being, as it were, their only real `country'. In this sense Brecht's Comintern agent `die Laender ofter wechselnd als die Schuhe' [changing countries more often than shoes - PW] remained in the same territory wherever he or she found themselves [...] In the Second International period we find such people frequently among anarchists, quite often as migrants or re-migrants from one national movement to another, notably among people born in eastern Europe...Such persons would clearly have put their energies with equal zeal into the struggle in Switzerland or Portugal if this had seemed politically desirable. (Hobsbawm 1988:12)

But, talking of the period following the Russian Revolution, he identifies a second type:

> In the Comintern period [the Communist International, 1919-43 - PW] these international cadres became institutionalised...Under the impact of the collapse of 1914 the Comintern deliberately developed this form of internationalism...in the form of loyalty to the international party line and the USSR. How far this duty was actually felt to be compelling outside the cadre of professional cadres and functionaries, is a question which still awaits research. (ibid)

The research is still awaited.[19] But, in the meantime, it seems to me important to note that Hobsbawm's two types have more significance than he himself recognises. He is, in the first place, talking about internationalists in two distinct periods of capitalist and state development:

---

[18] In the first draft of this paper, I used the word *networker* rather than *communicator*. The revised term is due precisely to reflection on such cases as those presented below. Further evidence, reflection, or critical commentary can be expected to lead to further fine-tuning, or even to the playing of another instrument entirely.

[19] In the case of Latin America, however, we do have such evidence and argument in the book of Manuel Caballero (1986). His work is confined to the second period, but here it shows the extensive overlap not simply between the two kinds of agent but also between the Soviet institutions sponsoring such. As a body supporting national revolutions in the cause of an international

- The first period - let us say 1815-1914 - is one of the formation and spread within Europe (and its semi-peripheries) of a nation-state-dependent industrial capitalism. This was a period in which the new mass class of workers was only just undergoing transformation from subjects to citizens, and initially felt more affinity with workers and the poor elsewhere than with old ruling and new capitalist elites.

- The second period - let us say 1918-68, is that of the maturation and universalisation of this model (often having more success in the state-national form than in the industrial-capitalist content!). This was the period of maximum incorporation of the working and popular classes into the state-nation, with socialism often acting as a left-populist nationalism.

Hobsbawm refers, in his second phase, only to the Comintern/Soviet Union. Whilst the USSR was not capitalist, it was certainly industrialising, modernising, nation- and state-building, reproducing many features of industrial capitalism and nation-statism in its internal and - in particular - its external relations. Whilst the Comintern/Soviet Union may therefore provide us with the prototypical internationalist activist, others were produced by Social Democracy within industrialised capitalist democracies, as later by third-world(ist) Populist movements and states. I call the second type of internationalist the *agent*, since this word neatly covers both one who *represents* and one who *spies*. The first operates in the public, the second in the covert sphere. All three left or socialist traditions - the Social Democratic, the Communist and the Populist - produced internationalist agents, operating across this spectrum. (So, incidentally, did the business-union tradition in the USA, the long identification of which with national capital and state-nationalism tended to maximise the *agent* role).

The third type of internationalist, the *communicator*, is my own addition to the typology. I see her/him as a product of a third period of capitalist and state development:

> This third period is marked, firstly, by a crisis in the state/capitalist developmental mode, and secondly by the present movement toward a globalised networked capitalism (GNC). Let us date the *crisis* from 1968. Let us date the *transformation* from 1989. These are, of course, crucial political dates for the left. 1968 is the year of the anti-statist, anti-authoritarian rebellions (in Senegal and Mexico as well as Paris and Prague), resulting in the pluralisation of internationalisms, later expressed in the development of women's, environmental, human-rights and other such movements. 1989 marks another peak of protest, leading however to the triumph of an informatised and service capitalism globally, penetrating, isolating or destroying not only the remnants of Communism and Populism but also threatening and undermining the state-nation and state-nationalism of the industrial capitalist period.

Let me try to characterise this new type of internationalist:

---

one, the Comintern was obliged to work clandestinely as well as publicly. As, however, the Comintern became increasingly subordinated to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs (the Narkomindel, or People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs), the confusion between revolutionaries and functionaries was only increased. In the early years, however, the agents were both proud and open about their double role (Caballero 1986:33-37).

The *communicator* is primarily a networker, a media-activist, educator and catalyst. S/he may both agitate and represent, but has as primary concerns and activities:

- the provision or creation of information/ideas/images unknown to or concealed from the public international sphere;
- the creation of new meanings and values around that which is public internationally;
- the empowerment of those excluded from the international public/political spheres to formulate their own understandings of the global, to become globally active, and to create appropriate relations in the light of such.

The *communicator*, operating across socio-geographic-political frontiers, in cyberspace as well as socio-political place, is the creator and bearer of the new global political solidarities and of global solidarity cultures. In so far as there is a common logic or ethic amongst such activists, this could be characterised as that of radical democracy and pluralism. Radical democracy means the democratisation of all social relations: the economic, political and socio-cultural; from the local to the global levels; within society, between movements, within movements, within homes - and even within beds. Pluralism means recognition of the multiplicity and complexity of hegemonic power and, therefore, the necessary multiplicity and multifariousness of contributions to emancipation. Networking opens up the possibility for large numbers of people to become active bearers/agents of internationalism, without the special qualities/capacities (including heroism or death-wish), that past internationalism have confined to an elite.

This third type is, of course, as much a proposed norm as an empirical generalisation. But the others are ideal types too, as has been suggested above and will be shown below.

It is not difficult to find evidence for the existence of the three proposed types. It is, however, also possible, to find:

- *agents* in the first period, acting for organisations and even for (would-be) states;[20]
- second-period *agents* who also agitate (as did many Comintern and Social-Democratic internationalists);[21]

---

[20] Despite the Northern blockade of Southern cotton shipments during the American Civil War, 1861-5, and at a time of mass unemployment, Lancashire cotton workers nonetheless supported the North. The union government had its own agents in Britain, who either directly or indirectly contributed to this end (Harrison 1957, 1965, Foner 1981). Shortly after the historic London dock strike of 1889, leaders of the London dockers took the ferry over to Rotterdam in order to support a strike there, and later worked for an international dockers' union. However generous and necessary this activity, their intention was not so much to create a federation or confederation of equal port or national unions, but to incorporate these new forces into their developing British one (Waterman 1998a: 88-9).

[21] I would like to consider I did this on the two occasions that I worked for international Communism (rather than the Comintern) in Prague. The first time was for the International Union of Students, in the mid-1950s, the second for the World Federation of Trade Unions, in the mid- to late-1960s. I was certainly an agitator for internationalism both before and after I

- third-period *communicators* who agitate and/or represent (in public, in lobbies, clandestinely).[22]

All three contemporary types are, moreover, conscious or unconscious inheritors of *earlier* internationalist traditions, as will be suggested below.

The point isthat in so far as we are only talking of three types of internationalist, we are also limiting ourselves to the capitalist and state-national period. Yet there are earlier traditions of what we should probably generalise as `solidarity beyond frontiers' or `community across borders'. We cannot, for example, forget or ignore the *cosmopolitanism* of the European Enlightenment and the explicit or implicit *universalism* of the great religious traditions of West, South and East Asia. These traditions also had their agitators, agents and communicators. They have a continuing influence in or on contemporary internationalisms (including, of course, conservative, authoritarian and even totalitarian ones). If we consider only the immediate precursors of 19th century internationalism, we will find both the *liberal-bourgeois cosmopolitan* and the *radical-democratic* (though not necessarily pluralistic) one. The word `cosmopolitan' is not, as might appear, of Greek origin. It was an 18th century attempt to give a secular liberal universalism some classical European licence. The radical-democratic universalism, which preceded socialist and labour internationalism, certainly itself drew from both the cultural cosmopolitanism of its bourgeois-liberal predecessor and from the ethical universalism of Judaeo-Christian religious tradition. The internationalism of Marx and Engels is clearly and powerfully marked both by European cosmopolitanism and Judaeo-Christian universalism.

The contemporary *communicator*, it seems to me, must either implicitly or explicitly choose between such elements and traditions, as well as clarifying the novelty of her/his own status. I would argue that this status *is or should be* radically new. If globalisation seems to merely universalise and intensify the (inter-)relations of capital and state, and therefore to geographically universalise, socially generalise and also subjectively intensify the contradictions of capitalism and modernity, informatisation represents an *epochal* transformation, in which age-old divisions and hierarchies are put into question. Informatisation/computerisation not only undermines divisions between the economic, political and socio-cultural, it potentially breaks down the division between the verbal-rational and the audiovisual-affective modes of expression and communication. And it makes culture/communication increasingly central to social life. The failures of, or limitations on, past internationalisms were surely due to their failure to become culturally embedded.[23] *Internationalism*, as has already been suggested, is itself an essentially *political/territorial* notion that both politically and etymologically incorporates - and is thus

---

became an agent (Waterman 1993, Waterman 1998a:Postscript). On the social-democratic side, we should consider those who worked for the International Transportworkers' Federation in the 1930s-40s. These obviously acted as public agents of the ITF and/or their national unions. But they equally obviously were doing agitational work (often against the Comintern and its union operations). They were obliged, by fascism, to enter into clandestine solidarity activity. And then were eager recruits into the intelligence and espionage work of the Allied Powers during World War II. (Waterman 1998a:88-9).

[22] Thus, Rigoberta Menchu was not and is not simply a media icon. She was and is also an agitator and agent, working both to create and then to represent an internationalism for and of indigenous peoples. See further below.

[23] For a rare study of the popular base of, or response to, internationalism, see the study of Victor Silverman (1993) on British and US workers in the period 1939-49. Silverman reveals the complex, delicate and varied collective subjectivities underlying such popular internationalism as there was in a period of high international consciousness. For a related work, which considers internationalist consciousness as revealed by British union conferences and publications, see Vogler (1985).

dependent on - that which it aspires to surpass: the nation-state, nationalism, nationality. In so far as they gained influence or power, the old internationalisms tended to take shape in the political party or the mass organisation (at best representative-democratic) and the nation-state (at best liberal-democratic). Whatever the communicational/cultural achievements of past internationalisms (and they were very considerable), they tended to subordinate these to political ends. The *communicator*, however, operates primarily within communicational/cultural space. This is neither territorially limited nor organisationally controllable (which is not to deny the relative power over them of Walt Disney Inc., Bill Gates and the US state). The new radical-democratic internationalist *communicator* may work within or between nation-states and organisations, but s/he acts also as a subversive element within - or innovatory alternative to - such. How far, to paraphrase Hobsbawm, this possibility is felt to be compelling outside the cadre of contemporary internationalists is, of course, another question which awaits research.

Internationalists in the Americas: also agitators, agents and communicators?

Here are a few thumbnail sketches of, and reflections on, internationalists in the Americas. They are based on material I have immediate access to, and inspired by the concepts spelled out above. They include only one North American internationalist, with whom I managed to do a short taped interview. The cases do not include - because of unfamiliarity - the tradition of *bolivarismo*, a Latin American internationalism with a long history, which interpenetrates the others.[24] Many other individual internationalists or internationalisms are here ignored. Nor do the cases necessarily illustrate my typology (but this, it will be remembered, is not the purpose of the typology anyway).

Flora Tristan (1803-44) was a pioneering utopian socialist, feminist and traveller, of Franco-Peruvian origin, who voyaged to Peru in 1833-34, in an attempt to claim a share of her father's fortune. She wrote *L'Union ouvriere*, considered a forerunner of the 1848 *Communist Manifesto*, and *L'Emancipation de la femme*, an early feminist tract. It was not only Flora who imagined herself a saviour of suffering humanity. She lost her life whilst travelling in France to spread her doctrine amongst workers, who themselves considered her `the workers' saint'. Flora can be seen as both a representative of European cosmopolitanism and a forerunner of labour and socialist internationalism. Her *Peregrinations of a Pariah* is the work of a cultured European traveller rather than anything reflecting *solidarity* with any non-elite Peruvians. Her earlier *Necessity for a Warm Welcome for Foreign Women*, however, also makes her a precursor of feminist internationalism. Her later *Workers Union*, is expressed in universalistic language, which, in classically European cosmopolitan style, ignores rather than confronts relations between nations and nationalities. In her later years she also spoke out against racial discrimination. Flora was nothing if not an agitator for her radically democratic and cosmopolitan ideals. In Peru she has been adopted into the national pantheon, and is memorised in the name of one of its major, internationalist, feminist centres. Her existence reminds us that our subject matter must be internationalists in (or and) the Americas rather than American internationalists. (See the introduction to Tristan 1986, Billington 1980:487-8).

---

[24] I have spent some time searching the bookshops and electronic databases for general work on *bolivarismo* and related categories, both in English and in Spanish. I am convinced that this exists, and therefore assume I am searching with the wrong keywords. The help of readers of this piece would be both gratefully received and acknowledged.

Pablo Neruda (1904-73) is not only the outstanding national poet of Chile but also of Latin America, and a major figure in 20th century poetry more generally. Neruda was the son of a railway worker, entered the bohemian world of Santiago, travelled the Americas, Asia and Europe, either as a lowly-paid consul, an internationally-hunted exile, or as an official ambassador and honoured poet. Always identified with the poor and (semi-)colonised, Neruda's poems sing of the nature, culture, history and poor of Chile, Latin America and the world. Much of his work is a poetic journalism, speaking for and to the poor, the rebellious and their revolutionary leaders. His involvement in the Spanish Civil War confirmed his movement toward Communism. He organised international artistic solidarity events and the rescue of those who were trying to escape from Franco. Through his travels he met numerous radical intellectuals and artists, as well as leading nationalist and revolutionary leaders and statesmen. In 1945 he read a poem of praise to the newly-released Communist leader, Luis Carlos Prestes (see below), in front of a crowd of 100,000 in a Brazilian stadium. In Chile he was a national political figure as well as an artistic one, identified with successive leftwing regimes there. He was active in the post-war conferences of the (Communist) World Peace Council. Neruda received a Stalin Peace Prize (Communist alternative to the Nobel Prize) at the instance, he proudly suggests, of Stalin himself. Later he became a member of the now-renamed Lenin Peace Prize Committee, which continued to serve as an instrument of Soviet policy. Neruda finally received the expected Nobel Prize for literature in 1971. He wrote poems of praise to the Soviet Union and Stalin, and was critical of both China and Mao. Even at the end of his life, and after the Soviet invasion of Prague, he only marginally qualified his identification with Communism. Neruda's continental and global vision, his republican nationalism and cosmopolitanism, his combination of the artistic life with political activity, of the politics of movements with those of the state, ensure that he rises above and survives the party with which he was identified. He was a successor to the great cultural cosmopolitan travellers of the 18th and 19th centuries (consider Lord Byron and his fatal voyage to aid Greece). His direct and simple mode of expression made his poetry accessible in translation beyond the Spanish-speaking world - and the traditional public for poetry. He was certainly an open agent of national and international Communism, but also an agitator for a humane and egalitarian world. He reminds us of the importance of a cultural cosmopolitanism to any internationalist project. (Neruda 1977, 1993).

Olga Benario (1908-43) was a militant and adventurous German Communist, who became a Soviet/Comintern *agent*, was appointed a bodyguard for the Brazilian Communist leader, Luis Carlos Prestes (with whom she fell in love), was involved in a disastrous Communist uprising in Brazil, 1935, was arrested and eventually sent back to Nazi Germany by the Getulio Vargas dictatorship, and was killed in prison in 1943. Whilst in prison in Brazil, an impressive international solidarity campaign was mounted which, whilst rescuing neither her nor him, succeeded in saving other refugees and suspected revolutionaries who the Vargas regime was trying to ship back to fascist states in Europe. As a woman revolutionary and internationalist, Olga has both predecessors and followers, both in Latin America and more widely, raising questions about the particular sphere of freedom that internationalist activity might have offered women. But she is also a typical *agent*, of either gender, in so far as she identified with her (inter)national party, and was both trained and dispatched by the Soviet party/state. The tragedy of Olga, it seems to me, was not only her involvement in the disastrously misjudged three-day attempted coup (reminding us of Prestes' background as a radical-nationalist military adventurer, for which see Post 1997:Chapter 4), nor her murder by the Nazis. It was the reconciliation of

Prestes with Vargas, consequent on the latter breaking with the Axis powers in 1942, modifying his dictatorship, restoring relations with the Soviet government, and thus enabling the Brazilian Communist Party to get a respectable percentage of the vote in forthcoming elections. After her death Olga had seven streets and 91 schools, factories and workers' brigades named after her in the no-longer-existing German Democratic Republic. She also has one such street in a city in the state of Sao Paulo. Curiously, she is excluded from the official German Democratic handbook on the international labour movement (Institut fuer Marxismus-Leninismus 1986). Her fate was not unlike that of many internationalists of the period of nation-state based capitalist development. Others were even less fortunate, being denounced or persecuted not only by the enemy but the state/party they served (Billington 1980, Caballero 1986, Hooks 1993, Morais 1990, Porter 1988, Post 1997, Trepper 1977).

Che Guevara (1928-67) is not only the most famous revolutionary internationalist activist of this century but is also considered something of a theorist of internationalism.[25] Yet, whilst he wrote extensively about Latin America, the Third World, imperialism, revolution and international economic, political and military relations, he seems to have rarely addressed himself to the concept of internationalism and, where he did so, tended to conflate `ties of proletarian internationalism' with support for - evidently non-proletarian - `wars of liberation' (quoted Gott 1996:34). Initially an adventurer, who travelled the sub-continent, Che, an Argentinean, was inspired by the *bolivarista* tradition, and threw himself into the struggle to defend the radical-nationalist Arbenz regime in Guatemala against a US-backed military coup (1953). He then became involved in the Cuban Revolution and was a leading figure in the new revolutionary government. Along the way he became a convinced Marxist-Leninist, though later critical of the Soviet variety. The combination of radical-nationalist *bolivarismo* and socialist Marxism-Leninism served well in contributing to the various *tercermundista* (thirdworldist) international(ist) projects produced in Cuba at this time. These ranged from the diplomatic, to the political-agitational, and, at the extreme, logistical/military/intelligence support to insurrectionary movements. Nor must we forget the cultural internationalism, of which the brilliant posters were just the best-known products. Che increasingly involved himself personally with such revolutionary movements, notably - and unsuccessfully - in the Congo (1965) and in Bolivia, where he met his death. Che, combining the youthful irreverence of the 1960s, the looks of a Dean or Brando and the aura of Jesus - was the outstanding international icon of the generation of 1968. Che was himself uneasy in the new Cuban state he had helped bring into existence and sought to contribute personally to a tricontinental insurrection. After his death, his tradition was continued by the Cuban party/state, in the person of Manuel `Barba Roja' Pineira. Later Cuba became increasingly involved in military aid to Third World regimes, some of a distinctly repressive, militaristic and even imperial nature. Che as icon lives on, as could be witnessed in streets and shacks on the 30th anniversary of his death in Latin America, 1997. He has also been the subject of two major biographies, both of which throw light on his internationalism. He may be the last great representative of insurrectionary nationalist internationalism. Yet Che, as portable and reproducible icon, also points forward to the communications internationalisms of the present day, for which the audio and visual count as much as the written and spoken. He, too, combines (or exchanges) the roles

[25] Thus the posthumous edited German collection, *Writings on Internationalism* (Guevara 1989) claims, on its back cover, that Che was an 'internationalist in theory and practice'. The book appears, however, to bear this word only in its title and on its cover, although the word `solidarity' (also unproblematised) does occasionally appear in the selected texts.

of *agitator* and *agent*. (Anderson 1997, Billington 1980, Castaneda 1993:51-89, Castaneda 1997, Dijk 1993, Keane 1995).

Chico Mendes (1941-88) was and remained an organiser of the rural poor in one of the most isolated areas of the world, but one increasingly afflicted by globalised exploitation and despoliation. He was trained by a Communist survivor of one of Brazil's waves of repression, listened to Radio Moscow, and became a rural labour organiser and ecological activist. He was associated with the wave of union organising that helped end Brazil's long period of brutal military rule, as with the Workers Party that came out of this and that remains a major force within national politics. Yet it was as an ecological activist that he became internationally known, being taken to the international stage by environmental movements active in the Amazon. Chico was one of a new generation of local heroes, enabled by international social movements, and the globalised media, to become an international one. Chico's life bridges the old social movements and the new, the old and new internationalisms. His growing international reputation was insufficient to protect him from the wrath of local land-owning and elite interests, who gunned him down and have never been indicted for the crime. He is one of the first of a new breed of 'local internationalists'. Hardly an internationalist *networker*, Chico certainly embodied and communicated the necessity for global solidarity. Ten years after his death the *New York Times* was recording his genius in reaching out to the global environmental movement, and the victory of the PT in his home state. (Mendes 1989, Revkin 1990, 1992, Schemo 1998).

Rigoberta Menchu (born 1959), a Guatemalan *indigena* and human-rights activist, stands in the footsteps of Che as a Latin American and international icon, but would seem otherwise as much a figure of our globalised and networked capitalism as he was of the industrialising and state-national one. She is, as was Chico Mendes, of popular and rural origin, adding to these brands those of woman and aboriginal. Where he was, however, ineffectively protected internationally, she has evidently been adequately so. As a noted figure on the international stage, even before her receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1992, she hardly fits the back-office, computer-operating, *networker* mould. But Rigoberta's activities and thoughts reveal the extent to which she incorporates many of those of her less-known opposite numbers. She also suggests the possibility of becoming a notable figure on the continental, international or global stage without losing local roots and relevance. Rigoberta was persecuted locally and nationally, has lived a life of forced exile, worked with refugees in Mexico, become aware of herself as a Mayan whilst living in Chiapas, Mexico. With the help of non-indigenous friends, organisations and churches, Guatemalan and foreign, she taught herself fluent Spanish and gained basic medical skills. She spent a number of years teaching herself how to operate within inter-state organisations and international NGOs, without necessarily succumbing - or subordinating herself - to their own myths and procedures. Along the way she has extended her interests, understandings and political demands to those of the women's, peace and ecological movements. Her second book is entitled *Crossing Borders*, but this title does not begin to suggest the extent to which it is not only about her activities but her reflections upon such. It is particularly in these chapters that we can find ideas common to the new internationalists/isms expressed in simple - but by no means simplistic - ways. All these come within her range: indigenous and minority cultures, human and democratic rights more generally, respect for differences (surprisingly or even shockingly encountered), identification with Muslim women in ex-Yugoslavia or indigenous minorities in South Asia, the necessity for multi-cultural nationalisms, environmentalism, a critical but engaged attitude toward modern technology (she travels with a laptop) and media, the rejection of ethnic or religious

fundamentalism. Rigoberta does not now identify herself with any national or international party - thereby having been apparently disregarded by the major Guatemalan guerrilla movement she once identified with. Again in tune with the new internationalisms, Rigoberta does not hold back in this book from critical self-reflection, either personal or in relation to indigenous peoples and movements. Rigoberta has used her international fame and fortune to create a foundation in her own name (of which we are only provided glimpses). She has turned herself from a victim of local, national and global forces into a protagonist of another kind of local, national, regional and global order. (Menchu 1998a).

Steve Zeltzer (born 1949) might be somewhat embarrassed to find himself in such illustrious company.[26] He is a skilled engineering worker, married to a Japanese woman who shares his political views and takes part in much of his activity. Steve lives between a largely Latino main street and a pleasant middle-class area of the San Francisco peninsular. His house overflows with left and union books and papers about or from a dozen countries, with ageing audiovisual and computer equipment, as well as with Japanese, African, Latin American and other artistic objects he and Kuzmi have collected. The kitchen is pungent with the Japanese food she still evidently favours. Upstairs there is a mattress on the floor of the spare room, ready for the visiting comrade from Russia (or The Netherlands). Steve is a third generation leftist, both his father and his grandfather (a Russian Jewish immigrant) having been active in labour politics, organising or protest. He began to be politically active at high school. He studied history and economics during the heady late-1960s, being involved in an anti-Vietnam War strike at San Francisco State University - and has an old newspaper clipping and photo to prove it. As a militant socialist, he wanted to become involved in labour struggles and found himself a job on the waterfront (where the radical and internationalist International Longshore Workers' Union was and is active). He then worked as a university librarian, being involved in a strike, before qualifying himself as an engineer. He has long been a member of one of America's tiny vanguardist socialist parties and is currently a union shopsteward.

Steve works at his job 40 hours a week, carrying out his political activities evenings and weekends. He says he became a Marxist and an internationalist already at high school and university in the heady 1960s. As a Trotskyist he considered the workers' struggle an international one. His early solidarity activities, in the 1980s, included support for Turkish comrades and for the release from prison of South African union leader, Moses Mayekiso. He was active in a campaign to prevent US intervention in the Middle East - a controversial issue given the widespread Zionism of US Jews and the pro-Israeli position of many US unions. His Latin American contacts are limited. He has been able to publicise videos of labour struggles in Peru and Mexico. But he points to the language problem (his?) in developing work with Latin America, as well as to the low level of labour media work there compared with Japan and Korea. He is, however, aware of such activity in Brazil, having learned of this through video.

If Steve is known nationally and internationally, it is because of his work with the San Francisco-based LaborNet website, because of his work with a national organisation of union

[26] I have known Steve since I first attending a LabourTech Conference in San Francisco 1992, meeting him again at similar events, such as Moscow 1993 and Seoul 1997. My comments here therefore draw on more than my 1998 interview alone. As someone who abandoned his own vanguardism 30 years or more ago, I felt an initial reluctance to interview, as a communications internationalist, someone who reproduces the socialist myths of 50 years ago! The reason why I nonetheless did so will become apparent.

communicators, UPPNET, and - above all - because of his sponsorship of the international LabourTech conferences. It was in the early-70s that he first became convinced of the necessity for labour to get on TV. In 1983 he was co-responsible for setting up the first labour programme on cable TV in the US. This had some international coverage. The Labour Video Project now has some 10 people involved, making contributions to the fortnightly programme. It has produced videos about South Africa and other countries and broadcast numerous foreign labour videos. He considers it important to simply show US workers how workers live and struggle abroad. Steve is interested in labour making use of an interface between video and the internet, thus permitting the rapid and cheap exchange of labour videos internationally. In 1991 Steve was the main figure behind the first LabourTech conference, bringing together video, radio and computer. He invited to the conference people both from the centre and the periphery of the labour movement, both academics and activists, both from the US and internationally. LabourTech conferences have been held in San Francisco, in Minneapolis, in Vancouver and in Moscow. Steve played a major role in the LabourMedia conference held in Korea, late-1997. Also present were labour media specialists from South Africa, East Asia, Canada and the US, the UK and other countries. South Korean labour-support groups and unions here first demonstrated both their interest and capacity to play an active role in international labour communication. The first East Coast labour and electronic media conference was to be held January 1999 in New York, with Steve and others from his international.

It was in the 1970s also that Steve became aware of the Institute for Global Communication (better known nationally through its PeaceNet, internationally through the Association of Progressive Communications). This has been one of the main bases of and stimuli for movement-oriented computer communications internationally. Out of APC/IGC came the formation of LaborNet, still one of the largest labour computer networks in the US. Steve is also a familiar figure on the left within Bay Area. He made the first computer contact between the Liverpool dockworkers and the San Francisco longshoreworkers. He is involved with the LaborFest, held every July, which commemorates the great San Francisco strike of 1934, and provides an opportunity for an international labour video festival. UPPNET, as a network of labour video and radio programmers, has become a national and even international network. It collaborates with people in Canada, South Korea and Japan. It produced *All for One*, a video about international solidarity with the Liverpool dockers' strike (1995-8).

Steve holds to the principles of labour internationalism he developed as a young Trotskyist in the 1970s. He sees globalisation and the new information technology as both requiring and making possible the Marxist ideal. The main difference he notes between the old left internationalism and the new one is precisely the new communications technologies. He sees these as tools and channels making possible a democratic labour internationalism and solidarity threatening not only capital, state and US world domination but also the traditional labour bureaucracies. These he sees as highly dependent on both nationalism and the control of information. Yet the working class, as an international class, and as those responsible for production and consumption, need to be able to control these internationally as well. Whilst he recognises the other new internationalisms, such as those of the ecological movement and women, and their use of the new technologies, it is obviously that of labour which he considers the most important. Speaking of communications and internationalism he says:

> I think it is the cutting edge. I do think that if you are an internationalist - if you consider yourself an internationalist - you cannot be without being a communications internationalist. So in that sense, it's actually critical to be into communications, at least with the computer on the internet. You have to use the tools of telecommunications to be a real internationalist. And whether you like it or not that is the reality. (Zeltzer Interview 1999)

Conclusion: holding up a mirror to a model

There are more things on earth and in cyberspace than are dreamed of in our discourses. It is therefore time for at least some rapid reflections on the relationship between the model offered and the cases sketched.

First our historical cases. I have already commented on the relationship between Flora and Neruda, on the one hand, and a liberal cosmopolitanism on the other. The same is, however, also partly true for Che. Although he is evidently someone of my second period and someone who could still be alive today (like Fidel Castro), he seems to me a 20th century bearer of a much older radical-democratic, cosmopolitan and insurrectionary internationalist tradition. This is well represented historically by 1) Tom Paine (1737-1809), the Englishman who threw himself successively into the American and French Revolutions, and who was known in the Caribbean (Dyck 1993, Keane 1995), and 2) Giuseppe Garibaldi (1807-82), an Italian who organised a guerrilla war for the liberation and unification of Italy in the 1860s, after having also fought for the independence of Uruguay (Billington 1980). Their hopes and struggles for universal justice found expression in the creation of modern liberal (and either more or less democratic) nation states. We may here have recourse to the notion of 'mixed times' (Calderon 1994) offered as a way of understanding a contemporary Latin America that is simultaneously premodern, modern and postmodern. This notion is subversive of the evolutionary typology it reproduces, suggesting a dialectical understanding of history, and an appreciation of what the past can offer both present and future. Che, representing a charismatic and heroic nationalist internationalism (Latin American or Third Worldist), burst upon a world in which the reproduction of a European state-building, industrialising nationalism was not only blocked (by transnational capitalism and Western military power). It was also a world in which new social movements were beginning to question statism, nationalism, militarism, industrialism and *machismo*. Yet the notion of a Latin American (or wider) identity and community, and of a total personal commitment to such, is one which remains to be realised and which certainly still has some appeal in Latin America.

I have treated Olga Benario as a second period agent. These tended to be subordinated to organisations and institutions that required loyal representatives - whether legal or clandestine. It is not universally true that such people lacked personal autonomy (take the critically-minded US citizen, Joseph Freedman (1938), who worked for the Comintern). But Olga appears to have been overwhelmed by the insurrectionary nationalism of Luis Carlos Prestes and his comrades, on the one hand, and the (from time to time) insurrectionary internationalism of the Soviet Union/Comintern, on the other. Additionally, as I have already suggested, she draws our attention to the particular attractions of internationalism - and clandestinity - for women.[27] The international

[27] Consider Tamara 'Tania' Bunker, who worked and died with Che. She was another clandestine agent of my second period in so far as she collaborated firstly with internal state security in the German Democratic Republic, then with its foreign

provided and sometimes still provides a space of relative freedom for women (Waterman 1998a:Ch. 6). This understanding provides a link back, or sideways, to the woman cosmopolitan or traveller. It also points us forward to the internationalism of those US women who provided the majority in the Central America peace movement (Smith 1996), and, of course, to feminist internationalists in the Americas (Alvarez 1997, Randall 1992:13-39, Vargas 1996, 1998).

Neither Rigoberta nor Chico may be the kind of person who springs to mind as an active agent of internationalism in the present era. I have myself been thinking more of those operating more modestly, or out of the public eye. These are exemplified, perhaps, by the earlier-mentioned Manuel Pineira (and his *muchachos* machos). The sketches above, however, do remind us that the creation of an internationalist culture has, till now, required both exemplary public figures and spectacle (combined in Pablo Neruda's 1945 poem to Luis Carlos Prestes, read before tens of thousands in a Brazilian stadium. See Neruda 1991:144-6). This may also seem to be the case in our present epoch, marked, as it is, by an increasing loss of respect for elite figures, whether from politics, the churches or elsewhere, and the increasing centrality of the newspaper, movie, TV or musical spectacle. In the UK, and elsewhere, the playgirl but dissident Princess Diana (and her work for the poor and rejected (inter)nationally!) became, dramatically, if momentarily, invested with public virtue. In the same year, for different people in other places, the dying Mother Teresa filled this role.[28] The existence of icons, however, is inevitably connected with the creation of both myths and worship. If they encourage idolatry they also provoke iconoclasm, neither of which would seem helpful to the creation of a friendly exchange between different-but-equals that a global solidarity culture would seem to require.

The cases of Chico and Rigoberta also raise the question of the class/social origin, occupation and lifestyle of internationalists. Most 19th and early 20th century socialist internationalists were, like Marx, Engels, Lenin, and the Peruvian Jose Carlos Mariategui, from the intellectual and/or cultural elite, however modest their origins or restricted their lifestyles. The skilled English engineering worker, Tom Mann (Tsuzuki 1991), is one famous exception, in so far as he customarily travelled with the tools of his trade, harking back to a pre-industrial world of wage labour; and his later Communism might have insured against him becoming, in the inter-war period, a comfortably-paid international bureaucrat. The much-travelled left-nationalist Latin American revolutionaries of the era of Che were customarily from the educated classes (an exception might be Pineiro's *muchachos*).[29] In so far as Rigoberta takes part in (inter)national political life, she is surrounded by a lifestyle customarily enjoyed by an educated, urban and

---

intelligence operations, later transferring her loyalty to the Cuban security, which approved her collaboration with Che (Anderson 1997:549-51, Anon 1970).

[28] Sanctified, even before death, by a large part of the world media, Mother Teresa turns out to be a dubious, devious and even Machiavellian figure. She was devoted to the unborn and dead rather than the living - or even the dying for whose supposed care she became famous. She also cultivated the rich and powerful, with no particular concern for their peace-loving or democratic credentials (they included the Duvaliers in Haiti, Margaret Thatcher in the UK and by Enver Hoxa's Communist heir in her native Albania). Mother Teresa has more than a casual relationship to our subject. She got the Nobel Peace Prize three years before Rigoberta Menchu, in 1989, presenting her pacifist credentials as resting on her opposition to abortion. She was both an icon and mediator of the North-South relation: 'The rich world likes and wishes to believe that someone, somewhere, is doing something for the Third World. For this reason, it does not inquire too closely into the motives or practices of anyone who fulfills, however vicariously, this mandate. The great white hope meets the great black hole' (Hitchens 1996:49-50).

[29] These seem to be demanding liberation from my parentheses, but they will have to await a further paper

cosmopolitan elite. The question is whether, today, computerised and globalised communication and culture will make possible a matching/opposed *democratisation* of internationalism. Can it, in other words, make internationalism part of daily life for the popular sectors?

There are here at least two aspects for consideration: the first is of the extent to which the common people *can* take control of an internationalism that traditionally speaks for them; the second, the extent to which it can take place where they live, work and - often prematurely, sometimes violently - die. Whilst it is evident that a GNC is being shaped by and for globalised and networked capitalists, the technologies these dominate do allow for both democratisation and localisation. In so far as the new global solidarities need to be both borne by the relevant collective social subjects (workers, lesbians, consumers) and expressed locally (in Liverpool, UK or Chiapas, Mexico), if they are to be both meaningful and effective, such possibilities surely need to be realised (Lipschutz 1996).

This leads me, finally, to the case of Steve Zeltzer, the one live, back-office, internationalist in the set, the only one interviewed in the light of my paperHe reminds us, firstly, that internationalists in the Americas do not necessarily confine themselves or even concentrate on internationalism *in* the Americas. Steve, secondly, shows how it is possible to have quite traditional views on internationalism whilst acting effectively in the present (mixed times?). He is not the only such case I know, particularly amongst those involved precisely with labour internationalism. I know a number of (ex-) vanguardist socialists who are active as communications internationalists. Like some of the others I am acquainted with outside the Americas, Steve has thrown himself enthusiastically, and with some technical competence, into the new mediated world order. If these men have little feeling for the new social subjects and their internationalisms (particularly women and feminism), they all see the new media as a privileged space for creating an internationalism for labour. Steve is, again, not the only one of them who sees the electronic media as `tools' or `channels' - as means to a previously known end. Whilst having a strong feeling for the democratic potential of the electronic media, and whilst evidently themselves here discovering a privileged space for internationalist self-expression, they do not necessarily consider that what is created in this space might be subversive of the old labour and socialis internationalism. How is it possible that Steve nonetheless makes a valuable contribution – and even plays an innovating role - in the advancement of the new internationalism? I believe this has to do with something which does not come out of the interview: a certain type of personality and a way of relating to others. Steve combines great energy, a devotion to his work, technical competence in carrying it out, and a capacity to relate to a broad range of people within the labour movement. Whilst he is not averse to plugging, in international events, his own particular political line, he has evidently won the respect of even those very US labour bureaucrats he most berates!

It seems - and with this thought we must bring the paper to an end - that the creation of a new internationalism requires not so much the right ideology but a particular kind of behaviour, a way of relating to other people, and to their ideas. A communications internationalism is not simply an internationalism that *uses* the media or communicates *through* it - even if this might be the way that Steve and his fellows see the matter. A communications internationalism is also an internationalism that *communicates* in the sense of *creating a sense of community*. And here we return to the necessity and possibility of a growing number of ordinary citizens of all the Americas (armed with information, disposed to tolerance and flexibility, culturally sensitive, equipped with

technology, committed ethically) creating global solidarity communities of their own. In order to achieve this, we need to show people internationalist activists to whom their response *may be* `I admire her/him', but *must be* `I should do that', `I could do that' and even `I would enjoy doing that'.

References and additional bibliography

Aceituno, Luis. Interview with Arturo Taracena (trans. Jill Robert). 1999. Forwarded email received January 25.

Archibugi, Daniele, Held, David and Koehler, Martin (eds.). 1998. *Re-imagining Political Community*. Cambridge: Polity. 352 pp.

Alvarez, Sonia. 1997. `Latin American Feminisms "Go Global": Trends of the 1990s and Challenges for the New Millenium', in Alvarez, Sonia, Dagnino, Evelina and Escobar, Arturo (ed.), *Cultures of Politics Politics of Cultures: Revisioning Latin-American Social Movements*. Boulder: Westview. Pp. 293-324.

Alvarez, Sonia, Dagnino, Evelina and Escobar, Arturo (ed.). 1997. *Cultures of Politics Politics of Cultures: Revisioning Latin American Social Movements*. Boulder: Westview. 459 pp.

Anderson, Jon Lee. 1997. *Che Guevara: A Revolutionary Life*. London: Bantam. 814 pp.

Anon. 1970. *Tania, la guerilla inolvidable* (with preface by Inti Peredo). Havana: n.p.

Appiah, Kwame and Gates, Henry (ed.). 1997. *The Dictionary of Global Culture*. New York: Knopf. 717 pp.

Barrios Chungara, Domitila. 1979. *Let Me Speak!*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Billington, James. 1980. *Fire in the Minds of Men: Origins of the Revolutionary Faith*. London: Temple Smith. 677 pp.

Brecher, Jeremy and Costello, Tim. 1994. *Global Village or Global Pillage: Economic Reconstruction from the Bottom Up*. Boston: South End. 237 pp.

Buhle, Mari Jo, Buhle, Paul and Georgakas, Dan (eds.). 1992. *Encylopaedia of the American Left*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 928 pp.

Burbeck, Roger and Orlando Nunez. 1987a. *Democracia y revolucion*. Managua:n.p.

Burbeck, Roger and Orlando Nunez. 1987b. *Fire in the Americas: Forging a Revolutionary Agenda*. London: Verso. 109 pp.

Caballero, Manuel. 1986. *Latin America and the Comintern 1919-1943*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 213 pp.

Calderon, Fernando. 1994. `America Latina: Identidad y tiempos mixtos - O como tratar de pensar la modernidad sin dejar de ser indios' [Latin America: Identity and Mixed Times - Or How to Think about Modernity without Ceasing to be Indians]. in Calderon, Fernando (ed.), *Cultura, estetica y politica en America Latina*. Caracas: CENDES. p.89-98.

Castaneda, Jorge. 1993. `The Cuban Crucible' in *Utopia Unarmed: The Latin American Left After the Cold War*. New York: Knopf. Pp. 51-89.

Castaneda, Jorge. 1997. *Companero: The Life and Death of Che Guevara*. New York: Knopf. 352 pp.

Castaneda, Jorge. 1997. *Companero: La Vida y Muerte del Che Guevara*. New York: Vintage. 400 pp.

Castells, Manuel. 1996-8. *The Information Age: Economy,Society and Culture*. 3 Vols. Oxford: Blackwell. 1,435 pp.

Chase-Dunn, Christopher. 1998. `Globalisation from Below in Guatemala', see under General/Papers on the Global Solidarity Site (Resources below).

Chronicle of Higher Education. 1999. http://www.chronicle.com/colloquy/99/menchu.

Crittenden, Ann. 1988. *Sanctuary: A Story of American Conscience and Law in Collision*. New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson. 410 pp.

Dennis, Peggy. 1977. *The Autobiography of an American Communist: A Personal View of a Political Life 1925-1975*. New York: Lawrence Hill. 302 pp.

Dyck, Ian. 1993. `Local Attachments, National identities and World Citizenship in the Thought of Thomas Paine', *History Workshop*, No. 35, pp. 117-35.

Eisenstein, Zillah. 1998. *Global Obscenities: Patriarchy, Capitalism and the Lure of Cyberfantasy* New York: New York University Press. 214pp.

Epstein, Barbara. 1998. `Interpreting the World (Without Necessarily Changing It), *New Politics*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (Winter).

Fernandez Garcia, Dina. 1998. `Stoll "No busco hundir a Menchu". El libro de David Stoll sobre Rigoberta Menchu sacudira los estudios sobre Latin America' (Stoll: "I am not trying to destroy Menchu". The Book of David Stoll on Rigoberta Menchu Shakes Latin American Studies', *Prensa Libre* (Guatemala City), December 18.

Freedman, Joseph. 1938. *An American Testament: A Narrative of Rebels and Romantics*. London: Left Books. 576 pp.

French, John, Cowie, Jefferson and Littlehale, Scott. 1994. `Labour and NAFTA: A Briefing Book'. Unpublished (Centre for Labour Research and Studies, Florida International University). 272 pp.

Foner, Philip. 1981. *British Labour and the American Civil War*. New York: Holmes and Meier. 135 pp.

Fox, Jonathon and Brown, David. 1998. *The Struggle for Accountability: The World Bank, NGOs, and the Grassroots Movements*. Boston: MIT Press.

Galeano, Eduardo. 1999. 'Disparen sobre Rigoberta' (They are Firing at Rigoberta), *Brecha: Nueva Edicion Internet* (Uruguay). January 15.

Garcia Castro, Mary. 1998. 'The Cooking - Vocabulary of Motifs - Not Dealt with but that are Part of the Text (The Food)'. Paper to Conference on Transnational Organising in the Americas, Hemispheric Dialog Program, University of California, Santa Cruz, December. 9 pp.

Gott, Richard. 1996. 'Che Guevara and the Congo', *New Left Review*, No. 220, pp. 3-35.

Gerassi, John (ed.). 1971. *The Coming of the New International*. New York: World. 610 pp.

Girard, Bruce (ed.). 1992. *A Passion for Radio: Radio Waves and Community*. Montreal: Black Rose. 212 pp.

Grandin, Greg and Francisco Goldman. 1999. (Forwarded email received 28 January).

Guattari, Felix. 1998. 'La produccion de subjetividad del capitalismo mundial integrado' (The Production of Subjectivity by an Integrated Global Capitalism', in *El Devenir de la Subjetividad*. Caracas/Santiago de Chile: Dolmen Ediciones. Pp. 25-40.

Gugelberger, Georg (ed.). 1996. *The Real Thing: Testimonial Discourse and Latin America*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Gugelberger, Georg. 1998. 'Remembering: The Post-*Testimonio* Memoirs of Rigberta Menchu Tum', *Latin American Perspectives*, Vol. 25, No. 6, pp. 62-8.

Guevara, Ernesto Che. 1989. *Schriften zum Internationalismus*. (Writings on Internationalism). Koln: Pahl-Rugenstein. 244 pp.

Harrison, Royden. 1957. 'British Labour and the Confederacy', *International Review of Social History*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 78-105.

Harrison, Royden. 1965. 'British Labour and American Slavery', in Harrison, Royden, *Before the Socialists: Studies in Labour and Politics, 1861-81*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp. 40-72.

Harcourt, Wendy (ed.). 1999. *Women @ Internet: Creating New Cultures in Cyberspace*. London: Zed. 256 pp.

Harvey, David. 1996. *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hitchens, Christopher. 1996. *The Missionary Position: Mother Teresa in Theory and Practice*. London: Zed Press. 98 pp.

Hobsbawm, Eric. 1988. 'Opening Address: Working-Class Internationalism', in Holthoon, F. van and Linden, M. van der (ed.), *Internationalism in the Labour Movement 1830-1940*. Leiden: Brill. Pp. 1-18.

Hooks, Margaret. 1993. *Tina Modotti: Photographer and Revolutionary*. London: Pandora. 296 pp.

Hunter, Allen. 1995. 'Globalisation from Below? Promises and Perils of the New Internationalism', *Social Policy*, Vol. 25, No. 4, Summer, pp. 6-13.

Institut fuer Marxismus-Leninismus beim ZK der SED. 1986. *Geschichte der internationalen Arbeiterbewegung in Daten* (History of the International Labour Movement in Dates). Berlin: Dietz Verlag. 868 pp.

Keane, John. 1995. *Tom Paine: A Political Life*. London: Bloomsbury. 644 pp.

Keck, Margaret and Sikkink, Kathryn. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 227 pp.

Lancaster, Roger. 1998. 'To the New York Times: On Rigoberta Menchu's Autobiography'. (Email received 16 December).

Lauer, Mirko. 1999. 'Observador: Quien es ella? Rigoberta Menchu se queda sin autobiografia? (Observer: Who is she? Rigoberta Menchu Remains Without a Name) *La Republica* (Lima), 31 January. <http://www.larepublica.com.pe/>

Lee, Eric. 1997. *The Labour Movement and the Internet: The New Internationalism*. London: Pluto. 212 pp.

Lipschutz, Ronnie (with Judith Mayer). 1996. *Global Civil Society and Global Environmental Governance: The Politics of Nature from Place to Planet*. Albany (NY): State University of New York Press. 365 pp.

Lynch, Cecelia. 1998. 'Social Movements and the Problem of Globalisation', *Alternatives*, Vol. 23, pp. 149-73.

Manalansan IV, Martin. 1997. 'In the Shadows of Stonewall: Examining Gay Transnational Politics and the Diasporic Dilemma', in Lowe, Lisa and Lloyd, David (ed.), *The Politics of Culture in the Shadow of Capital*. Durham: Duke University Press. Pp. 485-505.

Mariategui, Jose Carlos. 1973. 'Internacionalismo y nacionalismo' [Internationalism and nationalism], in Jose Carlos Mariategui, *Historia de la crisis mundial: Conferencias anos 1923 y 1924*. Lima: Amauta, pp. 156-65.

Menchu, Rigoberta. 1987. *I, Rigoberta Menchu, An Indian Woman in Guatemala*. London: Verso. 1987.

Menchu, Rigoberta. 1998a. *Crossing Borders*. London: Verso. 242 pp.

Menchu, Rigoberta. 1998b. *Rigoberta: La nieta de los Mayas* [Rigoberta: Granddaughter of the Mayas]. Madrid: El Pais/Aguilar. 348 pp.

Mendes, Chico. 1989. 'Peasants Speak: Chico Mendes - The Defence of Life', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 160-76.

Meyer, Birgit and Geschiere, Peter (eds.). 1998. 'Globalisation and Identity: Dialectics of Flows and Closures', *Development and Change*. Vol. 29, No. 4 (October), 601-928.

Mires, Fernando. 1991. 'La crisis del internacionalismo' [The Crisis of Internationalism], *Servicio Mensual de Informacion y Documentacion ALAI*, Quito, No. 113, pp. 17-20.

Moody, Kim. 1997. *Workers in a Lean World: Unions in the International Economy*. London: Verso. 342 pp.

Morais, Fernando. 1990. *Olga: The 'Gift' to Hitler*. London: Halban. 245 pp.

NACLA Report. 1995. 'Reinventing Solidarity' (Special Section), *NACLA Report on the Americas*, Vol. 28, No. 5, March-April. Pp. 15-48.

Neruda, Pablo. 1977. *Memoirs*. London: Souvenir. 370 pp.

Neruda, Pablo. 1993. *Canto General*. Berkeley: California University Press. 407 pp.

Newsletter of International Labour Studies. 1989. 'USA: Beyond Trade Union Imperiali$m', *Newsletter of International Labour Studies* (Special Double Issue). Nos. 40-41. 53pp.

Ortiz, Humberto and Ismael Munoz (eds.). 1998. *Globalizacion de la solidaridad: Un reto para todos (Simposio internacional)* (The Globalisation of Solidarity: A Challenge to All (International Symposium). Lima: Grupo Internacional Economia Solidaria/Centro de Estudios y Publicaciones. 496 pp.

Portella de Castro, Maria Silvia and Achim Wachendorfer (eds.). 1998. *Sindicalismo y globalizacion: La dolorosa insercion en u mundo incierto* (Unionism and Globalisation: The Painful Entry into an Uncertain World). Caracas: Nueva Sociedad. 352 pp.

Pollack, Aaron. 1998. 'Toward "A World in Which Many Worlds Fit": The Importance of the Zapatista Army of National Liberation for International Organising', Research Paper, MA in Politics of Alternative Development Strategies, Institute of Social Studies, The Hague. 119 pp.

Porter, Cathy. 1988. *Larissa Reisner*. London: Virago. 195 pp.

Post, Ken. 1997. *Revolution's Other World: Communism and the Periphery, 1917-39*. London: Macmillan. 219 pp.

Randall, Margaret. 1992. *Gathering Rage: The Failure of the 20th Century Revolutions to Develop a Feminist Agenda*. New York: Monthly Review. 192 pp.

Rarihowkwats. 1999. 'Where Does the Truth Lie: A Response to the Debate Surrounding Rigoberta Menchu'. Cultural Survival International Website (see below).

Revkin, Andrew. 1990. *The Burning Season: The Murder of Chico Mendes and the Fight for the Amazon Rain Forest*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Revkin, Andrew. 1992. *Chico Mendes: Su lucha y su muerte por la defensa de la selva amazonica* (Chico Mendes: His Struggle and His Death in Defence of the Amazon Forest). Mexico DF: Paidos. 253 pp.

Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins. 1998. 'Cybercultural Politics: Political Activism at a Distance in a Transnational World', in Alvarez, Sonia, Dagnino, Evelina and Escobar, Arturo (ed.), *Cultures of Politics Politics of Cultures: Revisioning Latin-American Social Movements*. Boulder: Westview. Pp. 325-52.

Ridenour, Ron. 1986. *Yankee Sandinistas: Interviews with North Americans Living and Working in the New Nicaragua*. Willimantic (CT): Curbstone Press. 175 pp.

Schemo, Diana Jean. 1998. 'A Crusader's Legacy Blurs in Brazil's Bitter Politics', *New York Times*, 27 December.

Rohter, Larry. 1998. 'Special Report: Tarnished Laureate: Nobel Winner Accused of Stretching Truth in Her Autobiography', *New York Times*, December 15.

Silverman, Victor. 1993. 'Popular Bases of the International Labor Movement in the United States and Britain 1939-1949', *International Review of Social History*, Vol. 38, pp. 303-20.

Shailor, Barbara. 1998. 'A New Internationalism: Advancing Workers' Rights in the Global Economy', in Jo-Ann Mort (ed.), *Not Your Father's Union Movement: Inside the AFL-CIO*. London/New York: Verso. 237 pp.

Smith, Christian. 1996. *Resisting Reagan: The US Central America Peace Movement*. Chicago: Chicago University Press. 464 pp.

Smith, Jackie, Chatfield, Charles and Pagnucco, Ron. 1997 (ed.). *Transnational Social Movements and World Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press. 311 pp.

Sousa Santos, Boaventura de. 1995. *Toward a New Common Sense: Law, Science and politics in the Paradigmatic Transition*. New York: Routledge.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1988. 'Can the Subaltern Speak?', in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Stoll, David. 1998. *Rigoberta Menchu and the Story of all Poor Guatemalans*. Boulder: Westview. 336 pp.

Thede, Nancy and Ambrosi, Alain (ed.). 1991. *Video the Changing World*. Montreal: Black Rose. 224 pp.

Trepper, Leopold. 1977. *The Great Game*. London: Michael Joseph.

Tristan, Flora. 1986. *Peregrinations of a Pariah*. London: Virago. 312 pp.

Trouw. 1998. `"Rigoberta's Niet-Gebeurd is al te Waar"' (What Did Not Happen to Rigoberta is Only Too True), *Trouw*, 17 December 1998.

Tsuzuki, Chushichi. 1991. *Tom Mann, 1856-1941: The Challenges of Labour*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 288 pp.

Vargas, Virginia. 1996. `International Feminist Networking and Solidarity: Toward the VII Latin American and Caribbean Feminist Gathering, Chile, 1996', *Occasional Paper*, No. 9, Women Living Under Muslim Laws. 16pp.

Vargas, Virginia. 1998. `Los feminismos latinoamericanos construyendo los espacios Transnacionales: La experiencia de Beijing - Reflexiones en proceso (Latin American Feminisms Constructing Transnational Spaces: The Experience of Beijing - Reflections Underway'. Paper to Conference on Transnational Organising, Hemispheric Dialogue Programme, University of California Santa Cruz. December.

Verso Books. 1998. `The Attack on Rigoberta Menchu', December 21. Verso Books Website, <http://www.versobooks.com/versobooks/>

Vogler, Carolyn. 1985. *The Nation State: the Neglected Dimension of Class*. London: Gower. 210 pp.

Waterman, Peter. 1992. `International Labour Communication by Computer: The Fifth International?', *Working Papers*, No. 129, Institute of Social Studies, The Hague. 80 pp.

Waterman, Peter. 1993. `Hopeful Traveller: The Itinerary of an Internationalist', *History Workshop*, No. 35, Spring, pp. 165-184.

Waterman, Peter. 1998a. *Globalisation, Social Movements and the New Internationalisms.* London: Mansell. 302 pp.

Waterman, Peter. 1998b. `Activists Beyond Borders and Theorists within Them'. (Review of Keck and Sikkink 1998). Unpublished. 7 pp.

Waterman, Peter. 1998c. `The Second Coming of Proletarian Internationalism? A Review of Recent Resources', *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.4, No.3, pp.349-77.

Waterman, Peter. Forthcoming. `The Brave New World of Manuel Castells: What on Earth (or in the Ether) is Going On?'. *Development and Change*, Vol. 20, No.3.

Yates, James. 1986. *Mississippi to Madrid: Memoirs of a Black American in the Spanish Civil War 1936-1938*. New York: Shamal Books. 221 pp.

Yow, Valerie. 1994. *Recording Oral History: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists.* Thousand Oaks: Sage. 284.

Resources

Dictionaries and handbooks. I have used these whilst writing this and related papers. They are useful not only for the provision of names and dates but also for what they themselves reveal of their own presentation, interpretation - and silences - concerning the cosmopolitan/international (see above: Appiah and Gates 1997, Buhle, Buhle and Georgakas 1992, Institut fuer Marxismus-Leninismus 1986). Appiah and Gates is an excellent handbook but has no entries on women or feminism as such. BB&G 1992 has a number of valuable entries (such as Garveyism and C.L.R. James) but is surprisingly thin on internationalism, for which it has no specific entry. The IM-L, despite its (East) German Communist origin, has nothing on the internationalist German Communist heroines, Olga Benario or Tamara Bunke (the German/Argentinean `Tania' who accompanied Che Guevara in Bolivia and died there also).

Amazon electronic bookstore The major US electronic bookshop www.amazon.com often works better than a library or database, and most of the books can be ordered (or looked up in a local library). It can be usefully searched for `international', `labour' and even `international labour' (to give one relevant example). It also lists some Spanish titles. Amazon now operates in and from the UK and Germany, providing a more rapid ordering service in Europe. Searches of Amazon for `internationalism' and `global solidarity' can be found under: http://www.antenna.nl/~waterman/amazinterbook1.html.

Cultural Survival International http://www.cs.org/main.html This provides an on-going international site for information and debate on indigenous issues, including both academic and activist voices, and has had considerable coverage of the Rigoberta Menchu controversy.

Cities, Citizens and Power http://www.chavez.demon.nl/ A Uruguayan Ph.D. student at the Institute of Social Studies, The Hague, Netherlands, Daniel's particular interest is urban democracy, development and movements, from the city to the global level. He has a more general interest in regional civil societies internationally. He has web skills, as can be seen from his self-designed site. He lists useful Latin American links, and, at time of writing, has ambitions to extend these to global civil society. The site is bilingual.

The Global Solidarity Site (GloSoSite) http://www.antenna.nl/~waterman/, is divided into two major parts, one personal, the other general. The personal side includes my own books, articles, and, particularly, recent review articles related to networking, labour and other internationalisms, and a global solidarity culture/communication. The general side includes articles and documents by others, some mentioned above, others relating to the theme. A sidebar on the home page provides a limited number of relevant linkages, mostly to sites that themselves provide good links and other resources in their specialised areas.

GloSoSite is currently being improved and extended. The latest version of this paper can, e.g., be found under http://www.antenna.nl/~waterman/internacipap.html/

Mayday Database http://www.antenna.nl/~waterman/ALISIS.MFN.html is my personal computerised bibliography, on WinIsis, with some 3-4,000 entries, many of them concerned with internationalism, some with internationalists and some with the Americas. The data is not always systematic and there are no abstracts and the data is not searchable except by names and keywords, either online or after downloading. I am negotiating with my Internet Service Provider, Antenna, to convert this into a searchable on-line bibliography of an increasingly familiar type.

Patria Grande: Una pagina con sabor latinoamericano. http://spin.com.mx/~hvelarde/ This is an imaginative and attractive site, created by Hector Velarde, from Mexico. Covering outstanding individuals (some mentioned in this paper or the bibliography), countries, ideas and further relevant links and resources, this site reflects the spirit of *bolivarismo*.

Sociofile bibliography on internationalism. This major academic database (to be found in US and other libraries as a CD-ROM) covers a period of more than 20 years, is a major resource for research. My search, using the keyword `internationalis*', turned up 384 entries. Many may be irrelevant to `internationalism' and `internationalists' but it nonetheless reveals angles usually forgotten in movement-oriented research on these topics. These include `internationalism' or `internationalists' in sociology, social work, education and science. This is very much a US database (though Spanish-language entries can be found), and `internationalism' in this country is most frequently understood as meaning the opposite, in foreign policy or international relations, to `protectionist'! I have saved a copy of my search on GloSoSite. But, although I have marked it with @ and @@ for relevance to my project proposal, readers are advised to go to the source: http://www.antenna.nl/~waterman/sfinternatbib.html.