

On the Export and Import of Civil Society in Times of Globalisation (and the Significance of Urban Turtles for Global Democracy)

Peter Waterman

2000

email: p.waterman@inter.nl.net
global solidarity site: <http://www.antenna.nl~waterman/>
[inactive]

Introduction: the solidarity of substitution¹

Kees Biekart's book on European funding agencies and civil society construction in Central America (Biekart 1999) makes an important contribution to the literature and raises wider questions about what I think of as the export and import of civil society in times of globalisation. Let me begin with reflections on this book, cast largely within the political/developmental discourse of the funding agencies themselves, and then move on to the political-economic/dependency discourse of the (neo)marxists. Along the way, I will suggest the primacy of radical-democratic social movements, and the necessity for meaningfully global networking and dialogue between such, if we are to develop an understanding of civil society relevant to the era of globalisation. A Post-Seattle Postscript is added, dealing with the challenge this presents to academic thinking on global civil society.

Kees Biekart begins with an Introduction on 'charity and solidarity'. Part I deals with 'civil society building' and the private aid agencies, both theoretically and analytically. Part II presents democratic transitions in Central America and evaluates the role of these agencies in this process. There is a Conclusion on the 'paradox of private foreign aid'. My expertise, on what could be considered the international relations of social movements, and my concern, with the role being played internationally by 'the solidarity of substitution', imply an address to the Introduction, the theoretical/analytical framework, one international case study, and the Conclusion.

¹ Kees Biekart was kind enough to subject a first draft of this paper to a justified critique but can, evidently, not be held in any way responsible for my response to this. The paper has been published in English and Spanish.

But first I should clarify what I mean by 'substitution solidarity' and its relation to charity. The solidarity of substitution belongs to a set that includes: Identity, Substitution, Complementarity, Reciprocity, Affinity and Restitution.² Briefly; *Identity* is expressed by the slogan 'Workers of the World Unite!', implying one long-term general interest; *Substitution* is exemplified by development cooperation, or 'standing in' for the poor, exploited and powerless; *Complementarity* by the solidarity of 'differential contribution' to a common interest or aim (which could be between workers, or North-South); *Reciprocity* by the exchange of similar quantities or qualities over time; *Affinity* suggests personal identity/friendship between, say, eco-feminists, socialists (of a particular hue), or even rock music fans; *Restitution* by recognition and compensation for past wrongs. Each of these has its *own* part of the meaning of international solidarity; each is only *part* of the meaning, and by itself can only be a limited and impoverished understanding of such. The limitations of a substitution solidarity are that it is a top-down, one-way relationship, *close to charity*. Like charity it does not contain any necessary address to the causes of inequality, nor implication of a transformation of the relation between the two parties: 'the poor are always with us'. Indeed, during the short history of development aid, it appears that the poor are always with us - in ever-rising numbers!

The 'Far From My Bed' show

Biekart's Introduction, is intended to identify the tension, contradiction or movement from solidarity to charity in the work of his 'European Private Aid Agencies' (henceforth EPAAs). Since he nowhere defines or discusses the notion of 'solidarity', it appears to be used rather as those agencies, or their Central American 'partners',³ understood it - as aid intended less for well-digging or disaster relief, more for self-empowerment and democratisation. Whilst I understand the usage, and prefer this kind of aid to the other, I evidently consider 'solidarity' problematic when applied to a relationship which is top-down, one-way, North/West-to-South/East, 'far from my bed' (as the Dutch have it) and basically financial.

Civil society and political economy

The key concept in Part 1 is that of 'civil society' (CS). Biekart presents a thorough discussion of this much-discussed term, and of such related ones as 'citizenship' and 'non-governmental organisations' (NGOs). The latter he considers a loose and ambiguous notion which he prefers to avoid, except when applied to organisations mediating between bodies at the base and those higher up the aid/finance hierarchy. Although Biekart is obviously aware that he is discussing both CS and Central America (CA) in the context of *neo-liberalism*, his index does not list either 'market', 'capitalism' or 'globalisation'. So his CS is understood, fundamentally, in relationship to the *state*. I will return to this.

² For more on international solidarity, and the source of my assumptions, see Waterman 1994, 1998.

³ A friend who founded a much-respected human rights network, carrying out work simultaneously innovatory, vital and dangerous, was uncomfortable at being named a 'partner' by one of Biekart's EPAAs, which was currently funding the initiative but also imposing its own developmentalist criteria, bureaucratic reporting and expensive accounting procedures. Hearing an employee of the agency refer, at a seminar, to 'funders and partners', she declared that she now understood what a 'partner' was. More on this below.

In so far as a new, globalised and networked capitalism is shaping up, it does seem to me to be also shifting priorities from force to consent - from violence to seduction (which evidently does not mean it will *stop* using the former, nationally or internationally, as in ex-Yugoslavia, or in Colombia). We nonetheless seem to be moving from a Leninist to a Gramscian capitalism internationally. An informatised capitalism appears to require, for a globally-integrated world of consumers, a stable and legitimate polity - from the nation to the globe - which is to be ensured by some kind of CS. Whilst the density and activity of such a civil society is variable in the extreme (in the USA it prominently includes the National Rifle Association, and permits guns to be the primary source of death amongst a particular cohort of the young), the existence of a lively CS could be understood as essential to the flexibility and innovation of a globalised, networked capitalism. Completion of the 'unfinished tasks of modernity' is clearly needed in CA (as in the US). But even the thoroughly modern and socially-civilised Netherlands is confronted by contradictions which capitalism produces and reproduces. In order for citizens and social movements to surpass this limitation they surely need to have a notion of CS that is in tension with the market in general, capitalism more specifically and, in Central America, an *externally imposed neo-liberal capitalism* in particular.

Foreign-funded farmers (and feminists)

In Part 2 we eventually arrive at the CA case studies, and I at the regional peasant network known as ASOCODE (Central American Association of Small and Medium Agricultural Producers), founded around 1991. In the meantime we have skipped some 200 pages of dense description and sophisticated analysis and conceptualisation of the EPAAs, their targets/recipients/partners in CA and even Biekart's notion of an 'aid chain' as the necessary object/process for analysis.

The ASOCODE falls into the category of international networks, and to two uncommon but crucial sub-sets of such, the 'sub/regional' and the 'popular'. If, as I believe, the development of a new kind of 'global solidarity' - an internationalism related to globalisation - is to come into existence, its most crucial building blocks will have to be, like ASOCODE, both geographically and socially close to the relevant 'people'. This network went further, providing both the stimulus to and basis for a regional coalition of Central American civil society networks in 1994, known as ICIC (The Civil Initiative for Central American Integration). The nature and history of the ASOCODE reminds me of those of feminist organising at the Latin American/Caribbean regional level (Alvarez 1998, 1999; Waterman 1998:Ch. 6). It may be that the clue to the rise and crisis of both lies precisely in their role as heavy aid recipients at a time of transition from international neo-Keynesianism to a globalised neo-liberalism.

ASOCODE and ICIC receive some 20 pages in Biekart's account, and I could have done with a great deal more (some can be found in Edelman 1998). Biekart deals with them under the sub-heading 'Strengthening Civil Society from a Regional Level'. The creation of this regional *campesino* network comes quite clearly out of a given history, specific social changes and a particular political opportunity. The history is that of semi-capitalist societies, military regimes, devastating (US-sponsored) civil wars, and of left rural insurrectionary strategies. The social changes include the creation of rural social structures increasingly interlinked with urban ones, ecological depredation, the crisis of the nation state confronted by globalisation, and the formal and

self-education of rural cadres. The opportunity was precisely that offered by the demilitarisation/democratisation process, and the creation of a regional identity and institutions, enthusiastically backed, as they were, by at least the European PAAs.

Out of a European Community-funded project on regional food security came the proposal for a network of *campesino* (peasant, farmer) organisations, led by a young charismatic activist from Costa Rica, Wilson Campos. Springing partly out of national needs and partly out of regional ambitions, the project rang the right bells with funding agencies - which had their eyes on the Earth Summit planned for Rio, 1992. In the first year of its existence the network received US\$ 110,000! (This project was clearly flavour-of-the-decade with the EPAAs). Campos presented the network as the *real* voice of the peasants at the grassroots, contrasting it with the rural-oriented but mediating NGOs. This argument evidently also appealed to the funders. By 1992, ASOCODE was receiving US\$ 200,000. By 1996 the budget had risen to US\$ 1.5 million! (One wonders where *exactly* this very considerable funding came from). Whilst in some cases there were existing or developing national *campesino* federations, in others they were being stimulated top-down by the network. ASOCODE produced 'alternative' regional documents on agricultural development, consulted and lobbied with new regional inter-governmental structures. Regional governments, and inter-governmental institutions, were impressed. They were also evidently unconcerned about any unrepresentativity of ASOCODE, any mishandling of finance, any lack of internal democracy or failures in reporting to financial agencies! With the help and advice of some of the EPAAs, the leader(s) of ASOCODE made international contacts outside the sub-region - though these seem to have been with Europe and North America (vertically?) rather than the rest of South America, Africa or Asia (horizontally?). At a certain moment, criticism of the network developed amongst the national federations, which felt ASOCODE had lost its popular address and base.

The success of ASOCODE led to the creation of the ICIC. Eight regionally organised networks were involved, including trade unions, the peasant organisations, small entrepreneurs, development NGOs and community organisations. As a regional network of regional networks, the ICIC - of which Campos was again a leader - had no national members. Foreign-funded heads without local bodies were looming on the horizon. Biekart concludes:

Of all the case studies presented in this study, ASOCODE therefore is probably the clearest example of the 'private aid paradox': private foreign aid facilitated the emergence of influential intermediary actors in civil society, but simultaneously created new problems that obstructed their organisational development. (287)

It would be interesting to know, now a few years have passed, how these bodies have developed, whether they are still totally dependent on foreign funding, whether they have empowered their bases and how, whether or not they have become articulated, in a subordinate role, into state activity at national or regional level.⁴

From civilising mission to civil-society mission?

⁴ Both appear to be still in existence, although the ASOCODE website provides little evidence of their activities. ASOCODE is involved in *campesino* networks both in Latin America and internationally, but the significance of this is also obscure. See: <http://par.sicanet.org.sv/programa-par/socivil.htm>.

The 'paradox' Biekart refers to is not, it seems to me, limited to misused funding, personalistic leadership, distance from the base, or bureaucracy (in the sense of institutional self-interest and self-referentiality). It includes, I would like to suggest, the injection (with appropriate cash incentives) of contemporary West European social-reformist values, such as 'sustainability' and 'gender awareness'. Whilst the first of these seems to have found an echo amongst *campesino* activists increasingly aware of environmental depredation, the latter related to no pre-existing awareness amongst a traditionally macho leadership. Any more than did later attempts to parachute into *ladino* ('white') consciousness a sensitivity to *indígenas* ('Indians') - although today both women and *indígenas* appear as categories on the ASOCODE website.

This, and more, is all well understood by Biekart. What he fails to note, far less to stress, is the relationship between these practices of value-importation and those of earlier generations of White Fathers (or Mothers), who introduced into their colonies such worthy notions as 'cleanliness is next to godliness'.⁵ In neither the historical nor the contemporary case is it easy to deny the progressive - even life-sustaining - nature of such imports. In both cases it is, however, necessary to recognise the nature of the relationship, and the relative power of the parties at various positions in the 'aid chain'. (Would not 'pyramid', suggesting a hierarchy, or 'waterpipe', allowing for taps and one-way flow, have been more appropriate metaphors?).

The appropriate conceptual framework for this kind of relationship is, surely, that of *patron and client*. There is here a well-developed theoretical literature, which would seem quite adequate to the case. That the patrons are themselves critics of colonialism, patriarchy, the church - even of charity or capitalism - does nothing to necessarily transform or even flatten the hierarchy. At *this* end: lifetime office jobs, professional status, a comfortable income, cars (his and hers), neo-liberal managerial doctrines and methods, health insurance (cradle to grave), generous retirement benefits. At *that* end: a pallid (dusky?) and, probably, temporary echo of these things, subject to the vagaries of European state developmental priorities, of European public response to the increasingly slick appeals of the funding agencies. (And in this contrast I am leaving out those at the bottom of the pyramid, at the end of the pipeline).

Biekart is not unaware of all this. There is, however, a *fundamental* (i.e. foundational) shortcoming of development funding, which I do not think is highlighted by Biekart. This is that the local process of struggle and learning, by which women and indigenous peoples impose themselves, from below or beyond, on conservative or privileged others, is truncated, with the consequent danger of the disappearance of any 'woman friendliness', or 'ecological awareness', once the external financial stimulus for such disappears. For me, therefore, there is no private aid *paradox*, there is a private aid *syndrome* and/or a private aid *contradiction*. All that Biekart tells us was, surely, predictable before the event, at the dawn of development aid.⁶

⁵ The relation of the civilising mission to the civil society one is quite central to the theoretical argument of Stephen Hopgood (2000:2). He says that the liberal conception of civil society 'appears to deal with people *as they are*, when in fact it deals with them as they have *already been remade*' (his emphasis), and takes the case of how Native Americans were 'civilised' before they could be admitted to the civil society of the US.

⁶ Compare the 20-year-old argument of Tillman Evers, in which he suggests that its role was to create a reformist counter-elite, and that the relationship between funder and fundee was one of mutual instrumentalisation rather than solidarity (Evers 1982:120).

This is not to say that the EPAA represents evil. It is to raise the question of what (or whom, and how) it represents. There are, no doubt, 'good' funding agencies or projects. But the fact that there might, according to one human interest, identity or preference, be 'good' wolves (or mice), does not tell us enough about the nature of the species 'wolf' (or 'mouse'). There are, after all, 'good' capitalist states. The Netherlands is an excellent example, and one wishes, for the sake of US schoolchildren, as for its Central American backyard - and for the rest of us living under the volcano - that the US had a similar state. In so far as these funding agencies do in some sense mediate between European civil societies and Third World peoples (mark my language), perhaps one should follow the argument of Wilson Campos and either do away with the mediator, or at least turn them into *public* or *civil* aid agencies, i.e. something directly dependent on, open and accountable to, a relevant part of the European public (labour, women, ecological, pacifist, human rights, etc).⁷ When, around 1890, Australian and British dockworkers practised effective solidarity (sub-species: identity-cum-reciprocal?) during successive dock strikes, the money came out of worker and public pockets. Maybe we could be inspired by this model, learn from it, and invent a new one appropriate to our age and problems.

I don't think I am saying anything particularly original or radical here. Much of the substance and tone can, I think, be found in a rather more sceptical work - to which Biekart earlier contributed and for which he was co-responsible (Sogge 1996). In judging the impact of the private funding agencies, he and his co-author here concluded as follows:

Overall, despite the misleading but politically correct use of the term 'empowerment', the bulk of the agency community is developmentally conservative and unempowering, happily fulfilling traditional roles of social support and welfare provision. The vocal few, advocating a different position in development do not correspond to the mainstream of agency activity. (Fowler and Biekart 1996: 128).

The question remains of not only why there are so few good wolves/mice, but of the nature, role and function of wolves/mice within an environment more broadly defined or understood.

Niet óf óf, maar én én?

So, back to civil society - and my exotic subhead - the economical Dutch for 'not either/or but both this and that'. I am referring to the political-economic critique of a primarily political concept of civil society and suggesting the necessity for a *that* as well as a *this*. But this should not (Goddess forbid!) be taken as an identification with any political-economic determinism. Both the items I cite below mount serious challenges to an over-political understanding of CS. But neither of them even defines, far less problematises the rock on which *they* stand, that of political economy.

⁷ These questions are being increasingly raised in both the more analytical/political literature (Middle East Report 2000, v. Tuijl and Jordan 1999) and the theoretical one (Millennium 2000). The MER collection critiques the role of foreign-funded NGOs in a world area very different from Latin America, suggesting their profound ambiguity. Van Tuijl and Jordan propose that, given the inevitable problems of accountability and representativity faced by transnational NGOs, one should rather specify the concept of 'responsibility' and use it in order to advance democracy within and beyond these bodies. The exchange in *Millennium* is particularly interesting in so far as it represents the response of international relations academics to the famous 'Battle of Seattle', November 1999. See further below.

We need an understanding which allows for both, and possibly more (social psychology? feminism? political ecology? cultural politics?).

Without pretending to solve the problem I have raised about an understanding of CS, let us see if a consideration of other recent material might point us in the right general direction. Pasha and Blaney (1998) consider that the notion of 'global civil society' (GCS) and 'transnational associational life' (TAL), are either premature or predefined, that they aid the development of the neo-liberal world order, and that what is required is a reassertion of the importance of a democratised nation state in the Third World. The story they have to tell is

one less heroic, even defeatist, about the prospects of opposition to the oligarchical features of the international system'. (437)

Although there are notes in P&B that suggest their attraction to the heroic and optimistic story of the GCS/TAL advocates, they seem to me deeply mired within 1) a political-economic determinism which suggests that nothing can change until everything changes, 2) a state-nation-defined notion of politics, which suggests that 'politics' occurs only in address to, within, or between, states.⁸ It is this that leads them to reassert a theoretical status and progressive international political role for a Third World that can hardly be recognised since 1) the disappearance of the Second one, and 2) its own political, economic and strategic differentiation. P&B are therefore 1) insensitive to what I would call 'theoretically critical and socially committed globalisation theory' (Waterman 1998:Ch. 7), and to such radically new phenomena as 2) the international campaign that got landmines banned, 3) the anti-Pinochet campaign which demonstrated how attempts to civilise global society can stimulate a national civil society (Chile), and 4) the contribution to a new kind of national and global civil society by a tiny band of *Zapatistas* and marginalised Mayan people in the south east of Mexico (Planeta Tierra 1997, de la Grange and Rico 1997).

Görg and Hirsch (1998, henceforth G&H) seem to come out of the same stable as P&B, have similar worries, but are enabled by their attraction to the idea of 'international democracy', and approval of certain kinds of NGOs, to spell this out positively - even if with heavy qualifications. Dealing with NGOs and GCS under the rubric 'between myth and reality', G&H seem themselves paralysed between an old myth and a new reality. The myth (OK, a *theory* related to a particular stage of capitalist development), is that of a contradiction between economic 'globalisation' (put in cautious quotes) and the political form of the nation-state. The new reality is that of a globalisation (mine comes without quotes) in which hegemonic power may be shifting from the political institutional form (state/interstate) to the socio-cultural one (consumption, media viewing, tourism). And in which even the political-institutional form/level may be being dispersed to the locality, the region (within, between nation states), the hemisphere, the globe. G&H do rehearse a series of challenges to notions of international democracy, and worry that, given the nature of the international sphere of decision-making, it becomes necessary to ask

what is the meaning of 'democracy' if there exist neither a 'people' in the democratic-constitutional legal sense, nor general elections, nor active and legitimate political

⁸ Compare here the argument of José Luis Tejada (1999) who, whilst favouring a democratised nation state for Mexico, also sees this as one that must both transform itself 'internally' and open itself up 'externally' so as to both benefit from and contribute to a more civilised condition of global interdependence.

parties, nor a parliament and organs of representation, nor a central state equipped with a monopoly of coercion? (606)

It is curious, given their Marxist station of departure, that their terminus appears to be liberal democracy and the bourgeois-democratic state. But what they seem to me to reveal is rather the challenge, to radical-democrats, to reinvent democracy, to reconceptualise civil society, globally/locally, re-discover/re-create a people, precisely to meet the threats and promises of a globalised and informatised capitalist (dis)order (see the contributions of Kaldor, Scholte and Gill to Millennium 2000). Despite their desire to do this, during which they again raise important problems, they cite the *Zapatista* movement (of indigenous peasants in the Deep South of Mexico) not as an example or source of relevant new experiences and ideas, but to argue its limitations (in the face of their industrial-nation-state model). And yet more clearly than P&B do they reveal their political-economic determinism, for

The various possibilities for democracy will only be realised when the dominant mode of capitalist production and the dominant mode of the capitalist way of life have been fundamentally altered. (612)

'Fundamentally altered', hey? As by such possible democrats as Lenin? Mao? Pol Pot? President for Life, Fidel Castro? Presidente Gonzalo (prematurely self-appointed, with a view to a 'fundamental alteration' of capitalist production and the semi-liberal nation-state in Peru)?

Back to Central America, which I will take here socio-culturally, so as to include at least the Southeast of Mexico just mentioned. *Zapatismo* clearly comes out of a comparable conjuncture to that which Biekart reveals in CA. It has also benefited from EPAA funding, at least indirectly (de la Grange and Rico 1997). But the CS it is attempting to create also comes out of both *national* and *indigenous* experience. Its discourse is not, as Yúdice (1999) says of the local, national and foreign NGOs involved with the two Brazilian projects he examines 'largely overdetermined by this network of collaborators and intermediaries'. Here is the take of Holloway and Peláez 1998 on the Zapatista concept of civil society:

The EZLN do not use the concept of 'class' or 'class struggle' in their discourse, in spite of the fact that Marxist theory has clearly played an important part in their formation. They have preferred, instead, to develop a new language, to speak of the struggle for truth and dignity... In looking for support, or in forming links with other struggles, they have appealed not to the working class or the proletariat, but to 'civil society'. By 'civil society', they seem to mean 'society in struggle', in the broadest sense: all those groups and initiatives engaged in latent or overt struggles to assert some sort of control over their future, without aspiring to hold governmental office. (180)

The same collection is also acutely aware of both the source of Zapatista power and originality, in a highly localised place, and, in its equally powerful and original address to the global, which makes effective use of cyberspace. One does not have to subordinate oneself to the seductive Zapatista language (energetically resisted by Hellman 1999) to see how - win, lose, compromise - the Zapatista understanding of civil society as local/global, real/virtual, can inspire radically new theory on how CS might be generalised under conditions of globalisation:

Networks - such as women's, environmental, ethnic and other social movements networks - are the location of new political actors and the source of promising cultural practices and possibilities. It is thus possible to speak of a cultural politics of cyberspace and the production of cybercultures that resist, transform or present alternatives to the dominant virtual and real worlds. This cybercultural politics can be most effective if it fulfils two conditions: awareness of the dominant worlds that are being created by the same technologies on which the progressive networks rely (including awareness of how power works in the world of transnational networks and flows); and an ongoing tacking back and forth between cyberpolitics (political activism of the Internet) and what I call place politics, or political activism in the physical locations at which the networker sits and lives. (Escobar 1999:32)

What, in any case, seems to be coming out of this socio-cultural Central America is less a notion of civil society as something exported (from the North by PAAs) or imported (into the South by NGOs), as *a hypothetical circulation of understandings and practices*, within a solidarity discourse and practice, extending across our mixed times as well as our muddled world. Biekart himself ends his book, quite literally, with the following notion:

In the years ahead, progressive private aid agencies will have to choose whether or not to use this [the CA/CS experience - PW] in order to 'reinvent' solidarity, for example by performing an active role in forging transnational alliances and bridging the gap between Northern and Southern civil society, a function that is currently being performed, unchallenged, by the transnational corporate sector. (302)

I will respond to this in a moment, but I want to again contrast the hope expressed briefly here with the much more specific conclusion to the Sogge collection. Here Biekart and Sogge suggest four possible scenarios for the future of private Northern development agencies, ending with this one:

The Common Agenda, and Reinvention[:] Pressed by allies and confronted with mounting social and environmental decay in the North, some agencies begin to rethink and recast themselves along lines of a common [global - PW] agenda... They drop their exclusive focus on problems 'out there' in the South. Structural adjustment, and widening social fissures, are now also realities of the North as well as the South. Agencies seek areas of joint interest with bodies hitherto focused on home ground... They develop pragmatic divisions of labour with activist and knowledge-based Southern NGOs... [V]olunteers and donating memberships ... grow [in the North - PW]. The latter are drawn into...campaigns...that touch everyday life North and South. In short, a scenario in which generosity and solidarity dethrone calculation and cold charity. (Biekart and Sogge 1996:205. My italics - PW)

This notion comes close to the one I earlier suggested, of learning from and reinventing the old labour internationalism.

It is not true, finally, that transnational corporations are currently unchallenged. Such solidarity is being reinvented, even in the immediate neighbourhood of Central America, often in

innovative 'cross-border, cross-movement' alliances (Pollack 1998, de la Cueva 1999, RECHIP 1999), which do, occasionally, effectively challenge the transnational corporate sector. Some such have, again, been funded by Dutch funding agencies (the Santiago Summit of 1997 recorded in RECHIP 1999)!

What we therefore now urgently need is to stimulate and investigate *such* phenomena, which surely represent a more advanced guard of the struggle to civilise the Americas. My feeling is, however, that the North-South relations even here need to be considered in relation to a solidarity discourse and practice. Standing on the theoretical and ethical rock of international solidarity, wielding the kind of conceptual tools I have suggested (improved ones would be welcome), we could then consider to what extent funding agencies might or might not be making a contribution toward the civilising of our dangerously globalised localities, nations, regions and globe.⁹

Postscript 2000: Post-Seattle

It is not possible, post-Seattle, to confine mention of this event to footnotes and references. Nor, on the other hand, is it possible to here even sketch the burgeoning - and often innovatory - literature around the topic (e.g. Castañeda 2000, Danaher and Burbach 2000, Klein 2000, O'Kane 2000, Sakai 2000, Waterman 2000). I will thus confine myself to the special section of the journal *Millennium*, mentioned in Footnote 7 above. I there said that it represented a rare response of academic international relations (IR) to the invasion of their subject of study and their discourse about such. The four contributors rightly conceive this event in terms of the creation (or not) of a global civil society, in both political and conceptual terms.

A conservative/elitist position is taken by Fred Halliday (2000) - conservative of traditional discourses, elitist in his application of pejorative language to those creating disorder on the streets of Seattle for three days rather than the whole world for two decades. Halliday begins by offering three orthodox traditional British IR discourses as essential for interpreting the event. And ends up arguing (in what could be called Nation-State-Marxist terms): 1) that Seattle revealed no 'emancipatory agent' (equivalent to Marx's industrial proletariat) for the creation of a global civil society, 2) that, in relation to the demonstrators, 'Turtles are not democrats, nor are the...ruckus societies, windbags, and conspiracy theorists who cluster at the edge of every cause', and 3) that 'Given the endurance of a world of states and corporations to which no plausible alternative exists', the best one can do is to make this system more informed, democratic and effective. The last point makes sense, if one excludes from consideration those who - in their determination to make the world (if not 'the system') more informed, democratic and effective - have come to the conclusion that an alternative is necessary and that it needs to be made plausible and possible.

Jan Aart Scholte (2000) is evidently more impressed and positive about this invasion but strikes a usefully cautionary note as to the depth and extent of its impact, here pointing out the absence of a vision of an alternative world order. I will suggest that his challenge is being increasingly met (see, e.g., Klein 2000 on the vision thing).

⁹ On the interpenetration, today, of the global and the local, see Doreen Massey's Post-Seattle reflections on the geography of power (Massey 2000).

Mary Kaldor (2000) and Stephen Gill (2000) respond positively to both the theoretical and political innovation represented by Seattle. Kaldor argues that it represents/requires a new understanding of civil society - as both a global rule of law and global political contestation. She sees the political future largely in terms of a coalition between 'the liberal globalisers and global civic networks', with the latter presumably pulling the former away from neo-liberalism. This would seem to me to either promote or allow for a global neo-Keynesianism, with the danger, as with national Keynesianism, that the relevant social movement will end up (like the Young Lady of Niger) inside rather than riding the tiger. Those who, like I, infinitely prefer a civilised capitalism and capitalists to World Monetary Fundamentalism and fundamentalists, may nonetheless wonder whether the world can sustain such.

Gill seems to be the most identified with the movement(s), precisely in terms of a 'new form of political agency',

understood as a set of potentials in movement...a complex, multiple, and diverse form of collective action, akin to a post-modern transnational political party [favouring] human and intergenerational security on and for the planet; democratic human development; and human rights. It combines defensive and forward-looking strategies that involve a universal politics of radical (re)construction...

I have removed from this quotation the Machivellian/Gramscian language, evidently addressed to Gill's colleagues rather than to anti-Seattle activists. But rather than further critiquing these efforts - which must have anyway been produced in short order - I would rather welcome and encourage the dialogue it potentially implies (between the academics, between the academics and the activists), point out additional aspects and then return to CS, CA and the EPAAs.

My first point would be to stress the extent to which this movement was both networked in form and cultural in expression. 'Networking' refers not only to the use of the internet but to the co-ordinated/dispersed form of demonstration developed by the Direct Action Movement. And also to the manner in which the most disparate bodies, ideologies and strategies allowed space for each other to participate/discuss/argue whilst protesting. Seattle invented/demonstrated a new principle of articulation (joining/expression), relevant to a globalised, networked capitalism:

[T]hese campaigns have not coalesced into a single movement. Rather, they are intricately and tightly linked to one another, much as 'hotlinks' connect their websites on the internet. This analogy is more than coincidental: the communication technology that facilitates these campaigns is shaping the movement in its own image. Thanks to the net, mobilisations unfold with sparse bureaucracy and minimal hierarchy; forced consensus and laboured manifestos are fading into the background, replaced by a culture of constant, loosely structured and sometimes compulsive information-swapping. (Klein 2000: 23-4)

'Cultural expression' refers to values, ideas, images, sound (as well as to self-produced videos, websites). One hundred urban turtles, are more *effective*, here, it seems, than the 20,000 demonstrators (half the total) who were trade unionists dressed as...um...trade unionists (and who consequently received only 5-10 percent of coverage in both the dominant and the alternative media). Turtles, *symbolising* defence/assertion of the human environment against the capitalist

economy, not only speak to the eye and the heart (and the subversive/creative humour-organ, wherever that lies), but do this in a *universal language*. As Castells (1996: Chapter 5, discussed Waterman 1999a:368-72) argues, cyberspace permits the re-articulation of reason and feeling - something that the invention of language, 2,700 years ago, turned into a hierarchy of the first over the second.¹⁰ The new global solidarity movement increasingly takes the form of a 'communications internationalism' in which a legal-rational notion of democracy is intimately (re)articulated with a democracy of access/expression (equality) and of ideals/feelings (solidarity) - on a world scale.

The second point is on precisely the extent to which the movement (including its 'organic intellectuals') is producing its increasingly specific alternatives, and also demonstrating its capacity for critical self-reflection (see, e.g., Brecher, Costello and Smith, and Starr, both forthcoming).

A third and quite fundamental point would be the way in which 'anti-capitalism' has become - after long absence - both an adopted slogan of a significant part of the movement and an epithet attached to it (unwisely?) by its detractors. A Spectre is Haunting Globalisation, the Spectre of Socialism (hopefully: green, feminist, holistic, pluralistic, modest, self-reflective...).

The implications of all, or even part, of this for a region (Central America), country (Russia), locality (Soweto, Chiapas, Liverpool), identity (women, *indígenas*, workers) or for solidarity with and between such, are only beginning to become apparent. Most important here is the recognition that globalisation is an increasingly central terrain of dispute, that the local and the global are mutually defining, that success requires a sensitive movement (in both senses) between these, and that culture/communication is not only increasingly central to such but a terrain particularly favourable for the Left (whose greatest asset and richest resource has always been its ideas, its ethics, its *son et lumière*).

In so far as all the above is true, it suggests both the necessity and possibility of a dialectical and multifaceted notion of solidarity, in which the exchange between Europe and Central America is no longer the export from the former of civil society, and the import from the latter of images, icons and symbols of resistance (which remain, inevitably, 'far from my bed'). Rather would it be one in which - in the Netherlands, in the highlands of Guatemala, in future Seattles - a global/local civil society is invented.¹¹ As for the EPAAs, they will either respond to this very different world and worldview or be no longer the ambiguous and puzzling subject they still are today for both activists and researchers.

¹⁰ In so far as the invention of language thus made possible the similar separation/hierarchisation of the study/control of international relations from its subjects (people, peoples, men, women, children, environment), it has a lot to answer for. In so far as cyberspace and multimedia make both possible an egalitarian and dialectical re-articulation of the two, it would seem to be full of promise - though not for IR mandarins.

¹¹ Which means a movement from the first book of Rigoberta Menchú (1984) to the second (1998), the latter showing how she developed her revolutionary rural indigenous nationalism into a radically-democratic feminist internationalism that both included and surpassed her former identity. See Waterman (1999b).

Bibliography

- Alvarez, Sonia. 1998. 'Latin American Feminists "Go Global": Trends of the 1990s and Challenges for the New Millennium', in Sonia Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino and Arturo Escobar (eds.), *Cultures of Politics: Politics of Cultures - Re-visioning Latin American Social Movements*. Boulder: Westview. Pp. 293-324.
- Alvarez, Sonia. 1999. 'Translating the Global: Effects of Transnational Organising on Local Feminist Discourses and Practices in Latin America', *Global Solidarity Dialogue*, www.antenna.nl/~waterman/
- Biekart, Kees. 1999. *The Politics of Civil Society Building: European Private Aid Agencies and Democratic Transitions in Central America*. Utrecht/Amsterdam: International Books/Transnational Institute. 416 pp.
- Castañeda, 'Globalización y minorías activas', *América Latina en Movimiento* (Quito), No. 306, pp. 16-18.
- Castells, Manuel. 1996. *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell. 556 pp.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1998. 'The Zapatistas and the Electronic Fabric of Struggle' in John Holloway and Eloína Paláez (eds.), *Zapatista! Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*. London: Pluto. 81-103.
- Cueva, Héctor de la. 1998. 'Global Crisis & Trade Union Recomposition in the Face of Regionalization of the Worldwide Economy'. Mexico DF: Centro de Investigación Laboral. 9 pp.
- Danaher, Kevin and Roger Burbach. 2000. *Globalise This! The Battle Against the World Trade Organisation and Corporate Rule*. Monroe (Maine): Common Courage Press. 218 pp.
- Edelman, Marc. 1998. 'Organising across Borders: The Rise of a Transnational Peasant Movement in Central America', in Jutta Blauert and Simon Zadek (eds.), *Mediating Sustainability: Growing Policy from the Grassroots*. London: Kumarian press. 215-47.
- Escobar, Arturo. 1999. *Gender, Place and Networks: A Political Ecology of Cyberculture*, in Wendy Harcourt (ed.), *Women@Internet: Creating New Cultures in Cyberspace*. London: Zed Press. Pp. 149-55.
- Evers, Tillmann. 1982. 'European Social Democracy in Latin America: The Case of West Germany', in Jenny Pearce (ed), *The European Challenge: Europe's New Role in Latin America*. London: Latin American Bureau, pp. 80-129.
- Fowler, Alan and Kees Biekart. 1996. 'Do Private Agencies Really Make a Difference?' in Sogge, David (with Kees Biekart and John Saxby) ed. *Compassion and Calculation: The Business of Private Foreign Aid*. London: Pluto. Pp. 107-135.

- Gill, Stephen. 2000. 'Toward a Post-Modern Prince? The Battle of Seattle as a Moment in the New Politics of Globalisation', *Millennium: Journal of International Politics*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 131-40.
- Görg, Christoph and Joachim Hirsch. 1998. 'Is International Democracy Possible?', *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp.585-615. Grange, Bertrand de la and Maite Rico. 1998. *Marcos, la genial impostura* [Marcos, the Brilliant Imposture]. Mexico DF: Aguilar. 471 pp.
- Grange, Bertrand de la and Maite Rico. 1998. *Marcos, la genial impostura* [Marcos, the Brilliant Imposture]. Mexico DF: Aguilar. 471 pp.
- Halliday, Fred. 2000. 'Getting Real About Seattle', *Millennium: Journal of International Politics*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 123-9.
- Hellman, Judith Adler. 1999. 'Real and Virtual Chiapas: Magic Realism and the Left', in Leo Panitch and Colin Leys (eds), 'Necessary and Unnecessary Utopias', *Socialist Register 2000*. London: Merlin. Pp. 161-86.
- Holloway, John and Eloína Peláez (eds). 1998. *Zapatista! Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*. London: Pluto Press. 201 pp.
- Hopgood, Stephen. 2000. 'Reading the Small Print in Global Civil Society: The Inexorable Hegemony of the Liberal Self', *Millennium: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 1-25.
- Kaldor, Mary. 2000. "'Civilising" Globalisation? The Implications of the "Battle of Seattle"', *Millennium: Journal of International Politics*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 105-14.
- Klein, Naomi. 2000. 'Does Protest Need a Vision?' *New Statesman*, (UK), July 3, pp. 23-5.
- Massey, Doreen. 2000. 'The Geography of Power', *Red Pepper* (UK), No. 73, pp. 18-21.
- Menchú, Rigoberta. 1984. *I Rigoberta Menchú: An Indian Woman in Guatemala*. London:Verso.
- Menchú, Rigoberta. 1998. *Crossing Borders*. London: Verso. 242.
- Middle East Report. 2000. 'Critiquing NGOs: Assessing the Last Decade', *Middle East Report*, No. 214: 2, 12-44).
- Millennium. 2000. 'Exchange - Seattle: December '99' (Mary Kaldor, Jan Aart Scholte, Fred Halliday, Stephen Gill', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 103-40.
- O'Kane, Ryan. 2000. 'Ghettoisation of the Direct Action Movement: the End of Ideology and the Creation of Myths', (University of East London). Paper to the Conference of Socialist Economists, University of London Union, London, June 1-2.

- Pasha and Blaney. 1998. 'Elusive Paradise: The Promise and Peril of Global Civil Society', *Alternatives*, Vol. 23, pp. 417-50.
- Planeta Tierra. 1997. *Cronicas intergalácticas: Primera encuentro intercontinental por la humanidad y contra el neoliberalismo*. (Intergalactic Chronicles: First International Encounter for Humanity and against Neoliberalism). Montañas del Sureste Mexicano: Planeta Tierra. 279 pp.
- Pollack, Aaron. 1998. 'Toward "A World in Which Many Worlds Fit": The Importance of the Zapatista Army of National Liberation for International Organising', Research Paper, MA in Politics of Alternative Development Strategies, Institute of Social Studies, The Hague. 119 pp.
- RECHIP. 1999. *Memoria de la Cumbre de los Pueblos de América (15-18 de abril de 1998)* [Report of the Summit of the Peoples of America (25-28 April 1998)]. Santiago: RECHIP. 150pp.
- Sakai, J. 2000. 'Aryan Politics and Fighting the WTO'. <http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Omega/>
- Scholte, Jan Aart. 2000. 'Cautionary Reflections on Seattle', *Millennium: Journal of International Politics*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 115-21.
- Sogge, David and Kees Biekart. 1996. 'Calculation, Compassion...and Choices', in Sogge, David (with Kees Biekart and John Saxby) ed. *Compassion and Calculation: The Business of Private Foreign Aid*. London: Pluto. 217 pp.
- Sogge, David (with Kees Biekart and John Saxby) ed. 1996. *Compassion and Calculation: The Business of Private Foreign Aid*. London: Pluto. 217 pp.
- Starr, Amory. Forthcoming. *Naming The Enemy: Anti-Corporate Social Movements Confront Globalisation*. London: Zed.
- Tejeda, José Luis. 1999. *México: Globalización, estado y nación* (Globalisation, State and Nation). Paper to the international seminar on Globalisation: The Insertion of Mexico and Inclusive Alternatives for the 21st Century, UNAM-UAM, Mexico DF, April 13-15.
- Tuijl, Peter van and Lisa Jordan. 1999. 'Political Responsibility in Transnational NGO Advocacy'. The Hague: Novib and Washington: Bank Information Centre. 27 pp.
- Waterman, Peter. 1994. 'Global, civil, solidario. La complejización del nuevo mundo' [Globalisation, Civil Society, Solidarity. The Complication of the New World], *Nueva Sociedad* (Special Theme: Governing the Globe: The South in Search of the North), No. 132, July-August, pp. 128-145.
- Waterman, Peter. 1998. *Globalisation, Social Movements and the New Internationalisms*. London: Cassell. 320 pp.

- Waterman, Peter. 1999a. 'The Brave New World of Manuel Castells: What on Earth (and in the Ether) is Going On?', *Development and Change*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 357-80.
- Waterman, Peter. 1999b. 'Of Saints, Sinners and Compañeras: Internationalist Lives in the Americas Today', *Working Paper Series*, No. 286, Institute of Social Studies, The Hague. 32 pp.
- Waterman, Peter. 2000. 'Nueve reflexiones sobre un internacionalismo de comunicación en la era de Seattle', Ponencia para la Conferencia 'Nuevos Escenarios y Tendencias de la Comunicación en el Umbral del Tercer Milenio' Quito, Febrero 14-17, 2000
- Yúdice, George. 1999. 'Activism under Neoliberalism in Brazil: Civil Society Networks', *Polygraph* (Duke University, Durham, NC), No. 11, pp. 49-65.