

**REFLECTIONS ON THE 2<sup>ND</sup> WORLD SOCIAL FORUM IN PORTO ALEGRE:  
WHAT'S LEFT INTERNATIONALLY?**

Peter Waterman

May 2002

Working paper 362

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 ISS is fundamental in the sense of laying a scientific basis for the formulation of appropriate development policies. The academic work of ISS 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, PhD participants and visiting fellows, and outstanding research papers by graduate students.

For further information contact:

ORPAS - **Institute of Social Studies** - P.O. Box 29776  
2502LT The Hague - The Netherlands - FAX: +31 70 4260799  
E-mail: **workingpapers@iss.nl**

ISSN 0921-0210

**Comments are welcome and should be addressed to the author:**

**ABSTRACT:**

This paper reflects on the implications for the international trade union movement and Left of the 60-70,000-strong World Social Forum II. The reflections concern the analytical, theoretical and strategic implications of and for this first major international movement of the era of a globalized and informatized capitalism. Considered in turn are: 1. The Forum's Charter and the Call of Social Movements issued from it; 2. The impact of the Forum on the Left as an 'old social movement'; 3. Its implications for feminism as a 'new social movement'; 4. The meaning of 'Left' in the light of the Forum; 5. The strategy problem the unions still imply for the global justice movement; 6. The necessity of moving the movement away from an organizational and toward a communicational logic; 7. The need for a political-economy of global civil society construction. The Conclusion reflects on the concept of revolution in the era of capitalist globalization, as well as the role of the global justice movement in surpassing the emancipatory model of the French Revolution.

## CONTENTS

**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Introduction .....	1
1. The Porto Alegre 'Charter' proposes relational principles that challenge both the latest capitalist (dis)order and the traditional internationalisms; The 'Call of Social Movements' represents the transition from an 'anti-global' to a 'global justice and solidarity' movement.....	1
2. The World Social Forum is transforming the thinking and/or behavior of both the old revolutionary and the reformist Left. (Or it should damn well do so if these want to remain on the radar screen).....	4
3. The Forum revealed the impact of feminism as a new social movement but also represented a challenge to such. (A provocation).....	6
4. The Left is dead! Long live social emancipation? (Another provocation).....	8
5. The Inter/national trade union movement represents the major challenge to the global justice movement (and to itself if it is not to be Left behind).....	12
6. The institutional logic of the old internationalisms has to be transformed by a cultural one (winning hearts and minds is not just an imperial military strategy).....	15
7. The development of the global justice movement requires that it be considered in political-economic terms (a matter of pipers, payers and tunes).....	17
Conclusion: Being There.....	19
References .....	21
Internet resources.....	27
Appendices .....	28



## INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

This paper reflects on the implications for the international trade union movement and Left of the 60-70,000-strong World Social Forum II. The reflections concern the analytical, theoretical and strategic implications of and for this first major international movement of the era of a globalized and informatized capitalism. Considered in turn are: 1. The Forum's Charter and the Call of Social Movements issued from it; 2. The impact of the Forum on the Left as an 'old social movement'; 3. Its implications for feminism as a 'new social movement'; 4. The meaning of 'Left' in the light of the Forum; 5. The strategy problem the unions still imply for the global justice movement; 6. The necessity of moving unionism away from an organizational and toward a communicational logic; 7. The need for a political-economy of global civil society construction. The Conclusion reflects on the concept of revolution in the era of capitalist globalization, as well as the role of the global justice movement in surpassing the emancipatory model of the French Revolution.

### **1. THE PORTO ALEGRE 'CHARTER' PROPOSES RELATIONAL PRINCIPLES THAT CHALLENGE BOTH THE LATEST CAPITALIST (DIS)ORDER AND THE TRADITIONAL INTERNATIONALISMS; THE 'CALL OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS' REPRESENTS THE TRANSITION FROM AN 'ANTI-GLOBAL' TO A 'GLOBAL JUSTICE AND SOLIDARITY' MOVEMENT.**

The WSF *Charter of Principles* (World Social Forum Charter 2001, *Appendix 2*), which was produced following WSF I, suggests that the construction of a new kind of world order is as much a matter of process as of program. Rejecting the notion of acting as some kind of global vanguard, in either leadership or policy terms, the Charter suggests that the function of the WSF is precisely that of providing an *agora* (meeting-place, market-place) for the movement against neo-liberal globalization. Whilst allowing for the presence of politicians and statespersons who oppose neo-liberalism, the Forum specifically excludes militaristic movements (*and* such politicians or governments?). Ambitious

---

<sup>1</sup> Acknowledgments for comments go primarily to my longtime compañera and sparring partner, Gina Vargas, of the Peruvian feminist center, Flora Tristán, with whom I shared the Porto Alegre experience. The paper is also for Gina. As well as for Thanh-dam Truong, of the Institute of Social Studies, in The Hague, and Anissa Helie, of Women Living Under Muslim Laws, London.

in declaring that the Forum has become a global rather than a local event, the Charter is modest in denying that the WSF is more than one component part of a movement against capitalist globalization:

The World Social Forum is a plural, diversified, non-confessional, non-governmental and non-party context that, in a decentralized fashion, interrelates organizations and movements engaged in concrete action at levels from the local to the international to built [sic] another world. It thus does not constitute a locus of power to be disputed by the participants in its meetings, nor does it intend to constitute the only option for interrelation and action by the organizations and movements that participate in it.

The notion that the Forum does not constitute a 'locus of power' is over-modest, even disingenuous, in so far as power - like death and taxes - is always with us. Even, however, if taken as an *intention*, the statement will provoke participants to work out ways that will minimize the power disputes that have weakened and destroyed previous internationals – right back to the Marx-Bakunin dispute that led the former to break up the First International (Collins and Abramsky 1965).

That dispute was and is salutary. The Socialist/Anarchist tension is clearly present within the global justice movement, with the latter tradition being more evidently revealed within the major confrontations at neo-liberal summits (One-Off 2001). This tension, however, is also within the events of both Opposition and Proposition of the global justice movement. This is revealed by the fact that a majority of the WSF Organizing Committee felt obliged to *reject* any notion of creating some kind of world Left political party, or movement, vanguard. Moreover, the principles of pluralism, dialog and networking have been clearly evident both on the streets, as in Seattle 1999, and in the proposal for 'social consultation' in Europe, circulated at the Forum (European Social Consulta 2002). The Consulta is proposed by a European 'network' (what else?) that has no apparent place of origin, only cyber-addresses without country codes (where else?)! The Consulta, whose origins in Spain or Catalonia are nonetheless suggested by the word itself, proposes something that would appear completely procedural, were it not for its jab at the 'dumbing down' of culture or, more substantially, at the 'complicity between electoral democracy and the economic dictatorship of large corporations'. Aimed, precisely, at the liberal democracies which are at the heart of neo-liberal globalization, the Consulta seems to be proposing a permanent and Europe-wide generalization of the notions of pluralism, dialog and social

self-mobilization suggested by the Charter. The challenge here presented is as much to the unions and the Left as to the hegemon of globalization.

The *Call of Social Movements* (Call of Social Movements 2002, *Appendix 1*) issued by a so-far unidentified alliance of such<sup>2</sup> at the end of the Forum, represents the most forceful declaration yet of what it itself calls a 'global movement for social justice and solidarity'. It is a declaration of global war against neo-liberal and corporate globalization – which includes, of course, a war against the globalization of warfare. The Call identifies most of the major negative impacts of the hegemonic model, it identifies the collective interests and identities thus negatively affected, it identifies *with* their struggles and demands, it declares that solidarity comes out of the diversity of democratic identities and forces, it proposes a humane, principled and ethical alternative to neo-liberalism, it makes an extended address to laboring people (not only the male, industrial, urban or unionized), to labor's needs and demands. It thus represents not only a challenge to the corporations, the (inter-)state organizations, the religious and economic fundamentalists, and their academic and media apologists. It also represents a proposal to which all democratic forces can, or should, respond. Unionists favoring global justice and solidarity can campaign for the adoption of this document within their organizations, at every level. And, at the same time, unions and other labor movement bodies, could respond to the CSM, specifying their objections or additions.

There may be such objections, from the Left internationally, stating, for example, that the document is not socialist, or that it does not identify capitalism as the enemy, or that it does not attack imperialism, that it is Eurocentric, that it is reformist or palliative, leading at best to a gentler, kinder capitalist alternative (c.f. Carotenuto 2002) Whilst such criticism may be justified, and is anyway already part of the dialog, a *condemnation* on such grounds would be one that fails to recognize 1) the international/ist achievement this document represents, and 2) that the development of social movements is determined not by ideological rectitude but - if radically-democratic and expanding in appeal – by the process of social self-education and empowerment they unleash.

---

<sup>2</sup> After having eventually tracked down and seen the list of signators, I was urgently requested not to publish it. Since the list appeared to me simultaneously interesting and innocuous, I have to assume that there is some problem about it, at least in the minds of those who originally released the document without the names attached! This, once again, reminds us that building a global civil society is not the same as inhabiting paradise.



If, on the other hand, there is criticism that the document was produced out of sight of the Forum, by a self-appointed institutional, or intellectual, or whatever, elite - which may have been the case - then there can be a struggle to ensure, at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Forum, that a further such document be formulated in the spirit of the participatory democracy the present one favors. There is, in any case, no obstacle to more-radical (or moderate) others producing their own alternative such documents within the Forum (for example, the surprisingly uninspiring Declaration of Intellectuals 2002).

If, finally, it is felt that the CSM is short on alternatives, then critics should ensure this is not the case in the future. I consider, for example, that it is weak on economic alternatives, especially given the small but growing number of such experiments in which working people are involved worldwide. Laboring people in Brazil and Argentina have been rather active here (see Powell 2002 for the latter case). These can no longer be adequately described merely as a 'survival strategy' (until the poor can be re-incorporated into some future capitalist economy). There is growing post-capitalist theory and strategy, in this region, going back 15 years or so (Quijano 2001, Suplicy 2000). And, given the 20 or more sessions in the Forum on the 'economy of solidarity', the absence of this notion from the CSM is striking. The same goes for the issue of a guaranteed minimum income (Euzeby 2000, Frankman 2001), as a means of overcoming marginalization, increasing needs-oriented demand, undermining labor market competition and enhancing social solidarity. Indeed, the whole issue of emancipation from capitalist work (Gorz 1999, Dinerstein and Neary 2002) needs to be on the agenda of the next Forum if capitalism, rather than merely neo-liberalism, is to be identified and challenged.

**2. THE WORLD SOCIAL FORUM IS TRANSFORMING THE THINKING AND/OR BEHAVIOR OF BOTH THE OLD REVOLUTIONARY AND THE REFORMIST LEFT. (OR IT SHOULD DAMN WELL DO SO IF THESE WANT TO REMAIN ON THE RADAR SCREEN).**

The WSF, and the movement it both represents and shapes, already has the power to transform the thinking and acting of the Old Left, whether 'revolutionary', 'reformist' or 'thirdworldist'. This is because these terms have lost most of their meaning and effect over the last two or three decades. 'Revolutionary' meant insurrectionary, and those who – de-

spite the miserable results of previous insurrections – still argue for a sudden, total and irreversible social transformation, are increasingly condemned to self-isolation. 'Reformism' has itself come to mean merely a graduated (or even sudden and total) adjustment to neo-liberal globalization, either with or without a human face. 'Thirdworldism' has lost almost all allure in its conversion from an appeal for popular emancipation and solidarity to a state doctrine of authoritarian nationalism (Mugabe).

Some prominent revolutionaries, present at WSF II, may have accepted, implicitly if not explicitly, that an event and process largely funded and supported by the state (at least local) and by Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs, previously 'agents of incorporation and imperialism'), not only provides a useful or acceptable platform, but even a privileged space for the advance of mass interests and transformatory processes. Significant vanguardist traditions seem to have embraced the global justice movement (Democracia Socialista 2000)!<sup>3</sup> Given the intellectual and political experience of such organizations or individual veterans, and their common commitment to mass movements, their presence within the Forum could help protect it against its *ongización* (ngo-ization) in particular, and its incorporation into a new global capitalist project in general (Elizalde 2002).

The presence of numerous foreign trade union leaders (Waterman 2002a), and officials of state-funded NGOs, as well as of academics concerned with the reform of interstate organizations, reveals the appeal of the Forum to those of the reformist tradition. In so far as the latter have also traditionally acted as lobbyists, pressure groups, elite advocacy

---

<sup>3</sup> Others not. Or only ambiguously so. James Petras, longtime scourge of the NGOs and all their works, was evidently happy to be on a Porto Alegre platform largely created by such, and to sign the Call of Social Movements (*Appendix 1*). His presentation, entitled 'Reform or Revolution' (Petras 2002a) could, however, have appeared anytime since the first Russian Revolution (1905). And, whilst he evidently considers that the grounds for reform no longer exist in Latin America, he seems to think that revolution and revolutionaries are obsolescence-free. His argument here is short and vague, his references being to past national(ist) revolutions rather than to even the direct-action element within the global justice movement. In a Post-Forum evaluation (Petras 2002b), he reiterates his lifelong manicheanism, telling a 'tale of two forums', in which all the complexity is forced into two procrustean beds, one middle-class and reformist, one proletarian/popular and radical (no more 'revolutionary'?). Since the first is invested with vice, the second with virtue, he has to see the future in terms of the defeat of the one and the victory of the other. The development of the global justice movement (including the anarchists he wishes to define out of his radical camp!), is, rather, one of a continuing dialog, in which the secret is that of allowing for complexity and contradiction rather than reducing them to a binary opposition and ruling out the wrong one *ab initio*. Petras' mechanical-materialist methodology (and posture as *the* middle-class US academic spokesman for the revolution) is, regrettably, one that may lead readers to dismiss the significant evidence he does present. They should not do so. They should, rather, do a compare-and-contrast exercise with the present and other interpretations (to be found where that of Petras is hosted, on the Evaluations WSF 2002 webpage). All of which suggests a possible Master's paper: 'Many Tales of One Forum'.

bodies, or intellectual advisers to ruling capitalist or state elites, this reconnection with actually-existing social movements could revive a radical, aggressive and campaigning reformism, with considerable potential for undermining an increasingly tarnished elite policy and ideology. Significant here is the largely positive evaluation of the Forum by the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC 2002).

So much for the old social movement.<sup>4</sup> At least until Part 5.

### **3. THE FORUM REVEALED THE IMPACT OF FEMINISM AS A NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENT BUT ALSO REPRESENTED A CHALLENGE TO SUCH. (A PROVOCATION).**

It is important to appreciate that the problematic relationship of the old social movement with capital and state, is not unique to labor. The ecological and feminist movements also find themselves torn between the Scylla of engagement with hegemonic forces and the Charybdis of autonomy from them (in the Greek myth the option for the one implies being thrown to the other). The dialectical and dialogical inter-relationship between the global justice movement in general and the feminist movement in particular was suggested by the Forum.<sup>5</sup>

There can be no doubt of the debt the global justice movement (including its non-violent direct-action wing) owes to the women's movements and feminist thinkers of the 1970s-80s. The influence can be clearly seen within the CSM and the Charter themselves. Much of the thinking of the new movement (on counter-power resting in a democratic diversity) and behavior (public cultural outrage and celebration) can be traced back to the feminists. Following the twinned process of liberal democratization and neo-liberal globalization, however, much of the international feminist movement became, it seems to me, over-committed to a 'long march through the institutions' (national, regional, international). Whilst familiarization with the politics of hegemonic institutions had an impact on these,

---

<sup>4</sup> The multiple contemporary dilemmas of unionism, in terms of even a national, social-democratic and industrial relations perspective, are dramatically revealed in the sophisticated analysis of Warrian (2001). Revealed but hardly solved since Warrian is thinking within the unquestioned parameters of capitalist globalization, the information economy, liberal democracy and unionism as-we-have-known-it.

<sup>5</sup> 'Suggested' in so far as I am here, more than elsewhere, perhaps, dependent on limited cases, documents and discussions. I await a full-length account. In the meantime, see the interpretation of Gina Vargas (2002).

and was necessary for the development of a globally-effective feminist movement (Vargas 2002), many never seem to have arrived at their Yenan – if they had one. As one feminist pointed out at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Forum, they had learned 'the language of Geneva' only to later discover that the UN institutions had been disempowered relative to the international financial ones (República de las Mujeres 2002). During the 1990s, feminist critics in the sub-continent identified, within their movement, both the reproduction of male Leftist sectarian vanguardism (Gobbi 1996) and - much more significantly - an extensive process of *organización* (Alvarez 1997, Vargas 1996).

Some of the feminist activities at the Forum revealed the mark of the Long Wander. Thus a distributed poster demanded

'Put the **Woman** at the Center',  
'The Place of the Women is in the **Leadership**'.

It showed, however, not the Organizing or International Committees of the Forum, but a meeting of heads of state.

And an impressive (and expensive) media or cultural campaign, including posters on Porto Alegre hoardings, a hot-air balloon, tee-shirts, masks, public testimonies and professional-looking brochures, was launched against 'fundamentalisms' (Marcosur Feminist Network 2002). Whilst this campaign *added* 'economic' or 'market' fundamentalism to the religious, most of the testimonies concerned the religious kind. The roots of contemporary religious fundamentalism *in* neo-liberal globalization was only pointed out elsewhere (Correa 2002). The campaign therefore appeared to continue a Long March tradition of 'completing the tasks of liberal-democratic modernity' (no bad thing given the move of liberal democracy in the other direction).<sup>6</sup> This campaign against fundamentalism, moreover, immediately followed the most perverse-ever campaign by the US and its allies to identify Fundamentalism with Islam and both with Terrorism, and to use this as a justification for war against one of the most-isolated, poverty-stricken and devastated countries in the

---

<sup>6</sup> As Boaventura de Sousa Santos somewhere says, we are today confronted with islands of political democracy surrounded by seas of social fascism. A striking metaphor which does not quite capture the full reality, since the islands are also polluting the seas! Moreover, the political democracy is one of decreasing intensity. And the seas are now flooding the islands. In a shocking recent case, the Netherlands discovered that dykes of elite political consensus and inconsequence do not protect it from the seas of social fascism, and that these can also be subterranean geysers, from which emerge the smooth-talking monsters of contemporary racism, the latter lightly disguised as 'the immigration problem'.

world. The campaign, finally, it seemed to me, failed to address national/ethnic (Mugabe?) and socialist fundamentalisms (Sendero Luminoso/Shining Path?).

It should, however, be pointed out that the *Articulación Marcosur* at least raised the global issue of conservative authoritarianism within the global justice movement. And it was also active in at least three other areas at Porto Alegre: 'Sex, Lies and International Trade', 'Combating Discrimination and Intolerance', and 'Migrant Women: Wide and Alien Borders'. The Canadian-initiated World March of Women, moreover, was evidently born *out* of the global justice movement, and came out forcefully at the Forum as

an international feminist action in the struggle against patriarchal capitalism and its worst consequences: poverty and sexist violence. (World March of Women 2002).

Its leaflet was actually addressed to 'Building the World Social Forum', and finished with the statement that.

Without feminism a new world is not possible. Without changing the world it is not possible to change the lives of women. (Ibid)

The general impact of the global justice movement on the feminist one, at least in Latin America, is suggested by the fact that the 9<sup>th</sup> Latin American and Feminist Encounter, to be held in Costa Rica, December 1-6, 2002, will be devoted to 'Active Resistance in the Face of Globalization'. And that a keynote discussion statement concerning this insists that feminism has to (re?)connect itself with the Left if it is to have a message for poor women (Facio 2002). Globalization, thus, finally becomes the subject of an *encuentro* some six years after it was first forcefully raised at such an event (Waterman 2001:177). It will be interesting to see whether this encounter surpasses traditional Left understandings of globalization (as simply the highest stage of imperialism), and what relationship it expresses to the global justice movement.

#### **4. THE LEFT IS DEAD! LONG LIVE SOCIAL EMANCIPATION? (ANOTHER PROVOCATION).**

Despite my recognition that many involved with the global justice movement would consider that what is occurring *is* a revival or re-invention of the Left, I would like to now argue the value of re-conceptualizing the matter in terms of social emancipation (Rethinking Social Emancipation website, Sousa Santos 2001, Waterman 2002b). This is

not so much because 'Left' is as old as the Constituent Assembly of the French Revolution in pre-industrial Europe, since 'emancipation' is even older! It is because the Left has been the 'counter-culture of capitalist modernity' and long dependent on that against which – within which - it has posed itself. A third component of the international Left, Radical-Nationalism or Thirdworldism (Carotenuto 2002), has also lost almost all progressive meaning and impact (as witness the rhetoric of the Mugabe regime in Zimbabwe and the endorsement of his grossly fraudulent re-election by most neighboring regimes in Southern Africa). Some of the more energetic elements of the Old Lefts are, however, seeking either rescue by, or control of a new movement which surpasses it in breadth of appeal and depth of understanding, as well as in ethical universalism.

Whilst the presence of such traditional Lefts at Porto Alegre revealed their recognition of the importance of social movements, and even a growing understanding of the value of the autonomy of such in relationship to states, parties and unions, the Left parties, particularly those of Latin America, were apparently hoping to create some kind of international Left party forum on the model of the well-established Forum of São Paulo (Schvartz 2002, Hardt 2002). This child of the Brazilian Partido dos Trabalhadores (PT), which meets regularly in different cities of Latin America, has just as regularly demonstrated the in-built restrictions of the party form (see, for its Havana meeting, 2001, the São Paulo Forum website). To say that it has had trouble coming to terms with the majority of the Latin American population (women), and with feminism as its emancipatory expression, would be to radically understate the problem. These are *nationally-defined*, and often *mutually-competitive* political parties, whilst the movement they are chugging behind is defined by collective interests, identities, problems or propositions of an increasingly global nature. There can, of course, be no reason why such parties should not organize an International Left Political Party Forum, on the lines of the World Parliamentary Forum that sponsored a discussion on the party-movement relationship at Porto Alegre. It is simply that one would rather be somewhere else when they are deciding which parties are Left enough to join their forum, or which parties represent the Left in India, China or the USA. (We already know which party it considers to represent the Left in Cuba).

The case for 'emancipation' rests on the necessity of liberating the global social movements and global civil society (other equally problematic terms!) from the collective

subjects ('Working Class', 'Third World', 'Nation', 'People') the ideologies (57 often-fatricidal claims to socialist verity), and forms (the party, the union) within which the Left has become increasingly imprisoned over the last 200 years. What began as a movement for *emancipation* from wage-slavery became increasingly one for *regulation* of relations between labor and capital/state (cf Sousa Santos 1995), including the regulation of official ideology, of follower identity, of membership rights. Whilst parties, unions, parliaments, and the nation-states to which they relate, will continue to exist (and attempt to reduce social movements to their rigid and parochial dimensions), Porto Alegre demonstrates that the innovatory or central issues, forces, forms and alternatives have moved to places and spaces which the institutional Left cannot (yet?) reach.

In the time and space of a globalized, networked, informatized capitalism (Castells 1996-8), the focus for social movements, and the movement of society, becomes, increasingly, the global. Global, it should be remembered means not simply worldwide but holistic - thus *also* allowing for, recognizing and empowering the local and the locale (Escobar 2000). The movements take the network form (Castells and Escobar again). They are increasingly present in the arena of culture, communication and the media. And they broaden out the areas of struggle from the political-economic to the surpassing of capitalist, statist, patriarchal, heterosexual, westocentric, racist and other alienating relationships within *society*, amongst *ourselves* and *within* ourselves.<sup>7</sup> Would it not therefore be more fruitful to discuss such matters in terms of emancipation than of the Left? Would this not increase the appeal to those whose experience of one or more of the Lefts has been either disappointing or, *pace Marx*, alienating?

In discussion of what I have been here calling the 'global justice movement', but which others call the 'anti-globalization', 'anti-corporate', 'anti-capitalist' movements, or

---

<sup>7</sup> Amongst an outpouring of new Left/Emancipatory writings on the new social movement worldwide, comes the highly original one of John Holloway (2002). Whilst this is inspired by the Italian 'Workers' Autonomy' Marxism of the 1970s, Holloway draws heavily on the tradition of critical sociology, placing 'fetishisation', rather than 'classification' at the centre of his argument. So far so original. But what is most striking to me is his invocation of an existential 'scream' of anguish, and then of a putative 'we', a rhetorical-psychological appeal to the sense and sensibility of his reader.

'global civil society', various original attempts have been made at conceptualization.

- One has been discussing responses to neo-liberal globalization in terms of *supporters of current arrangements, reformists, radical critics favoring another globalization, alternatives outside the mainstream, and nationalist rejectionists* (Pianta 2001, cf Anheier, Glasius and Kaldor 2002).
- An 'alternative' theorist (Starr 2000) conceives the matter in terms of an anti-corporate movement, consisting of three tendencies, *Contestation and Reform; Globalization from Below; Delinking, Relocalization, Sovereignty*. She identifies herself with the last of these.
- I myself have identified as major popular responses to neo-liberal globalization those of *Celebration, Rejection, and Critique/Surpassal* – as overlapping and interpenetrating types (Waterman 2001a).
- Christophe Aguiton (2001, 2002a), himself an experienced Left (Alternative?) unionist and a leader of the French and international global justice movements, tentatively identifies three 'poles' within the *global justice movement*: a *Radical Internationalist*, a *Nationalist*, and a *Neo-Reformist* one. The first looks beyond both capitalism and the nation-state, the second is a mostly-Southern response (France here presumably being in the South), and the third is the kind of 'global governance' tendency also present at the Forum (Rikkilä and Patomäki 2001)

Significant is that none of these uses the language of the Left (Right, or Center), and that, in practice, each of these categorizations cuts across the Left-as-we-know- it, the Left of a national-industrial-(anti)colonial-capitalism, now passing into history. 'Left' originated as, and largely remains, a position within or an attitude toward a polity or a political-economy (national, inter/national). 'Emancipation' would seem a more appropriate term when discussing society, nature, culture, work and psychology – as well, of course, that increasingly important but placeless place, cyberspace.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> The general movement beyond a traditional Left language or methodology means, inevitably, the production of rather different analyses and strategies. One looks forward to them becoming part of an international exchange. For rather different evaluations of the major French network, ATTAC (of Christophe Aguiton), see Hardt (2002) and Arraya Dujisin (2001). For analysis of Amory Starr, and other intellectuals writing on or contributing to the movement, see Barker and Cox (2002). For a much-trumpeted work, on the present order and disorder of things, by Hardt and Negri (2000), see, again, Holloway (2002: 167-75).



I will, of course, continue to find myself using and engaged with the discourses of the Left and of Socialism (particularly when anyone attacks – or defends - them) but my feeling is that a discussion of emancipation in and against a globalized and networked capitalism might re-open also the discussion of utopia to which socialist eyes have been long closed (Panitch and Leys 1999 is an honorable exception).<sup>9</sup>

**5. THE INTER/NATIONAL TRADE UNION MOVEMENT REPRESENTS THE MAJOR CHALLENGE TO THE GLOBAL JUSTICE MOVEMENT (AND TO ITSELF IF IT IS NOT TO BE LEFT BEHIND).**

Let us assume, with gargantuan generosity, that the 60-70,000 at Porto Alegre in some way 'represent' 60-70 million people. But the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, alone, has 157 million members! (Whether they know that *it* has *them* is a mute point). 100-200 million organized in trade unions represents the largest institutionalized mass constituency the global justice movement could possibly win. Given, however, the 100 or more years of union entrenchment within what I have called national, industrial, (anti)colonial capitalism; given, further, the profound ambiguity this international movement demonstrated even at Porto Alegre, in the face of neo-liberal globalization and the global justice movement (Waterman 2002a); how can the latter impact on the former in the most effective manner? The answer, it occurs to me, is *in every possible way*. Indeed, also in ways so far considered impossible or even unimagined (suggestions welcome).

The last and least way would be through *leadership negotiation* – one favored by leading international unionists, and possibly by some within the global justice movement (Waterman Forthcoming). The unionists may be thinking in terms of some sort of compromise with, and possibly a commitment by, the movement (on 'spheres of influence'?, on 'non-intervention'?, on a literal 'division of labor'?). There is, however, no way the global justice movement could do this, without institutionalizing itself, and becoming a union-

---

<sup>9</sup> A brilliant initiative here, is the page of the Philadelphia node of IndyMedia, entitled 'Alternatives to Corporate Globalization' (see Internet Resources below). Launched in the right spirit and the appropriate space (the cyber one), this has, unfortunately, proven an irresistible attraction to antediluvian leftists and utopian fantasists – in which the United States has always been rich. There must be nuggets in here somewhere, but it would require a traveller with more time than myself to sift for them. The page reflects the dilemma of the WSF: how, in the exploration and invention of a utopian alternative now becoming a matter of urgency, does one combine radical pluralism with purposeful direction.

look-alike, capable of either ignoring or controlling its own suspicious and unruly base! I do not see, further, how one could reach a compromise between the past and the future, without the latter going backward; or between an old nation-state-based institution addressed to negotiable issues, and a new global movement which questions, well, *everything*. And, in so far as there might be issues or moments in which leadership negotiation might seem justifiable, and *can* be justified, then one non-negotiable condition surely must apply: that negotiations take place in the public sphere.

*Alliances and coalitions* between unions and communities (variously defined) have a long history, at levels from the local to the national and the global. The presence and activity of the unions at Porto Alegre could be seen as simply continuing and furthering this practice. There is, however, an equally long history of unions instrumentalizing less-experienced, less-structured, or less single-minded others (DeMartino 1991). There seems, on reflection, little danger of this happening to the new movement, with its developing principles of transparency, participatory or direct democracy, and public dialog. (Except in so far as we are talking of certain members or forces in the global solidarity movement which do not – apparently - even practice representative democracy!).

Although *penetration* sounds invasive, imperial and phalocentric, I am thinking here more of the increasing porosity, willy-nilly, of an international union movement that previously exercised extensive sovereignty over its affiliates and their members. The decline of worker identification with unions, and the breaking down of a single identity, understood between worker and union (Catalano 1999), means an increasing union openness to whatever else is addressing worker identities and needs. In so far as these needs are also being forcefully addressed by conservative, reactionary and fundamentalist movements – some international – the importance of attention by radical democratic movements increases. Penetration, incidentally, applies in both directions, since it also means the infection of the oft-times class-blind global solidarity movements by an international working-class institution which does have – I repeat - 150-200 million members.

*Circumvention*. The international unions like to pretend (both imagine and claim) that they are the sole representatives of labor, for example within the International Labor Organization. But neo-liberalism and globalization has meant they not only represent a declining proportion of 'organizable' workers, but that these – always a minority of working

people if housekeeping is included – are a decreasing proportion of those doing industrial, service and carework for capitalism globally (for a major industrial city, São Paulo, see Jakobsen, Martins and Dombrowski 2000). The so-called 'atypical' workers are increasingly typical, and non-unionized or non-unionizable. But they are also increasingly organized – sometimes in bodies that call themselves unions, but increasingly in associations and international networks, supported by NGOs that are themselves often linked closely to the global justice movement. These inter/national associations of 'labor's others' (Waterman 2002d) are also, customarily, open to a free and equal relationship with such trade unions as do not try to instrumentalize or incorporate them. This is, in other words, an area in which friendly cooperation/competition between unions and the global justice movement would be to the benefit of both – not to speak of the workers concerned.<sup>10</sup>

*Dialog* is both necessary and possible, between and around the unions, in the period leading up to World Social Forum III. WSF II already saw discussion of the union-movement relationship. And this only continues a process that began, if somewhat awkwardly, in Bangkok, early 2001 (Waterman Forthcoming). Whilst the CSM might itself provoke face-to-face dialog at local or national level, the obvious channel for a worldwide dialog would, of course be the internet.

Whilst a reach to, or involvement of, the union (and movement) base obviously requires print or audio-visual media, union and community educational activity, an internet dialog could hypothetically reach 500-1,000 top and middle-level union and movement activists. And whilst this might seem to confine discussion to an elite, and to be biased to the North, a lively discussion on the matter, with even 50 active contributors and 500 passive readers would still represent a breakthrough. There are relevant experiences here, with the ILO/ICFTU 'Conference on Organized Labor in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century'– though this is something more to be learned from than repeated (Waterman 2001b). Such a site, combining discussion with files of longer papers and an archive, could be run as a bi- or trilingual (English, Portuguese/Spanish) email list, using the free Yahoo service. Or it could be hosted by one or other union, or pro-union site, or by a site of one or other movement, providing this was one in which possible contributors would have confidence. Motivated

---

<sup>10</sup> For a systematic discussion on relations within and between movements in and around the movement, see Brecher, Costello and Smith (2000).

union and movement journalists, magazines and educators could translate the electronic messages into accessible forms. The exercise could be seen as an experiment and could also be a matter of discussion at the Third Forum.

**6. THE INSTITUTIONAL LOGIC OF THE OLD INTERNATIONALISMS HAS TO BE TRANSFORMED BY A CULTURAL ONE (WINNING HEARTS AND MINDS IS NOT JUST AN IMPERIAL MILITARY STRATEGY)<sup>11</sup>**

Although the global justice movement is way in front of the international trade union organizations in its feeling for the increasing centrality of 'the media' (commercial), communication and culture, this is not demonstrated in the 'Call of Social Movements', nor too much at Porto Alegre itself. Whilst there was plenty *son et lumière* during the Forum, plenty of youthful exuberance, some striking feminist events and plenty of music, the major tee-shirt around was the 30-year-old Che Guevara one.<sup>12</sup> And the Forum tee-shirt was not one likely to tug at any collector's heartstrings.

This, it later occurred to me, may be a reflection of NGO, union (CUT Brazil) and party (PT) influence on the Forum, since these do not seem to represent the cutting edge of cultural activity within the global justice movement as a whole. The privileged space for such cultural activity may rather be the direct-action events, revealed in the protests against neo-liberal globalization. A privileged form/site for such has to be the earlier-mentioned IndyMedia Center (IMC), which sprang to life, as a combination of media-savvy US electronic media operations, during Seattle in 1999. This has now become a coordinated international network of rather professional multi-media sites, with a number of such in, for example, Latin America (Hyde 2002). This represents a potent force for the global justice

---

<sup>11</sup> In their emancipatory phase, the old internationalisms were also cultural movements, often in innovative ways. This was brilliantly demonstrated by the thirdworldist movement that followed from the Cuban Revolution, the OSPAAAL (the Organization of Solidarity with the Peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America). Samples of this tradition are kindly provided us by the - Anti-Castro - Cuban Information Archives (see Internet Resources below).

<sup>12</sup> Whatever happened to the Marcos teeshirts, and, indeed, to the Zapatistas themselves at the Forum? The overwhelmingly-civil Chiapas uprising has to be seen as a major precursor of the GJM and one hopes that, after being over-celebrated by the Left earlier, its failure to achieve certain exaggerated expectations is not now leading to it being forgotten - or excluded.

movement. And it could also be potent in engaging the trade union organizations, or at least those union activists open to such.

International union, or pro-union, media of communication remain, to varying degrees, dependents of unions, in either a material or a moral sense. Independent international labor media, whilst sometimes of professional quality, tend to be limited by some notion of service to *organizations* rather than of stimulation to the labor and social - *movements*. The pro-union media, produced either by individuals or groups beholden to the unions, tend to fail in their potential of broadening out beyond the functions of information and propaganda. They thus reflect the unions back to themselves, rather than placing them in the real world of globalized capitalism, labor and social movement struggles. Coverage of the global justice movement in general, and of the World Social Forum in particular, is thus likely to do little more than echo union positions. (Check this in the archives of one of the most sophisticated international labor sites, LabourStart).<sup>13</sup> They are at their weakest in doing what the internet is most revolutionary in doing - promoting debate, discussion and dialog. In comparison with IndyMedia, at either international or national level, they appear provincial.

This does not necessarily mean that sites close to the global justice movement are likely to have much impact amongst even those labor unions and activists most open to such. This would require an explicit recognition of the importance of labor and unions to the movement, and specific approaches to the existing independent labor and movement sites, to labor issues and to the unions themselves.<sup>14</sup> The same goes for the cultural and communications activists within the global justice movement more generally.

The point here is not simply a matter of understanding the extent to which power and empowerment are shifting to the places where understandings and feelings are created. It is also one of recognizing that the way unions have 'represented' workers is one that decreasingly fits them. What is at issue here is not 'representation' in a conventional political sense, but 're-presentation', in which the conventional commonsense is challenged, and in

---

<sup>13</sup> The Porto Alegre coverage of LabourNet Germany makes an interesting contrast with LabourStart in so far as this provides documents and reports from both within and outside the German or international unions. <http://www.labournet.de/diskussion/wipo/seattle/index.html>.

<sup>14</sup> For a case of a developing social movement site that has so far ignored labor and unions, see the Comunidad Web de Movimientos Sociales, and León, Burch and Tamayo 2001.

which union members and the union constituency are both stimulated and empowered. This is how the evidently 'unrepresentative' global justice movement, consisting to a considerable extent of 'small and irresponsible' NGOs, has become a power in the world.

## **7. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GLOBAL JUSTICE MOVEMENT REQUIRES THAT IT BE CONSIDERED IN POLITICAL-ECONOMIC TERMS (A MATTER OF PIPERS, PAYERS AND TUNES)**

The global justice movement needs not only celebration and promotion. It also needs research and critique. And this should not be confined to the customary political, ideological - or even communicational/cultural - aspects. Whilst the movement has done much to restore the significance of the political economy (capitalism and alternatives to such) amongst the 'new social movements' of the last 10-20 years, the closest the Forum comes to recognition of its *own* political economy seems to be its search for funding, and – possibly - its reporting on such!

The promotion, however, of a radical-democratic civil society, particularly at international level requires self-awareness about the role within it of money and power.<sup>15</sup> If, in the most general terms, political economy is the understanding of the manner in which the cash/power nexus *influences* – not necessarily determines – social development, then we also need a political-economy of the global justice movement.<sup>16</sup>

Part, if not all, of the participation in the Forum, is directly or indirectly funded by Northern states and private foundations. One does not have to be a 'funding-mentalist' (funding-fixated, a believer in piper-payers determining tunes played) to recognize that presence, activity and power in this global-civil-society-in-the-making is in large part a function of access to and the distribution of such funding. The priorities of foundations and

---

<sup>15</sup> As good a place as any to start would be with a Special Issue of *Nueva Sociedad* (2001). In the contribution here of Araya Dujisin (2001), we see, however, how a considerable sophistication with respect to the role of the Internet in creating new global communities, ignores (in its case study of ATTAC) any consideration of the the money/power syndrome that might limit this powerful player in the new field.

<sup>16</sup> Clifford Bob (2002) presents a power-political view of how, and which, Third World causes obtain international (US?) media coverage, recognition, funding and support. There is enough reality in his profit-and-loss account of relations between local causes and international (US) funders to give the global justice movement cause for systematic self-reflection - in political-economic terms. 'Global civil society' Bob claims, 'is not an open forum marked by altruism but a Darwinian marketplace where legions of groups vie for scarce attention, sympathy, and money' (37). Reading his account might stimulate the new movement to develop understandings of civil society, and means for advancing such, that surpass his cynical realism and, in doing so, avoid the traps he reveals.

development-funding agencies tend to provide parameters for the activities and orientations of recipients. This is now the commonsense in the world of development funders and recipients. NGOs and trade unions dependent on state or foundation funding tend, however, to be coy about reporting and discussing this fact (how many in the US unions - or anywhere - know that the international cooperation activities of the AFL-CIO are 90 per cent dependent on the US state?).

At this moment, the funding agencies may be being won over to the Forum (though I understand that there was anxiety when a major European funder of WSF I appeared to be less enthusiastic about WSF II). That such funds are available suggests that tunes played also influence piper-payers. But what happens if radical groups within the Forum make funding a major public issue? Or if the Forum should increasingly emphasize 'the complicity between electoral democracy and the economic dictatorship of large corporations'?

We need to consider now (and not under pressure during a crisis) to what extent the whole project of 'global civil society construction' is dependent on state and foundation funders in Northern liberal democracies. In one case at WSF II it was clear that there was a conflation of notions of 'global civil society construction' with the foreign policy of the funding state (Rikkilä and Patomäki 2001). On the other hand, it is arguable that such ambiguous or even 'foreign' spaces could, and do, allow for movement-autonomy *within* movement-engagement *with* (see again, Vargas 2002).

These questions suggest a priority for both research and action. Without demonizing state funding, we need to develop principles and practices that ensure that a radical-democratic project for global emancipation does not become reduced to an instrument for the modernization, regulation and even the (necessary) civilizing of global capitalism. This is what happened to the international/ist labor movement. It could happen to the global justice movement.

## CONCLUSION: BEING THERE

History is also biography. Or, in my case, autobiography.<sup>17</sup> Which provides me with license for some even-more personal reflections to round off this paper.

Having both promoted and followed the 'new labor internationalism', 'the new global solidarity', for 15 years, I found myself in the later-90s both overtaken and overwhelmed by the new movement. In applying to attend WSF II I discovered that I was just one individual who, being no part of any significant movement or network, and no longer having academic status, had to pay his own way and find his own corner.

The Charter of the Forum, the notion that every civil anti-global voice could speak, provided me with a two-hour workshop slot (Waterman 2000c), attended by 15-20 people, of whom about half were known to me and well-qualified to contribute. I had hoped that my proposal for a session on the separate meaning and inter-relationship of globalization, internationalism, networking and solidarity (*Appendix 3*) might merge with those of others. This did not happen. The discussion was nonetheless lively and constructive, and the event certainly created or reinforced a network of interested people from three or four continents. Next time, however, I will have to try to ensure that I am incorporated into something with a membership of more than one.

In the absence of any notable interest in my presence, on the part of groups that had their own priorities and personnel, I decided to be an observer and a journalist, something I once earned my living by. My formal irresponsibility for anything except my own workshop – along with my 'subject position', as white, western, male, middle-class, pensioned, etc – allowed me the freedom to write this piece. And, hopefully, the power to have risen above the chaos. If this essay contributes to the further advance of a movement that has by far surpassed that of 1968, so much the better.

---

<sup>17</sup> I have written elsewhere on my international/ist itinerary (Waterman 1993). Sidney Tarrow (2001), writes a related paper, though inspired, rather, by the itinerary of his father. Tarrow, however, entitles his paper 'Rooted Cosmopolitans' (in implicit reference to the Hitler/Stalin accusation, particularly against Jews, that they were rootless ones). Tarrow's paper is an effort to relate his new cosmopolitans to an old world of nation states. Hereby hangs a considerable literature (e.g. Biblio 2002), much of it revealing to what extent the 'cosmopolitan' is and was a eurocentric and even imperial personage. Whilst I believe that it is increasingly possible and necessary for contemporary internationalists to retain local roots, it occurs to me now that globalization both allows for and needs internationalists whose subject-position, address and field of disputation are global. I hope so, because I have to confess, or at least recognise, that I am rootless cosmopolitan whose internationalism is played out in the global arena and – even worse for Tarrow? – in cyberspace.



An English poet wrote, at the time of the French Revolution,

Bliss was it in that first dawn to be alive.  
To be young was very heaven.

In this first dawn of a global emancipation movement, it is not bad to be old either.

Reflecting back on my own reflections, it occurs to me that we may be involved in the French Revolution of the era of globalization! That it is not tied to a particular locale or state, that it is a non-violent one, that it proposes the civilizing of society rather than its violent overthrow, that it aims at a revolution of everyday life - at a cultural revolution such as Lenin (1923) sought as his revolution went sour - is a sign of maturity (cf Brecher 2002).

The old idea of a 'world turned upside down' - in one mighty, violent, totalizing moment - was a sign of the *incapacity* of the oppressed to otherwise impose themselves on society (that incapacity being revealed shortly after each revolution in an inability to preserve it from external invasion/infection, or from internal conservatism/elitism). The task of today's revolutionaries is to make such revolutions unnecessary, and, therefore, the counter-revolutions that follow them impossible. (Also, as 2002 already makes clear, to make conservative or reactionary 'counter-revolutions' impossible within liberal democracies). That our present revolution takes place in a globalized society, has global ambitions, and addresses people(s) also in places of what Castells (cited and criticized in Thayer 2001) calls 'structural irrelevance', suggests that the conditions for a theory and practice of global solidarity are finally being laid. This revolution, moreover, although rooted and manifesting itself in territorialized places, is not only occurring throughout global space but also in that least territorial, most infinite, plastic and contradictory of places – cyberspace.

The Masters of the Universe and their court intellectuals may wish to think this is the end of history – that the Wall Street speculator represents the peak of human evolution.<sup>18</sup> When a fundamentalist, machista and militarist network attempted to turn this world

---

<sup>18</sup> In Tom Wolfe's (1988) *Bonfire of the Vanities*, the self-appointed Master of the Universe, who is such a speculator, is a figure of ridicule until he is stripped down to his White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, Two-Fisted, core. In the light of what happened after September 11, it seems as if the US is now offering us this Action Man, armed with State-of-the-Art, Hi-Tech, Smart weapons, as the foremost representative of Western civilization, the deliverer of a profound message to 'lesser breeds without the law'.

upside down, September 11, 2001, it only provoked a violent, machista and anti-democratic reassertion of a now evidently vulnerable mastery.

That the global justice movement took September 11 and its consequences in its stride (with the partial exception of the US itself) suggests not so much foresight as a new depth and breadth of understanding of a globalized world disorder.<sup>19</sup> Remember Scylla and Charybdis: the one extreme implies the other. A realization that these options are less opposed than interdependent suggests, however, the necessity to surpass the powerful Forum slogan that 'another world is possible'.

Today, clearly, it is also necessary - and urgent.

## REFERENCES

- Aguiton, Christophe. 2001. *Le monde nous appartient* (The World Belongs to Us). Paris: Plon. 251 pp.
- Aguiton, Christophe. 2002a. *O mundo nos pertence* (The World Belongs to Us). São Paulo: Viramundo. 222 pp.
- Aguiton, Christophe. 2002b. 'The West Bank: A First-Hand Account', *Sand in the Wheels* (Attac Weekly Newsletter), No. 124, 17.04.02, <http://attac.org/attacinfoen/attacnews124.zip>
- Araya Dujisin, Rodrigo. 2001. 'La globalización de los ciudadanos: El caso Attac' (The Globalization of Citizenships: The Case of ATTAC), *Nueva Sociedad*, No. 176, pp. 87-101.
- Alvarez, Sonia. 1997. 'Latin American Feminisms "Go Global": Trends of the 1990s and Challenges for the New Millennium', in Sonya Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino and Arturo Escobar (eds), *Cultures of Politics/Politics of Culture: Revisioning Latin American Social Movements*. Boulder: Westview.

---

<sup>19</sup> There were and are elements within the movement who consider those who carried out the September 11 massacre, as heroes of Third World anti-imperialism; or who discount September 11 by reference to the history of US or Western-engineered massacres and holocausts (like Hebe de Bonafini, of the Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo, for whom see Canavese and Gruss 2001). The majority, I would hazard, are likely to identify with the understanding incorporated in the CSM (*Appendix I*). This is the mark of a movement that sees itself less as negating neo-liberal capitalist globalization than as surpassing it. For a further example of the manner in which the 'anti-globalization movement' is embracing - or becoming - the peace movement, see the report on a visit to devastated Palestine by Christophe Aguiton (2002b).

- Anheier, Helmut, Marlies Glasius and Mary Kaldor (eds). 2001. *Global Civil Society Yearbook 2001*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 360 pp.
- Barker, Colin and Laurence Cox. 2002. "'What Have the Romans Ever Done for Us?': Academic and Activist Forms of Movement Theorizing', <http://www.iol.ie/~mazzoldi/toolsforchange/afpp/afpp8.html>
- Biblio (ed). 2002. 'Cosmopolitanism and the Nation-State'. *Biblio: A Review of Books* (New Delhi). Special Issue. March-April. 58 pp.
- Bob, Clifford. 2002. 'Merchants of Morality', *Foreign Policy*, March-April. 36-45.
- Brecher, Jeremy, Tim Costello and Brendan Smith. 2000. *Globalization from Below: The Power of Solidarity*, Boston: South End Press. 164 pp.
- Brecher, Jeremy. 2002. 'Reply to Chuck Morse, "Theory of the Anti-Globalization Movement"'. Email draft received May 8, 2002.
- Call of Social Movements. 2002. 'Call of Social Movements'. II Ciranda – 07 Documento, 08/02/2002 22:18. Ciranda, <http://www.ciranda.net/>
- Canavese, Mariana y Luis Gruss. 2001. 'Entrevista a Hebe de Bonafini: Salirse de Madre' (Interview with Hebe de Bonafini), *Tres Puntos*. N° 226, 25 de Octubre de 2001. <http://www.3puntos.com/search.php3?numero=251>
- Carotenuto, Gennaro. 2002. 'Documento final de los movimientos sociales: Una cosa es hablar y otra escribir' (Final Document of the Social Movements: It is One Thing to Talk and Another to Write), *Brecha* (Montevideo), February 8, pp. 16-17.
- Castells, Manuel. 1996-8. *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Vols. 1-3. Oxford: Blackwells.
- Catalano, Ana María. 1999. 'The Crisis of Trade Union Representation: New Forms of Social Integration and Autonomy-Construction', in Ronaldo Munck and Peter Waterman (eds), *Labor Worldwide in the Era of Globalization*. London: Macmillan. Pp. 27-40.
- Collins, Henry and Chimen Abramsky. 1965. *Karl Marx and the British Labor Movement: Years of the First International*. London: Macmillan. 356 pp.
- Correa, Sonia. 2002. 'Globalization and Fundamentalism: A Genderscape', *Addressing the World Social Forum: A DAWN Supplement*. Montevideo: REPEM/Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era. Pp. 1-3.

- Declaration of Intellectuals. 2002. 'Declaration of a Group of Intellectuals in Porto Alegre'. [http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/eng/temas\\_declara\\_grupo\\_intele\\_POA\\_eng.asp](http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/eng/temas_declara_grupo_intele_POA_eng.asp)
- DeMartino, George. 1991. 'Trade-Union Isolation and the Catechism of the Left', *Rethinking Marxism*, 4(3), Fall : 123-456.
- Democracia Socialista. 2000. 'Teses internacionais: VI Conferencia Nacional' (International Theses: 6<sup>th</sup> National Conference). Porto Alegre: Cadernos de em Tempo. 38 pp.
- Dinerstein, Anna and Michael Neary. 2002. *The Labor Debate: An Investigation into the Theory and Reality of Capitalist Work*. Aldershot: Ashgate. 245 pp.
- Elizalde, Rosa Miriam. 2002. 'James Petras: EEUU no es omnipotente' (James Petras: USA Is Not Omnipotent), *La República* (Montevideo), February 11, p. 22.
- Escobar, Arturo. 2000. 'Notes on Networks and Anti-Globalization Social Movements', 2000 AAA Annual Meeting, San Francisco, November 15-19.
- ETUC. 2000. 'Foro Social Mundial 2002. Porto Alegre 31 enero-5 febrero 2002: Informe de la delegación de la CES' (World Social Forum 2002. Porto Alegre January 31-February 5: Report of the ETUC Delegation). Brussels: European Trade Union Confederation. 9 pp.
- European Social Consulta. 2002. 'European Social Consulta: Internal Consultation'. Network of ESC Promotor Groups. 2 pp. [eng@consultaeuropa.org](mailto:eng@consultaeuropa.org). [www.consultaeuropa.org](http://www.consultaeuropa.org).
- Euzeby, Chantal. 2000. 'Uma revolução tranqüila do trabalho' (A Quiet Revolution at Work), *Globalização e Mundo do Trabalho*. São Paulo: Le Monde Diplomatique, No. 1, pp. 28-30.
- Facio, Alda. 2002. 'Globalización y feminismo: Tema del 9 Encuentro Feminista' (Globalization and Feminism: Theme of the 9<sup>th</sup> Feminist Encounter), *9 Encuentro Feminista Latinoamericano y del Caribe. Costa Rica 2002*. No. 2, January. Pp. 2-6.
- Frankman, Myron. 2001. 'From the Common Heritage of Mankind to a Planet-Wide Citizen's Income: Establishing the Basis for Solidarity', McGill University May 31, 2001. [myron.frankman@mcgill.ca](mailto:myron.frankman@mcgill.ca)

- Gobbi, Carina. 1997. 'VII Encuentro Feminista Latinoamericano y del Caribe: El desencuentro Feminista Latinoamericano' [7<sup>th</sup> Latin American and Caribbean Feminist Encounter: The Latin American and Feminist Dis-encounter], *Mujer/Fempres*, No. 183, pp. 8-9.
- Gorz, Andre. 1999. *Reclaiming Work: Beyond the Wage-Based Society*. Cambridge: Polity. 185 pp.
- Hardt, Michael. 2002. 'Hardt en el Foro Social: Soberanía nacional y militancias en red' (Hardt on the Social Forum: National Sovereignty and Networked Militancy)', *Clarín*, (Buenos Aires), March 13. <http://old.clarin.com/suplementos/cultura/2002/03/23/u-00302.htm>
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Holloway, John. 2002. *Change the World without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today*. London: Pluto. 237.
- Hyde, Gene. 2002. 'Independent Media Centers: Cyber-Subversion and the Alternative Press', *First Monday*, Vol. 7, No. 4 (April 2002), URL: [http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue7\\_4/hyde/index.html](http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue7_4/hyde/index.html)
- Jakobsen, Kjeld, Renato Martins and Osmir Domrowski (eds). 2000. *Mapa do Trabalho Informal: Perfil socioeconômico dos trabalhadores informais na cidade de São Paulo* (A Map of Informal Work: A Socio-Economic Profile of Informal Workers in the City of São Paulo). São Paulo: Editora Fundação Perseu Abramo. 64 pp.
- Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich. 1923. 'On Cooperation'. <http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1923/jan/06.htm>
- León, Osvaldo, Sally Burch and Eduardo Tamayo. 2001. *Social Movements on the Net*. Quito: Agencia Latinoamericana de Información. 206 pp.
- Marcosur Feminist Network. 2002. *Tu boca fundamental contra los fundamentalismos* (Against Fundamentalisms Your Mouth is Fundamental). Montevideo: Articulación Feminista Marcosur. 6 pp.
- Nueva Sociedad. 2001. 'Entre la globalización y el multilateralismo cooperativo' (Between Globalization and Cooperative Multilateralism), (Special Issue), No. 176, pp. 48-145.

- One-Off. 2001. *On Fire: The Battle of Genoa and the Anti-Capitalist Movement*. London(?): One-Off Press. 141 pp.
- Panitch, Leo and Colin Leys (eds). 1999. 'Necessary and Unnecessary Utopias', *Socialist Register 2000*. London: Merlin.
- Petras, James. 2002a. 'Reforma o revolución? Una discusión en las condiciones actuales de América Latin' (Reform or Revolution? A Discussion of the Present Situation in Latin America). [Exposición en el Forum Social Mundial Porto Alegre 2002]. <http://rcci.net/globalizacion/index.htm>
- Petras, James. 2002b. 'Una historia de dos foros' (A Tale of Two Forums), 18 February. [www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/eng/balanco\\_fsm\\_2002.asp](http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/eng/balanco_fsm_2002.asp)
- Pianta, Mario. 2001. 'Parallel Summits of Global Civil Society', in Helmut Anheier, Marlies Glasius and Mary Kaldor (eds). 2001. *Global Civil Society Yearbook 2001*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 169-94.
- Powell, Jeff. 2002. 'Petty-Capitalism, Perfecting Capitalism or Post-Capitalism? Lessons from the Argentinean Barter Network'. *Working Paper Series*, No. 357. The Hague: Institute of Social Studies. 73 pp.
- Quijano, Aníbal. 2002. 'Sistemas alternativos de produção' (Alternative Production Systems), in Boaventura de Sousa Santos (ed), *Producir para vivir: Los caminos da democracia participativa*. Pp. 475-514. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
- Rikkilä, Leena and Katarina Sehm Patomäki (eds). 2001. *Democracy and Globalization: Promoting a North-South Dialog*. Helsinki: Networking Institute for Global Democracy and Ministry for Foreign Affairs. 129 pp.
- República de las Mujeres. 2002. 'El género en el Foro Social' (Gender in the Social Forum). *La República de las Mujeres* (Montevideo). February 9. Pp. 2-3.
- Schwarz, Nico. 2002. 'La relación partidos-movimientos sociales en el eje del debate de Porto Alegre: Proponen crear un Foro partidario internacional de izquierdas' (The Party-Social Movement Relation in the Axis of Debate at Porto Alegre: An International Left Party is Proposed), *La Republica* (Montevideo), February 9, p. 21.
- Sousa Santos, Boaventura de. 1995. *Toward a New Common Sense: Law, Science and Politics in the Paradigmatic Transition*. New York: Routledge. 614 pp.

- Sousa Santos, Boaventura de (ed). 2001. *Produzir para viver: Os caminhos da produção não capitalista*. (Produce to Live: The Paths of Non-Capitalist Production). [Vol. 2 of *Reinventar a Emancipação Social: Para Novos Manifestos*]. São Paulo: Civilização. 518 pp.
- Starr, Amory. 2000. *Naming the Enemy: Anti-Corporate Movements Confront Globalization*. London: Zed. 268 pp.
- Suplicy, E. M. 2000. *Renda de cidadania: a saída, e pela porta*. São Paulo: Cortez. 367 pp.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 2001. 'Rooted Cosmopolitans: Transnational Activists in a World of States', (A talk prepared for delivery at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, November 2nd, 2001).
- Thayer, Millie. 2001. 'Transnational Feminism: Reading Joan Scott in the Brazilian Sertão', *Ethnography*, No. 4, June.
- Vargas, Gina. 1996. '1996: Odisea Feminista'. *Cotidiano Mujer* (Special Issue: 7<sup>th</sup> Latin American and Caribbean Feminist Encounter), No. 23, November 96-March 97, pp. 2-6,8.
- Vargas, Virginia. 2002. 'On the Tension between Civil Society and State in the Global Arena'. (Draft). Lima. March. 28 pp.
- Warrian, Peter. 2001. 'Can't Get There from Here: Old/New Unions in an New/Old Economy', Sefton Lecture 2001, University of Toronto.  
[http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/cir/library/electronicarchive/SeftonLectures/SeftonLecture19th\\_2000-01\\_Warrian.pdf](http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/cir/library/electronicarchive/SeftonLectures/SeftonLecture19th_2000-01_Warrian.pdf).
- Waterman, Peter. 1993. 'Hopeful Traveller: The Itinerary of an Internationalist', *History Workshop*, No. 35, Spring, pp. 165-184.
- Waterman, Peter. 2001a. *Globalisation, Social Movements and the New Internationalisms*. London: Continuum. 320 pp.
- Waterman, Peter. 2001b. 'Labor Internationalism in the Transition from a National/Industrial/Colonial Capitalism to an Informatized/Globalized One...and Beyond', in Bart de Wilde (ed). *The Past and Future of International Trade Unionism: International Conference, Ghent (Belgium), May 19-20, 2000*. Ghent: Amsab. 324 pp.

- Waterman, Peter. 2002a. 'A Report on Labor at the World Social Forum, Porto Alegre, January 31-February 5, 2002, Reflects on: The Still Unconsummated Marriage of International Unionism and the Global Justice Movement'. 42 pp.
- Waterman, Peter. 2002b. 'Emancipating Labor Internationalism', [To appear in Boaventura de Sousa Santos (ed). *Trabalhar o mundo: Os caminhos do novo internacionalismo operário*. Vol. 5 of *Reinventar a Emancipação Social: Para Novos Manifestos*]. São Paulo: Civilização Brasileira. [www.ces.fe.uc.pt/emancipa/en/themes/index.html](http://www.ces.fe.uc.pt/emancipa/en/themes/index.html)].
- Waterman, Peter. 2002c. 'Propositions on Globalization, Internationalism, Networking and Solidarity'. 1 p.
- Waterman, Peter. 2002d. 'Shall the Last Be the First? The Internationalism of Labor's Others'. (Incomplete draft outline). 7 pp.
- Waterman, Peter. Forthcoming. 'Talking across Difference in an Interconnected World of Labor'. *Transnational Associations*.
- Wolfe, Tom. 1988. *Bonfire of the Vanities*. New York: Bantam. 669 pp.
- World March of Women. 2002. 'World March of Women Building the World Social Forum'. Montreal: World March of Women. 4 pp.
- World Social Forum Charter. 2001. 'World Social Forum Charter of Principles'. (Approved and adopted by the Organizing Committee, São Paulo, April 9, modified and approved by the International Council, June 10). 5 pp.

### **Internet resources**

Alternatives to Corporate Globalization

<http://phillyimc.org/article.pl?sid=01/11/23/0039242&mode=thread>

Ciranda (2nd Forum Information Exchange) <http://www.ciranda.net/>

Comunidad Web de Movimientos Sociales <http://www.movimientos.org/>

Cuban Information Archives [http://cuban-exile.com/doc\\_201-225/doc0225.htm](http://cuban-exile.com/doc_201-225/doc0225.htm)

Evaluations WSF 2002. [www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/eng/balanco\\_fsm\\_2002.asp](http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/eng/balanco_fsm_2002.asp)

European Social Consulta. [www.consultaeuropea.org](http://www.consultaeuropea.org), [eng@consultaeuropea.org](mailto:eng@consultaeuropea.org)

Globalización: Revista Web Mensual de Economía, Política, Sociedad y Cultura (Spanish/English) <http://rcci.net/globalizacion/index.htm>

Global Solidarity Dialog Group/List <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/GloSoDia>



IndyMedia Center (USA) <http://www.indymedia.org/publish.php3>

LabourNet Germany <http://www.labournet.de/>

LabourStart <http://www.labourstart.org/>

Rethinking Social Emancipation [www.ces.fe.uc.pt/emancipa/en/themes/index.html](http://www.ces.fe.uc.pt/emancipa/en/themes/index.html)

São Paulo Forum <http://www.forosãopaulo.org/>

## **APPENDICES**

### **Appendix 1:**

#### **II Ciranda – 07 Documento - Call of social movements 08/02/2002 22:18**

##### **Call of social movements**

- 1) In the face of continuing deterioration in the living conditions of people, we, social movements from all around the world, have come together in the tens of thousands at the second World Social Forum in Porto Alegre. We are here in spite of the attempts to break our solidarity. We come together again to continue our struggles against neoliberalism and war, to confirm the agreements of the last Forum and to reaffirm that another world is possible.
- 2) We are diverse - women and men, adults and youth, indigenous peoples, rural and urban, workers and unemployed, homeless, the elderly, students, migrants, professionals, peoples of every creed, color and sexual orientation. The expression of this diversity is our strength and the basis of our unity. We are a global solidarity movement, united in our determination to fight against the concentration of wealth, the proliferation of poverty and inequalities, and the destruction of our earth. We are living and constructing alternative systems, and using creative ways to promote them. We are building a large alliance from our struggles and resistance against a system based on sexism, racism and violence, which privileges the interests of capital and patriarchy over the needs and aspirations of people.
- 3) This system produces a daily drama of women, children, and the elderly dying because of hunger, lack of health care and preventable diseases. Families are forced to leave their homes because of wars, the impact of "big development", "landlessness and environmental disasters, unemployment, attacks on public services and the destruction of social

solidarity. Both in the South and in the North, vibrant struggles and resistance to uphold the dignity of life are flourishing.

- 4) September 11 marked a dramatic change. After the terrorist attacks, which we absolutely condemn, as we condemn all other attacks on civilians in other parts of the world, the government of the United States and its allies have launched a massive military operation. In the name of the "war against terrorism," civil and political rights are being attacked all over the world. The war against Afghanistan, in which terrorists methods are being used, is now being extended to other fronts. Thus there is the beginning of a permanent global war to cement the domination of the US government and its allies. This war reveals another face of neoliberalism, a face which is brutal and unacceptable. Islam is being demonized, while racism and xenophobia are deliberately propagated. The mass media is actively taking part in this belligerent campaign which divides the world into "good" and "evil". The opposition to the war is at the heart of our movement.
- 5) The situation of war has further destabilised the Middle East, providing a pretext for further repression of the Palestinian people. An urgent task of our movement is to mobilise solidarity for the Palestinian people and their struggle for self-determination as they face brutal occupation by the Israeli state. This is vital to collective security of all peoples in the region.
- 6) Further events also confirm the urgency of our struggles. In Argentina the financial crisis caused by the failure of IMF structural adjustment and mounting debt precipitated a social and political crisis. This crisis generated spontaneous protests of the middle and working classes, repression which caused deaths, failure of governments, and new alliances between different social groups. With the force of "cacerolazos" and "piquetes," popular mobilisations have demanded their basic rights of food, jobs and housing. We reject the criminalisation of social movements in Argentina and the attacks against democratic rights and freedom. We also condemn the greed and the blackmail of the multinational corporation supported by the governments of the rich countries.
- 7) The collapse of the multinational Enron exemplifies the bankruptcy of the casino economy and the corruption of businessmen and politicians, leaving workers without jobs and pensions. In developing countries this multinational engaged in fraudulent activities and

its projects pushed people off their land and led to sharp increases in the price of water and electricity.

- 8) The United States government, in its efforts to protect the interests of big corporations, arrogantly walked away from negotiations on global warming, the antiballistic missile treaty, the Convention on Biodiversity, the UN conference on racism and intolerance, and the talks to reduce the supply of small arms, proving once again that US unilateralism undermines attempts to find multilateral solutions to global problems.
- 9) In Genoa the G8 failed completely in its self-assumed task of global government. In the face of massive mobilisation and resistance, they responded with violence and repression, denouncing as criminals those who dared to protest. But they failed to intimidate our movement.
- 10) All this is happening in the context of a global recession. The neoliberal economic model is destroying the rights, living conditions and livelihoods of people. Using every means to protect their "share value," multinational companies lay off workers, slash wages and close factories, squeezing the last dollar from the workers. Governments faced with this economic crisis respond by privatising, cutting social sector expenditures and permanently reducing workers' rights. This recession exposes the fact that the neoliberal promise of growth and prosperity is a lie.
- 11) The global movement for social justice and solidarity faces enormous challenges: its fight for peace and collective security implies confronting poverty, discriminations, dominations and the creation of an alternative sustainable society.

Social movements energetically condemn violence and militarism as a means of conflict resolution; the promotion of low intensity conflicts and military operations in the Colombia Plan as part of the Andes regional initiative, the Puebla Panama plan, the arms trade and higher military budgets, economic blockades against people and nations especially against Cuba and Iraq, and the growing repression against trade unions, social movements, and activists.

We support the trade unions and informal sector worker struggles as essential to maintain working and living conditions, the genuine right to organise, to go on strike, to negotiate collective agreements, and to achieve equality in wages and working conditions between women and men.

We reject slavery and the exploitation of children. We support workers struggles and the trade union fights against casualisation, subcontracting of labour and lay offs, and demand new international rights for the employees of the multinational companies and their affiliates, in particular the right to unionise and space for collective bargaining. Equally we support the struggles of farmers and peoples organisations for their rights to a livelihood, and to land, forests and water.

12) Neoliberal policies create tremendous misery and insecurity. They have dramatically increased the trafficking and sexual exploitation of women and children. Poverty and insecurity creates millions of migrants who are denied their dignity, freedom, and rights. We therefore demand the right of free movement; the right to physical integrity and legal status of all migrants. We support the rights of indigenous peoples and the fulfillment of ILO article 169 in national legal frameworks.

13) The external debt of the countries of the South has been repaid several times over. Illegitimate, unjust and fraudulent, debt functions as an instrument of domination, depriving people of their fundamental human rights with the sole aim of increasing international usury. We demand unconditional cancellation of debt and the reparation of historical, social, and ecological debts. The countries demanding repayment of debt have engaged in exploitation of the natural resources and the traditional knowledge of the South.

14) Water, land, food, forests, seeds, culture and people's identities are common assets of humanity for present and future generations. It is essential to preserve biodiversity. People have the right to safe and permanent food free from genetically modified organisms. Food sovereignty at the local, national, regional level is a basic human right; in this regard, democratic land reforms and peasant's access to land are fundamental requirements.

15) The meeting in Doha confirmed the illegitimacy of the WTO. The adoption of the "development agenda" only defends corporate interests. By launching a new round, the WTO is moving closer to its goal of converting everything into a commodity. For us, food, public services, agriculture, health and education are not for sale. Patenting must not be used a weapon against the poor countries and peoples. We reject the patenting and trading of life forms. The WTO agenda is perpetuated at the continental level by regional free trade and investment agreements. By organizing protests such as the huge demonstrations and plebiscites against FTAA, people have rejected these agreements as

representing a recolonisation and the destruction of fundamental social, economical, cultural and environmental rights and values.

16) We will strengthen our movement through common actions and mobilizations for social justice, for the respect of rights and liberties, for quality of life, equality, dignity and peace. We are fighting for:

- democracy: people have the right to know about and criticize the decisions of their own governments, especially with respect to dealings with international institutions. Governments are ultimately accountable to their people. While we support the establishment of electoral and participative democracy across the world, we emphasise the need for the democratisation of states and societies and the struggles against dictatorship.
- the abolition of external debt and reparations.
- against speculative activities: we demand the creation of specific taxes such as the Tobin Tax, and the abolition of tax havens.
- the right to information
- women's rights, freedom from violence, poverty and exploitation.
- against war and militarism, against foreign military bases and interventions, and the systematic escalation of violence. We choose to privilege negotiation and non violent conflict resolution. We affirm the right for all the people to ask international médiation, with the participation independent actors from the civil society.
- the rights of youth, their access to free public education and social autonomy, and the abolition of compulsory military service.
- the self determination of all peoples, especially the rights of indigenous peoples.

In the years to come, we will organise collective mobilisations such as:

In 2002:

- 8 March: International women's day
- 17 April: International day of peasant's struggle.
- 1 May: Labour Day.
- 7 October: world day for the homeless.
- 12 October: cry of the excluded.

- 16 October: world food day.

Other global mobilisations will take place:

- 15-16 March: Barcelona (Spain), summit of the EU.
- 18-22 March: Monterrey (Mexico), United Nations Conference on Financing for Development.
- 17-18 May: Madrid (Spain), Summit of Latin America, Caribbean and Europe.
- May, Asia Development Bank Annual Meeting, Shanghai, China
- 1 May: "International day of action against militarism and peace"
- End of May, 4th preparatory meeting for the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Indonesia
- June: Roma (Italy), world food summit;
- 22 -23 June: Sevilla EU summit
- July: Toronto and Calgary(Canada), G8 summit.
- 22 July: USA campaign against Coca Cola
- September: Johannesburg (South Africa), Rio+10.
- September, Asia Europe Meeting (ASEM), Copenhagen
- October: Quito (Ecuador), Social continental forum "A new integration is possible"
- November: Cuba, 2nd Hemispheric meeting against FTAA
- December: Copenhagen (Denmark), summit of EU.

In 2003:

- April: Buenos Aires (Argentina), summit of the FTAA.
- June: Thessaloniki EU Summit
- June, France, G8

WTO, IMF and World Bank will meet somewhere, sometime.

And we will be there!

## **Appendix 2**

**Brasil, domingo, 12 de agosto de 2001**

### **World Social Forum Charter of Principles**

#### **By Organizing Comitee**

The committee of Brazilian organizations that conceived of, and organized, the first World Social Forum, held in Porto Alegre from January 25<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup>, 2001, after evaluating the results of that Forum and the expectations it raised, consider it necessary and legitimate to draw up a Charter of Principles to guide the continued pursuit of that initiative in the terms of the Information Note that it issued at the close of the Forum. While the principles contained in this Charter - to be respected by all those who wish to take part in the process and to organize new editions of the World Social Forum - are a consolidation of the decisions that presided over the holding of the Porto Alegre Forum and ensured its success, they extend the reach of those decisions and define orientations that flow from their logic.

1. The World Social Forum is an open meeting place for reflective thinking, democratic debate of ideas, formulation of proposals, free exchange of experiences and interlinking for effective action, by groups and movements of civil society that are opposed to neoliberalism and to domination of the world by capital and any form of imperialism, and are committed to building a planetary society centred on the human person.
2. The World Social Forum at Porto Alegre was an event localized in time and place. From now on, in the certainty proclaimed at Porto Alegre that “another world is possible”, it becomes a permanent process of seeking and building alternatives, which cannot be reduced to the events supporting it.
3. The World Social Forum is a world process. All the meetings that are held as part of this process have an international dimension.
4. The alternatives proposed at the World Social Forum stand in opposition to a process of capitalist globalization commanded by the large multinational corporations and by the governments and international institutions at the service of those corporations’ interests. They are designed to ensure that globalization in solidarity will prevail as a new stage in world history. This will respect universal human rights, and those of all citizens - men and women - of all nations and the environment and will rest on democratic interna-

tional systems and institutions at the service of social justice, equality and the sovereignty of peoples.

5. The World Social Forum brings together and interlinks only organizations and movements of civil society from all the countries in the world, but intends neither to be a body representing world civil society nor to exclude from the debates it promotes those in positions of political responsibility, mandated by their peoples, who decide to enter into the commitments resulting from those debates.
6. The meetings of the World Social Forum do not deliberate on behalf of the World Social Forum as a body. No-one, therefore, will be authorized, on behalf of any of the editions of the Forum, to express positions claiming to be those of all its participants. The participants in the Forum shall not be called on to take decisions as a body, whether by vote or acclamation, on declarations or proposals for action that would commit all, or the majority, of them and that propose to be taken as establishing positions of the Forum as a body.
7. Nonetheless, organizations or groups of organizations that participate in the Forum's meetings must be assured the right, during such meetings, to deliberate on declarations or actions they may decide on, whether singly or in coordination with other participants. The World Social Forum undertakes to circulate such decisions widely by the means at its disposal, without directing, hierarchizing, censoring or restricting them, but as deliberations of the organizations or groups of organizations that made the decisions.
8. The World Social Forum is a plural, diversified, non-confessional, non-governmental and non-party context that, in a decentralized fashion, interrelates organizations and movements engaged in concrete action at levels from the local to the international to build another world. It thus does not constitute a locus of power to be disputed by the participants in its meetings, nor does it intend to constitute the only option for interrelation and action by the organizations and movements that participate in it.
9. The World Social Forum asserts democracy as the avenue to resolving society's problems politically. As a meeting place, it is open to pluralism and to the diversity of activities and ways of engaging of the organizations and movements that decide to participate in it, as well as the diversity of genders, races, ethnicities and cultures.



10. The World Social Forum is opposed to all totalitarian and reductionist views of history and to the use of violence as a means of social control by the State. It upholds respect for Human Rights, for peaceful relations, in equality and solidarity, among people, races, genders and peoples, and condemns all forms of domination and all subjection of one person by another.
11. The meetings of the World Social Forum are always open to all those who wish to take part in them, except organizations that seek to take people's lives as a method of political action.
12. As a forum for debate, the World Social Forum is a movement of ideas that prompts reflection, and the maximum possible transparent circulation of the results of that reflection, on the mechanisms and instruments of domination by capital, on means and actions to resist and overcome that domination, and on the alternatives that can be proposed to solve the problems of exclusion and inequality that the process of capitalist globalization currently prevalent is creating or aggravating, internationally and within countries.
13. As a framework for the exchange of experiences, the World Social Forum encourages understanding and mutual recognition among its participant organizations and movements, and places special value on all that society is building to centre economic activity and political action on meeting the needs of people and respecting nature.
14. As a context for interrelations, the World Social Forum seeks to strengthen and create new national and international links among organizations and movements of civil society, that - in both public and private life - will increase the capacity for social resistance to the process of dehumanization the world is undergoing and reinforce the humanizing measures being taken by the action of these movements and organizations.
15. The World Social Forum is a process that encourages its participant organizations and movements to situate their actions as issues of planetary citizenship, and to introduce onto the global agenda the change-inducing practices that they are experimenting in building a new world.

**São Paulo, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2001**

ABONG - Brazilian Association of Non-Governmental Organizations

ATTAC - Association for the Taxation of Financial Transactions for the Aid of Citizens

CBJP - Brazilian Justice and Peace Commission, National Council of Bishops (CNBB)

CIVES - Brazilian Business Association for Citizenship

CUT - Central Trade Union Confederation

IBASE - Brazilian Institute for Social and Economic Studies

CJG - Centre for Global Justice

MST - Movement of Landless Rural Workers

Publicada em 26/04/2001 -

FSM-2002!

Approuvée en 9 Avril, 2002...

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Internationalism, Networking, Solidarity in the Era of Globalisation**

**Globalisation** means a simultaneous stretching and intensification of all social relations – economic, political, military, gender, ecological, cultural/ communicational - creating for the first time a meaningfully global society. This is a process that began long before capitalism and will continue after. It is also, actually, something that the major religions, secular humanist and socialist traditions have always sought. Under a neo-liberal capitalist hegemony, of course, globalisation bears the traits of the old imperialism, but has implied a dramatic intensification of all the contradictions of capitalism. This therefore means that it has also produced and enabled an intensification of opposition to neo-liberalism, which is now pretty much worldwide.

Precursors to **internationalism** can be found in religious universalism, in enlightenment cosmopolitanism, before taking shape in the C19th as labour and socialist internationalism. Inter-nationalism, however, as the name implies, was a relationship between nation-states, nationalities, nationalisms, nationalists. Despite heroic efforts and achievements, it became increasingly attenuated and hollow during the C20th, until it no longer moved anyone or anything. Its contemporary successor is something best understood as a global solidarity movement, in the sense that it addresses global problems (of which those

of nations/nationalities are but one part), and that it addresses them holistically (neither isolating one struggle from, nor prioritizing one, over others).

**Networking** is a relational form that has been the most common one throughout the ages, but was marginalised in the age of organized industrial capitalism. With computerization the network has become the dominant relational form, to the point that globalisation is inconceivable without it. Our present period is therefore most usefully conceived as a globalised networked finance and services capitalism (GNC for short). Whilst networking would seem to suck all wealth and power out of locales in which people live, undermining their traditional communities and organizations, we know that its 'virtual reality' has actually created the terrain on which the new global solidarity movements depend for their speed, flexibility, reach and effect. Whilst capital, state, patriarchy, religious fundamentalisms and racism can use the web, the movement that lives within and from it is the new radical-democratic and internationalist social one.

The notion of **solidarity** is also contained, in its historically specific forms, within all notions of community, universalized by the major religions, and forming part of the secular trinity of the French Revolution (limited as 'brotherhood', and eventually by the nation-state). 'Solidarity', however, is the forgotten term in this secular trinity, never theorized even by the socialists, reduced, finally to a token. In the age of globalization, however, we are condemned to 'solidarity with others', to 'solidarity with distant strangers', if we are ourselves to survive. Our new global solidarity, however, has to be rethought in network (communicational, cultural) terms, and it has to become at least as sophisticated as the GNC it seeks to defend people against, and to eventually surpass. Solidarity needs to be specified according to at least axis, directionality, reach and depth. It also needs to be differentiated in terms of at least Identity, Substitution, Complementarity, Reciprocity, Affinity and Restitution. Each of these carries part of the meaning of Solidarity, each of them alone only carries part. A restoration of this ethical principle to pride of place amongst the values of emancipatory movements would provide them with something no capitalist, no state, can either reduce to a commodity, nor claim as its own.

*It is in the articulation of internationalism, networking and solidarity that emancipatory power rests in the era of globalisation.*