

'MAKING' THE MOVEMENT
A Case Study on the Social Forums as Peculiar Spaces of
the Counter-Globalization Movement

FIRAT GENÇ
103611008

İSTANBUL BİLGİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
KÜLTÜREL İNCELEMELER YÜKSEK LİSANS PROGRAMI

Yrd. Doç. Dr. FERHAT KENTEL
İSTANBUL EKİM 2006

'MAKING' THE MOVEMENT
A Case Study on the Social Forums as Peculiar Spaces of
the Counter-Globalization Movement

HAREKETİ 'YAPMAK'
Karşıt-Küreselleşme Hareketinin Özgün Mekânları Olarak
Sosyal Forumlar Üzerine Bir Çalışma

FIRAT GENÇ
103611008

Tez Danışmanı : FERHAT KENTEL.....
Jüri Üyeleri : BÜLENT SOMAY.....
Jüri Üyeleri : KENAN ÇAYIR.....

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih : EKİM 2006

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı: 160

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)
1) Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler
2) Karşıt-küreselleşme
3) Sosyal Forumlar
4) Tecrübe
5) Muhayyile

Anahtar Kelimeler (İngilizce)
1) New Social Movements
2) Counter-globalization
3) Social Forums
4) Experience
5) Imagination

Abstract

Since the mid '90s, we are observing an uprising in the field of social and political dissent. At the first glance, it may be easily said that the common denominator of these organizations is being opposed to the current forms of globalization processes. Throughout the study we will mostly use the term 'counter-globalization movement' to identify this cluster of social dissent movements.

This thesis aims to analyze the counter-globalization movement within the conceptual universe of the term 'autonomy', focusing on the social forums born out of the recent movement. Specifically, the traces of a radical imaginary will be searched within the dynamics of social forums. Social forums, as open processes, will be our object of investigation, on which we will develop a discussion about the potentials, possibilities, constraints, and illusions of the present movement.

The study is going to be based on a field research conducted with the activists organizing the Turkish and Istanbul Social Forums. However, although our case study is restricted with the social forum processes, the ultimate intention is to utter some words on the counter-globalization movement.

This field research has been conducted to inquire the demands, discourses, opinions, organizational forms, decision making processes, tactics and perceptions of the activists taking part in the construction of social forums in Turkey. In order to comprehend the experiments and signification frameworks of activists profoundly, in-depth interviews were deployed.

Özet

90'lı yılların ortalarından bu yana toplumsal ve politik muhalefet alanında bir yükselişin yaşandığına tanık oluyoruz. İlk bakışta, bu örgütlenmelerin ortak noktasının, küreselleşme süreçlerinin mevcut biçimlerine karşı gelmeleri olduğu söylenebilir. Çalışma boyunca, bu gruptaki toplumsal muhalefet hareketlerini tanımlamak için 'karşıt-küreselleşme hareketleri' ifadesini kullanacağız.

Bu tez çalışmasının amacı, mevcut hareketin içinden doğan sosyal forum oluşumlarına odaklanmak ve böylece karşıt-küreselleşme hareketini, 'özerklik' teriminin kavramsal evreni içerisinde çözümlenektir. Çalışma dâhilinde, radikal bir muhayyilenin izleri, sosyal forum dinamikleri içerisinde aranacaktır. Her biri birer açık süreç olarak tanımlanan sosyal forumlar, bu çalışmanın araştırma nesnesini oluşturacak; mevcut hareketin potansiyelleri, imkânları, sınırlılıkları ve yanlısalarına dair bir tartışma bunlar üzerinden geliştirilecektir.

Bu çalışma, Türkiye ve İstanbul Sosyal Forumlarını organize eden eylemcilerle gerçekleştirilmiş bir saha çalışması üzerine temellendirilecektir. Ancak, her ne kadar bu alan çalışması sosyal forum süreçleriyle sınırlı tutulmuş olsa da, çalışmanın nihaî niyeti karşıt-küreselleşme hareketi üzerine bir şeyler söylemektir.

Bu saha çalışması Türkiye'deki sosyal forumların inşasına katılan eylemcilerin taleplerini, söylemlerini, örgütsel formlarını, karar alma süreçlerini, taktiklerini ve algılamalarını anlayabilmek için gerçekleştirilmiştir. Eylemcilerin tecrübelerini ve anlamlandırma çevrelerini bütünüyle kavrayabilmek adına derinlemesine mülakatlar kullanılmıştır.

In memory of A.C.G.
Your wisdom will never be forgotten.

Acknowledgements

The very last words of this study are traced by a mixed feeling of joy and exhaustion. The joy and the exhaustion of finishing an ‘impossible’ work are mingling just before the closure of a ‘circle’. But before the last shot I would like to express my deep gratitude to ones, without whom this study would always be lack. I would like to thank

Ferhat Kentel; he has inspired the main pillars of this study. Without his contributions, the whole process would be, at least, more boring. However, beyond being a supervisor, he has been a genuine friend to me. His unreserved humaneness is unforgettable.

Bülent Somay; for his all-round friendship;

My classmates Ayşe, Diler, Kubi, Elif, Gamze and Latife; by courtesy of them, I experienced the most cheerful days of my university life;

Bruna; her existence has made me more able;

Salih; for being my supervisor-in-shadow;

Kaan; he has been like my technical support during this process;

My gang from Değirmendere; for their unconditional support, even when they have no idea of what I am doing;

Gülengül; for her insubstitutable aid in the translation of interviews, and of course for her delightful words during my desperate times;

My friends who shared their invaluable comments with me during this process: Zeynep, Senem, Esin, Fırat and Berke;

Alisa and Başak; for the rosy conversation on that lovely Bosphorus night;

My family, particularly my mother and father; thanks to them, I could dare to do what I want;

My beloved sister, Ilgın; for abiding all my distempers;

And Aslı; without her, this study would never finish. Her absence will always be my companion.

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 On Methodology	5
2. ACTION	10
2.1 Historical Lineages.....	13
2.1.1 1968 as a Cornerstone.....	14
2.1.2 'New' Social Movements	18
2.1.3 Years of Nineties	21
2.2 Major Streams in the Movement.....	24
2.3 Social Forums	27
2.3.1 World Social Forum	28
2.3.2 European Social Forum	30
2.3.3 Mediterranean Social Forum.....	32
2.4 Turkey.....	32
3. STRUCTURE	40
3.1 Globalization.....	41
3.2 New Times	45
3.2.1 Material Life in the New Times	50
3.2.2 Ideological Façade of the New Times	56
4. EXPERIENCE	64
4.1 Conceptualizing the Movement	65
4.1.1 The Movement as a Void.....	65
4.1.2 The Movement as a Search	71
4.2 Positioning the Movement.....	79
4.2.1 Coping with <i>Today</i>	79
4.2.2 Haunted by the <i>Past</i>	85
4.3 Grasping the Movement	90
4.3.1 Great Minds Think Alike?	92
4.3.2 Not in My Name. Thanks!	97
4.3.3 Kramer versus Kramer.....	100
5. CONCLUSION.....	106
APPENDICES	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY	147

1. INTRODUCTION

A new generation of social movements is forming before our eyes. This sprouting generation is creating its own specific forms, processes, structures, networks, and relations alongside with the more traditional ones. Naturally, these embryonic social phenomena are bringing together with them some novel questions to be answered. This dissertation has derived its motivation from this set of questions.

Since the mid '90s, we are observing an uprising in the field of social and political dissent. Various groups, organizations, and individuals from different political traditions, orientations, and motivations have succeeded to gain a serious level of appearance. At the first glance, it may be easily said that the common denominator of these organizations is the opposition of the current forms of globalization processes. Such a commonality is notable even in the level of naming. Similarly, throughout the study we will mostly use the term 'counter-globalization movement' to identify this cluster of social dissent movements, although it must be added that there is not a consensus yet.

This dissertation aims to analyze the counter-globalization movement within the conceptual universe of the term 'autonomy', focusing on the social forums born out of the recent movement. Specifically, the traces of a radical imaginary will be searched within the dynamics of social forums. Surely, social forums do not involve the whole range of participants acting against the institutions of global governance all around the world. Nonetheless, the social forums, as peculiar forms, we argue, give us a chance to ask *some* questions and give *some* partial answers. Therefore, social forums, as open processes, will be our object of investigation, on which we will develop a discussion about the potentials, possibilities, constraints, and illusions of the present movement. Obviously, it is not possible to analyze the numerous social forums all over the world within the limited boundaries of this study. Thus, we will base our study on a field research conducted with the activists organizing the Turkish and Istanbul

Social Forums. However, although our case study is restricted with the social forum processes because of the limitations of an academic work, our ultimate intention is to utter some words on the counter-globalization movement.

To repeat, this study is based on a field research conducted to inquire the demands, discourses, opinions, organizational forms, decision making processes, tactics and perceptions of the activists taking part in the construction of social forums in Turkey. In order to comprehend the experiments and signification frameworks of activists profoundly, in-depth interviews were deployed.

This dissertation takes its initial motive from a multilayered and multifaceted question: does the new generation of social dissent movements—the anti/alternative/counter globalization movement—involve a radical potential to subvert, transform the current social, political, economic, and cultural *system*, or is it merely a disillusionment intrinsic to the *system* which, within the given liberal democratic consensus, streams the oppositional energy to the refreshment of the *system* without transcending its borders? We do not intend to produce a comprehensive response to such a complex question; it is obvious that it would be a meaningless attempt within the limited boundaries of this study. Yet, we pursue some partial answers here; our assumption is that the counter-globalization movement will be radical to the extent that it manages to negate the dominant modern imaginary and be a space of a search for autonomy of the human subjects that make their own history. Once we note our main assumption, now we can draw the contours of our conceptual framework, that is, the outline of the study.

The study has been based on a mostly neglected simple argument. The relationship between the social subjects and the totality of social relations that surround them is not linear but contingent and multi-directional. For sure, human beings, as social entities, become human beings within a social matrix; however, this process is not identical in each case. They do not passively absorb the social relations that encompass them but perceive, feel,

experience and signify them, and then commit actions that challenge, support or/and transform those social relations. That is, there is a non-deterministic dialectical relationship between the social structures and social agents. The crucial concept here is ‘experience’ that indicates a domain of mediation in which that dialectical relationship comes into being.

Additionally, the textual body of the study was edit, that is, the outline was arranged in accordance with this argument.

The next chapter, *Action*, was designed to make clear what is meant by the counter-globalization movement and social forums. We based the chapter on somehow journalistic issues, and endeavored to render the *object* of our study more comprehensible. There are questions that need to be answered in order to deepen our discussion: Who are we referring to, when we mention the counter-globalization movement? What currents make up the movement? And, how are they organized? Not to mention, social facts do not appear/disappear overnight, nor did the counter-globalization movement. Thus, it has its own antecedents, roots diffused into the history, and there are organizational attempts in various levels behind its public appearance. That is why; we shed light on the historical lineages of the movement delineating three remarkable periods that, we think, are quite influential on it: namely, the radical youth movement of 1968, the so-called new social movements that have appeared in the seventies and lost their power to a large extent in the eighties, and social movements of the nineties that have a direct influence on the emergence of the counter-globalization movement. Then, in this chapter, we continue to tell the story of social forums and clarify the organizational structures of those peculiar political spaces. The last section of this chapter describes the formation, development and maturation of social forum processes in Turkish context.

The third chapter, *Structure*, aims to grasp the social relations and structures in/against which the activists of the counter-globalization movement act. Once again, we take the late sixties as a unique cornerstone to set up our narrative, and contend that modern capitalism since then has undergone a substantial qualitative transformation. It is clear that such a

total alteration would have corresponding total turbulences on various aspects of social life. Therefore, we try to draw the contours of this alteration on material and discursive levels in this chapter. Instead of scrutinizing exhaustively the global transformation of capitalism, its historical trajectory, or the underlying causes of this alteration, we aim to draw the contours of this transformation from a given standpoint—standpoint of the participants of the social movements. At the first instance, we clarify what is to be understood by the term ‘globalization’, since the movement defines itself referring to this ‘cover term’. What are the general lines of the structural transformation summarized under this ‘cover term’? When we mention the ‘global’ movement, what are we referring to? These questions are tried to be answered in the first part of the chapter. After that, we widen and deepen our discussion on globalization and place it in a context that may be described with numerous terms like post-industrial, post-fordist etc. In this second part of the chapter, we focus on the material and discursive aspects of this total modification. Accordingly, we initially summarize the renovations occurred on the material plane dwelling on the work organization, labor processes, technology and general mode of economy; then, demark the key points of the ideological formation of this new era of global capitalism. In this last section, we try to expose the dominant imaginary that stands at the centre of our critique focusing on its discourse of necessities, efficiency, rationality etc.

In the main chapter of the study, *Experience*, our intention, at the broadest level, is to capture the mediation domain that we mentioned above, and read the universes of signification of the movement’s activists by commenting the findings of the field research. This chapter has three sections. In the first one, *Conceptualizing the Movement*, the notions like relationality, experience and of course autonomy are defined, discussed and interrelated to provide an acceptable ground for our main problematic. In the second section, *Positioning the Movement*, in accordance with the conception of the term ‘experience’ in the study, we concomitantly read the past and present experiences of the activists in order to grasp one part of

their signification chambers. And finally, in the *Grasping the Movement*, we focus on the family matters and attempt to render explicit the traces of the dominant imaginary within the movement itself.

During the field research and the process of writing, we have benefited from various theoretical sources of which juxtaposing may seem a bit paradoxical. Some of them have not entered directly to the study; however, their effects may be noticed. In our approach, which we may liken to a Foucauldian ‘toolbox’, dissimilar theoretical sources can be divided to their parts and put together to take a new step. Thus, we aimed to shed one more light on the areas that might have been omitted.

Finally, we have to say a few words on the initial motivations of the study. As far as we know, the academic literature in Turkey on social movements is exceedingly narrow, or at least it is not as rich as in the western world. On the other hand, a considerable part of these foreign studies deals with more functional and operative aspects of the movements instead of problematizing their potentials, perils, possibilities or constraints. For sure, this dissertation does not aim to fill that gap, but by attempting to scrutinize the social movements in a manner that deals with their transformative aspects, intends to take a further step. We believe that Cultural Studies as a discipline provides us with some of the most suitable tools to deal with such social phenomena that intersects more than one scientific area, and makes explicit the division between activism and academia. In accordant with our arguments that we develop in the study, we take these two realms that stay distant to each other most of the time as inseparable. We hope that our study can grasp at least some of the concerns shared by the first generation of Cultural Studies.

This is how “we” make the movement.

1.1 On Methodology

The following part of the dissertation will be devoted to the methodology that is to be employed throughout the case study research. There are three reasons why we prefer to do case study research to explore

our thesis problematic. We are basically after “how” and “why” questions and case study research is an appropriate way to get the answers. We as the investigator have no control over the events as it is often in the social sciences and we aim to observe the processes as they really are. Lastly, we focus on a contemporary phenomenon within some real life context and this makes doing a case study research possible. Hopefully, the case study will allow us to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of experiences as real life events with the help of its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence-documents, artifacts, interviews and observations.¹

A research design is the logic that links the data to be collected (and the conclusions to be drawn) to the initial questions of a study. Every empirical study has an implicit if not an explicit research design. The five components of a research design are a study’s questions, its propositions if any, its units of analysis, the logic linking the data to the propositions and the criteria for interpreting the findings. This study does not pose speculative propositions but instead has some essential questions. The logic linking the data to the questions and the criteria for interpreting the findings will be implicit in the theoretical context.²

“A complete research design, covering the five components described above, in fact requires the development of a theoretical framework for the case study that is to be conducted. The use of theory, in doing case studies, is not only an immense aid in defining the appropriate research design and data collection, but also becomes the main vehicle for generalizing the results of the case study”.³ That is why a review of the relevant literature and a general theoretical and historical framework are presented throughout the study. In a way the questions are evolved in the process and the logic, linking the findings of the case studies to the theoretical context is structured.

¹ Robert K. Yin, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, foreword by Donald T. Campbell (New Bury Park: Sage Publications, 1989), pp. 13-4.

² Yin, *Case Study Research*, pp. 27-9.

³ Yin, *Case Study Research*, p. 40.

This study has been based on a field research. Technically, two different methods have been deployed: namely, participant observation and semi-structured interviewing. These techniques, in parallel to our theoretical concerns, made it possible to grasp the experiences, the ways of interpretation of reality of the respondents, their motives to participate in the movement, thus the universe of signification of the activists.

Being an activist who has been in various campaigns, protesting demonstrations, meetings, social forums organized in Turkey and abroad since the university years has given us a chance to observe the daily workings of forum processes, organization of regular meetings and demonstrations, political disputes, ideological divisions, personal disagreements in a time which is not limited with a field research. In other words, this research is based on personal observations and experiences that exceed the actual time of research. However, this may give us merely a beginning point; it may only be a facilitator. Thus, we have conducted semi-structured interviews to expand and strengthen the base of the study.

At the center of this research, there are activists of the social movements, political parties, trade unions, circles and campaigns that have participated in the social forum processes in Istanbul (these processes date back to five or six years ago). As explained above, we chose the social forums as a case to reflect upon a wider context, the counter-globalization movement. Due to the limits of the study, we had to restrict boundaries of our case study. Even though we use the notions 'social forum processes' and 'the counter-globalization movement' interchangeably within the study, it should be kept in mind that the social forums and the participants of the forums do not represent the whole body of the counter-globalization movement.

There are many organizations, movements, and individuals that stay away from forum processes because of the reasons varying from political to personal. However, in the context of Turkey, it is not totally meaningless to read the movement within the social forums, because major part of the political entities that we may identify as somehow global movement (a

considerable share of the oppositional groups in Turkey is out of the view of this study, because these groups do not have discourses, actions or problems that may be linked on a global plane; the content of this study is first of all restricted with the political structures and individuals that identify themselves as a part of a global movement) has been in relation or is still in relation with social forums. We did not intent to represent quantitatively all the participants of the social forums since all *formal* components of the process do not identify themselves specifically with this globalizing trend. Hence we were able to avoid unnecessary repetitions that are not of concern to our study. We should once more note that all our interviewees then or now have material and *real* experiences in the movement so healthier discussion sessions become possible.

During the interviews, we had a semi-structured interview guide in our mind which helped us with considering the main themes of the research continuously as well as the social and personal peculiarities of the interviewees. At the same time, as more and more experience is accumulated in our hands, we altered the questions and the ways to interpret them. In short, this stems from the recursive and ongoing character of our research method.

Eighteen activists were interviewed, twelve males and six females. Almost all were individual talks with one three persons and one two persons groups. In order to catch experiences of the activists, life history interviewing technique was utilized. Additionally, two of the interviews may be regarded to be “key informant interviewing” that enables us to question “a few well-placed informants, sometimes over an extensive period of time, to obtain descriptive information that might be too difficult and time-consuming to uncover through more structured data gathering techniques”.⁴ Specifically, the chapter *Action* was partially structured on the

⁴ Kathleen M. Blee and Verta Taylor, “Semi-Structured Interviewing in Social Movement Research,” in *Methods of Social Movement Research* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002), p. 105.

narratives of Mr. E and Mr. F. All the interviews were conducted in public places.

2. ACTION

“There is a crack in everything,
That’s how the light gets in.”

Anthem, Leonard Cohen

“So ours is a worldwide guerilla war, of
publicity, harassment, obstructionism.”

5 Days That Shook the World: Seattle and Beyond,
Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair

On March 1, 2003, an astounding hearsay diffused among the large crowd of demonstrators gathered in Ankara to protest against the war in Iraq and influence the ballot vote in the Turkish National Assembly. It was being whispered that the Assembly refused the government’s memorandum that aims to make possible the conveyance of Turkish armed forces to Iraq and settling of foreign forces in Turkey. News created a mood of joy beside that of shock among at least the demonstrators. Leaving aside the discussions on whether it is merely the anti-war movement’s success to block the plans of US led coalition, the day caused something else. The unexpected number of protesters (approximately 100 000 people gathered in Ankara) and then the shocking decision of Assembly led many to reflect and talk on the unforeseen rising of local branch of global peace movement. Surely, this is not the first attempt which focuses on preventing the war, nor the sole experience of organization in Turkey seeking the establishment of peace. However, this was the first time peace movement was reacting that fast and that massive (though this should not be exaggerated; contrary to the optimistic discourse of diligent anti-war activists, demonstrations could never exceed its March 1 peak). So, where did *they* come from?

There is a worldwide consensus that the mobilization of social dissident movements has escalated in the last decade. Generally speaking, the turbulent days in Seattle in November, 1999, has provided us with the symbolic departure point of the current generation of dissenters. Accordingly, it would not be misleading to place the peace movement in

Turkey in this social context born out of the Seattle *big bang*. With the increased public appearance, the movement has become one of the main elements of the globalization processes. But, what is *the movement*?

Up to now, several labels were deployed to define the opponents of institutions leading the current processes of globalization. As we mentioned at the outset of the study, there is not a consensus yet on how to name them. Such inconsistency is observed both amid the adversaries and activists of the movement. As the most known and popular term “anti-globalists” was invented by the mainstream media in the days following the Seattle street protests. It was reasonable within the perspective of media to call the people trying to blockade the annual ministerial conference of the World Trade Organization (WTO)—the leading figure of neoliberal globalization—so. What was surprising was the general acceptance of the term among the components of the movement. For a period, it was used as a self-descriptive tag, and even today it is still using interchangeably along with its alternatives. By the time, as a result of discussions indicating the gap between the limited and negative-oriented connotations of the term and the perspectives of the movement, several alternatives were substituted for it. The initial motive was to draw a line between the movement and the “authentic” opponents of the globalization like neo-fascists, racists, religious-nationalist groups, which advocate increasing the levels of protection of nation-states both in terms of capital and labor mobilization to reduce the negative impacts of neoliberalism. To give some examples: alternative- and counter-globalization, which focus mainly on the positive constituent aspects of the movement, have become widespread particularly after the first World Social Forum (WSF) held in Porto Alegre, Brazil, in 2001. A similar idiom—*altermondialisme*—has occurred in France and become popular in French speaking world and Europe. Another highly popular idiom, “globalization from below”, was coined by Richard Falk, one of the leading figures of the movement, to stress a similar position.⁵ It

⁵ Richard Falk, “The Making of Global Citizenship,” in *Global Visions: Beyond the New World Order*, eds. Jeremy Brecher, John Brown Childs and Jill Cutler (Boston, MD: South End Press, 1993).

connotes the aspirations of a global civil society, and is very popular among the socialists and humanitarian circles. “Movement of movements” is being employed to indicate the diversity of components of the movement.

Diversity and plurality are some of the foremost elements of the movement’s self-descriptive discourse. In the North America, usages like “anti-corporate movement” or “anti-plutocracy movement” are very common; they both refer to an aspiration for a democracy constituted by the people, not by a wealthy minority. Likewise, the term “global justice movement” emphasizes the globality of the attempts seeking to build a just world. Beside these, more classical expressions like “anticapitalist” or “anti-imperialist” are deployed to define this multinational popular resistance.

The list can be extended, new items can be added. Probably, there are plenty of alternative sayings used by various groups or organizations of which we are not aware. However, what is important for us is the present possibility of talking on a sprouting cohort of dissenters. The movement is still molding and being molded by numerous social dynamics, it is still forming before our very eyes. Nonetheless, it is logical to observe a worldwide mobilization, an uprising. It would not be incorrect to mention a certain level of radicalization among especially the young people. Such a common mobilization, and its peculiar forms and outlooks of organization lead us to conceive the period in itself. So, it is worthwhile to situate the counter-globalization movement into the centre of our analysis and reflect upon it. But once again: the movement, *how* do they do?

It is the aim of this chapter to give adequate answers to these questions. We intend to render the movement more comprehensible. We will try to make the social action challenging the structure visible. In parallel to our triple model, the realm of action will be described throughout the chapter. Not to mention, social facts do not appear/disappear overnight, nor did the counter-globalization movement. It has its own antecedents, roots diffused into the history, and there are organizational attempts in various levels behind its public appearance. It has created its own forms,

organizational structures, tactics, practices etc., and we are still witnessing its tumultuous shifts. Thus, as a social phenomenon that is not less complex than any, it forces us to deal with complicated threads of reality. That it is consisted of numerous different sects of social dissent; and that it does not have unique, given organizational structures, intensifies the clouds around it. Hence it is our objective to clarify these structures, the major groups participating into the movement, its historical lineages, and its major events as soon as possible. The first part of the chapter will draw the lines of the movement in international context; whereas the second part will deal with its patterns in Turkey. In both sections, before describing the social forum processes, which are central to our study; we will overview the general patterns of counter-globalization movement out of which social forums were born. However, it should be repeated that social forums do not involve the whole body of globalization movement; although we use the terms sometimes interchangeably, yet there exist various sectors of the movement rejecting ideologically and politically to participate in forum processes. On the other hand, despite the novelty and limitedness of the global movement among the oppositional groups of Turkey, or put it in other way, the relative abundance of groups (some rooted sects of Turkish left e.g.) that cannot link themselves directly to the multinational/international campaigns, organizations, the social forum practices are becoming to be the prevalent—but not sole, for instance, some parts of anarchist movement possessing global political awareness, do not attend forum organizations—ground in Turkey functioning in parallel to the global movement.

2.1 Historical Lineages

What has directed the public gaze onto the counter-globalization movement may be the street demonstrations in Seattle, but the movement, as we noted, did not appear abruptly. Beyond (or behind) its uniqueness as a social power, which could manage to mobilize large numbers in a wide geography, there exist practical, organizational, ideological, political and tactical lines that we may trace within the chaotic past of the social

movements. However, in our case, it may be seen that it is more difficult to trace these lines, if the diversity of the movements that compose *the movement* is considered. Hitherto the sole condition sufficient to keep together these movements which come from dissimilar traditions, political attitudes and organizational formations was the common negation of the neoliberal policies undertaken by the global bodies. In other words, the counter-globalization movement consists of various movements (and their sub-movements in some cases) that must be examined and commented separately. Furthermore, in general terms, there is not any temporal limit which we can assign to scan any social movement. Undoubtedly, any group or organization of today can be linked to its far relatives occurred in the past. For instance, this is more relevant for socialist or anarchist components of the movement which have a heritage of more or less two hundred years. Likewise, it may be argued that activists of alternative life communities are in one manner the heritors of the romantics of modern era.⁶

2.1.1 1968 as a Cornerstone

Given the impossibility of a complete historical account, in this section we take—once again—1968 as a unique cornerstone to set up our narrative. Such a perspective provides us the opportunity of observing the theoretical and organizational legacies of the past forming the movement. Instead of giving the family trees of each group, rather we try to indicate the common historical patterns that shed light onto the today's movement. Obviously, we assume here a temporal tread that links the '68 and today. Continuities and discontinuities are not absent within our plot. However, it may be stated that the social imaginary in which the counter-globalists wander was shaped by the '68 movement. We argue that current movement should be perceived within the context sprung out of the rupture that '68 rebellion has created in the field of social dissent. In fact, this is not just a

⁶ For a meticulous analysis of Western German Alternative Movement, see Necmi Zeka, *Batı Almanya'da Alternatif Hareket* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1985).

matter of chronology, but of theoretical, organizational and political universe born out of this rupture.

So, what is to be understood from such a linkage? Where are the signs of this connection? Probably, it might not be incorrect to state that the primary continuities on the level of individuals and organizations between the alter-globalization movement and the May '68 are weaker than the secondary connections between the parts. Of course there are many who involved in youth rebellion of '68 and contributing to the today's process, however it may be easily argued that the dominant outlook of the current movement is the increasing radicalization of the young people, who did not involve any political attempt in their lives priorly. Thus the concrete presence of older activists in the movement is of relatively little relevance to constitute such a link. On the other hand, a similar comment may be made for the groups, organizations and circles. The number of organizations, which have direct historical ties with the past, is considerably fewer than that of novel structures mostly organized in the last decade. So, what are the supposed relations between the past and today?

It is the intellectual heritage of the past where we should seek these ties. The '68 movement, as a "social bottom wave", as Insel put it, has generated long-term effects that superseded its immediate consequences.⁷ According to Insel, like any great revolution in the history of human, it has kept out the traditional institutions of society that limit the social tensions, and thus demolished the boundaries for a moment. We may find a similar approach to the movement in Michel de Certeau's words. He describes the tumultuous moments in which the "parole" has been conquered as "une révolution de la parole", a revolution of speech, in that the right to have a word was appropriated by the students and young workers.⁸ Students and the radical sections of the working class spoke out against the established

⁷ Ahmet Insel, "Mayıs '68: Trajedisiz Bir Devrim," *Birikim* 109 (Mayıs 1998): 45.

⁸ Quoted in Oliver Marchart, *Staging the Political: (Counter-) Publics and the Theatricality of Acting*, 2004, online source, http://www.republicart.net/disc/publicum/marchart03_en.htm.

powers of the system. In parallel to a comprehensive critique of the capitalist system that includes the whole spheres of life, they have also developed a radical critique of the Sovietic system, and of the traditional communist parties and trade unions which were the counterparts of this system within the western world. Such a critique points to already existing socialist countries' inability to revolutionize the micro spheres of everyday life. They have been criticized for not touching into the realms of life except for the economy and the administration of state. Furthermore, the political strategy of traditional movements, which prioritize the capturing of state power, has been on the agenda of the May '68 movement as one of the main points of their objections. This two-sided critique, the critique directed against to the social, political, economical, cultural and ideological relations and institutions of both the modern capitalist system, and the real socialist system—and its counterparts functioned mostly to absorb the oppositional energy in the western countries—that is seen as the mirror image of the former, gives us the connection point that we seek.

In our view, there are two stages of transmission that we may identify: one is of the scope and content of the politics, and the other that of method and mode of the politics. Obviously, with the first term we point out the extension of political ground in parallel to the critique of '68, which prioritized to revolutionize the whole spheres of social life beside the mere economic relations, that is to say, the realms of culture, ideology and discourse. The meaning of such an attempt was to subvert (or, may be, to fix) the non-dialectical duality defined between (in classical terms) the base and superstructure that contains a supposed hierarchy. This meant more than a mere epistemic rupture; in the sense Castoriadis defines the term, an aspiration for “autonomy” was the leading cause that featured in the movement.⁹ “Individual, social, class-based, sexual ...all sort of autonomy”, in Insel's words.¹⁰ As a result, a cluster of organizations focusing on gender,

⁹ Cornelius Castoriadis, *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, trans. Kathleen Blamey (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997).

¹⁰ Insel, “Mayıs '68: Trajedisiz Bir Devrim,” p. 46.

ethnic or race issues, which have transformed in time into the components of identity-politics, have occurred. To illustrate, the second generation of feminist movement has taken form within the '68 movement, or gay and lesbian movement has risen and radicalized in the USA in the period. The environmental issues have been introduced to the agenda of social movements to the extent that even the more traditional left organizations cannot ignore today.

If the extension and redefinition of the political ground is one of the stages we identified, then other one is the re-appropriation of the organizational forms of the '68 movement. Organization patterns, which exclude vertically hierarchised, representation-based structures, inspire the dissenters to believe the necessity of constituting any alternative model envisaged in today's bodies. One of the most principal features of the counter-globalization movement is the consistent insistence on the non-hierarchical bodies that may be observed particularly among the young participants. The lack of up-to-down schemes and the prevalence of networks is the key figure in the movement's discourse deployed to define itself. Networks, as temporary structures, bring together the individuals—even if they are working for an organization—, put them on the nodes to reach the supposed target, and then abolish themselves. However, this should not be understood as a celestial supreme-platform where any power relation is reduced. Not surprisingly, various kinds of relations of dominancy are still operating at numerous levels, as we will see in the last chapter, despite the central role of this motivation within the self-descriptive discourse of the movement. However, what is valuable here for us is rather the impact of May '68 on such an insistence to pursue the aim of non-vertical organizations, instead of the movements' limited success in accomplishing these aims.

Yet this parallelism between the '68 movement and the counter-globalists should not be overstated; the social structures forming and being formed by the movements have altered substantially as we summarized in the third chapter of the study. At least the sociological positions of the

subjects of the upheaval have varied as we can observe even in the unspoken, unnamed mood of the today's campaigns. In short, in the sixties the western world was experiencing the last times of a blooming capitalism, the students or workers did not have negative expectations in terms of the given standards of the system; however, after the enduring attacks of neoliberalism the citizens of today's world do not share a similar sense of security in any country. Surely, it is not our aim here to prove the benefactions of welfare capitalism, but to point out the structural differences that may be useful to explain the behavioral discrepancies between two generations. In short, thus, '68 movement ought not to be regarded as a mythical Phoenix that will reborn out of its ashes, as Somay remarked,¹¹ but as a historical moment enabling the social imaginary, in which the current alter-globalization movement makes up its forms, organizations, relations, demands and tactics, to emerge.

2.1.2 'New' Social Movements

The second station that we arrive in our short historical scan is the bunch of social movements appeared in the seventies after the *defeat* of the '68 movement, which are named mostly as new social movements (NSMs). The term is used mainly to branch out the oppositional movements, which occurred in that time and were inspired predominantly from the radical youth movement of the late sixties, from the traditional working class movement.¹² It comprehends an ample realm: feminist movement, black movement, environmentalist movement, peace movement, movements struggling for the rights of gays and lesbians, anti-nuclear movement, consumer rights movement, and in smaller scale struggles fighting against the asylums and prisons. Even if each one of them has diverse motivations and dynamics, the common denominator of these movements is the state of

¹¹ Bülent Somay, "'68: İsrail'in Sûru mu, Bahar Ayini mi?," *Birikim* 109 (Mayıs 1998): 85.

¹² Kate Nash, "The Politicization of the Social: Social Movements and Cultural Politics," in *Contemporary Political Sociology: Globalization, Politics and Power* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), p. 102.

being different from the working class movements and the institutionalized socialist/left formations of the previous era—we can observe here the impacts of the May '68 without difficulty. Wallerstein identifies two main points differentiating these two camps: firstly, former opponents oppose the idea that the concerns that they address were “secondary”, and should be postponed until *the revolution*. In the second place, they have serious doubts about a practical and theoretical universe reduced to the capturing of the state. It is obvious that so-called NSMs have direct connections with the '68 movement. When the “social bottom wave” withdrew in the first half of seventies, it has left behind social institutions and relations questioned and criticized thoroughly. While the forcefulness of the socialist/anarchist elements of the '68 movement has decreased, more particularistic movements that dealt with limited issues have gained popularity. Most of these movements have been organized by the activists who had participated in the radical youth movement, and continued to define themselves as socialists/anarchists. At this point we should stop and say a few words on the “novelty” of these movements. In our view, such a supposed novelty of these movements is somehow problematic because of the long- and short-term historical linkages of this movement. As mentioned above, these groups appropriated their political and ideological bases primarily from the “new left” streams of the sixties; additionally, they inherited their modes of action and organizational models directly from these former movements. Secondly, their fields of question and the demands they enounced had certain commonalities, as Calhoun and Bora argued, with the social movements of the 19th century.¹³ Given the increased impacts of capitalist modernization in the 19th century, the popular movements of the Western Europe and the USA struggling against the atomizing and alienating relations that commodify human relations remind us the new social movements of the late 20th century. While according to Calhoun these

¹³ Craig Calhoun, “‘New Social Movements’ of the Early Nineteenth Century,” in *Readings in Contemporary Political Sociology*, ed. Kate Nash (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2000). Tanıl Bora, “‘Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler’ e Dair Notlar,” *Birikim* 13 (Mayıs 1990): 49.

movements were based on nonmaterial issues like life style and religious, Bora identifies them as “petit-bourgeois streams based mostly on romantic critique of capitalism and aspirations to an organic society”.¹⁴ In short, the issue of the discontinuity between the “old” and “new” movements is overstated, as Faulks stated.¹⁵ However, what is crucial for us is rather to comprehend the social conditions that created these movements in order to comment on the counter-globalization movement, not to conduct endless discussions on the issues of novelty. To repeat, beside the primary connections of the NSMs with the current movement, the initial influence of this generation on the current one has been to contribute to the determining of the coordinates of contemporary opposition which are shaped within the post-’68 social imaginary. NSMs consisted of the social movements that problematized the novel facades of society becoming more and more apparent as the transformation of the capitalism—that we tried to summarize in the first chapter—furthered. So, what links the NSMs to the counter-globalization movement is their opposition to the social relations that Clause Offe describes in his words as the “structural pluralization of social conflicts”.¹⁶ That is to say, the domains of questioning were transmitted from the ’68 movement to today’s movement with the mediation of NSMs. Although since the mid-’80s most of the organizations of this generation have lost their acceleration and transformed in part into substitutes of social democratic parties,¹⁷ these movements had two vital consequences as Bora stated: first, the politicization of areas of social conflict other than the capital-labor conflict and its intrusion into the discourse of the opposition, in other words, the expanding and deepening of

¹⁴ Bora, ““Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler’e Dair Notlar,” p. 49.

¹⁵ Keith Faulks, “New Social Movements,” in *Political Sociology* (New York: New York University Press, 1999): p. 99.

¹⁶ Quoted in Bora, ““Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler’e Dair Notlar,” p. 50.

¹⁷ Tanıl Bora, *Yeşiller ve Sosyalizm* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1988): pp. 97-101.

the political realm; second, the creation of alternative channels of opposition that mobilize large masses and encourage direct democracy practices.¹⁸

2.1.3 Years of Nineties

After the deep silence of the eighties, we reach our third station of our historical scan.¹⁹ In this section, unlike the previous sections, we deal with more primary links, with significant moments of the nineties that prepared the political ground of present upheaval. The last decade of the century witnessed the escalation of struggles that conceived properly the nature and impacts of neoliberalism and its structural adjustment programs. These chiefly Latin America-origin struggles set up the required conditions for the international spaces of encounter of the latter era.

São Paulo Forum (FSP), an international conference aiming to deliberate mature alternatives to neoliberalism in the continental scale, was constituted in 1990 July with the call of Brazilian Worker's Party (PT) to the left-wing political bodies of Latin America and Caribbean region. The primary motivation was to constitute a common defense line taking into account the new emerging worldwide conditions subsequent to the fall of Berlin Wall. After the first meeting in the Brazilian city, forum came together every year till today in one city of the continent.²⁰

On January 1, 1994, the same day that the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between the United States, Canada and Mexico became operational, EZLN (Zapatista Army of National Liberation, Zapatistas in short), an armed revolutionary group based in the jungles of Chiapas, southern Mexico, started an upheaval that came to an end after twelve days with an unilateral ceasefire. In accordance with the choice of the day that began the uprising, the primary motive of their struggles is to

¹⁸ Bora, “‘Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler’e Dair Notlar,” p. 51.

¹⁹ To map out this era we mainly benefited from F. Levent Şensever, *Dünya Sosyal Forumu: Aşağıdan Küreselleşme Hareketi ve Küresel Direniş* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003).

²⁰ For the list of notable participants in FSP, see the Appendix A.

fight against the neoliberalism that threatens the life areas of the indigenous people. Despite the local character of their programs, by the help of internationalist discourse they deployed, Zapatistas became highly popular among the global public and influenced too many activists even in Europe and North America. Their approach to the issue of state power and non-hierarchical community based organization models charms the social movements all around the world, and offers one of the main models that are prevalent among the counter-globalization movement.

In the last days of 1995, France has witnessed the largest demonstrations of last two decades. Between November 24 and December 12, millions of workers from public transport, hospital, telephone, utility, postal, education and public service sectors were on strike to protest against the government's plan to overhaul the welfare system, decreasing benefits all round, cutting back on medicine and public sector workers' conditions. With the powerful support of students, the strike turned out to be the most important reactions against neoliberal government policies of the nineties.²¹

In the week from July 27 to August 3, 1996, the first 'Intercontinental Encounter for Humanity and against Neoliberalism' was held in Chiapas with the attendance of approximately 4000 delegates from almost every country of the world. The call of the gathering had been made in January 1996 by Sub-commandante Marcos, four separate preparatory meeting were held in four continents from January to July. Among the attendees, there were striker workers from France, mothers of Argentinean political missing persons, political refugees from Iran, squatter autonomous from Berlin, former guerillas from Latin America, Italian activists organizing the social centers (*centri sociali*), Gandhian socialist peasants from India, indigenous groups such as the Maori of New Zealand and Kuna of Ecuador, a community organized by escapee slaves from Central and South America, Brazilian syndicalists, MST (Landless Worker's Movement) and Spanish

²¹ Andrew Flood, "French Strike Wave: Why not here?," *Workers Solidarity* 47 (Winter 95/96), <http://struggle.ws/ws/france47.html>.

and British anarchists.²² The second intercontinental encounter was held in Barcelona, between July 25 and August 2, 1997. These gatherings have played a crucial role to strengthen the idea of acting globally especially among the organizations coming from anarchist/autonomist backgrounds.²³

Following the East Asian financial crisis that started in Thailand, in July 1997 and affected mainly Thailand, Indonesia and South Korea, the Russian and Brazilian crisis were triggered. Unsurprisingly, the chaotic environment caused by the substantial economic crisis led thousands to protest against the neoliberal institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB).

People's Global Action (PGA)—a worldwide network of radical social movements, grassroots campaigns and direct actions resisting to capitalism—was launched in February 1, 1998, by the social movements met in Geneva. The primary objectives and organizational principles of the network had been drafted in the first and second international encounters mentioned above. The first two conferences of the PGA, which have contributed to the organizing of most influential counter-globalist demonstrations, were held in Geneva, on February 23-25, and in Bangalore, India, on August 23-26, 1999, respectively. PGA, as the organizer of Global Action Days like 'carnival against capital' (June 18, 1999), the 3rd WTO summit in Seattle (November 30, 1999), the IMF/World Bank meeting in Prague (September 26, 2000), the G8 meeting in Genoa (June 21, 2000), the 4th WTO summit in Qatar (November 9, 2001), etc., has been one of the leading figures of the movement.²⁴

On the 3rd of June 1998, ATTAC (Association for the Taxation of Financial Transactions for the Aid of Citizens), an activist organization

²² Şensever, *Dünya Sosyal Forumu: Aşağıdan Küreselleşme Hareketi ve Küresel Direniş*, p.143; David Graeber, "The New Anarchists," *New Left Review* 13 (January-February 2002): p. 64.

²³ For a brief analysis of the first two encounters, see Andrew Flood, *A Report on the First Encounter for Humanity and against Neoliberalism*, http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/andrew/encounter1_report.html; and *A Report on the Second Encounter for Humanity and against Neoliberalism*, http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/andrew/encounter2_report.html.

²⁴ For the brief history and hallmarks of the network, see <http://pgaconference.org/>.

demanding the levying of a tax on speculative financial transactions on global scale (this proposal was derived from the model of Nobel Prize winner economist James Tobin) and the redistributing of surplus gained from these cuts to the unprivileged parts of the societies, has been founded officially in France. An ample range of trade unions, democratic institutions and social movements responded to the call of Ignacio Ramonet, the editor-in-chief of *Le Monde Diplomatique*, and made up one of the most important element of the counter-globalization movement that has 30 000 members in and out of France. ATTAC, as “an action-oriented movement of popular education”, in Bernard Cassen’s words,²⁵ one of the founder-members of the association, has mobilized a large amount of people against neoliberalism, and has played a crucial role in the formation of World Social Forum (WSF). Even it may be argued that the first WSF was a fruit of initiatives like ATTAC alongside with Brazilian organizations.

So far we endeavored to indicate the historical lineages of the alter-globalization movement to comprehend more profoundly the structures, forms, demands, tactics and critiques of the movements, groups and organizations that compose it. In the next section, we will name the major streams in resistance to neoliberal capitalism in order to render *the movement* more explicable.

2.2 Major Streams in the Movement

That the counter-globalization movement is consisted of countless groups and organizations, and thus it should be considered as a ‘movement of movements’, is repeatedly enunciated. In accordance with such a discourse, the plurality and diversity of its constituents is praised, in other words, unlike the single-faced social struggles of the previous eras, current movement cannot be explained in terms of doctrines of any particular body or simplistic coalitions hegemonized by such bodies. However, this should

²⁵ Bernard Cassen, “On the Attack,” *New Left Review* 19 (January-February 2003): p. 44.

not be grasped as that the spaces of alter-globalists are power-free and abstracted from the hegemony struggles of its parties. Surely, there exists a certain level of internal disagreement that split various position-holders as we will try to report in the fourth chapter, *Experience*. Nevertheless, it may be argued that the counter-globalization movement and social forums, as peculiar forms born out of it, could and can manage to make a difference owing to their reinvented modes of coming together. Hence what is to be done at this point of the study is to delineate the parts making up this multidirectional social movement, even if it is unreasonable to suppose a complete list of all groups and organizations doable. Consequently, in this section we will map the key fields of struggle and name the major streams fighting in these fields.

Wallerstein identifies the so-called anti-globalization movement as the “new claimant for the role of antisystemic movement” in the era, which “seeks to bring together all the previous types [...] and includes groups organized in a strictly local, regional, national and transnational fashion”.²⁶ Those previous types of social opposition forms referred by Wallerstein are Old Left—both the established sects of western left, and the Maoist bodies organized worldwide especially during/after the ’68 rebellion to constitute an alternative to the formers but in time turned out to be old left—, new social movements, human rights organizations and others struggling to improve the power of civil society—which have gained a public popularity particularly in the nineties and then have become NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations). Wallerstein states as a peculiarity of this movement its ability to embrace all such diverse struggles under a common slogan—however, this is limited, according to him, with the prevalent negative character of the movement based on the rejection of neoliberalism.²⁷

²⁶ Immanuel Wallerstein, “New Revolts Against the System,” *New Left Review* 18 (November-December 2002): pp. 36-7.

²⁷ Wallerstein, “New Revolts Against the System,” p. 37.

In a more thorough work, Starr clusters the social struggles named as anti-corporate movements under three groups: movements and sub-movements seeking a ‘contestation or reform’ of globalization processes; those aspiring to a ‘globalization from below; and those aiming a ‘delinking’ from or a ‘relocalization’ of global political and economic bodies.²⁸ Although there are ongoing crossings between these three modes, first mode of contestation and reform, according to Starr, includes cyberpunks; groups and organizations which are fighting against structural adjustment programs and corporate welfare regulations; defending peace and human rights; struggling for land reform—these may take forms of rural land reform, urban squats or anti-growth campaigns— and contesting explicitly corporations. Activists of this mode mostly aim to reclaim the state authority in order to regulate multinational corporations and confine their activities resulting with public losses. In the trilateral model of Starr, the second mode contains principally the environmentalists, socialists— classical political parties or alternative institutions—, labor organizations, Anti-FTA (free trade agreements) campaigns, and Zapatistas. Movements of this mode aim to substitute people’s internationalist governance bodies for the institutions of neoliberal globalization. Lastly, third category takes account of anarchists; those fighting for sustainable development in rural or urban areas; small business projects seeking to be alternative of large corporations; sovereignty movements; and religious-nationalist movements struggling to build a defense wall against capitalist globalization.²⁹

Unsurprisingly, like any schematic attempt, Starr’s model does not comprehend exhaustively the complicated dynamics operating across political bodies that project to fight such complex social structures. Nonetheless, it provides us a chance to review key streams that determine the coordinates of this social matrix. Now we may summarize the major events of the counter-globalization movement in the next section.

²⁸ Amory Starr, *Naming the Enemy: Anti-Corporate Movements Confront Globalization* (London and New York: Zed Books; Australia: Pluto Press, 2000), p. xi.

²⁹ Starr, *Naming the Enemy*, p. 149.

2.3 Social Forums³⁰

As we noted above, although there had been numerous previous attempts, the counter-globalization movement came on the scene with the street demonstrations organized in Seattle, USA, between November 28 and December 3, 1999. A crowd of approximately 80 000 people that came from trade unions united under the AFL-CIO (American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations), environmentalist organizations like for instance Ruckus Society, Earth First, Friends of the Earth or Rainforest Action Network, NGO's like Global Trade Watch or Global Exchange, or student organizations like Students United Against Sweatshops filled the streets to protest the ministerial conference of WTO. Owing to the successful tactics of direct action groups and the relative unpreparedness of police forces against these groups, demonstrators could manage to attract public interest and create a mood of enthusiasm. Moreover, the diversity of groups gathered in the streets has become an indicator of the organizational composition of the current generation of social dissent.

Within the passionate mood Seattle caused, the next step of American social movements was to meet in Washington DC, in April 16, 2000, to oppose this time the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Although the activists could not make an impact as effective as Seattle, nonetheless A16 has indicated that a wave of massive street demonstrations following the key meetings of global institutions was on rise — Millau, Prague, Nice, Cancun, Genoa, etc.³¹ What gave rise to an idea of global venue that encompasses whole range of oppositional groups and individuals all over the world is this social and historical context. By 2001, there was a marked shift in this regard, and the movement, in part to overcome the

³⁰ Since the social movements, groups and institutions in Turkey attend predominantly the World Social Forum, European Social Forum and Mediterranean Social Forum, this section focuses principally on these, not on continental/regional forums like Asian Social Forum, African Social Forum, Social Forum of the Americas, Caribbean Social Forum, Pan-Amazon Social Forum, or other thematic forums.

³¹ A selective chronology of notable moments in the short history of the counter-globalization movement may be found in Appendix B.

repeated criticisms that activists had no alternatives and nothing to offer but criticism, moved on to new terrain, creating the first World Social Forum (WSF).

2.3.1 World Social Forum

The World Social Forum is defined by its organizers as “an open meeting place where social movements, networks, NGOs and other civil society organizations opposed to neoliberalism and a world dominated by capital or by any form of imperialism and came together to pursue their thinking, to debate ideas democratically, to formulate proposals, share their experiences freely and network for effective action”.³² Thus, intrusion of any organization or individual to this open process is not restricted by any authority, as long as they follow the Charter of Principles, the only binding document of the forum.³³

According to a common and widely accepted story, the idea of holding a worldwide forum that stands against World Economic Forum (WEF) was born during a conversation between Oded Grajew, Brazilian human rights activist and a former entrepreneur, Francisco Whitaker, the secretary to the Commission on Justice and Peace of the Council of Brazilian Bishops, and Bernard Cassen. As an overall alternative to everything the WEF symbolizes, the forum was planned to be held in the global south, in a city —Porto Alegre—that was on the spot at that time due to the participatory budget model of the local administration of Brazilian Worker’s Party. Given the enormous social injustices on the one hand, and the relative forcefulness of social movements and the adequateness of economic resources of the country on the other, Brazil, and Porto Alegre in

³² “What The World Social Forum is,” official web site, http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/main.php?id_menu=19&cd_language=2.

³³ In April 2001, after the first forum, the Brazilian Committee declared a Charter of Principles for the initiative they had taken. Just after the formation of International Council, Charter was revised and reissued on June 10, 2001. Both versions may be found in Appendix C and D. For an analysis of this process, see Jai Sen, “A Tale of Two Charters,” in *The World Social Forum: Challenging Empires*, ed. Jai Sen, Anita Anand, Arturo Escobar and Peter Waterman (New Delhi: The Viveka Foundation, 2004).

particular, was, according to Cassen and his friends, a proper candidate to host such an international forum. With the initiative of ATTAC-France and Brazilian organizations, the call of forum was made by Miguel Rossetto, then vice-governor of Rio Grande do Sul, during the UN Social Summit in Geneva, in June 2000.³⁴ Subsequently, social movements all around the world supported the project and responded to the call, and the first WSF took place from January 25 to 30, 2001, with the attendance of 4702 delegates and 25 000 participants from 117 countries.³⁵ The second and third forums were organized in Porto Alegre too, with much more attendees and a positive-oriented strategic plan that aims to save the Forum from being merely an antidote of WEF meetings. Accordingly, the fourth forum was held in Mumbai, India, in accordance with the decisions taken in the previous forum to render the process global in real terms. The Forum came back home in 2005 once again, and in 2006 it was organized in more than one center — in January in Bamako (Mali) and Caracas (Venezuela), and in March in Karachi, Pakistan. Lastly, the seventh WSF will take place from January 20 to 25, in Nairobi, Kenya.

At this point it would be appropriate to mention the organizational model applied by WSF in order to grasp the differences between the WSF and other social forums. We mentioned above that at the very early stages of the process, eight Brazilian organizations which had responded to Grajew and Whitaker's attempts have formed a national committee. The first WSF was organized with the initiatives of this local committee. However, in early June 2001 this group of eight summoned an 'Advisory Council', since then renamed the 'International Council', in order to "take the Forum to the world level".³⁶ Hence, since the first WSF there is applied a triple model — International Council, National Organizing Committees (in the case of Brazil, Committee consists of eight organizations mentioned above), and

³⁴ Cassen, "On the Attack," pp. 48-9.

³⁵ Şensever, *Dünya Sosyal Forumu: Aşağıdan Küreselleşme Hareketi ve Küresel Direniş*, p.57.

³⁶ Quoted in Sen, "A Tale of Two Charters," p. 72.

National Mobilization Committees.³⁷ The International Council, which comprises more than one hundred organizations and was determined by the Brazilian Organizing Committee, plays a crucial role in this model, and draws the strategic line of the Forum. It is not based on representation of the organizations, nor does it involve voting mechanisms; however, it attributes a great importance to the diversity of the participants in terms of geography and the fields of struggle. It cooperates with other two organs to organize world-wide, continental, regional and thematic forums.

2.3.2 European Social Forum

As a result of the decision taken in the second WSF to encourage spreading the continental forums, the first European Social Forum (ESF) was held from November 6th to 10th, 2002, in Florence, Italy. The event itself was really astonishing. With an unofficial agenda predominantly determined by the offensive plans of USA on Afghanistan, tens of thousands of people gathered in Florence. Following the considerable achievement of the first ESF to incorporate the social forums from outside of Italy, the second and third forums were held in November 2003, in Paris and in November 2004, in London. Finally, the last ESF, in accordance with the decisions to expand the movement to the Southeastern and Eastern Europe, was organized by Greek social forums from May 4th to 7th, 2006, in Athens.

The very mentality of organizing of ESFs is an obvious indicator of the fact that the core aspect of forum processes is the preparatory stages rather than the event itself. As it may be grasped by this sentence, ESF deploys an organizational model somewhat different than the WSF's model that is based on large open preparatory assemblies. The decisions are taken; the commissions are arranged during these assemblies that have to be at least four times in a year and in different cities of the Europe. The model, as known as Italian model, envisages three main body — European Assembly,

³⁷ The list of organizations that consist of the International Council are given in Appendix E.

Secretariat and working groups. Likewise the WSF, ESF is not based on organizational representation; the attitudes of individuals are of major importance in decision-making processes.

European Assembly as we noted gets together at least four times in a year, and is an open structure to any social movement that accepts the Charter of Principles WSF has launched. The participation is not restricted according to the time any organization or individual has been in the process, that is to say, it is not obligatory to follow the meetings from the very beginning. In addition, the decisions concerning the ESF are taken here by consensus, not by voting, after the Assembly is informed by the Secretariat and working groups about their activities. After each preparatory the Assembly, the meeting notes of the working groups, the decisions taken by the Assembly and the activities of the Secretariat are reported on the official web site of the Forum.

The geographical location of the ESF is determined according to a rotation system and is generally announced in the last day of forum — the only exception is the fourth forum held in Athens, in 2006. So the national social forum—if there does not exist a national social forum, a coalition of the social movements—of the country is assigned as a Secretariat that is responsible of the coordination of practical concerns. Although it has a crucial role in organizing the process, it is obliged to obey the decisions taken in the Assembly.

Lastly, responsibility of solving the practical issues belongs to three working groups that are open to anyone at any point of the process. To repeat, they are based on individual participation; although those individuals may work within an organization, individual-based participation bypasses the bureaucratic bodies of the organizations since the decisions are taken here and now. Firstly, the program group is responsible for arranging the plenary sessions, seminars and workshops to be held in the Forum, by classifying the great mass of proposals that come from organizations, merging them in a meaningful manner, and determining their speakers. Secondly, the expansion group works to incorporate more social movements

into the process. And the last one is the logistic and organization group that works to resolve the infrastructural problems of the Forum.

2.3.3 Mediterranean Social Forum

Mediterranean Social Forum (MedSF) is the first interregional social forum, created by the movements from southern Europe, Maghreb and Mediterranean Middle East, within a perspective that aims to decentralize the social forum processes. Accordingly, the MedSF process was started up in Barcelona, November 2001 with the intention of “becoming a space for a plural and transversal work open to different sensitivities, cultures, beliefs and peoples in order to articulate, at a regional level, communities from Mediterranean societies wishing to work collectively, reflect and generate specific alternatives to the currently ongoing process of neoliberal globalization”.³⁸ After the general assemblies of Rabat (Morocco), Naples (Italia) and Pervolia (Cyprus), Malaga (Spain) and Marseilles (France) the first MedSF was held in Barcelona, in 2005 June 16-19. According to the principle of rotation the next will be held on the other side of the Mediterranean.

MedSF, to a large extent, has deployed the organizational model developed by European Social Forum, thus has three main bodies that are open to any organization and individual —General Assembly, Secretariat (which, contrary to the ESF’s model, is located in one city, Barcelona, to facilitate the practical problems) and working groups (on program, expansion and communication, and logistic and financial issues).

2.4 Turkey

So far we tried to shed light on the main points of the international process of the counter-globalization movement to make it more understandable within our general problematic. In this section of the chapter, our intention is to give answers to the questions on the pattern of

³⁸ Mediterranean Social Forum, official website, <http://www.fsmed.info/en/pres-en.doc>.

the movement in general and the social forum process in particular within the context of the Turkish social forum processes, and then add some novel questions to be focused in the last chapter. In compliance with such goal, we will provide the key moments in the *story* of Turkish social forum movement.³⁹

To begin, it may be argued that the period, in which the first signs of the counter-globalization movement became noticeable in the world scale, corresponds to the recession years of Turkish oppositional movements. In accordance with the worldwide panorama, the eighties and then the nineties are the years that the Turkish left experienced subsequent defeats in political and ideological terms — at this point the crucial role of the 1980 military coup ought to be remembered. In these two decades, socialist groups, which had gained considerable support before the coup, have been dismantled; trade unions could not mobilize the workers except the strikes in the late eighties triggered by the actions of coalminers; the feminist movement has lost its efficiency compared with the expansion in the eighties; the environmentalist organizations that had occurred and created a significant impact in the post-coup period have lost their early enthusiasm; the student movement, after the rise in the mid-‘90s based on the struggle of university students for their democratic and economic rights, has withdrawn. On the other side, the state of general inefficiency of oppositional groups continued on the issues that determined predominantly the agenda of the country — the armed conflict in southeastern Turkey that had began in 1984, and the political tensions about the issue of secularism that had intensified by 1997. Moreover, the inability of opposition to respond to the structural adjustment programs of the capitalism’s global transformation has accelerated the decline in its social support and intensified the mood of defeat. Therefore, to repeat, the times that some sections of Turkish left started to observe and discuss the spanking global hullabaloo are the times that the oppositional

³⁹ This section has been built upon the personal observations, the in-depth interviews conducted with two of our key respondents (Mr. E and Mr. F), web sites of various organizations, and F. Levent Şensever, *Dünya Sosyal Forumu: Aşağıdan Küreselleşme Hareketi ve Küresel Direniş* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003), pp. 85-103.

politics in general and the left in particular keep in silence. In other words, the counterparts of the alter-globalization movement in Turkey have not occurred following a massive social uprising as it has been in Italy for instance, but the process has been designed voluntarily as a “project” by some sections of the Turkish left.⁴⁰

Following the Seattle big bang and the subsequent protest demonstrations, first echoes, in a subtle fashion, came from the universities. Some student groups mostly from DSİP and, to a certain extent, ÖDP circles appropriated the discourse of global movement, began to use their peculiar expressions in their posters and organized meetings to inform the students on these actions.⁴¹ In this period, activists from DSİP organized campaigns focusing on the demonstrations in Prague and Genoa. Finally in April 2002, discussions began among these activists to start an initiative for organizing a local social forum in Istanbul. Having informed the trade unions, institutions and other political organizations, on June 6th 2002 the call of Istanbul Social Forum (İSF) has been made publicly. Due to the lack of knowledge in Turkey about the processes and working styles of social forums, the primary occupation of the initiative has been to provide general information about the process. In the period, İSF arranged its first open discussion meeting on trade unions followed by discussions on the problems of students, anti-war movement, F-type prisons (special-designed prisons for political militants) and neoliberal policies. During this early period, the process has contained some environmentalists, socialists, Kurdish organizations, professional chambers, feminists, human rights activists, anti-war movement and gay-lesbian groups. In July 2002, for the first time activists delegating a local social forum in Turkey went to a general assembly of European Social Forum. The assembly, gathered in Thessalonica, Greece, has been an event to experience the forms of working in social forums. In the November of the

⁴⁰ Şensever, *Dünya Sosyal Forumu: Aşağıdan Küreselleşme Hareketi ve Küresel Direniş*, p.97.

⁴¹ DSİP, Revolutionary Socialist Worker Party, a Trotskyist party organically connected with Socialist Worker Party from Britain; ÖDP, Freedom and Solidarity Party, a coalition of left-wing groups from various traditions like Leninists, Trotskyists, greens, feminists, etc.

same year, İSF has organized a bi-dimensional campaign both to go to the first ESF to be held in Florence, and to arrange parallel activities in Istanbul at those days.

At this point, we have to make an excursus and give some notes on the peace movement in Turkey, which has been a key moment in the social forum process. In parallel to the substantial mobilization caused by the offensive practices of the US-led coalition initially for Afghanistan and then for Iraq, the public sensibility for the issues of war has increased in a considerable fashion in Turkey. Following the keen discussions, in the summer of 2002 ‘No to War Platform’, that is to be transformed into the ‘Coordination of No to War in Iraq’ with the participation of large mass organizations at the end of the year, has been founded. The Coordination has organized three major street demonstrations in four months — December 1st Istanbul meeting, February 15th (Global Action Day that had been decided in Florence) and March 1st Ankara meeting mentioned at the beginning. In September 2003, the Coordination has split because of the political disagreements between the highly differentiated groups, and then BAK (Global Peace and Justice Coalition) was born out of this split up. Despite the cyclical up-and-downs of the movements due to the ever increasing hegemony of the war coalition, peace movement has sustained to be one of the most important elements of the opposition in Turkey in the new millennium. Beside the street protests, with the initiative of activists of the antiwar movement, an idea of constituting an international tribunal on war crimes in Iraq has spread in the global scale, and after a two years work, the final session of the World Tribunal on Iraq has been organized in Istanbul, in June 2005 (the call of the tribunal was made in Berlin, in April 2003, during the preparatory meeting of the second ESF).

Having summarized the general pattern of Turkish anti-war movement, we can go on to make clear the contour of our plot. We noted above that social forum processes in Turkey have not developed on a given social mobilization, thus activists seeking to constitute the local dynamics of the movement have preferred to focus on interweaving international

networks between the local institutions and their international counterparts. Within such a strategy, organizing international assemblies in Istanbul and attending the preparatory meetings abroad have been one of the primary modes of expansion. Accordingly, the intention was to intensify the contact between *here* and *there* and hence to help the local movements grasp the methods, forms, and styles of the international movement. Activists have followed the whole set of preparatory meetings, attended the ESFs in Paris, London, and Athens (the attendance of Turkish activists in Athens was surprising; the number was around 1000), and hosted two general assemblies of ESF. This attempt to constitute international connections was not restricted with saloon meetings; for instance, in April 2004, activists from abroad joined to the demonstrations in Istanbul organized to protest NATO meeting, or activists of social forum have realized a campaign and counter-activities with activists from mostly southeastern Asia in parallel to the annual governors' meeting of Asian Development Bank held in Istanbul, in the first week of May 2005.

Meanwhile, İSF, on June 18th 2003, in an open meeting arranged with the intention of expanding and restructuring has declared its principles—which are in conformity with the Charter of Principles of the World Social Forum—and organizational model.⁴² According to this, İSF has deployed a model inspired from the European social forums. In this model, the mere body authorized to give decisions was the General Assembly that gathers at least four times in a year. Assemblies are open to everyone and based on individual participation. The general line and the program of the social forums are determined here. At least one person from working groups—expansion, program and logistic—and secretariat (it is obliged to coordinate

⁴² Among the attendees of this meeting were Barış Anneleri İnisyatifi (an initiative of Kurdish women), DEHAP (then mass party of the Kurdish politics), DSİP, Göç-Der (an association working on forced migration especially from southeastern Turkey), Greenpeace, Halkevleri (a socialist group), İHD-İstanbul Şubesi (Association of Human Rights-Istanbul), Küresel BAK (Global Justice and Peace Coalition), Ortaklar Evi (a socialist group working with urban poors), ÖDP, Özgür-Der (an Islamic association), SAV (Foundation of Social Researches), SODEV (Foundation of Social Democracy), TMMOB-İstanbul (Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects-Istanbul branch), TUHAD (an association focusing on the political militants in the prisons), Türkiye Sakatlar Derneği (the association of disabled persons), Yeşiller (Greens).

the working groups and to solve practical issues; it cannot make decisions) has to attend to the assembly to yield their reports. Finally, institutional communication committee works as a consultative body and communicates with the participant institutions. The committee, which has not authority to make decisions, had a duty to form a general perspective and encourage the active participation of the groups.

In this formation stage of the social forum movement, two main titles have come out. As noted above, İSF, which defines itself as a descendant of international social forum processes like WSF and ESF, appropriated their principles and declared its clear rejection against the usage of violence as a means. The questioning of this principle by some groups (mostly around the issue of Palestine) caused some divisions, and these groups have gone out from the process. Unlike the issue of violence, a second principle concerning the participation of political parties to the social forums did not lead this kind of split up. Although the Charter of WSF prevents parties' direct representation, İSF preferred to follow the route of ESF and adopted a more flexible attitude against the political parties. Not allowing the organizational representation in decision-making processes and encouraging individual participation, İSF did not consider the issue as a problem. In the current situation, left-wing parties like DSİP, EMEP and ÖDP, and DTP (successor of DEHAP) are actively involved in the Turkish Social Forum.

At the end of 2004, a discussion among the participant groups and individuals on the necessity of the Turkish Social Forum has begun. According to this argument, İSF had overgrown and turned out to be a secretariat of a national forum, thus exceeded the limits of the supposed local forum. To prevent the possible representational problems between the İSF and Turkish social movements, an idea of constituting a national forum has been supported. After almost a six month discussion and expansion period, the official call of the TSF was launched by the Constitutive Board in June 14th, 2005.⁴³ TSF has inherited the principles of İSF and formed its organizational structure blending the models of WSF and ESF. Thus unlike

⁴³ For the list of 28 organizations that make up the Board, Appendix F.

the İSF, it has a Constitutive Board that is limited with the 28 organizations that has participated in the pre-call period. Inspired from the International Committee of the WSF and the organizational schema of the ATTAC-France, the Board aims to guarantee the sustainability of the process. It makes its decisions by consensus like any other body, and is not built upon organizational representation. Beside the Board, there are general assemblies that are open venues to take decisions, working groups, and bureau (secretariat). The official course that began with the June 14th call will give its first produces with the TSF gathering to be held in Istanbul, from September 30th to October 1st, 2006. Up to now five general assemblies have been set up to deliberate the issues of preparation in Istanbul, Diyarbakır, Ankara, İzmir, and once again Istanbul. According to the report prepared by the program working group for the last preparatory meeting, TSF will host 24 seminars and 16 workshops focusing on trade unions, the European Union membership of Turkey, nuclear energy and global climate changes, Kurdish issue, the future of the counter-globalization movement, imperialism, women, F-type prisons, alternative culture, youth, health policies, forced migration, education, local administrations, extrajudicial executions, anti-war movement in Turkey, Islam and laicism, environmental responsibilities, the rights of gay, lesbian and transsexuals, patriarchy. TSF has managed to expand during this one year period, the number of the participant organizations has almost exceeded fifty, the diversity of the political subjects has increased to a certain degree; however, it still has a number of problems like including some institutions into the process e.g. the local administrations except the municipalities in the Kurdish region or associations of small-scale merchants, consumers, professional groups, etc. which have contributed to the anti-war movement during the pre-Iraq war period.

Now the general characteristics and historical corner-stones of the counter-globalization movement in general and the social forum processes in particular both globally and locally are made visible in the eyes of the reader, we are ready, in the light of this empirical description, to extend and

reflect upon our general problematic. The following chapter continues with drawing the contours of the total transformation that social structures have undergone. Once we have clarified the movement, then we can attempt to grasp the social structures against which the movement acts.

3. STRUCTURE

All fixed, fast frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real condition of life and his relations with his kind.

Communist Manifesto

We all are witnessing the perplexing effects of the ‘new times’.⁴⁴ The perplexity in part comes from the far-reaching debates on the defining characteristics of these times. Those involved in these debates are producing diverse analyses on the determinant causes, socio-economic consequences, structural implications, or historical interval of this novel era. Despite these profound disagreements, yet a common label has occurred to define the period: globalization. Since the mid-80s the term has been popular and become a ‘cover term’, as Arjun Appadurai puts it,⁴⁵ which embrace a vast field of discourses ranging from the academia to kitchen literature, national politics to management policies. Moreover, as Held et al. foresaw,⁴⁶ it has become a cliché of our times that both expresses popularly and conceals the determinant dynamics of this social reality. Acknowledging the fact that the term itself is not neutral but subject to a hegemony struggle, we will continue to use the term to draw the contours of the era in which the counter-globalization movement has emerged.

⁴⁴ Obviously we are referring here to the conceptual package of the writers of *Marxism Today*, which have focused mainly on the structural alterations experienced by the British society during the 1980s, and the possible alternatives against these alterations. For a detailed discussion, see Stuart Hall and Martin Jacques (eds), *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1990).

⁴⁵ Arjun Appadurai, “Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination,” *Public Culture* 12:1 (Winter 2000): 6.

⁴⁶ David Held, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Perraton (eds), *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture* (Cambridge, Polity Press, 1999), p. 1.

At this stage of the study, we need to clarify what is to be understood by the term ‘globalization’. What are the general lines of the structural transformation summarized under this ‘cover term’? When we mention the ‘global’ movement, what are we referring to? The aim of this chapter, thus, at the broadest level, is to understand the nature of the social structures against which activists of the counter-globalization movement position themselves. However, owing to the limited boundaries of the study, throughout the chapter we will not scrutinize exhaustively the global transformation of capitalism, its historical trajectory, or the underlying causes of this alteration, but rather draw the contours of this transformation from a given standpoint—standpoint of the participants of the social movements. Initially, we will attempt to give an answer to a basic-but-obligatory question: what is globalization? After that, we will widen our temporal span and place our description in the post-68 context. Analytically, it will be tried to capture the main points of the new times with the help of a twofold reading, namely the material and discursive/ideological side of the new times. Finally, it should be noted that this chapter is a partial description focusing on the discontinuities, rather than the continuities, between the previous and current stages of the modern history.

3.1 Globalization

On a daily basis, the term “globalization” serves as an umbrella term that envelops simultaneously various aspects of contemporary social life. At the first glance, clustering of these aspects under such an imprecise definition may seem controversial. For instance, globalization indicates, on the one hand, an emerging ‘global village’, a fusion of local cultures, that is, a certain level of global integration, on the other hand, absorption of local differences, or, to use George Ritzer’s terminology,⁴⁷ the ‘McDonaldization’ of the world. In economic terms, globalization expresses the expansion of the domain of the free market, an increase in foreign trade transactions,

⁴⁷ George Ritzer, *The McDonaldization of Society: An Investigation into the Changing Character of Contemporary Social Life* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press, 1996).

foreign direct investments and foreign portfolio equity investments, that is, in short, neoliberalization of the world economies. In the field of technology, globalization is thought closely with the advances in cognitive and micro information technologies. Politically, globalization is seen as the nickname of the U.S. hegemony over other sites of the world on the one hand, and on the other, as a new era of the world history which is characterized mainly with the emergence of supranational institutions of ‘governance’. Likewise, Ulrich Beck mentions five aspects of globalization processes—informational, ecological, economic, cultural globalizations, and the globalization of labor cooperation or production—and argues that the most recent wave of globalization should be grasped as a dialectic aggregation of these interwoven aspects.⁴⁸

However, beyond the popular comments—which may seem controversial but also reflect in unrefined modes the dialectical character of social reality—on globalization, the comments emerged in the contemporary social theory have focused on the shifts in the human experience of temporality and spatiality. Scheuerman contends that “globalization refers to fundamental changes in the spatial and temporal contours of social existence, according to which the significance of space or territory undergoes shifts in the face of a no less dramatic acceleration in the temporal structure of crucial forms of human activity”.⁴⁹ According to this argument, due to the material alterations underlying the globalization, as the time—the unique unit to measure the spatial distances—required to link any given spatial unit to another one is reduced, spatial interval is ‘annihilated’ or, in Harvey’s terms, ‘compressed’.⁵⁰ Such a compression affects the humans’ experiences of space and time, and thus amends the senses of

⁴⁸ Ulrich Beck, *What is Globalization?*, trans. Patrick Camiller (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000), pp. 17-9.

⁴⁹ William Scheuerman, “Globalization,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta (Summer 2006), <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2006/entries/globalization/>.

⁵⁰ David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1995).

concepts like local or national in the social imaginary. In Beck's conception, the upshots of globalization on nationality are emphasized. As said by Beck, globalization indicates the "processes through which sovereign national states are crisscrossed and undermined by transnational actors with varying prospects of power, orientations, identities and networks".⁵¹ In like manner, according to Keyman, globalization means "the termination of temporal and spatial boundaries drawn between the inside and outside, the national and international, the West and East, the First and Third World, the modern and traditional, the identity and difference, the self and other".⁵² Similarly, Held et al. think of globalization as "the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life, from the cultural to the criminal, the financial to the spiritual".⁵³ Although there is not yet a consensus on the causal forces behind, the historical pattern of, or the sociopolitical, economical and cultural implications of the globalization, in the light of these definitions, interconnectedness and interdependency may be considered as the main features of globalization processes. Furthermore, Scheuerman lists the basic rudiments of the concept "globalization".⁵⁴ First, globalization is associated with *detrterritorialization*, that is, the termination of the direct connection between social activity and the "geographically identifiable location" which accommodates it. In other words, human activities and the "social spaces" in which they occur do not need to coincide spatially anymore. For instance, the amazing financial organization of the global markets allows one to make transactions in Dow Jones while seating in an office in Tokyo. Second, globalization is linked closely, as mentioned above, to the increasing *interconnectedness* of social and political units. It would be a kind of truism to say that daily lives of the citizens of underdeveloped countries are bound with the adjustment

⁵¹ Beck, *What is Globalization?*, p.11.

⁵² E. Fuat Keyman, *Türkiye ve Radikal Demokrasi* (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 1999), p. 15.

⁵³ Held et al., *Global Transformations*, p. 2.

⁵⁴ Scheuerman, "Globalization".

programs of global institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Third, globalization expresses the escalating *velocity* of social activity. Owing to the technological improvements and mainly the structural transformation of capitalist system, the pace of all kinds of social activity has raised dramatically. The flow of information through the contemporary media channels may perfectly exemplify the acceleration on global scale. Just a daily experience: in a sunny day of June 2004 an anti-war activist living in New York was reading just-in-time the latest news—which were uploaded by another activist—on the final session of World Tribunal on Iraq organized in Istanbul. The fourth feature of globalization reported by Scheuerman is about its historical interval. Despite the disagreements among the social theorists on its historical periodization, it is generally accepted that globalization is a relatively *long-term process*. Beyond the last two decades, globalization has specific roots in modern history. Beck gives some examples to illustrate different periodizations of globalization by some authors.⁵⁵ As quoted by Beck, in Marx's analysis of modern capitalism and Wallerstein's world system theory, the globalization may be initiated in the 15th century; in Robertson's analysis between 1870 and 1920; and in Giddens' works on modernization in the 18th century. However, it should be kept in mind that, despite the historical rootedness of globalization, its current processes have peculiar aspects that differentiate them from the previous ones. Fifth, according to Scheuerman, globalization should be conceived as a *multi-pronged* process manifesting itself in diverse (economic, political, and cultural) domains of social life.

So far we have tried to capture the common points in some basic conceptualizations of globalization and draw the general lines of current order of capitalist system in order to clarify the connotations of the term. However, as we mentioned above, the very realm of conceptualization is a contested one and subject to a hegemony struggle among various discourses on globalization. Attempts to define economic and political nature of

⁵⁵ Beck, *What is Globalization?*, p.167.

globalization reflect a certain contestation that is experienced in micro (individual), mezzo (sectoral), macro (national) and mega (supranational) levels, and has political implications. Held et al. group these discourses under three titles.⁵⁶ According to their model, the contesting discourses that provide differentiating accounts on the definition, nature, extent and consequences of globalization may be called hyperglobalizers, skeptics, and transformationalists. In short, while for the hyperglobalizers recent era of globalization may be defined as the domination of people worldwide by the disciplines of global marketplace, thus indicates a total shift in history, for skeptics, globalization is nothing but a myth that conceals the new form of international order. In this international order, economic power is segmented into three regional areas in which nation states are still influential. On the other hand, transformationalists' argument is that "contemporary processes of globalization are [...] historically unprecedented such that states and societies across the globe are experiencing a process of profound change as they try to adapt to a more interconnected but highly uncertain world".⁵⁷ Surely, it would be inappropriate to take these positions as absolute frontiers of the contestation. In fact the given boundaries between two camps are blurred and players wander among the grey areas of the pitch.

However, more importantly, it should be kept in mind that this demarcation would be inefficient and unavoidably non explanatory unless we place our discussion in a wider context. To do so, we will widen our 'reading interval' and try to draw the contours of alteration of capitalism in post-68 context.

3.2 New Times

Having provided a general definition of globalization, at this juncture of the study the initial task to be handled is to render the highly ambivalent expression like 'new times' more precise. However, that even the naming of this epoch is subject to controversies depicts the complexity of such a task.

⁵⁶ Held et al., *Global Transformations*, pp. 2-10.

⁵⁷ Held et al., *Global Transformations*, p. 2.

To remember some: the term *post-industrialism* introduced and popularized by Alain Touraine and then Daniel Bell in the 1970s indicates the change of the stage of production in modern capitalist societies and utters a sectoral differentiation (the rise of the so-called service sector) and a rapid diffusion of information technologies.⁵⁸ On a similar line, *post-fordism* refers to the structural modification of the mode of production in developed capitalist countries as a response to the internal crises of capitalism. The term, post-fordism, which has a central role in the analyses of the Regulation School, will be employed throughout the study along with the concept post-industrialism as it serves to explain the material renovation that has taken place in capitalist system since the 1970s.⁵⁹ Furthermore, Ulrich Beck bases his analysis within an overall paradigm that he prefers to call *second modernity*, and contends that the various autonomous logics of globalization and the current forms of globality denote to this second modernity.⁶⁰ Additionally Castells introduces the term *network society* to examine the social structure characteristic of the Information Age which expresses another stage in the history of modern capitalism.⁶¹ Together with these, numerous concepts—e.g. late capitalism, third industrial revolution, post-Taylorism, Californication, flexibilization, so on—were created by authors from various fields of social sciences and ideologies to shed a light on the supposed shift in the modern history. Although baptizing the era is of major difficulties, nonetheless, in our view, modern capitalist societies have

⁵⁸ Alan Touraine, *Post-Industrial Society* (New York: Random House, 1971); Daniel Bell, *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting* (New York: Basic Books, 1973).

⁵⁹ For the basic concepts of the school, see: Alain Lipietz, *Towards a New Economic Order: Postfordism, ecology, and democracy*, trans. Malcolm Slater (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993); Robert Boyer, “The Political in the Era of Globalization and Finance: Focus on Some *Régulation* School Research,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24:2 (June 2000): 274-322; and once again, David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1995).

⁶⁰ Beck, *What is Globalization?*, pp. 11-2.

⁶¹ Manuel Castells, *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture* (Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 1996), 3 Volumes.

undergone an ‘epochal shift’⁶²—which still continues—as a response in part to capitalism’s crisis which had materialized since the 1960s and had reached its apex in the 1970s. In the chapter, the passage from a modern type of social structure to a postmodern one is conceived mainly within a framework of which main pillars may be extracted from these four main perspectives mentioned above.

The so-called Nixon Shock is reasonably accepted as the visible beginning of the end of welfare economies which had been formed in the most developed countries of the world, in post-World War II period. On August 17, 1971, when Richard Nixon, president of the United States, unilaterally invalidated the dollar-golden convertibility and imposed 10 percent surcharge to imports of the U.S. from Europe, the Bretton Woods system has been practically terminated. The termination of the system, which had been based on the intergovernmental agreements aiming to construct new international economic structures—International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), International Monetary Fund (IMF), General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)—in order to rehabilitate and regulate the national and international economies of post-war world, was the inevitable consequence of the far-reaching financial deficit crisis the western, and mainly the U.S., economies had undergone since the 1960s.

It would not be inaccurate to argue that welfare economies were based on a compromise/reconciliation system, taking place on intra- and international levels among the non-socialist countries. On the international level, the first objective of the financial institutions emerged in the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference gathered at Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, in July 1944, was to heal the injuries of European economies caused by the world war, and then to set a monetary system functioning to ease the perpetual development. On the other hand, the

⁶² Roger Burbach, *Globalization and Postmodern Politics: From Zapatistas to High-Tech Robber Barons* (London; Sterling, Va.: Pluto Press; Kingston, Jamaica: Arawak Publications, 2001); Jean Comaroff and John L. Comaroff, “Millennial Capitalism: First Thoughts on a Second Coming,” *Public Culture* 12:2 (2000): 292.

national economies were founded on corporative relations among the state, capitalists and trade unions. All parties were conscious of the possible gains and losses necessary to maintain the economic growth. The state was undertaking a pretty active role in monetary and fiscal policies in order to neutralize short-run negative impacts of business-cycles, and realizing public projects to keep employment rates stable. The established sectors of trade unions were in coordination with capitalists to maintain the operation of system based on collective bargaining and strong social security regulations. And the corporations were transferring a considerable share of their profits to sustain high economic growth and low unemployment rates, performing a relatively high wage system based on collective bargaining with the trade unions. In effect, the two decades after the war were the ‘golden times’ for the developed countries of the West that have experienced high and relatively stable annual average growth rates. As the economies grew steadily, new job opportunities were created. Taylorist ‘scientific management’ methods ensured high productivity levels. The problem of under-consumption—one of the most serious nuisances occurred during the history of capitalism (of crises), e.g. the Great Depression of 1930s—was solved by paying relatively high wages to workers and providing an effective social security system, thus increasing the life expectancy levels and dragging the savings into the cycles of economy. The Keynesian dream of full employment was not that far away anymore. Theoretically, the system was a concomitant articulation of three major paradigms: “a synthesis of Taylorism in the organization of labor, Fordism in the wage regime, and Keynesianism in the macroeconomic regulation of society”.⁶³ However, dream did not last so long and in 1973 the crisis of the system made itself explicit. Actually, the crisis had begun in the early 1960s as a result of the increasing labor costs, but the no-way-back point has come in 1973 with the beginning of oil crisis. The shock increase in energy costs triggered a collapse in national budgets, which were already vulnerable due

⁶³ Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Press, 2001), p. 242.

to the increasing costs of labor organization of welfare system. The result of the initial precautions was a permanent stagflation, that is, concomitant increases in inflation and unemployment rates. For instance, in the U.S.A the rate of unemployment raised approximately from 4 percent to 10 percent between 1969 and 1982; in Europe from 2 percent to 10 percent in the same period. On the other hand, between 1960 and 1980, the annual rates of inflation raised from 1 percent to 8 percent in the U.S.A., and from almost 4 percent to 8 percent in Europe.⁶⁴ As Harvey indicates, the annual growth rates in developed western countries dropped dramatically after 1973. Between 1973 and 1979, the annual percentage rates of change in output per capita was 1.8, between 1979 and 1985 it was 1.3 (3.8, between 1950 and 1973, the golden age of welfare economy; and 1.2, in the period of 1913-50, the years of total destruction and recession due to two world wars and a quite influential economic crisis).⁶⁵

Although up to now, we have solely summarized the economic dimension of the all-inclusive crisis capitalism has undergone during the 1970s, it would be highly misleading to reduce the dialectical interplay of plural factors contingently gathered around the 1960s and 1970s, which forces bourgeoisie to make obligatory and doable alternative policies to modify the capitalist system. The multidimensionality of the crisis has rendered the character of passage decidedly qualitative more than quantitative. The former patterns of production and consumption, organizations of management, production technologies, labor processes have been substituted with the novel forms, procedures, and organizations, which have an increasing importance on the determination of the coordinates of social matrix. Surely, is still capitalism the name of the system in which we keep to live after that period; exploitation and domination are relevant more than ever; structural conflicts of the system still affect our everyday lives.

⁶⁴ Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity*, p. 148, Figure 2.8.

⁶⁵ Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity*, p. 132, Table 2.1.

Accordingly, social opposition is affected by the structural transformation of the system. In our case, the components of the counter-globalization movement are both molding and being molded by this new set of social relations. Sociologically, the subjects of the movement are crops of this transformation. So, now, let us remind the key features—to repeat, merely the distinctive discontinuities, not the whole domains—of this new epoch of capitalism through a twofold analytical framework.

3.2.1 Material Life in the New Times

We have already mentioned that the passage from modern to postmodern capitalism is based on the substantial modifications of material base of capitalist societies. The most obvious threads of this substantial modification can be observed in the realm of economy, of work organization and of labor processes. Not to mention, these are closely related spheres of social life, and have direct influences on persons' daily lives. Hence, to trace the lines of the transformation realized in these spheres will provide us a significant opportunity to grasp persons' experiences of the new times. However, first of all, we need to mention the technological innovations characterizing the last quarter of the twentieth century, then we can summarize the structural changes in the social domains mentioned above.

Not as a premier determinant but as a compulsory proviso, technological advances have served to make probable the alteration of production system in accordance with the up-and-coming needs of capitalism. In other words, without the given improvements, it would not be possible to speak of post-industrial production systems or of flexible work. According to Castells, the post-industrial era, or in his terminology, the Information Age is prevailed by “a new technological paradigm”, a new set of informational technologies.⁶⁶ This new set involves electronic- and knowledge-based, information/communication technologies around which

⁶⁶ Manuel Castells, *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. Volume I: The Rise of the Network Society* (Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 1996), p. 28.

“a constellation of major technological breakthroughs took place in the last two decades of the twentieth century in advanced materials, in energy sources, in medical applications, in manufacturing techniques, and in transportation technologies”.⁶⁷

These breakthroughs created a sectoral shift in the field of economy. The locus of economic system has shifted from industrial-based mass factory production to information-based production. The share of the tertiary sector of industry, that is, that of the so-called service sector, has increased dramatically against the secondary (manufacturing) and primary (agriculture, mining, etc.) sectors of industry. The economic share of ‘intangible goods’ raised dramatically in comparison to ‘tangible goods’. Surely, the meaning of this situation is not that the industrial production has been transferred totally from the developed countries to the other parts of the world. Industrial production still exists in these economies, although the employment in these sites of production has decreased in considerable portions. However, what is more important is to grasp the qualitative change in these sectors. For instance, there still exists automotive production in Germany or Italy today, but the determinant character of these production sites is technology based just-in-time production, not mass production based on scale economies. In other words, information-based flexible production and modern industrial production coexist today, but former is the new type of production processes which are coloring the era. On the other hand, it would not be perfectly correct to imply that the former forms of production have been transferred to the developing countries and novel forms have been located in the developed countries. It is true that the manufacturing units of transnational corporations mostly shifted to less developed countries; however, it would be a reduction to label these countries as the factory sites of the world. In the current term of capitalism, the very nature of production has changed. To grasp the changing nature of production

⁶⁷ Castells, *The Rise of the Network Society*, p. 29.

processes, we may benefit from Swyngedouw's schema that makes a comparison between the fordist and post-fordist modes of production.⁶⁸

Mainly, the fordist mode of production was based on scale economies, that is, production system was designed to increase the amount of standardized commodities in order to increase profit rates, decreasing per unit production costs. Huge stocks of commodities were being deployed to prevent the negative effects of business cycles. And sources were the key determinants of future projections. The uncontrollable factors such as energy costs and amount of raw materials were quite influential on the economy. To minimize the risks, huge amounts of goods were being manufactured and this in turn decreased the rates of profit; in parallel to the changing patterns of consumption this type of production reached its own end. On the other hand, post-fordist or just-in-time production is based on diversification economies. Unlike the previous era, production of diversified goods in small units is essential. Producers decrease the amount and increase the diversity of goods. Accordingly, there is not over-production to create stocks. Stocks are seen as a negative impact on profit rates. Production processes are determined by the demand of goods, that is, investment decisions are shaped according to the demand patterns.

Unsurprisingly, changes in production processes require parallel adjustments in work organizations and labor markets, so work and employment patterns are renovated to a large extent. In this period, as a response to these requirements flexible work has emerged as the prevalent form of work organization. The term denotes a wide range of work styles and employment practices, and is used to describe all kinds of employment, which differ from the traditional 9-5 full time job with a permanent contract. It includes the changes in working times, location of work, and work contracts. Under this paradigm, working schedules are regulated according to the demand fluctuations. Along with the business' needs, employees may work part-time, in flexitime schemes, or in compressed working weeks. Whichever type it is, traditional 9-5 full time job is seen as unnecessary, and

⁶⁸ Quoted in Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity*, p. 177-9, Table 2.8.

more importantly, inefficient. It is expected from employees to organize their everyday time to fit flexible schedules. Flexible work also changes the classical definition of work location. The whole units of business do not need to be in the same place anymore. Employees may work on the move, from home, or from telecentres. It has become a usual practice, for instance, to hire a worker who lives in another country—i.e. a less developed country where the general level of wages is relatively low—for a job conducted on the phone in the first country. In parallel, the collective job contracts are substituted with temporary/fixed term contracts conducted with individual employees, or in some cases firms outsource their workers, that is, hire agency employees to whom firms do not have contractual liabilities. Thus they dispose of the legal responsibilities of traditional work contracts. As a consequence of these regulations, part-time work, temporary work and self-employment have become the main features of new labor markets. Long-term employment in a fixed unit has faded away, and persistent labor mobility has become predominant. In the light of this general review, we can argue that there has been an ample swing in the class structures of modern societies. But before speculating on this issue, let us consider the structural changes in the domain of labor.

At first glance, it may be argued with no trouble that restructuring of production patterns, redefining of work organizations, and accelerating innovations in the realm of technology have led to come to light more competent sectors of labor force. In parallel, sectors without qualifications of this sort have been marginalized. Considering the ever-growing division within his own Information Age theory, Castells identifies two categories of labor in the network society: self-programmable labor, and generic labor.⁶⁹ According to him, self-programmable labor has a capacity to modify itself, and adapt to new conditions, “as technology, demand, and management speed up their rate of change”. Conversely, generic labor is deprived of such adaptation ability, thus is “exchangeable and disposable”. The very division

⁶⁹ Manuel Castells, “Materials for an Explanatory Theory of the Network Society,” *The British Journal of Sociology* 51:1 (January/March 2000): p. 12.

between self-programmable and generic labor reflects the growing cleavage between skilled and deskilled sections of labor force. Yet the distinction covers solely the realm of employed labor, beyond the realm of employable labor, according to Castells, exist “legions of discarded, devalued people” that are excluded enduringly from the primary cycles of social life.⁷⁰ Alternatively, some strands of Marxist thought, especially the Italian Autonomous Marxists conceptualize the alterations of labor in post-industrial societies within the theoretical division between material and immaterial labor.⁷¹ Immaterial labor (*lavoro immateriale*), in this school of thought, expresses the sectors of labor, which produce the informational, cultural and sentimental elements of commodities. As, in capitalist societies, service sector predominates the economy, the field of immaterial labor expands. This does not eliminate the material labor totally; however, the most qualified units of the immaterial labor are privileged unsurprisingly against less qualified ones of the immaterial labor and the material labor at all. Social exclusion and polarization is more profound than ever in not only less developed but also in developed countries. The transformation of work definitions create a stable level of unemployed mass, which cannot be explained in terms of Keynesian full employment/underemployment paradigm. The fact of persistent unemployment has become normal while the possibility of mobility among different sectors of labor force has diminished considerably due to the changing patterns work. Not to mention, restructuring of labor force is closely linked to the general outlook of global economy. Before finishing this subsection we will review general lines of economy in the last quarter of century.

That economic globalization is the most seeable facet of the current processes of globalization is widely accepted among the numerous discourses on globalization. On popular and practical political basis,

⁷⁰ Castells, “Materials for an Explanatory Theory of the Network Society,” p. 12.

⁷¹ For a brief analysis of the term, see: Maurizio Lazzarato, “Immaterial Labor,” in *Radical Thought in Italy*, ed. Michael Hardt and Paolo Virno (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), pp. 133-51.

economic differentiation born out of globalization is valued as the leading consequence of the era. Indeed, economic indicators support in part such a daily acceptance. Like in the previous era of historical globalization—the period of 1870-1914—in the recent period of globalization, the mobility of capital has boosted dramatically. While the previous era that came after the first industrial revolution led to an expansion in the trade of real goods, the current era cannot be solely explained with an increase in international trade. Both capital and labor—not in the same amount with capital but in considerable fashion—has reached to increased levels of mobility in this period. In accordant with the division of labor mentioned above, whole sectors of labor force have become more mobile on global scale. While the most qualified, high-level parts of labor are strolling among the ‘global cities’ of the globe, the least skilled ones has to create alternative paths of globality to survive. On the other hand, we may observe the increased mobility of capital under two titles: globalization of production, and globalization of financial systems, in other words, financial integration. The augmentation of foreign investments may provide us with valid evidence. To put some numbers: as key actors of the era, transnational companies (TNCs)—corporations that run production or deliver services in more than one country—are leading bearers of these investments. The very shocking increase in the number of these corporations—approximately 65,000 TNCs in 2002 with 850,000 foreign affiliates, which account for one tenth of world gross domestic product and one third of world exports—is a simple indicator of economic globalization.⁷² The considerable increase in foreign direct investments (FDI) since 1980 proved the unimaginable augmentation in globalized production levels of TNCs: according to United Nations Conference on Trade and Development’s report on foreign direct investments, the amount of FDI inflows in worldwide reached to 648,146 million dollars in 2004 (which was 55,108 million dollars in 1980), and that

⁷² Quoted from United Nations Conference on Trade and Development’s World Investment Report 2002, in Nuchhi R. Currier, “World Investment Report 2002: Transnational Corporations and Export Competitiveness,” *United Nations Chronicle Online Edition*, 2003, http://www.un.org/Pubs/chronicle/2003/webArticles/031803_wir.html

of FDI outflows reached to 730,257 million dollars in the same year (53,747, in 1980).⁷³

Throughout this subsection, we tried to draw the contours of the restructuring of capitalist system in the realm of material life, and to demonstrate the qualitative change on which we endeavor to shed light by the help of economic indicators. Not to mention, data given here does not comprehend the whole domains of material life, rather, they were chosen to indicate the obvious shifts resulted from the processes of globalization, or those of the so-called new world order. In the following, we will try to take a picture of the era focusing on institutions, thus we aim at gathering different outlooks of the new times together.

3.2.2 Ideological Façade of the New Times

At the very beginning of the study, we noted that we intend to read the counter-globalization movement within the conceptual universe marked by the term “autonomy”. In the fourth chapter, *Experience*, we discuss the term in detail and position the movement within this universe; however, at this point we have to clarify some points in order to provide a useful ground for the discussion in the following chapter. To expand the boundaries of the discussion of autonomy, here we have to render more seeable the dominant imaginary against which we pose the counter-globalization movement. By doing so, we believe that it would be more probable to comprehend the nodes of social matrix in which the movements’ activists exist.

In the previous lines, we endeavored to draw, on the material plane, the contours of the ‘new times’, of the qualitative transformation capitalism has undergone. Focusing on the work organization, labor processes, technology and general mode of economy, we attempted to indicate the material base that alters substantially the sociological positions of the activists. At least, the changing character of social classes at the current

⁷³ United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, *Handbook of Statistics 2005 On-line*, <http://stats.unctad.org/Handbook/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=142>.

stage of capitalism, for instance, forces us to rethink the long-lasting debates—which have reigned within the radical thought for long times—on the subjects of social transformations. We pointed out this alteration, in those previous lines, by delineating the different sects of labor — e.g. material-immaterial labor division introduced by Autonomous Marxists. However, our intention in this study is not to make a contribution to this immense debate—which seems quite important to us—but to grasp, at least in part, the dynamics that mobilize a considerable number of people all around the world within this global movement. Therefore, we prefer in this section to focus on the strategy of global capitalism, the grandiose discourse of this strategy. Consequently, our aim is to demark this strategy’s ideological elements that accompany the material transformation summarized above. Yet, as an important note, we need to state that delineating analytically the material and discursive aspects of any social system does not necessarily imply a somehow simplistic relationship between the social base and superstructure, which is criticized in detail in the following chapter. For sure, thoughts are born out of the social structures; however, this cannot be reduced to a simple line. Let us now leave aside these debates and make explicit the key points of the language of global capitalism.

We have already noted that the transformation of capitalism has started due to its multifaceted crisis that had began in the sixties and reached its apex in the subsequent decade. Especially the seventies can be regarded as a transition period in which the crisis of capitalism became apparent in various levels. Accordingly, owing to the turbulent effects of those crises on the various aspects of western welfare economies, capitalism’s ideological armor has been seriously damaged; and it took almost a decade to renovate its discursive formation in a manner that can regain its hegemonic dominance. With the eighties, especially with the administrations of two symbolic figures—Ronald Reagan in the USA and Margaret Thatcher in England—of the era, a new hegemonic formation of capitalism has began and matured. In parallel to its popular usages, we prefer here to call this

ideological totality 'neoliberalism'. Yet, we have to clarify what is meant by this term.

At the most basic level, the advocates of neoliberalism defend the re-activization of the imperatives of classic liberal doctrine that were, according to them, interrupted during the Keynesian post-war era. In this line of thought, the socio-economic model that we label welfare system up to this point is seen as an example of the unavoidable destructive effects of an interventionist state. Keynesian mentality is regarded as the responsible of a general inertia that led the system to an overall crisis. Keynesianism has opened the doors to the state intervention, thus created a social order that discourages entrepreneurship and disables spontaneous dynamics of economy; additionally, it has privileged a social security system that cannot be sustained, increased the costs of investors to finance this system, and given way to a social atmosphere that encourages a common lethargy among the working sectors of the society due to the unsustainable security benefits. In short, neoliberal ideology has come to the stage for the sake of a fundamental renovation in the conceptions of society, individual, economy, polity etc. This is a highly important point; neoliberalism cannot be limited with the realm of economy, it means more than that, in fact, it means in one manner the implementation of the 'objective' rules of economy to the whole sites of the social life. Therefore, to discuss neoliberalism in a context mingled with economic terms is exceedingly important and necessary to criticize it properly. Since it is an ideology that subordinates the whole domain of social relations to the dynamics of a so-called self-regulating, autonomous economy, it is crucial to grasp the key points of such an approach to economy that is its legitimizing dynamo.

What is crucial here from our point of view is the autonomy attributed to a determinant economical realm by the ideologues of neoliberalism. In this line of thought economy is seen as a self-directed domain with its own mechanisms that are derived from the notions of classical political economy—e.g. well-known 'invisible hand' of Adam Smith—, and it is believed that economy has a state of nature that would be always reached by

the actors of economic system if there is not an external intervention. Markets are natural totalities that are capable to sustain a general equilibrium, and the individuals are the rational actors of these markets. Such a human type that is conceptualized as *homo oeconomicus* is in accordance with the requirements of the conventional conception of economy. According to this, economy is a science of satisfying the boundless desires and needs with limited sources. And so, *homo oeconomicus*, as a part of this world, is a human being potent to make decisions in order to sustain his/her optimum equilibrium. He/she has the freedom of choosing whether to work or not to work, to buy or to sell a good, to invest or to save. As noted by Amin, such a definition of individual and freedom is exceedingly accordant with the conception of freedom of the liberal tradition.⁷⁴ Accordingly, freedom is defined as unconstrainedness that enables human beings to implement their own decisions in order to reach their personal optimum equilibriums. As a historical consequence of such conception, society is organized on the basis of three generalized markets — namely, markets for labor, products, and business units. This is exactly we mean by the ‘free market society’. The mere presence of the relations of free markets in the social matrix is not a sufficient condition to mention a market society; market society is the expansion of characteristics attributed to free market to the whole spheres of social life. All those spheres, which have not been thought with the terms of markets up to that point, are considered in the light of the values that are marked by these market terms. This is exactly the mentality that corresponds to the transformation of capitalism mentioned above. According to this, for the sake of the future of economy, spheres—sectors like education and health services, which have been mostly kept under the protection of public system, are the most typical and obvious examples—that have been protected to a extent during the Keynesian era are made open to the free market relations. What this means is that the whole social units become

⁷⁴ Samir Amin, “Unity and Changes in the Ideology of Political Economy,” in *Cultural Studies: From Theory to Action*, ed. Pepi Leistyna (Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), p. 23.

merchandisable and consequently commodified. The fact that we mentioned in the previous section, the expansion of tertiary sectors, that is, services is closely linked to this point. What is pointed out here is not simplistically the expansion of capitalism in geographical/spatial terms, but its deepening. Undoubtedly, as a result of the articulation of the countries in Eastern Europe, central Asia, and global south to the free market system after the collapse of soviet system, capitalism has expanded its limits in physical terms. However, to reduce this observation to such limited point cannot help us comprehend the issue in depth, and moreover restricts our ability to read the alterations in for instance the most developed western economies. What is experienced, to repeat, is the deepening of capitalism. The result is to consider/understand the whole domains of social life with the terms that are believed peculiar to markets.

At this point, we should note that the imaginary that we attempt to make clear in relation with neoliberal ideology—since neoliberalism provides us the most obvious and clear examples of this imaginary—is not limited with a mere doctrine; it prevails within many thoughts from left and right. Of course, what is hegemonic for present is the neoliberal ideology; however, the boundaries of the dominant imaginary out of which the language of the strategy has born are more ample. This point is explained in detail in the following chapter, hence we just point out the main elements of this prevailing language here. Yet, it should be added that we label this imaginary “economics ideology” in order to articulate the extensiveness of that that we discuss here.⁷⁵

The economics as scientific discipline has a central role in the dissemination of economics ideology; even we can argue that economics, ironically, in contrary to all characteristics attributed by the Enlightenment to the scientific thought, has become the motor of an ideological dominance. For present, what we call the language of strategy is mostly the product of the economics.

⁷⁵ For two examples of the discussion in Turkish, see Ayşe Buğra, *İktisatçılar ve İnsanlar: Bir Yöntem Çalışması* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1995); Ahmet İnsel, *İktisat İdeolojisinin Eleştirisi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1993).

One of the most prominent elements of this language is the theme “rationality”. As mentioned above, human being defined as *homo oeconomicus* is the rational subject who makes the decisions necessary to sustain the optimum level of his/her profits — these profits are not described in each case in a pejorative manner, for instance, as a greed for an endless economic profit that would be a mere caricaturized figure; according to this mentality, for instance, the behavior of an individual that postponed the investment decisions because of the family issues is considered as an optimum one, what is crucial here is the translation of all human elements to economic profit-loss balances. According to this type of conception of human being that finds its most obvious example in the ‘rational choice’ theorem in economics, there is in each case and each time a rational level. Going out of this level causes the irrationality; the counterpart of this in the plane of sociality is the elimination of general equilibrium that is believed to come as a result of the singular optimum decisions of rational individuals. In other words, society, in this line of thought, is conceived as a general rationality realized due to the aggregation of singular rationalities. And for sure, the consequences of such a conception of society and individual make themselves apparent in all domains of social life. Perhaps, the most overt instance of this fact is the limitation of even the established, instituted politics. For present, it is not a coincidence that the counter-globalization movement articulates itself in the most explicit manner during the summits of the global institutions of capitalism. These are supra-political institutions that are independent from the mechanisms of representative political system, and in which the main directions of capitalism are negotiated. At the most basic level, the protesters protest the fact that those decisions are made out of their political wills — even though such a will could not express itself properly within the political-institutional structure of the previous era.

A second concept that we come across is “efficiency”. This ideological keyword that has a central role in the re-regulation of the public and private parts of economy—deregulation in popular terms—is used as a

tool to colonize the lives of individuals. There is no need to detail the examples; in many cases decisions that are directly influential on one's life are made out of his/her will in the name of a more efficient economic system.

What is striking here is that this language, the language of the strategy is a language based on somehow necessities. Financial markets, direct foreign investments, privatizations etc. all these notions are presented as objective and universal necessities of a sort of supra-human, unhistorical social order. What is expected is the unconditional affirmation of various sects of society to these necessities. Of course there would be dissenters that oppose; however, they are regarded as irrational ignoramuses deprived of sufficient knowledge and insight of the operation of social order.

Such a mentality empowers, disseminating the belief that the functioning of social structures are supra-historical and natural. However, at least since the work of Karl Polanyi, *Great Transformation*, in which he exposes the legislative regulations that are mostly based on physical force during the periods of settlement of capitalism, we all know that neither the free market society nor any social order is given, unhistorical, unchangeable and independent from human action.⁷⁶

One of the most significant aspects of the counter-globalization movement may be its presence making apparent such mystification, challenging it, and in the sense that de Certeau implies, demanding to recapture the speech.

The movement is a product of the qualitative transformation that we attempted to summarize in this chapter, that of the material and discursive planes of this alteration; but it is not a simple and reducible product. As we have repeated so many times throughout the study, the counter-globalization movement has born into this social universe and created an interaction with it. The movement is both molding it and molded by it. Having noted that point, we can try to grasp the realm in which social action and structures

⁷⁶ Karl Polanyi, *Great Transformation: The political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, foreword by Robert M. McIver (Boston: Beacon Press, 2001).

mediate, or in the terminology of the study, the domain of experience of singular and collective political subjects.

4. EXPERIENCE

“We start from negation, from dissonance. The dissonance can take many shapes. An inarticulate mumble of discontent, tears of frustration, a scream of rage, a confident roar. An unease, a confusion, a longing, a critical vibration. Our dissonance comes from our experience, but that experience varies.”

Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today, John Holloway

At this point it is best to evoke that famed motto of Zapatistas, and keep ‘walking while questioning’. It is the aim of this chapter to replicate in one manner the questions that were ostensibly answered in the previous chapters, to link and then deepen them, and eventually to produce a partial response to our guiding query that we noted in the *Introduction*. To repeat that: does the new generation of social dissent movements—the anti/alternative/counter globalization movement—involve a radical potential to subvert, transform the current social, political, economic, and cultural *system*, or is it merely a disillusionment intrinsic to the *system* which, within the given liberal democratic consensus, streams the oppositional energy to the refreshment of the *system* without transcending its borders?

In the second chapter of the study, *Action*, we constructed our narrative on somehow journalistic issues, and tried to render the *object* of our study more comprehensible. While talking on the counter-globalization movement, who are we referring to? What are the major streams involved in the movement? First of all, what is this movement? Where was it born? And how: how are they organized? How did/do they summon together?

Next, in the third chapter, *Structure*, we endeavored to shed light on the social formations against which the counter-*globalization* movement acts; in other words, we exposed the socio-historical context out of which the movement was born, delineating analytically the material and discursive aspects of this context within a twofold model. It was our intention to make

clear the qualitative modification that capitalism has undergone worldwide since the late sixties, and thus to help comprehend the shift in the sociological positions of the *act*-ors of the movement.

In the following pages that we prefer to gather up under the title *Experience* because of the reasons explained below, we strive to deeply explore those seemingly practical questions in order to widen our discussion around the problematic of autonomy.

4.1 Conceptualizing the Movement

4.1.1 The Movement as a Void

The universe of signification of social movements is formed within a bunch of endless relations, that is to say, social movements are configured around an axis of relationality. What this argument means is that social movements are not fixed categories that may be found within a given social structure. They and their participants, as singular and collective political subjects, are nexuses of numberless interactions; however, we may identify two main directions that allow us to make a movement thinkable. The first direction of this relationality points out the positioning of the movement against its adversaries, in other words, this is the realm of negative constitution of the movement. Unsurprisingly, social movements that aim to produce an effect on their actual and future participants, define a circle of oppositions. The boundaries of this circle do not have to be clarified in exact terms in each case, or its scale does not need to correspond perfectly for each oppositional group. For instance, in the case of a self-aid group that provides disadvantaged gays and lesbians who live under the conditions of permanent physical attack with material and immaterial support, the main objection is to the common and manifest homophobia in the society; however, for an anarchist squatter commune, for instance, the object of opposition is unclear and even grandiose compared to the first instance. Capitalism, with all hierarchies, power structures, inequalities and discrimination it creates, is placed here at the center of critique. In the second place, the next direction has to do with the interactions among the

movements' adherents that share a realm of common action. However, like for the negative side of the mobilization, even in increased degrees, the coordinates of this realm may vary in each case. Nonetheless, despite the specific dissimilarities among them, we may contend without a difficulty that social movements are based on such a two-sided "requirement", in Yenil and Kırılı's words.⁷⁷ According to the writers, for any social movement to emerge and operate, two "requirements" have to be fulfilled: firstly, "communization of the experience among the dissidents", and secondly, "determination of a common adversary responsible for the problems and difficulties that the dissidents suffer". In fact, the key points of this argument were introduced by E.P. Thompson in a work in which he examined working class not as a thing but as a relationship, and reflected upon the cultural dimension of the working class identity. In his words:

[C]lass happens when some men, as a result of common experiences (inherited or shared), feel and articulate the identity of their interests as between themselves, and as against other men whose interests are different from (and usually opposed to) theirs.⁷⁸

In Thompson's framework, social class is not understood as a submissive outcome of social structures that posit working class and bourgeoisie in a stable, constant interplay. *Contra* orthodox economist approaches, Thompson defines class in its historicity, hence in its relationality. Criticizing the arguments that reduce the working class to a mere economic result of capitalist production structures, Thompson admits the dissimilarities among the working class men and women as political subjects in the reception processes of the effects of social structures and in the ways they commit political action against these structures. In other words, Thompson denies the strict deterministic relation defined by orthodox Marxist approaches between the base and superstructure, and

⁷⁷ Zafer Yenil and Biray Kolluođlu Kırılı, "Distopyalar ve Ütopyalar Arasında Karşı Küreselleşme Hareketleri," *Birikim* 197 (Eylül 2005): 13.

⁷⁸ Edward Palmer Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York: Vintage Books, 1966), p. 9.

recognizes the realm of culture as the domain of mediation of determinant social structures and social action. According to this argument, the social relations born out of the material life are not directly absorbed, but *experienced* by singular and collective subjects. As a result of this experimentation process, they take their place in the universe of signification of concrete subjects. In turn, those social relations are not given; they are challenged, transformed or consolidated by the actions of those subjects.

What is crucial here for our analysis is the concept ‘experience’ to figure out the relational character of the positioning of material life, institutions and ideology on the one hand, and social agents and their actions on the other. Appropriating Thompson’s analysis, we contend that experience is the key concept that implicates the two sides of these bunches of relations. So, what is the significance of this statement for our case? How can we read the *inside* and *outside* of the counter-globalization movement? Speaking of a movement that is defined as the “movement of movements”, or that privileges its diversity and plurality owing to the absence of a common future project shared by all those movements, how can we think of this relationality? However, at this point, before trying to answer these questions, we have to make an excursus and explain the way in which the term ‘experience’ is used, in order to make more lucid how our problematic is conceived.

As a beginning, we shall make a linguistic explanation and render explicit the different implications that the term may entail. To do so, we benefit from the German language’s multilayered concepts. Oskar Negt and Alexander Kluge, in their work in which they attempt to comprehend the potentials of a proletarian public sphere as an influential alternative to the dominant bourgeois public sphere, deploy the term ‘experience’ as a keyword that points to a sort of mediation level mentioned above.⁷⁹ In

⁷⁹ Alexander Kluge and Oskar Negt, *Public Sphere and Experience: Toward an Analysis of Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere*, foreword by Miriam Hansen, trans. Jamie Daniel, Peter Labanyi, and Assenka Oksiloff (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993).

similar fashion with Thompson, they posit the proletariat not as a frozen receptive category, but as an unstable collectivity which is shaped dialectically. Within their conceptual package, the German term “Erfahrung” (experience), with its connotations differing from its English counterpart, indicates the indeterminacy of the axis of relationality. In the *Foreword* written by Miriam Hansen, it is argued that *Erfahrung* differs from *Experience*, which has more empiricist connotations and “tends to assume a basically unmediated, stable relationship between subject and object”.⁸⁰ On the contrary, according to Hansen, *Erfahrung*, which comes from the German root *fahren* (to ride, to travel), includes “a sense of mobility, of journeying, wandering, or cruising, implying both a temporal dimension, that is, duration, habit, repetition, and return, and a degree of risk to the experiencing subject”.⁸¹ In fact, Negt and Kluge, as inheritors of the Frankfurt School, appropriated the concept from the first generation of the School, especially from Walter Benjamin, Theodor W. Adorno, Siegfried Kracauer and Ernst Bloch, who had focused on the experience of modernity. With different emphases, these writers tried to grasp the changing character of experience of people living under the conditions of a total transformation. Within the conceptual universe of the School, Hansen contends, there exist two dialectical extremes of the term *Erfahrung*:

[T]he concept oscillates between an emphatic pole and an empirical pole: on the one hand, it refers to the capacities of having and reflecting upon experience, of seeing connections and relations, of juggling *reality* and *fantasy*, of remembering the *past* and imagining a different *future*; on the other, it entails the historical disintegration and transformation of these very capacities with the onslaught of industrialization, urbanization, and a modern culture of consumption. With a dialectical twist, then, experience in the emphatic sense comes to include the ability to register and negotiate the effects of historical fragmentation and loss, of rupture and change.⁸²

⁸⁰ Miriam Hansen, “Foreword,” in *Public Sphere and Experience*, p. xvi.

⁸¹ Hansen, “Foreword”, pp. xvi-ii.

⁸² Hansen, “Foreword”, pp. xvii. Emphases added.

To put it another way, *Erfahrung* refers to a domain in which individuals' perceptions of social dynamics, and significations born out of these perceptions mediate, that is, a domain in which social horizon of meaning comes into being. Individual and collective subjects, as social beings surrounded by the social relations, do not passively receive, but perceive, experience, feel and articulate these relations. And, due to the dissimilar experimentation processes, they commit dissimilar individual and collective actions. What is crucial here is the unlikeness of these experimentation processes. As somehow spiritualistic implications of the term *Erfahrung* enable us to see, there exist voids in the relation between the social structures and agents. This is where the hope takes shelter; this is where the idea of escaping from "the prison house of the present", in Tormey's words, lies.⁸³ A radical, transformative politics cannot exist without some image of another, better world. Opposing to the present is the precondition of any subversive attempt. As argued by Hansen in the above quotation, experience refers to the interplay among the reality and fantasy, thus it implies voids, that is, hope. This means that any given condition of social being, that is, any state of social-historical does not need to be a natural, scientific or religious must.

This brings us to the place where we search the answers of our questions asked in this study — the social imaginary. Hope or hopelessness does not refer to given, essentialistic values—freedom, equality, fraternity, solidarity etc.—, these values stream from the imaginations of the singular and collective subjects. That is to say, all those values are constructed within the imaginary institution of the society. To make our way of thinking explicit, let us clarify these concepts—imaginary, imagination, institution of the society—in the following lines.

⁸³ Simon Tormey, "From Utopian Worlds to Utopian Spaces: Reflections on the Contemporary Radical Imaginary and the Social Forum Process," *Ephemera* 5: 2 (2005): 397.

All that is written in the preceding paragraphs shed light on the way we conceptualize the counter-globalization movement in the study. We take the movement in its dual relationality (inside and outside), and put the concept of experience in the heart of the analysis. Now we have commented upon the structure (the global capitalism with its transforming faces) and the action (the alter-globalization movement), it is time to fulfill the theoretical concept of experience which links structure to action with the help of subjects' material everyday *experiences*. We conceive of experience as a domain of mediation between structure and action, and that's why we edited the textual body of the whole study in accordance with this argument. We derived our empirical data from these everyday *experiences* of the subjects of the movement, so that we can get an insight about their imaginaries that would, we argue, give birth to a potential of radicalism. To us, the synonym of the question "is there a potential of radicalism?" is "is there hope?" borrowing from the literature "is there a void between the structure and structured?".⁸⁴

⁸⁴ The conceptualization that we endeavor to develop here challenges some dualities prevailing our ways of thinking since the Enlightenment era: material vs. ideal, subject vs. object, or subjective vs. objective. Therefore, before proceeding, we need to touch these controversial points in order to strengthen our base on which we place our narrative in the following sections of the study.

In our view, these dualities stem from an incorrect conceptualization that naturalizes the analytical distinction between the particular and universal. Regarding the material-ideal duality, it is assumed, in this line of thought, two separate categories which are to determine each other. In the philosophical approaches called 'materialist', the material determines the ideal in the last instance; on the other hand, according to the 'idealist' approaches what is determinant is the ideal. What is common for these two streams is the possibility of an inquiry level in which these categories can be separated. However, such an inquiry level requires an absolute abstraction plane that lies out of the social. In our view, such an abstraction plane that exceeds the limits of sociality does not exist, in other words, sociality is already intrinsic to every sort of scrutinizing. In this sense, we may not speak of two separate categories, but of a "minglement" of them, as Ceylan and Pelek put. Özcan Ceylan and Selin Pelek, "Söylemin Demokratikleştirilmesi: İktisatta Self-Refleksiyon," unpublished paper, p. 5.

In parallel, we must reflect upon the positivistic duality between the subject and object, which is not less important than the previous one. Within the Enlightenment thought, the human subject is conceived as a total being that has an unrestricted capacity of reflecting upon inanimate objects and other human subjects that are reduced to objects in the eye of this first subject. Surely, there may occur some problems in this process of conceiving, but, as a rule, the subject may be escalated to that level with the aid of, for instance, a formal school education or ideological improvement provided by enlightened vanguards. The problem in this line of thinking is the omitting of, as in the first duality, the minglement of subjects and objects. What is explanatory here for our model is the mutual

4.1.2 The Movement as a Search

Being aware of the fact that the meaning of the terms ‘imagination’ or ‘imaginary’ may vary in daily language and that it is not the mere path in social thought dealing with these concepts, we shall base our plot on a particular line of thought, namely, that of Cornelius Castoriadis (1922-1997). By doing so, our intention is to elucidate and specify the problematic of autonomy around which we discuss the counter-globalization movement.

It would not be misleading to state that Castoriadis’ thought was shaped within an intellectual universe led by Marxism. During his whole intellectual journey (which we may roughly divide into two parts: the first period in which he still claims to be a Marxist while criticizing the instituted Marxism, and the second period in which he quits calling himself such) he dealt with Marxian themes, and dealt with the fact that the libertarian side of Marx’s thought was dominated by the *scientific* side of Marx’s very thought. In his major work, *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, in which he collected his writings on Marxism published in a French journal *Socialisme ou Barbarie* along with his novel considerations on the keywords of his thought, Castoriadis makes an assessment of Marxism.⁸⁵ Roughly, according to Castoriadis, Marx’s own thought consists of two conflicting ideas: the first is his approach that posits the human as the creator of his/her own history while bringing down the source of the truth from skies and admitting the immanent character of the history. On the other

determinacy between subjects and objects (both non-human entities and human subjects reduced to the position of object).

Accordingly, here emerges a need of re-conceptualization of subjectivity. How can we conceive of the matter of subjectivity, if we deny the absolute separateness of subject and object, and admit their mutual relationality? At this point, we may benefit from the attempts of psychoanalytic literature. See, Bülent Somay, *Tarihin Bilişçüsü* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2004), pp. 30-4. Somay labels the current dominant form of subjectivity that constitutes the ‘other’ not as a subject, but object, ‘idiosubjectivity’; and then offers an alternative (‘heterosubjectivity’, in Somay’s terminology) that enables us to *imagine* the ‘other’ as a subject. Within this framework, human subject is not understood as a whole agent capable of comprehending absolutely its environment or as a passive product of the surrounding dynamics, but it is seen as a nexus of endless relations among itself and other subjects/objects.

⁸⁵ Cornelius Castoriadis, *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, trans. Kathleen Blamey (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997), pp. 9-71.

hand, the second trend, according to Castoriadis, searches for general laws of the history, attempts to grasp the iron rule that determines the succession of socio-historical orders. Consequently, the dominance of the latter on the former eliminates the potential of Marx's thought to realize the praxis, which is one of his major issues. Determinacy negates the role of the human subjects as the mere creators of their history. If there is such a determinacy which may be expressed in and through the general laws, then, human activity, that is, politics in a sense, would be reduced to a technical activity that, as a rule, does not contain a genuine creative content. The revelation of such general laws, paradoxically, abolishes the historicity or temporality itself. In Castoriadis' own words: "History cannot be thought in accordance with the deterministic schema (nor, moreover, in accordance with a simple 'dialectical' schema) because it is the domain of *creation*".⁸⁶ Castoriadis deploys the terms "self-creation" or "self-institution" to express the fact that the society is instituted not by any transcendental subject, but by society itself. In this manner, autonomy on the social plane is the recognition of the fact that the society is a self-institution.

Alienation, which Castoriadis inherited from Marx along with the concept 'praxis', in this model, refers to a belief in an *asocial* constituent agent, that is, to a (mis)conception of history that omits the instituting character of the society. In an alienated society, individual and collective subjects do not see the social relations surrounding them as their own products streaming from their individual and collective actions, but as a must of the celestial order or economic necessities. Whatever be the source of the necessity, social subjects position it beyond themselves. Castoriadis explains alienation, or in other words, heteronomy—being subjugated to the law of other— as such:

The institution is a socially sanctioned, symbolic network in which a functional component and an imaginary component are combined in variable proportions and relations. Alienation occurs when the imaginary moment in the institution becomes autonomous and

⁸⁶ Castoriadis, *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, pp. 44-5. Original emphasis.

predominates, which leads to the institution's becoming autonomous and predominating with respect to society. This becoming autonomous, or autonomization, of the institution is expressed and embodied in the material nature of social life, but it always presupposes at the same time that society lives its relations with its institutions in the mode of the imaginary, in other words, that it does not recognize in the imaginary of institutions something that is its own product.⁸⁷

In this sense, praxis, or what Castoriadis prefers to call 'revolutionary project', is nothing but a search for autonomy, an eternal struggle that never ends. This project never ends because there is not such a thing as a society that is purely transparent to itself. According to him, to assume a society in which the all social conflicts would be eliminated, is nothing but "a mythical formation, equivalent and analogous to that of absolute knowledge or of an individual whose 'consciousness' has absorbed his entire being".⁸⁸ This brings us to the issue of relation between individual and social in Castoriadis' thought. Such an assumption is mythical because it requires the elimination of the mutual relationship between the social and individual. Castoriadis explains this impossibility with those words:

The social-historical dimension, as a dimension of the collective and the anonymous, initiates for each and every one of us a simultaneous relation of interiority and of exteriority, of participation and of exclusion, which can in no way be abolished or even 'controlled', in any definite sense of this term. The social is what is everyone and what is no one, what is never absent and almost never present as such, a non-being that is more real than any being, that in which we are wholly immersed yet which we can never apprehend 'in person'. [...] [The social] is something that can be presented only in and through the *institution* but which is always infinitely more than the institution, since it is, paradoxically, both what fills in the institution, what is formed by it, what continually overdetermines its functioning, and what in the final analysis founds it: creates it, maintains it in existence, alters it, destroys it. There is the social as instituted, but this always presupposes the social as instituting.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ Castoriadis, *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, p. 132.

⁸⁸ Castoriadis, *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, p. 111.

⁸⁹ Castoriadis, *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, pp. 111-2. Original emphases.

Castoriadis' framework denies the dualities like the ones between the object and subject, or social and individual. According to this model, there cannot be any object which is out of the realm of language. The language realm of the subject involves the object, and is involved by the imaginary. We cannot conceive of subject and object as separate categories as in the classical philosophy (remember the footnote 85), because object is constituted within the realm of subject's language. Out of this realm, there is not any object *per se*. Similarly, there cannot be mentioned an absolute separation between the social and individual. The social is already and always present in the individual, that is, the universal is already and always present in the singular. Thinking with the concepts of psychoanalysis, Castoriadis sees the issue of autonomy, even in the individual level, as a social one, because autonomy, for him, appears in the relation between the discourse of the Self and the "discourse of the Other"—Unconscious—which is at the start parental other and then the society as a whole.⁹⁰ Therefore, it would be a serious mistake to consider Castoriadis' conception of autonomy as same with that of liberal philosophy that assumes a completely rational subject who has an endless capacity to grasp the laws of objects. Contrarily, Castoriadis' conception states that this very 'rationality' is constituted within the imaginary. Castoriadis indicates this point when he explains how he conceives of the imaginary:

The imaginary of which I am speaking is not an image *of*. It is the unceasing and essentially *undetermined* (social-historical and psychical) creation of figures/forms/images, on the basis of which alone there can ever be a question *of* 'something'. What we call 'reality' and 'rationality' are its works.⁹¹

According to this way of thinking, we cannot mention discoveries but only a permanent investigation, that is to say, what is crucial is the self-

⁹⁰ Castoriadis, *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, p. 102.

⁹¹ Castoriadis, *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, p. 3. Original emphasis.

reflexivity of the societies and individuals — which are in a sense the society, since they are singular carriers loaded with sociality. Autonomy, both collective and individual, appears in the moments of reflectivity directed to the distance between the *instituted* society and *instituting* society, in other words, it appears in the voids that are the expressions of the search for something that is different than what it is.

So, how should we think of the counter-globalization movement in the light of these conceptual considerations? What answers should we give to the questions that we have asked throughout the study? The main thesis of this dissertation is that the counter-globalization movement, which manifests itself in various forms, in different organizational structures or in diverse political and ideological camps, is, along with many other things, a space of a search for autonomy; autonomy in the sense Castoriadis defines the term, a never-ending journey of reflexivity, the opposition to the regulation of one's law by an other's law. This search has two separate but interlinked aspects: autonomy as the struggle for politicization against the depoliticizing global *capitalism*, and autonomy as the struggle for politicization against the depoliticizing *anti-capitalism*. As it is clear, these two aspects are nothing but two different faces of *an* antagonism between two incommensurable imaginaries: imaginary as the “creation *ex nihilo*”⁹² or radical imaginary as “the capacity of claiming for that that does not exist, of seeing that that is not ready in something”⁹³, on the one side, and the imaginary that posits the *rationales* of the modern world for both the capitalist and anti-capitalist camps, on the other.

What we have argued here may seem a bit confusing, therefore, let us clarify what we say with other terms that we borrow from political science.

Aykut Çelebi, in an essay in which he discusses the concepts of a democratic-political ontology (he calls that ‘three moments of democracy’)

⁹² Castoriadis, *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, p. 3.

⁹³ Cornelius Castoriadis, “Öznenin Bugünkü Durumu,” *Birikim* 108 (İstanbul 1998): 73.

in relation with the debates on public sphere and civil society, argues that the constituent power (*kurucu iktidar*, *potere costituente*) is the starting point of this ontology.⁹⁴ According to this model, the constituent power, which is essentially a modern fact, implies the moment in which the political will is formed, the political realm is radically transformed.⁹⁵ The legitimacy of the political realm streams from the constituent power.

On the other hand, the collateral power (*tâli iktidar*) is materialized within the universe that the constituent power creates. The creative/imaginative mode of the constituent power is limited and reorganized by the administrative bodies of the collateral power. Çelebi describes the process with those sentences:

The constituent power, by definition, is a stream—with its endless energy and restructuring force—that does not have a definite target. To channel this stream, there emerges a need for an external intervention to the chaotic structure of the constituent power that may even abolish its own gains. Otherwise, the infinite restructuring force of the constituent power would eliminate present gains and make probable a chaotic flow that will last forever. The collateral power, drawing the contours of the new order, constructs a novel balance, a novel center that takes the current equilibrium of power into consideration. The revolution or the era of great social transformation has ended, and the dissidents of the yesterday have become the guards of today's order.⁹⁶

The parallelism between Çelebi's ontological model and Castoriadis' framework that defines the instituting and instituted society is extremely obvious.⁹⁷ Both models envisage an endless tussle between those two dynamics.

⁹⁴ Aykut Çelebi, "Kamusal Alan ve Sivil Toplum: Siyasal Bir Değerlendirme," in *Kamusal Alan*, ed. Meral Özbek (İstanbul: Hil Yayın, 2004), p. 239.

⁹⁵ Çelebi, "Kamusal Alan ve Sivil Toplum: Siyasal Bir Değerlendirme," p. 238.

⁹⁶ Çelebi, "Kamusal Alan ve Sivil Toplum: Siyasal Bir Değerlendirme," p. 239.

⁹⁷ The distinction which is present in both of these models may also be expressed by the aid of the different layers of the concept 'power'. However, one more time, English would be insufficient to do this. In Italian there exist two separate words—*potenza* and *potere*—that articulate two separate meaning contained by the word 'power'. *Potenza* implies an uncentered, unrepresented potentiality, which corresponds to the instituting

In Çelebi's model, the last moment of the democracy is the public sphere that contains all sorts of mass organizations, non-governmental organizations, social movements and anti-systemic movements. To him, the constituent power has been captured, organized and represented by the bodies of the collateral power, however, yet the public sphere involves the residues of the constituent power. In this sense, public sphere is seen as a potential for the reemergence of the constituent power.⁹⁸ But the conceptualization of the public sphere here is amply different from that of Habermasian tradition that privileges the communicative and procedural elements of the publicness. Çelebi does not discuss the subject in a normative level, but elaborates it as an antagonistic plane on which the dynamics of the constituent and collateral powers clash. In Çelebi's words:

In short, public sphere, in Habermasian conception, corresponds to the rationalization of the operation of the collateral power and to the ways and principles in the participation process to the system. As an irony of the history, as long as the problem of democratization of public sphere is based on the axis of communicative procedure by Habermas—to the extent that it constitutes the communication norm of the liberal democratic political order—the deliberate, political and cultural dimensions of publicness—that is, publicness itself—disappear.⁹⁹

Ecco, this is where the counter-globalization movement resides. The movement, a 'movement of movements', with all its forms and manifestations, and the social forums in particular, as a peculiar form born out of the movement, give us one of the most explicit examples of a global publicness, a form of publicness, or as Çelebi put, a 'publicness in

character of society in Castoriadis' thought and to the constituent power in Çelebi's threefold model. On the other hand, *potere* entails the authority of a centered capacity, of an institutional body that represents this caged capacity — that is, the instituted society and collateral power. At this point, a Turkish reader would recognize that the Turkish translation of the term 'autonomous' (*öz-erk*, self-power literally, that is, being-able-to-do) makes it easier to see the concept's closeness to the first side of the above explanation.

⁹⁸ Çelebi, "Kamusal Alan ve Sivil Toplum: Siyasal Bir Değerlendirme," p. 240.

⁹⁹ Çelebi, "Kamusal Alan ve Sivil Toplum: Siyasal Bir Değerlendirme," pp. 246-7.

motion',¹⁰⁰ that exceeds the national boundaries and challenges the dominant forms of publicness prevailing the global public sphere. In the sense that Çelebi uses the term, the counter-globalization movement acts in the global public sphere—which is dominated by the global capitalist system and its grandiose discourse of necessity, rationality, and professionalism—as a search for autonomy against this dominant imaginary, as instable tracks of the constituent power, which is considered as a matter of security by the polarizing discourse of neoliberal governance system. However, on the other hand, the counter-globalization movement came to the global scene as an antidote to the dogmatic forms of leftist politics that are influenced by a similar imaginary — imaginary of professionalism, experts and necessity again. For the simplicity, let us call both of them modern imaginary for a while, modern in the sense that is deprived of its radical roots. The counter-globalization movement as a space of a search for autonomy is what we shall elaborate in the following sections of the chapter. We are interested in the extent to which the counter-globalization movement appropriates its *instituting capacity*, surpass its *alienation*, and realizes its *revolutionary project* as an endless voyage.

Analytically, we read the movement in two discrete levels. First of all, we deal with the experience worlds of the activists regarding the outside of the movement which corresponds in the following part to *Positioning the Movement*. As noted at the outset of the chapter, this is the realm of the negative constitution of the movement. And then, we try to capture the universe of significations of the activists with whom we made in-depth interviews regarding the inside issues, family matters, which correspond to *Grasping the Movement*. Not to mention, these analytical divisions do not have relevance in the real world, it is not that easy to take apart two mutually decisive dimensions of signification chambers, thus, it is the most suitable way for the reader to read them together. Needless to say, the outside ever and ever leaks to the inside, whereas the inside opens its gate and diffuses to the outside.

¹⁰⁰ Çelebi, “Kamusal Alan ve Sivil Toplum: Siyasal Bir Değerlendirme,” p. 252.

Technically, we benefit from the in-depth interviews, slogans, web sites, bulletins, magazines, modes of protesting, textual and performative expressions of the movement. This may seem a bit unsystematic; however, textual and non-textual forms of expression are equally significant to understand a social movement by explicating its “discursive formation”, as Nalçaoğlu states.¹⁰¹ Any social movement, according to him, develops a discursive formation that is composed of the movement’s demands and the ways of articulating these demands, that is, “grammar of demanding” in his words. Thus, to analyze a social movement, revealing its grammar of demanding is as important as understanding its demands. Particularly, in our case, a movement consisted of numerous movements and their sub-movements that does not have a common future project, or, more accurately, a movement in which an important proportion of its participants consider not having a common project as an idea to be defended, requires an elucidation that privileges the ‘grammar of demanding’. Thus, in the following sections we attempt to ‘read’ activists’ universe of signification to bring this grammar into light.

4.2 Positioning the Movement

4.2.1 Coping with *Today*

Throughout the study, we intentionally refrained from commenting globalization neither as a natural, supra-human process—in a way neoliberal ideologues like to do—which seems like a transcendental fact beyond human action, nor as a non-concept, a sort of fake situation—in a way preferred by a considerable part of leftwing politics—that is produced by neoliberals to deceive publics all around the world. Because, both of these conceptions are far away from comprehending the nature of globalization processes, and reduce the conflictual character of social facts to a straight line. Rather, in the third chapter, *Structure*, we attempted to shed light on the multiple façades of globalization (remember the classification of Ulrich

¹⁰¹ Halil Nalçaoğlu, “Devrimci Öğrencilerin Özgül Fantezi Uzamı: ‘Seattle’ a Selam Olsun!,” *Toplum ve Bilim* 93 (Yaz 2002): 144.

Beck) focusing on the concepts ‘interconnectedness’ and ‘interdependency’. Obviously, these concepts simultaneously refer to both positive and negative effects of global dynamics from the point of view of social movements, thus, they do not have an immediate content on which an ethical judgment is based.

Therefore, it would be highly beneficial to take into account Ferhat Kentel’s distinction between two fashions of globalization, in order to grasp the significations of globalization by the activists of the counter-globalization movement: namely, ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ variants of global processes that surround unexceptionally every person on the earth.¹⁰² ‘Soft’ globalization, which may be dated back to 1968 as a monumental reference point, involves the democratization, hybridization, interculturalization or in short, modernization of modern social relations. Kentel describes soft globalization with those words:

A perfect horizontal dynamic, rather than vertical authorities of the institutions of the modernity... A novel modernity in which the experiences of all human beings are shared, that which is produced collectively... A permanent change; modernization, radicalization of the modernity; the individual being salvaged from the confinement of instrumental reason and profit, the individual discovering culture, memory, emotion... That is, a mode that develops human potential... “Soft globalization”...¹⁰³

On the other hand, we see the dark side of globalization, the problematical side of the social structure, which is more apparent to all citizens of the world; a state of permanent insecurity, risk and anxiety, as Mr. A, one of our interviewees, enunciates with those striking words:

Besides, with all the distrustfulness, this world has gradually become the world of empty looking eyes, wandering around due to a state of existence which only strives to survive. Only to stay alive... as a matter of fact, there is something as distrustfulness which itself is a very heavy burden. (Mr. A)

¹⁰² Ferhat Kentel, “‘Yumuşak’ ve ‘Sert’ Küreselleşme ve Türkiye,” online posting, 31 March 2005, *Gazetem.Net*, <http://www.gazetem.net/fkentelyazi.asp?yaziid=214>.

¹⁰³ Kentel, “‘Yumuşak’ ve ‘Sert’ Küreselleşme ve Türkiye.”

‘Hard’ globalization refers to a period of ontological insecurity, to a sort of *deterritorialization* in an existential sense. In Kentel’s words:

On the one hand, international domination and hegemony of capitalism, on the other, a harsh polarization that puts an end to all hopes, as a result of the Wall collapsed on people, the bloodshed in Yugoslavia, the death of humanity in Sarajevo-Bosnia... “Hard globalization”... Globalization of capitalism that, due to its structural transformations, de-functionalizes the revolutionary struggle of the working class and socialism based on social classes; that makes consumption a way of living; that makes us a part of it with all sort of microscopic control tools; that does not need special mechanisms of domination... [...] This globalization is increasing the risks and insecurity, and it is becoming impossible to resist this movement that does not have an apparent “master”... [...] We do not have even a language by which we can appeal people against the most powerful (at least, apparently) capitalist domination of all times... This gap is being filled by violence...¹⁰⁴

The counter-globalization movement emerged as a product of this twofold process, of turbulent social dynamics that involve both potentials and perils. The very existence of it gives us a perfect example of ‘soft’ globalization. However, on the other hand, the destructive side of social transformation that we denoted by the term ‘hard’ globalization, makes up the external reasons that bring together the contentious components of the movement. In many instances, we have noticed that this general situation is described with the term ‘attack’. Commonly, the economic and political aspects of the transformation led by the globalized neoliberal capitalism are regarded as a ‘total attack’. Besides numberless written texts, some of our interviewees also preferred to use the term. Mr. L, who is coming from a religious family and Islamist political background, and currently working in a leftwing party initiative, argues for an emergent coming together of Islamists and leftists in Turkey:

¹⁰⁴ Kentel, “‘Yumuşak’ ve ‘Sert’ Küreselleşme ve Türkiye.”

We are facing with an attack which is so enormous that, Islamist or socialist, we all have to stand side by side. (Mr. L)

Likewise, Mr. A uses those words to imply a general attack:

We had receded so much that, we had receded as far as to our identities. It is only our identities left behind in our hands. (Mr. A)

In both cases and in many written texts such as bulletins or magazines, the two decades, eighties and nineties, are seen as ‘years of lose’ in which relatively advantageous setups of welfare system or import-substitution system in developing economies like Turkey were eliminated harshly with the help of comprehensive legislative regulations.

Obviously, it is not possible here to elaborate in detail the effects and causes of that state of ‘total attack’ within Turkish context. In the third chapter, *Structure*, we marked the precincts of that general appearance, and pointed out the material, institutional and discursive façades of that ‘attack’. That is to say, it is not the intention of the study to provide a detailed analysis of neoliberalization of Turkey in each aspect. However, nonetheless, a general state of *depoliticization*, which surrounds Turkish society as well, ought to be identified here. Not to mention, this fact is valid for every corner of the earth, and is not peculiar to any specific society. And additionally, it has to be kept in mind that the state of affairs uttered by the term ‘depoliticization’ is something different than an ordinary analysis inspired by somehow Jacobin mentality that sees all around a disseminated apathy of ‘apolitical masses’. Rather, what we wish to convey with the term is the grandiose discourse of neoliberal capitalism that freezes and suspends the capacity of ‘multitude’ to create its own existence, or more accurately, that makes us believe that there does not exist such a capacity and the social order we live in is unprompted, beyond human action. If the broad (or real) sense of the term ‘politics’, that is, constituent and creative action of human subjects instead of tug-of-war of ‘real politics’ (remember the discussion in the previous section) is taken into consideration, what we mean by the ‘depoliticization’ would be more understandable.

There may be identified two mutually determining aspects of this suspension: first, the mystification and naturalization of the social order called ‘free market society’, and second, the polarization of societies in both national and international scales in order to provide a substantial support to the *status quo*.

This twofold process corresponds to the language of ‘strategy’ in the sense that Michel de Certeau uses the word. This is the language of professionalism, experts, necessity and security/insecurity, which naturalizes the global capitalism. Before commenting this language, let us see what de Certeau means with that term:

I call a ‘strategy’ the calculus of force-relationships which becomes possible when a subject of will and power (a proprietor, an enterprise, a city, a scientific institution) can be isolated from an ‘environment’. A strategy assumes a place that can be circumscribed as *proper (propre)* and thus serve as the basis for generating relations with an exterior distinct from it (competitors, adversaries, ‘clienteles’, ‘targets’, or ‘objects’ of research). Political, economic, and scientific rationality has been constructed on this strategic model.¹⁰⁵

The keyword here is rationality that serves like an ideological tool as we noted in the related section of the third chapter. Such rationality operates with a hegemonic terminological toolbox that includes efficiency, necessities, requirements, profitability etc.

The very reason of the counter-globalization movement to exist lies here. The movement, first of all, denies the language of that strategy, and then claims to build up another language that is composed of the languages of each movement, that is not identical. The first and most obvious sign of this denial is the well-known slogan of the movement: ‘Another world is possible!’ versus Margaret Thatcher’s ‘There is no alternative!’. That the astonishing street demonstrations that made the movement apparent were organized against the global institutions of capitalism is not a coincidence,

¹⁰⁵ Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), p. xix.

but an indicator of a struggle for the autonomy. Autonomy, as self-regulation and self-management (which is not restricted with the economic field), against the strategy that expands the bases of power and domination in order to, in de Certeau's words, "delimit one's own place in a world bewitched by the invisible powers of the Other".¹⁰⁶ This is where two incommensurable imaginaries, which we discuss in the previous section, clash. One of our interviewees, Mr. B, expresses that quite directly:

Efficiency... To make this notion disputable is probably one of the major missions of social forums... [...] To think of people as an object, in other words to be able to calculate, to be able to influence people... Even as a thought it is very strange... (Mr. B)

One of the most direct consequences of the neoliberalization is the creation of a general belief that the economic relations are out of the control of political mechanisms. Accordingly, established political structures are reduced to a sort of facilitator for technical details. Mr. B indicates this point:

Economy and politics have been separated from each other. Political mediums can no longer control economy, especially if we are talking about a global one. (Mr. B)

In this context, the existential cause of the movement is in the first hand to oppose to the appropriation of the speech by global institutions, locus of strategy; that is, it is a struggle to reappropriate the global public sphere, in Negri's words.¹⁰⁷

At this point our argument which is supported by the quotations above is that subjects of today are increasingly deprived of a sphere of autonomy. As capacity for subjectivity weakens day by day owing to the domination of capitalist rationality, a general mode of insecurity crisscrosses human life all

¹⁰⁶ de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, p. 36.

¹⁰⁷ Antonio Negri, *Kamusal Alanın Yeniden Ele Geçirilmesi*, <http://www.korotonomedia.net/kor/index.php?id=7,61,0,0,1,0>.

over the world. The movement manifests itself as an outcry against this trend, and gives us the primary expressions of a radical imaginary.

4.2.2 Haunted by the *Past*

The other face of that generalized mystification is an equally generalized polarization that exceeds the national boundaries. Although this global state of insecurity is constantly expanded by the politicians and ideologues of the global order, the ethnical, racial or religious conflicts may be seen as expressions of a *real* sentiment of insecurity that surrounds (non-) communities unprotected in front of the global capitalism.

In the context of Turkey, the last three decades (1980 is a somehow symbolic point in Turkey's history: on January 24th of that year a comprehensive official program that regulates the de-regulation of national economy, that ends the official import-substitution orientation of the country, that internationalizes the trade affairs, that reduces the public investments except military expenditures, in short, the neoliberalization manifesto of Turkey was declared; and September 12th, the military coup that makes up a new constitution and official institutions that are relatively out of the control of parliament, that haunts the whole spheres of life in Turkey) may be commented as the years of fragmentation and polarization marked by a harsh military coup, an undeclared civil war in the southeastern and eastern regions of the country in which Kurdish citizens inhabit, a sharp division between Islamist and fundamental laicist camps, a dispersed nationalistic wave that expresses itself mostly with violent attacks. The residue of all these is a common sentiment of thirsty or scarcity:

After all we grew up in Turkey and we grew up after the military coup, which means at a point where everything was dying... at a time where there were no public movements, no nothing. After all, you have born in 1980 and I have born in 1981. (Mrs. D)

The traces of this period are determining remarkably the universe of emotions of the activists. Mr. A expresses the psychological side of the global activism:

According to one thinking, it is a psychological matter. Plus, for people like us it is extremely psychological, since there is not much happening in these streets... [...] Those social forums made me feel good. (Mr. A)

In a similar line, Mr. A mentions “the scarcity in these lands” and comments emphatically the activists that participate in the demonstrations abroad:

They are giving up their hopes about this country and they are going away to store some morale. (Mr. A)

Or, in Mr. I’s and Mrs. C’s words:

Hope, mostly hope... knowing that you are not alone... Sometimes some news arrive from abroad, like one hundred thousand people had walked... it gives an enormous push. During the demonstration in Saraçhane, we had listened to the slogans from the demonstration in Venezuela and we had also shouted the same slogans. It was amazing. (Mr. I)

Of course it makes me excited... Making demonstrations simultaneously on five different locations on world might look formalistic to an outsider...but there is something common, a common spirit that thrills me, a feeling that I am not alone, that there are some other people out there. The demonstrations in France, what happened in fifty two universities in Athens, other things happening like this... Then I say, not everybody is silent, not everybody is afraid, some people are giving reaction, I think something might just happen. I realize a lot in Turkey that some of my friends are afraid, because in the history of this country there are a lot of things happened during the 1980s. Maybe their parents were killed, or their parents’ friends were kept in custody, or may be they were killed too. Beside all other things, there is a kind of oppression, an agent of fear coming from our parents and it is effective over the people of the same age with me. But since there isn’t anything like this in France, well at least I think there is not, it is possible to do something and it is possible that someone who is watching the news might see it and get motivated. I think this is important. (Mrs. C)

Mrs. C indicates an exceedingly important point. The fear factor shared by most of the parents’ narrative is transferred as an exclamation mark to new generations. Mr. G, a 17 years old high school student, is working in a campaign organized by the initiative of a NGO against the Israeli attacks on

Lebanon, and is going to the anti-war demonstrations, however he is dubious about working for an organization:

My father said that: If you would walk through the road of ideology, you would get lost. You would walk through and then you would walk back, and you would see that you gained nothing. He had seen 1980s. [...] Besides our campaign has nothing to do with politics, it is something totally humane. (Mr. G)

It is possible to find a similar pattern in the words of Mr. I. When we asked the attitude of his parents about his political activities, Mr. I said:

You know those “ex-leftists” who did nothing but to throw a couple of stones. They always say: “We have seen a lot of these...” My father was one of them. (Mr. I)

The following remarks of Mr. A who has been actively in the influential mobilization of university students in the 90’s may be explanatory regarding the psychological patterns of the last generation of activists:

In every demonstration, in every fight people were used to be knotted to each other. I mean, it is not an easy thing to do. That fear was establishing a background. [...] We haven’t seen violence in the family, we haven’t seen it in the school; we have seen it only from the police. None of my parents hit me, but the bastard comes on you propped up with... I had my first beating from police... why would I be the scapegoat? (Mr. A)

The issue of how the protest demonstrations look has been a sort of polemic between various sects of Turkish left, as Mrs. C noted:

I think of leftists as very conventional, as people who does not improve themselves a lot, as people who lacks creativity and I think they make demonstrations which are not very attractive. Creativity is very important. [...] On the 20th of August, our cortege in the demonstration was criticized. Why? They said: There is a war going on and what you do here is buffoonery. But I found it very formalistic to think that way. If a demonstration goes on for four hours, and during all that time if you just stand there with a very angry expression, chanting slogans, and then, the day after if you can go on with your life as if nothing had happened, than you are a lie too, you are acting too. (Mrs. C)

New activists mostly organized in the anti-war movement, with their outfits, hair styles, banners, chants, slogans, flags and gestures differ from the red flags of socialist groups. Thus, what does this differentiation mean? According to us, new activists of this generation want to show their dissimilarity to both themselves and others. They want to believe that they are not among the people that they watch on TVs or see in the universities confronting the police. They want to draw a line between *themselves* and *others*. Among many other things, to understand this situation, it may be argued that those young girls and boys do not want to identify themselves with the people who are regarded as a part of the dark past of the country. Going one step further, we are faced with a form of “legitimacy import”; an import of hair styles, words, slogans, outfits, and so. Mr. I, a 23 years old anti-war activist, says:

There is a very big difference between them [“the angry brothers”] and us [“the madcap teens”]. They know the defeat, we don’t. We have more excitement... One shouldn’t confuse them with us. We walk the same line, but in different ways... Our community doesn’t know the violence. How many of us have ever been exposed to a gas bomb? They have to be angry, they can’t just get flippant. They can’t even if they want to. (Mr. I)

On the other hand, Mr. A, as a more experienced activist, points to the violence of the state and comments this attempt as a requirement:

In Europe for example, this language [protesting demonstrations] is a language to discuss in the political sphere, but in the case of us, it has always been the language of hatred. [...] Well this is not Europe, we live in a country where broken glass is more valuable than human life, you have to change your rituals, you have to change your forms. (Mr. A)

The need for making up a new language was articulated commonly by the interviewees. A language that can deny its adversary’s words, surpass the mode of compression within the boundaries drawn by the state.

You can not determine the agenda; you follow the one that exists. And this relates you to the language of the system... Life obliges you to

change the system with the language of this language. But it is not enough to know this. We could have changed this system with another language too. First we have to find that language... this is what happens when we can not find it. (Mrs. E)

Mr. A likens politics to a duello that insists on its own rules:

You know, there is this side of the politics... When you have an encounter with your contrary a state of duello emanates from it and that state establishes its own rules. Those rules are very, very strange things, they begin to trap you and you can not realize that. Then naturally you begin to be like your contrary, why? Because action depends on his behavior and his reaction depends on your power of resistance. There comes a common language into being from this form of relation... You, meanwhile, begin to be trapped in it... One should resist against that language constantly. (Mr. A)

He sees this state of affairs as an abstracted and isolated language interwoven with specific codes that may be understood merely by the state and activists, and then goes on:

If your state of existence is perceived as an issue of security by others then there is a problem... Something has to be done... Both the police's and the citizen's customs should be disturbed. [...] The other language is understood only by you and the state. But the other man should suffer the consequences. (Mr. A)

Similarly, Mr. B expresses the same problem and takes a more pessimistic position about the capacity of social forums to sustain such a state of self-reflexivity:

Your enemy creates you. [...] What is really important is the possibility of other languages to exist within your grassroots. But the biggest problem in the World Social Forum is already the obligation to speak with the words of your enemy. (Mr. B)

Taking own words of activists into account enable us to figure out how alter-globalists feel, experience, signify and enunciate the soft and hard sides, today and past of globalization, the processes of depoliticization that we tried to describe with terms like mystification and polarization. In other words, their own words help us picture their universe of signification,

horizon of meaning, thus comprehend the very movement. For that reason, we attempted to weave our narrative around the parts of interviews, and discuss the general lines occurred in the interviews in parallel to our theoretical considerations.

“We have to do something, something anew!” It was written on the first page of a bulletin that was issued for a few times in 2003 by a little group consisting different sects of leftist university students. This straightforward sentence entails so many things that we try to put here. It is an outcry raised against the strategy, against its discourses and practices; an outcry that involves a need for a new language, a language that can hunt the phantoms; an outcry raised against the established or historical sects of left as well.

In the following section, we focus on the other side of the medallion, that is, family matters.

4.3 Grasping the Movement

During our field research, we came across many times an issue that seems quite significant to us. For almost every person we talked, it was a common acceptance that the counter-globalization movement has managed to mobilize or radicalize a young generation that had not been in any political organization previously. Of course, this has to do with the fact that the sociological positions of young and educated population have changed substantially even in the most developed countries of the world, that the global transformation of capitalism has influenced even the social groups that have seemingly a relative protection against capitalism. For sure, this is also valid for Turkish context, and this explains the ‘elite’ face of the movement. In this sense it is not a big surprise that almost all of our interviewees are graduated from or still attending to university (Mr. G is a high school student), that all of them can speak at least one foreign language, or that the places where we met with our interviewees are central/privileged neighborhoods of Istanbul. However, what is crucial here is to explain why a considerable portion of the movement’s activists have

not been in organized politics previous to this period, why most of the university students participating in anti-war meetings, demonstrations, for instance, hesitate to be in oppositional groups in their own schools. Consequently, this brought us to that what we call family matters, to the relations of alter-globalist activists with present sects of Turkish left. Surely, it would be a serious mistake to consider this situation peculiar to Turkey. The movements all around the world are dealing with such questions in various paths. The traces of this may be found in the discussions at the World and European social forums about the ideological or organizational concerns. For instance, the disagreements on determining a common orientation for social forums, or the conflicts between the groups organized as horizontal networks and those through vertical schemes may be regarded as related questions. All these topics, which are quite central for the movement, have created own camps since the first World Social Forum. In this sense, the social forums are not ideologically neutral realms, but conflictual spaces in which dissimilar imaginaries clash. However, what we prefer here is not to give an account of the parties and terms of these disagreements, enumerate the ideological differences, or elaborate on the movement's cultures of organization. Surely, what we want to tell is not that these are irrelevant issues. However, it seems more important at that stage to understand the antagonism between different political imaginaries that constitute those dissimilarities; therefore we discuss in this section the family matters in the Turkish context around the problematic of autonomy.

Unsurprisingly, this is a harder task compared to understanding the relations of the movement with its adversaries. Although the counter-globalization movement consists of various positions in the manner of defining the object of opposition (it is not possible to mention a common enemy each and every one of the movements and sub-movements that compose the counter-globalization movement recognizes, as we tried to point out in the second chapter of the study, yet for the moment the current neoliberal mode of globalization processes may be seen as the amplest denominator around which the activists gather), nonetheless the traces of a

common search for autonomy are manifest in a way in the movements' textual and non-textual materials. However, we are deprived of such relatively 'easy' documents in order to focus on the second aspect of our analysis, thus we gave a special attention in our interviews to this issue.

Accordingly, there are some essential interrelated themes— representation, rationality, (un-)committed-ness etc.—repeated in many of the interviews. This section carries on commenting these themes.

4.3.1 Great Minds Think Alike?

In the previous pages, we commented the counter-globalization movement as a search for autonomy against the strategy that insists its own language — a language that claims to be the possessor of the truth. A language that determines the rationales of life, that presents them as a necessity, that is, that sets the rules of the game. From this point of view, there are objective laws of social life that can be grasped by capable minds, what is crucial is to know them. Thus, what an ordinary analysis would tell us is that the counter-globalization movement as a challenge to this dominant imaginary is searching for languages that exclude such general laws. However, at this point we have to ask ourselves that to what extent the counter-globalization movement is independent from this dominant imaginary, especially when there are ample evidences that *outside* insistently leaks itself to the *inside* and poses itself as a family matter. Those words of Mr. B might be an appropriate departure point:

Somebody knew something and it was this incident of knowing that bothered me most... That knowing incident has a weight by itself... (Mr. B)

Mr. B told these words, while he was talking about a quarrel between him and some members of a socialist party that is a participator of the forum process. According to his narrative, Mr. B, who is a young academic, was criticized pejoratively for being isolated from the truths of society and developing irrelevant arguments. He could not see the facts of life and has been trapped with bright discourses of the academic life. According to Mr.

B, those high-rank members of the party already knew the problems, and they did not need any argument that may confuse minds. This anecdote straightforwardly indicates us that the issue is relevant for the counter-globalization movement as well. So, this is the point that we have to touch in order to interrogate the subversive character of the movement.

In fact, such a quarrel is nothing but another page of an old book. The history of left has been loaded with the discussions on vanguard parties, general laws of history etc. as we mentioned in the previous parts of this chapter while discussing the concept 'autonomy'. Although the notions like Leninist vanguard party or rising the consciousness of masses through party units have become unfashionable especially as a result of the "deep wave" of 1968, this does not mean that similar approaches have totally vanished. And, in the case of alter-globalization movement, which has managed to summon together various kinds of leftist groups, this is a relevant fact that needs to be elaborated. In some of our interviews this situation was articulated by our respondents, especially the leftist activists coming from non-party organizations indicated this point. For instance, Mrs. E, who has been in leftist organizations since the seventies and currently working in feminist and anti-militarist groups, declared her anger at the attitudes of socialists about the issues she concerns:

They say 'the new social movements', as if they are swearing at... What new?! When we speak of feminism or 'conscientious objection', we speak of something even older than you are. (Mrs. E)

The point here is to assume a hierarchy of struggles. In this instance, the problem of patriarchy or/and militarism is seen as a secondary issue that may be resolved by the resolving of the primary social antagonism. Thus, the individuals and groups struggling for 'secondary' issues like these are reduced to a sort of supplementary elements in the eyes of essential organizations. Actually, this is not articulated explicitly in the seeming discourse of the movement, but that some of our respondents mentioned the presence of such an attitude should be noted here.

Although this situation was related essentially with socialist groups in our interviews, it would be misleading to consider it limited merely to them. This is something more than that. What is crucial here is the presence of a somehow teleological way of thinking that prevails in various streams other than socialists or communists as well. According to this way of thinking, there exist general laws of history (whether they be obvious or more obscure) that determine the flow of social life. Although we, human subjects, have a certain capacity to move within this flow, in the final analysis what determines our 'free' acts is those laws. Thus, the political subjects that aim to transform those social structures (which will eventually change) have two options: either they wait peacefully the transformation of social life which would happen as a result of the intrinsic crises of capitalist system for instance or they act collectively to deepen those crises and accelerate the process. What is common in these two lines is the belief in the unavoidable transformation of the structures to a better one. For us, what is crucial here is the absence of politics, creation *ex nihilo*, in the sense that we discussed earlier. Paradoxically, such a conception of history reduces the transformative politics (in effect, this is an unnecessary repetition; in the sense we define the term, politics may only be transformative) to a technical issue. In other words, the politics is annihilated; the human action and its creativity vanish. If there are such laws, the mere requirement is to discover them. So, what we need is not superfluous delusions of creativity, but the proper strategies and tactics that accelerate the history. The only realm in which we aspire to creativity is that of techniques. We already have the address of the final destination, so all we need is the 'creative' ways that help us contribute large masses to our voyage.

As it is obvious, such a conception of politics is as depoliticizing as the strategy of global capitalism. The creative capacity of political subjects is once again omitted or reduced to an auxiliary tool. The clash between two incommensurable imaginaries that we mentioned earlier to position the counter-globalization movement appears here with its other face. Simon Tormey, in an essay in which he discusses the peculiarity of social forum

processes, introduces the term “utopian world” to describe the way of thinking we conferred here, as opposed to the term “utopian spaces” by which he tries to conceptualize the alter-globalization movement. According to his view:

Commitment to a utopian world relegates the space of the social forum to a vehicle or means for the realization of something else: the better world to come. An imaginary orientated to the proliferation of utopian spaces translates for our purposes as a commitment to social forums on the terms set by the social forum charter itself: to contingency, uncertainty and creativity. In doing so it anticipates – or could anticipate – the creation and multiplication of spaces that resist over coding, homogenization, and uniformity.¹⁰⁸

Speaking with Tormey’s words, “utopian worlds” and “utopian spaces”, those two imaginaries collide within the social forum processes, and this collision is the source of major divisions that are present between various participants of the movement — e.g. different organizational forms that we may categorize as vertical and horizontal. Mr. B comments the situation with those words:

I have been thinking that what is more efficient is not having a social project at all. This will happen, that will happen, our society will be like this... It is exactly what restricts world social forum. [...] Of course, all these groups have different social projects, it not like anybody saying ‘let’s wander around’ or something... But, if the matter would come to a proclamation of conclusion; if the world social forum would become an instrument of constituting a project, then I am afraid, it will fail to fulfill its promise... I think ‘the promise’ itself should stay as a void too... social forum should stay as a void. (Mr. B)

As Mr. B verbalized with a perfect clarity, the point here is not to criticize the movement for having a future ideal, utopia; on the contrary, we regard utopias as the mere way to challenge ‘scientific’ general laws of sociality; having a utopia is to accept that there always exist voids, cracks.

¹⁰⁸ Simon Tormey, “From Utopian Worlds to Utopian Spaces: Reflections on the Contemporary Radical Imaginary and the Social Forum Process,” *Ephemera* 5: 2 (2005): 395-6.

For sure, the movements have their own future projects that are born out of their oppositions, outcries. Rather, what we argue is that to produce deterministic schemes that design the contents of these utopias, to fill those voids negates the human creativity, that is, historicity.

As an expectable byproduct of this discussion, we come across with the issue of representation. However, before discussing the representational problems in the movement, we have to mention another aspect of depoliticization that is related with technical issues.

During the interviews, some of our respondents repetitively mentioned the depoliticized character of regular meetings of social forums. According to them, the agendas of meetings are mostly shaped around technical matters that do not leave any room for genuine political debates. The meetings focus on the daily matters; controversial issues are left aside in order to prevent any separation between groups and individuals having dissimilar political practices, principles or orientations. Whereas all “these technical issues are quite political as well” as Mrs. E noted, in other words they are subject to a hegemony struggle. Mr. B indicates this point:

You go there and you really think that everybody can hear your voice. After some experiences you realize that it is not like that. A group of people know what should be done; there is a schedule to follow and agenda of topics... [X] always determines the agenda in advance. Leave it aside that you can not say much on the agenda topics, the guy had already pre-determined the topics. This is not about knowing it better. Then you find yourself discussing over the technical matters like whether the buses will depart on that time or this time... (Mr. B)

But Mrs. A does not see it as the only possible way:

There is a certain attitude that cares a much about not to offend anybody or not to leave anybody out, not to let the forum to break up... however it is possible to include new people through dispute. (Mrs. A)

As it is obvious, such a restriction abolishes the political content of the forum process itself. Isolating the meetings from controversial matters and demarcating them with only neutral practices paradoxically strengthens the

unseen hegemonic domain and eventually does not leave a room for the politics itself.

Whenever there is a dispute, let us say ideological discussion, whenever a crack is heard, he says 'please do not disturb the agenda and interrupt the works that should be done, this discussion belongs some place else, we are only a coordination committee here.' So where are we going to discuss? We always talk about coming together and discussing issues, and coordination committees are the only places that we come together... we don't spare a word on action, on thought, on significance... (Mr. B)

Consequently the own language of the anti-systematic power is trapped with the system's rational language that it opposes. The realm of opposition is equalized to the terms of necessity; for the sake of efficiency the irreducible divergences are naturalized:

You can not be critical, because you always have some things to do which make you feel jammed; constant meetings, demonstrations... Suddenly all these necessities make you turn back to your former character, since it is the easiest. Three people come together and make a decision. (Mrs. E)

4.3.2 Not in My Name. Thanks!

The discussion above unavoidably brings up the issue of representation. Owing to the nature of teleological politics, representative structures are necessary (read it, inevitable) and also logical. If there is a given telos; and if someone can grasp this telos and the ways to reach it, so it is the most appropriate way to provide this person with the representative authorities. This would be the most logical way that accelerates the process; there is no need to waste time. The revolutionary vanguard would deliver the best recipe to the 'subjects' of revolution. In fact, within the history of left this has been an ever-ending dispute; Mr. A touches on the same point, his words are summarizing perfectly what we say here:

I will stand in that fist with my own identity. I am performing within a space which is determined by me and formed through my complaints. If you will accept, then I am in. In the past, things were determined from

above and then you were to be invited. In some ways, that was told to the workers too. (Mr. A)

According to Mr. A the only responsibility of activists is to render the problems apparent, to light up and then disappear. He questions the role of revolutionary with those impressive words:

Let something be seen, with all its harshness, with all its severity and then wait. It is not possible that he wouldn't come. But when he comes don't let him to see you with a recipe in your hand. [...] We made the dinner table ready, and then we should withdraw. We are a part of that table, we have to stay for chat, to listen what they are saying... (Mr. A)

However, from our interviewees we understand that this is not so. Seemingly, social forums, despite their principles that prohibit the participation of political parties and armed groups and its discourse that encourages individual participation, cannot avoid representational problems:

The movement called grassroots was really glowed suddenly and then it aroused something important, but the problem is the existence of the movements which are attempting to evolve on the wave that was created by grassroots and trying to take its credit for themselves. [...] Now, the Social Forum of Turkey will be held. Why the villagers of Bergama are not there? It is just the kind of public action, or the so and so collective in Zonguldak, or why there isn't anybody like Nebahat Akkoç from Diyarbakır who neither speaks from government's side, nor from PKK's? (Mrs. D)

In our view, there is an observable conflict, as Mrs. D noted, between the grassroots movements and the more representative structures that attempt to lead these multidirectional flows, that is, determine the political language of the counter-globalization movement. The presence of grassroots movements is the determining characteristic of the counter-globalization movement; however, Mr. J, who has been in the social forum process from the beginning, frankly admits the absence of the grassroots in the context of Turkey:

Social movement as I understand it, like it is in Brazil or India, is the standing up of certain groups who have some social problems, or to make

these groups stand up for themselves... I think this is what we couldn't succeed. We couldn't succeed it as Greens too. When we look at the program of the Turkish Social Forum, there are 120 titles; I think all of them are by academicians. Well, which means our friends... open software etc., we are also defending that, of course, but this is not a social movement. (Mr. J)

However, the problem is not limited to Turkey. Mr. A contends that the risk has been there from the beginning:

It was obvious that there would be a problem of representation. A group of men, a group of white men, began to walk around and make some connections. After these connections, they took everything upon themselves. But these men began to be very much alike and this likeness had laid a community. A community, in quotation marks, began to form. All kind of communities go there and inform other communities about themselves...but when they go back to their country, I am not sure how long that psychological carries its effect on. (Mr. A)

The point that Mr. A indicates seems quite important to us. The inevitable consequence of the representative structures would be a sort of closure. Such a movement would see the other participants either as a rival to itself or as a rank and file element to be absorbed. Tormey points out this threat in the context of social forums:

From this point of view it is clear that the function of the social forum for those in possession of this kind of final map or picture is to help 'build the party-movement'. The social forums are in this sense a means to an end, principally for recruitment of the uncommitted; for the retention of doubters and wavers; for defeating opposing viewpoints in the less-than-mortal combat of plenary session, workshop or seminar.¹⁰⁹

The point of view Tormey describes entails the elimination of self-reflexive capacity, the termination of the search for autonomy, an unavoidable absolute closure. Therefore, we have to think on the notion of closure; in the following pages we discuss the feeling of being a community.

¹⁰⁹ Tormey, "From Utopian Worlds to Utopian Spaces," p. 401.

4.3.3 Kramer versus Kramer

In this final subsection we prefer to discuss the counter-globalization movement by the help of the concept ‘empowerment’, because it may enable us to re-think on the relationship that we pose throughout the study between the social structure and individual.¹¹⁰ To repeat, we argued in the previous sections that it cannot be assumed a frozen, strict, absolute principle of determinism that exists between the social structure and individual. For sure, human being as a social totality is formed by the social relations in/against which he/she acts, but in our view this formation is not absolute and identical in each case. Human being is something more than a social manufacture, he/she exceeds it. Human being does not simply receive the social relations; however he/she perceives, feels and experiences them. As we discussed in the related section of the study, such an experimentation process consists of voids and cracks, in other words, a human being does not absorb these relations in identical ways in each case or with each human being. In the sense that we define the concept experience, experience as a two-edged relationality, the way the individual perceives the sociality and the universe of signification that occurs as a result of that perception are unique and singular. The social action that human subjects commit as a result of these experimentation processes vary, though the action is mostly collective. Thus, we can think of this state of excess, that is, the sociality with voids, with the notion ‘capacity for subjectivity’.

There is no need to repeat in detail a discussion that we already did. However, some points should be underlined in the context of the theme that we aim to discuss in this subsection. In the previous pages, we noted that the qualitative alteration of capitalism has deepened a mode of existential deterritorialization, and than we posed the counter-globalization movement in opposition to this mode. If we re-think this statement with other terms, we may say that the counter-globalization movement is a strategy of

¹¹⁰ We borrowed the concept from Aksu Bora and İlknur Üstün, *Sıcak Aile Ortamı: Demokratikleşme Sürecinde Kadın ve Erkekler* (İstanbul: TESEV Yayınları, 2005) that discusses gender relations along with the concepts ‘habitus’ and ‘empowerment’.

empowerment that is taking shape in opposition to the strategy of neoliberal globalization, global capitalism. In other words, it is an attempt to increase the capacity for subjectivity, or with the terms that we used throughout the study, it is a search for autonomy. Though, we argue in this subsection that such a strategy of empowerment may become a sort of disempowerment.

We all know that, at least since Thompson's work on working class by which we benefit in this study, any collective action creates a sort of community. Every social action unites and convenes the persons who share the experience emerged as a result of the common action. In this sense, it creates a kind of identity. The points that we noted up to this point do not provide us any ground on which we can base an ethical judgment. It is senseless to assign a positive or negative label to these identities. In addition, such an identity formation may be more inclusive in comparison to our identities like gender or ethnicity that are innate or that we gain during our very first socialization processes. Therefore, these former identities may be exempted to a certain extent from the critiques that are directed toward the social movements focusing on these later identities. We say "to a certain extent" because we think that this situation has limits as well. The key concept here is self-reflexivity; self-reflexivity like the search for autonomy is an ever-ending cycle. What it means is that such identities and states of being together, even if they have been gained in the maturity period of human life, have to be questioned continuously. During our field research, we gave a special attention to this point and spoke with our interviewees of the issues of (O)rganizations. Let us clarify what we mean with three narratives that deserve to be elaborated here.

Mrs. C is a 22 years old university student. She has been participating in the activities of an anti-war coalition for two years. This is a coalition composed of individuals, that is, organizational representation is not valid. Mrs. C is one of the many activists that are not working in any trade union, non-governmental organization etc. However, for a certain period Mrs. C used to be in an organization. In the first year of university, she affiliated with an anarchist organization which is one of the most

influential groups in her school. After almost one year with that group, she began to have some problems. According to her, the primary issue was the lack of insight and self-reflexivity. Let us read her words:

As a result of my drawbacks, the things that I found as not right and also the violence in the demonstrations made me withdrew from the organization. I realized that the very basic principles of anarchism, like leadership, any kind of hierarchy, possession...etc. was not wholesome in this organization... I mean it is not as it is told. I started to think that they weren't able to observe from themselves from outside... But I was new and I was able to examine people's attitudes...but they were all internalized each other so much that they weren't aware that only one of them was conducting. But within an organization which was structured by the principles of anarchism, hierarchy can not exist, this is against the very essence of anarchism... At the beginning there wasn't much reaction against me but when I had started to share my thoughts with the others then they labeled me as someone who indisposes others. (Mrs. C)

There is not any extremely interesting point here, but the universe of signification that Mrs. C developed after those events is quite instructive. At a point of interview, she used those words to reply a question about the motives that led her to leftist politics.

Not the left. Nothing pushed me to the left. I have never seen myself as inside or as a part of the left. (Mrs. C)

“What about anarchism?”, and she told:

Yes, but anarchism is not left. Anarchism is neither left nor right. (Mrs. C)

At another point, when we were talking about the anarchist group she used to be in, she chose those words to describe them:

How should I call them? Fascist anarchists or leftist anarchists? They are not completely anarchist for sure? (Mrs. C)

So, how do we have to comment these words? Aren't these erroneous statements of an inexperienced girl? Yes, may be erroneous; but, inexperienced? Despite the problems in conceptualization, Mrs. C revealed

a quite important issue. She verbalizes this issue with a perfect lucidity rendering our analysis unnecessary:

There is always this issue of not being able to observe themselves from outside and a fetishism of organization in the structures that I don't feel like a part of, and I think it is not inconvenient to call these structures as left. This can be a result of leftist convention. I think it is because of the feeling of assurance resulted from being a together, being a couple of people and seeing other people as shit. I believe this is the biggest problem and this is what would undermine the movement. (Mrs. C)

Secondly, Mr. I is a 23 years old university student. He is working for the campaigns of the same anti-war coalition with Mrs. C. He says that he started to attend the regular activist meetings after he helped his friends in the rock festival organized by peace activists. After two years of being uncommitted, he is now a member of a socialist party that is highly active in the social forum process in Turkey. Unlike Mrs. C he does not have a fundamental opposition to political parties. Though he used those words, while we were talking about parties:

I believe marriage would eventually kill the love. (Mr. I)

When we asked him how he justifies being a member then, he said:

[X] is not a very leftist party, it is leftist but... They don't look at it with the mentality of a party. There are some very leftist friends who consider the party as primary. [...] When you go to a demonstration, you don't see the party flag, you see other things. Being there is enough for me just by itself. Who cares that it is written [X] over there. What is important is to pull the masses over there. (Mr. I)

For him, a party unlike a party is a party in which he wants to be. Does it seem controversial? Another inexperienced boy? So, let us consider our third narrative.

Mrs. A is a 24 years old university student. In the first years of her activism career she has been close to environmentalist groups. Environmental issues have always been important to her. For the last three years, she has approached to leftist groups, but never been a member of any

of them. She considers herself as an uncommitted leftist who does not ignore environmental problems. She is a typical example of this generation of activists. She has focused interests like nuclear energy for instance, but she is also doing her best to attend actively almost all campaigns that she considers significant. Additionally, unlike the first two respondents she is following regularly the periodical meetings of social forum. When we asked her why she is insisting on being uncommitted, she said:

I can't find a place to hold on. When you go inside a leftist organization you realize that no one cares about environmental issues, and after all, Greenpeace is an organization which functions within the system. In no way I want to identify myself with an organization. [...] Assume that you are a member of a party and there comes something new in the program. You have to work on this new thing but you have no idea about it. I mean it is funny... (Mrs. A)

However, Mrs. A told that being uncommitted is not so perfect even in the social forum process.

Of course I had a lot of difficulties. When you have an organization backing up for you, then you become more of a concern. [...] Just think about it, there is me and then there is TMMOB [Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects]... they give a lot of money. Of course their word is more valid. [...] There was an approach which gave preference to the name of the organizations and that bothered me a lot. [...] It is not much perceived but everybody have an opinion in their mind like: It is important to be a part of an organization for everyone. (Mrs. A)

Similar critiques about the dominance of institutions on the social forum process came from our other interviewees as well. For instance, Mr. J and Mrs. E touched on this point:

According to us, since this last year everything is going too much under the domination of chambers. Personally, this does not encourage me much. After all, I know how they are functioning... (Mr. J)

One of the basic principles of social forums is individual participation, but in here, everything is in progress in a very institutional manner... (Mrs. E)

So, how should we conceive of these three narratives that are loaded with contradictory expressions? Are they nonsensical parts of an ordinary observation that may be omitted? Or, does this mean that the new generation of activists is a perfect example of liberal ideology that poses the impossibility of organized collective action? The point what we try to discuss here is not to be organized or non-organized. Undoubtedly, the discussion we developed in this dissertation forces us to see the inseparableness of individual and social planes of autonomy, thus that of individual and social aspects of the search for autonomy, praxis. Rather, what is crucial here is to be organized in an organization or in an Organization. Thinking with the terms of the discussion that we detailed at the outset of this subsection, it would be clear that the latter notion paradoxically corresponds to a sort of closure, a mode of disempowerment.

Today, as stated by so many commenters, there exist two main currents within the counter-globalization movement that we may identify as two separate pole of camping about the organizational practices, namely vertical and horizontal organizations. For sure, we are aware of the fact that such a division is not totally explanatory; there exist coincidences, intersections etc. Yet the very division indicates a fact that needs to be reflected. There are a significant number of activists that consider and defend horizontal networks as forms peculiar to the counter-globalization movement. In the light of the above narratives, we can argue that the counter-globalization movement, along with many other things, introduced a new type of activist — a free-floating activist that chooses to be here and there. In our view, this is one of the key points that determine the faith of the movement. The movement is expanding on the one hand as it enables these activists to act; and on the other hand, it is freezing as the representative rational Organizations keep them stable.

5. CONCLUSION

This study, first of all, has been shaped around a simple and equally important argument: as discussed in detail, there is a dialectical relationship between the singular and collective actions of individuals and the whole of social structures in which these individuals exist. According to this argument, the relationship that involves a mutual determinacy between those parties cannot be reduced to a strict deterministic line. Human subjects are more than this; they exceed the boundaries of simplistic schemes. In other words, there are voids, cracks in the realm of sociality. The hope to realize any state of affairs which is different than what it is; the hope, which is commented in the study as the precondition of a transformative project, that is, the realm of utopia, keeps alive the possibility of escaping from “the prison house of the present”. Accordingly, the counter-globalization movement has been read here within the intellectual universe based on this argument. Even the textual body of the study has been arranged according to this threefold model. Needless to detail, the second chapter of the study, *Action*, corresponds to the realm of social action that is embodied in the counter-globalization movement in this case; the third chapter, *Structure*, depicts the primary nodes of social matrix in/against which the political subjects—the alter-globalists—commit action; and thirdly, *Experience* corresponds to the domain in which the social formations and actions mediate.

What is crucial here is the two-sided relationality that is tried to be captured throughout the study with the term ‘experience’. That any social movement is configured around an axis of relationality, within a bunch of endless interactions directed to the *inside* and *outside* of the movement is one of the core points of this study. Social movements are not a thing but a relationship materialized within the universes of signification of its participants which are based on their experiments.

As discussed in detail, experimentation processes of human beings have a structure that consists of voids, and this makes experience, in

accordance with the basic presupposition of the study, one of the key concepts on which the study is based. Here experience is the keyword that links the three parties necessary for any scientific elaboration: the theoretical package, the problematic and the data. In this case the tie that binds the theoretical elaborations on autonomy to the findings extracted from the field research is experience. In order to reflect the importance of the concept, the main chapter of the study in which the data are commented and discussed in parallel to the main problematic has been interwoven around the in-depth interviews made with the activists.

The departure point of the study, as noted in *Introduction*, was to give an answer to the question to what extent the counter-globalization movement is radical, subversive or has a potential to transform the strategy, system. Undoubtedly, it was obvious that to give a complete answer to such a multifaceted question, at least within the boundaries of such a study was quite impossible. Yet, the problematic of autonomy could provide an acceptable ground on which partial-but-satisfactory answers to the questions of potentiality could be searched. As noted repeatedly throughout the text, the focal point of problematization of this study is autonomy.

Accordingly, the main thesis of this dissertation is that the counter-globalization movement, which manifests itself in various forms, in different organizational structures or in diverse political and ideological camps, is, along with many other things, a space of a search for autonomy; autonomy, a never-ending journey of reflexivity, the negation of the regulation of one's law by another's law. This search has two separate but interlinked aspects: autonomy as the struggle for politicization against the depoliticizing global *capitalism*, and autonomy as the struggle for politicization against the depoliticizing *anti-capitalism*. These two aspects are nothing but two different faces of *an* antagonism between two incommensurable imaginaries: imaginary as the "creation *ex nihilo*" on the one side, and the imaginary that posits the *rationales* of the modern world for both the capitalist and anti-capitalist camps, on the other.

In the light of the discussions of this study, it can be stated that the counter-globalization movement could mobilize and radicalize individuals all around the world whose sociological positions have changed substantially and who have been surrounded by a sort of existential *detrterritorialization* and *disempowerment* due to the qualitative transformation of modern capitalism, because it could have been a space of a search for autonomy against the depoliticizing dominant imaginary that is present both in systemic and ‘anti-systemic’ forces.

Accordingly, the counter-globalization movement in general and the social forums as its peculiar forms are the reinvention of politics in the sense of creativity, the capturing of speech as in the radical youth movement of 1968. Such a parallelism between the current movement and 1968 is not a matter of mere comparison. What is crucial here is not to value the counter-globalization movement in the face of a nostalgic golden era, but to pose our case within a context marked to a large extent by the “deep waves” of the ’68.

However, the movement’s negation of dominant imaginary and of the social formations born within this imaginary is not limitless. The *outside* has leaked into the *inside*. The language of the strategy has counterparts among the anti-systemic forces that make up the movement. The language of rationality, efficiency, necessities, experts have surrounded the language of some of the participants of the movement, or put it more accurately, this language has already been there. For sure, this is not a novel fact, this has a long history.

In conclusion, the counter-globalization movement, as far as we can observe during our research, has been the locus of a search for autonomy, the space in which the instituting-constituting capacities of social subjects have emerged; it could have been another major moment of a ever-ending journey of self-reflexivity. For us, the importance of the movement and its potential to realize a radical subversion stems from this point.

On the other hand, the study has shown us that the counter-globalization movement is not a celestial space which is free of the

alienation of the society. The dominant imaginary that negates the self-creative characteristic of the societies, abolishes the politics in its proper sense, omits the constituent face of the human beings, that is, neglects the historicity itself has already embraced the movement.

From our point of view, the counter-globalization movement is a space in which those two incommensurable dynamics, the radical imaginary as a capacity of claiming for that that does not exist and the dominant modern imaginary that is most explicit in its grandiose discourse of necessities, rationality, efficiency etc. clash. Therefore, the radical potential of the movement is configured within the collision of these two imaginaries.

For sure, this is not the mere way to attempt to give an answer to our fundamental question. There exist other paths of thinking different than that we chose; other theoretical packages different than those we deployed; other methodological approaches different than that we used. In fact, our intention at the very outset of our field research was to base the study on the discussions on public, counter-public, publicness and public sphere along with the problematic of autonomy. We planned to find out the clues of alternative forms of publicness within the movement which may be considered as a counter-public, or more accurately, a minglement of counter-publics. However, while our research was still continuing we noticed that such a widening of the problematic of the study would necessarily delimit the content. For sure, this does not mean that such a study cannot be realized properly, but that it exceeds the boundaries of a master thesis. One of the main reasons is the over-loaded character of the concepts like public sphere, publicness etc. As rapidly pointed out in the study, the Habermasian conception of the terms dominates the field; thus, it is compulsory to deal with this line of thought to produce a valid alternative conception. This is not impossible of course, we have already mentioned the clues of an alternative way of thinking in the study; however, extending the discussion on this plane would restrict the discussions on our concepts—first of all, autonomy—that are quite remarkable for the problematic of the study. To focus deeply on a certain area, we intentionally refrained from

dealing with these themes in detail. Yet, the question of the potentials of the counter-globalization movement and the social forums born out of it as counter-public(s) still remain as a valid ground for a future research.

As a final note, it should be stated that this study has derived its motivations from a matter that is not merely academic. The questions that are tried to be grasped here cannot be restricted within the realm of mere academic interests. The author of these lines has been in some of the movements mentioned throughout the study as an activist, thus shares some of the concerns and hopes of his research 'objects'. Therefore, this work, *contra* the conventional academic concerns, may be regarded as an expression of a 'personal' search, a limited proof of its considerations on the minglement of research's object and subject, a modest contribution to the journey of all, of us.

APPENDIX A

Some Participants in FSP

- Argentina - Communist Party of Argentina
- Barbados - Clement Payne Movement
- Bolivia - Communist Party of Bolivia
- Brazil - Workers' Party, Communist Party of Brazil
- Chile - Communist Party of Chile, Socialist Party of Chile
- Colombia - Colombian Communist Party, National Liberation Army, Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia
- Costa Rica - Costa Rican Peoples Party
- Cuba - Communist Party of Cuba
- Dominica - Dominica Labor Party
- Dominican Republic - Dominican Liberation Party
- El Salvador - Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front
- Guatemala - Guatemalan National Revolutionary Unity
- Guyana - Working People's Alliance
- Mexico - Party of Labor, Popular Socialist Party
- Nicaragua - Sandinista National Liberation Front
- Paraguay - Paraguayan Communist Party, Free Homeland Party
- Peru - Peruvian Communist Party, Socialist Party of Peru
- Puerto Rico - Puerto Rican Nationalist Party, Socialist Front, Hostosian National Independence Movement, University Pro-Independence Federation of Puerto Rico
- Uruguay - Broad Front, Communist Party of Uruguay, Socialist Party of Uruguay, Tupamaros
- Venezuela - Communist Party of Venezuela

APPENDIX B

A Selective Chronology of the Counter-Globalization Movement

1994

1 January

The Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN) takes seven towns in Chiapas and Mexico, and its leader Subcomandante Marcos, issues the first Declaration of the Lacandon Jungle, declaring war on the Mexican government and army but also protesting neo-liberal ideology and in particular NAFTA. The Mexican army begins a bloody counter-offensive against the Zapatistas.

5-7 August

7,000 Mexican civil society activists attend the first 'Aguascalientes Forum' in the jungle of Chiapas, convoked by Zapatistas, who call on a civil society 'defeat them' by achieving a peaceful transition to democracy.

29 September

At the 50th anniversary of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, activists summit the Manibeli Declaration, signed by 326 groups from 44 countries, asking for a moratorium on the World Bank funding for big dams. The date also remarks the beginning of an international campaign against the activities of the Bank and Fund 'Fifty years is Enough.'

1995

4-15 September

The Fourth World Conference on Women takes place in Beijing.

19-22 October

One week after the ceasefire in Bosnia, hundreds of people from the former Yugoslav republics and from the other European countries gather for a general assembly of the Helsinki Citizens Assembly in war-torn Tuzla to discuss the role the international community and civic initiatives from both Bosnia-Herzegovina and abroad can play in the solutions of the conflict in Bosnia.

1996

Brazilian police troops fire on the demonstrators from the landless peasant movement (MST) who are blocking the road in the Brazilian state of Para. 19 are killed and 51 are injured.

27 July-3 August

The Zapatistas convoke the first Intercontinental Meeting for Humanity and Against Neo-Liberalism in Chiapas, Mexico, attended by 3,000 people from 44 countries.

10 September

After many years of lobbying anti-nuclear activists and NGO's, the United Nations finally adopts the Comprehensive Nuclear test-Ban Treaty (CTBT)

1997

2-4 February

Over 2,900 people from 137 countries attend the Microcredit Summit in Washington D.C, which launches a campaign to reach 100 million poor people with microcredit facilities by 2005.

5-6 February

In Ecuador, 2 million people go on a strike, and march against President Abdala Bucaram's corrupt government, prompting the Ecuadorian Congress to vote him out of office.

21 February

After three months of street protests, peaking at 500,000 demonstrators, Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic accepts the election results and opposition leader Zoran Djindjic is installed as a mayor of Belgrade.

17 April

Thousands of landless Brazilian reach the capital Brasilia after a two month march, to pressure the government to implement the land form. The streets are lined with people to welcome them.

1998

11 January

More than 10,000 Indians stage a sit-in to protest against the building of the Maheshwar Dam on the Narmada river, which would displace thousands of people.

1 March

300,000 rural Brit take part in a march on London to ask attention for the problems faced by people living in the British countryside, including fears for the future of hunting and other field sports, and concern at the problems facing livestock farmers.

16 May

70,000 people form a human chain around the city centre of Birmingham, UK, where the leaders of the G8 leaders are supposed to be meeting, in support of debt relief for developing countries. The G8 leaders have moved their summit to countryside, however; only the British Prime Minister Tony Blair comes to meet the demonstrators.

1 June

Hundreds of children from over 50 countries reach the International Labour Organization in Genova at the end of a global march against child labour.

20 September

After leading a demonstration of 30,000 people against Prime Minister Mahathir, former Malaysian finance minister Anwar Ibrahim is arrested, sparking further demonstrations.

1999

30 November- 3 December

The World Trade Organization hold a conference in Seattle. Governments fail to come to an agreement, and the talks of collapse. Approximately 50,000 people, including trade unionists, environmentalists, farmers, development workers, and anti-capitalist campaigners, demonstrate, sometimes violently in the streets. The police reacts by using teargas against the crowds.

2000

21-28 February

A demonstration by Christians in the northern Nigerian State Kanuda, protesting against the governor's intention to implement Islamic *sharia* law, sparks sectarian violence all over the country.

15-17 April

Tens of thousands of people blockade the streets surrounding the IMF and World Bank buildings in Washington, D.C, where the annual board meetings are held, in protest against the policies of the financial institutions. Meetings are delayed by the blocked, and some delegates fail to make it through. Over 600 demonstrators are arrested.

30 June

Tens of thousands of French farmers and other anti-globalizations protesters gather in Millau, France, where French farmer Jose Bove stands trial for attacking the local branch of Mac Donald's hamburger restaurant a year earlier.

26-28 September

Approximately 12,000 activists gather in Prague where the annual IMF-World Bank meeting is held. The meeting is disrupted, and demonstrators clash with police, leading to many arrests.

2001

25-30 January

The first World Social Forum is held in Porto Alegre, Brazil, as an alternative to the World Economic Forum being held in Davos, Switzerland. 11,000 activists gather to protest against neo-liberalism and discuss alternatives to capitalists globalisations under the banner of 'another world is possible'. The event is organized by a number of civil society organizations, including many progressive Brazilian ones such as the Landless Movement and trade union groups, with ATTAC-France also being prominent. It is decided during the forum that the event should be held annually.

22-27 February

Anti-capitalist initiate a series of activities to parallel the regional World Economic Forum(WEF) held in Cancun, Mexico.

25 February-5 March

The Zapatistas leave their refuges in the highland of Chiapas to initiate a march to Mexico City called the 'Zapatour'.

17 March

A Global Forum is held in Naples, Italy on governance and the impact of the Internet on government. Parallel initiatives are organized by an estimated 20,000 anti-capitalist protesters and violent street clashes also takes place between demonstrators and the police.

21 April

Tens of thousands of protesters from diverse groups demonstrate against the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) project at the Summit of the Americas held in Quebec, Canada. There were 80,000 protesters.

1 May

Protesters, trade unionist, and anti-capitalist demonstrators take to the streets throughout the world in global May Day protests.

14-16 June

In Gothenburg, European leaders meet to discuss the future direction and expansion plans of the EU. During the meeting in Gothenburg is overtaken by protests and violent clashes take place with the Swedish Police. Lots of demonstrators were injured.

19 June

A World Bank meeting planned to take place in Barcelona is cancelled due to fears that anti-capitalist protests would disrupt the event. The conference is instead held partially on the Internet, however, 20,000 demonstrators still gather to protest in Barcelona's Central Square.

16-20 July

An initial planning meeting is held for the World Civil Society Forum (WCSF), aiming to bring together large numbers of different kinds of civil society organizations in Genova.

18-21 July

The G8 Summit is held in Genoa, Italy, and is marked by large-scale protests, marches and demonstrations as a contingent of 250,000 protesters from 700 groups descend on the city. But the police are prepared for violence. And one protesters is killed by the police and 200 others are injured.

27 September

An anti-war demonstration is held in Naples, Italy to protest against the possibility of using military action in response to the September 11 attacks on the US. 10,000 people attend the event to demonstrate against war and NATO.

29 September

In Washington DC, civil society groups come together for a march to stop war and racism.

7 October

Air strikes are launched on Afghanistan by the US in the war on terror.

13 October

In London a march and rally for peace and justice is attended by more 20,000 from a wide range of communities. An anti-war demonstrations in Berlin is attended by 30,000 people, calling for peace, solidarity and social justice. In Italy, there were 250,000 anti-war demonstrators.

6 November

In Delhi, 15,000 people gather to protest against the World Trade Organisations.

18 November

Another anti-war demonstration is held in London with up to 100,000 marching to the capital's Trafalgar Square for a rally.

13-14 December

The European summit is held in Brussels. A march organized by trade unions is attended by up to 80,000 people. There are later clashes between some protesters and police.

20 December

Mass public protests by Argentinian citizens lead to the resignation of President Fernando de la Rúa, a culmination of prolonged protests at the government's handling of the economy. At least 25 people are killed during the riots.

2002**30 January-5 February**

In Porto Alegre, Brasil, the Second World Social Forum is held with 68,000 participant.

31 January-4 February

During the World Economic Forum (WEF), 10,000 join protests against the policies of WEF, IMF and World Bank.

1 February

In Munich, Germany thousands of anti-war demonstrators hold a protest while 400 defence experts, representing most NATO countries, attend a major NATO defence summit there.

23 March

In Rome, Italy, a mass demonstrations and march with over one million workers takes place. This is organized by trade unionist to defend labour rights, as the government plans to scrap legislation protecting employees from unfair dismissal.

21 April-5 May

The shock victory of the far-right National Front leader, Jean-Marie Le Pen, in the first round of the French presidential elections sparks protests across the Europe. The largest protests is on May when 2 million demonstrate across France.

20-22 June

To coincide with the EU summit being held in Seville, Seville Social Forum organizes two days of conference, seminars. The opening day is marked by a general strike organized by Spanish trade unions. The counter-conference ends with a 200,000-strong demonstrations.

26-27 June

There is an influential demonstration against G8 which is held in Canada.

26 August-4 September

The World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) is held in Johannesburg, South Africa, and a counter-summit and protests held simultaneously by civil society organizations.

14 September

Under the banner 'Another world is possible' a day of action and a protest march is held by 40,000 protesters in Cologne, Germany, to protest against process of neo-liberal globalization and against a possible war in Iraq.

27-28 September

In Washington DC, thousands of activists hold a two-day protests against international trading policies while the IMF and the World Bank hold their annual meeting.

28 September

One of Europe's anti-war protests in recent years takes place as approximately 400,000 demonstrators march through the streets of London.

5 October

In Italy, a protest of one hundred cities against a possible war in Iraq draws 1.5 million protesters in a wave of local mobilizations.

26 October

The biggest anti-war demonstrations since the Vietnam War takes place in the USA, as 200,000 people march in Washington, 100,000 people march in San Francisco.

6-10 November

As one of the regional forums planned at the WSF, the European Social Forum is held in Florence, Italy.

14 November

In Sydney, Australia, protests are held as trade ministers from 20 countries arrive for informal trade walks.

15-18 November

The Uruguay Social Forum is held in the country's capital, Montevideo.

20-21 November

A NATO summit in the Czech Republic is marked by a week of actions and demonstrations organized by anti-war protesters.

30 November

Australia's largest anti-war demonstration in recent years is held as 15,000 protesters march through Sydney.

12 December

Demonstrations are held across Italy to protest against the arrest of 20 Italian activists who were centrally involved in the organization of the European Social Forum in Florence, Italy.

12-15 December

During the EU Summit in Copenhagen, an alternative civil society forum is organized by 59 NGO's.

20-22 December

The Moroccan Social Forum takes place in Bouznica, northern Morocco.

27-30 December

The Thematic Social Forum Palestine, which was planned at the World Social Forum, is held in Ramallah, the Palestinian city under siege of by Israel.

2003**2-7 January**

The first Asian Social Forum is held in Hyderabad, Indian.

5-9 January

In Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, the Second African Social Forum takes place, involving people and organizations from 40 countries.

16-19 January

The Second-Pan Amazonic Social Forum takes place in Belem, Brazil, bringing together a wide range of people and focusing on environmental issues and preparations for the Third Social Forum.

23-28 January

The Third World Social Forum is held in Porto Alegre, Brazil, attended by 100,000 people attend from 123 countries, making it the largest social forum to date.

15 February

This claimed to be a global day of mobilization against the war in Iraq. There were approximately 25 million protesters all around the world.

1 March

In Istanbul, Turkey, one of the largest demonstration for the Iraq war is held by civil society organizations, attend by 100,000 protesters. In the same day, government's memorandum was rejected by the parliament.

20 March

Despite strong civil society protests internationally, the US-led war to topple Iraqi president Saddam Hussein officially starts when American missiles are launched against targets in Baghdad. Around the world, anti-war activities are stepped-out.

5-6 April

The First Hungarian Social Forum is held Miskolc, northeastern Hungary.

12 April

In Rome, 300,000 people demonstrate against the war in Iraq, an action organized by Italian Stop The War, in cooperation with international peace groups.

25-27 April

The Uppsala Social Forum takes place, the fourth social forum in Sweden to date, with 3,000 participants from 63 organisations. The possibility of establishing a Nordic regional forum is discussed.

1 May

International Labour Day becomes a platform for anti- war protests.

7-9 May

The Stockholm Social Forum and the Skane Social Forum take place.

10 May

The Belgium Social Forum is held in Brussels.

29 May-1 June

The Austrian Social Forum is held in Hallein, Salzburg.

1-3 June

Around 150,000 protesters demonstrate against the meeting of the G8 in Evian.

7-10 June

The first-ever Portuguese Social Forum is held in the country's capital, Lisbon.

16-20 June

A thematic social forum, conceived at the Third World Social Forum, is held on Democracy, Human Rights, War and Drug Trafficking.

20-22 June

In Thessaloniki, the first Greece Social Forum is held.

23 July

Trade unions in Columbia call for a worldwide boycott of Coca-Cola's products amid allegations that the company has employed militias to murder nine union members in the past 13 years.

6 August

Demonstrations and protests take place against social security reform in Brasilia. They are attended by 80,000 civil servants, with some protesters breaking windows in an attempt to invade the Government Palace.

20-24 August

Caribbean Social Forum is held.

8-9 September

A thematic Social Forum for Global Social Rights takes place in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

10-14 September

The Fifth Ministerial Meeting of the WTO is held in Cancun, Mexico, surrounded by thousands of civil society activists.

19-21 September

The Swiss Social Forum takes place in Friburgo, Switzerland.

25-26 September

The Nigerian Women Social forum takes place in Niamey, Nigeria.

9-11 October

The first Zimbabwe Social Forum takes place in the capital Harare, described by the organizers as a People's Forum for Peace, Reconstruction and Prosperity.

10-11 October

The Second Uruguayan Social Forum takes place in Montevideo.

17-19 October

The first Irish Social Forum takes place in Dublin, Ireland.

24-28 October

The first Brazilian Social Forum is held.

9-10 November

The African Social Forum takes place in Lusaka, Zambia.

12-16 November

The Second European Social Forum takes place in Paris, France.

2004**16-21 January**

The Fourth World Social Forum is held Mumbai, India.

4-8 February

The Third Pan-Amazon Social Forum takes place in Ciudad Guayana, Venezuela.

20 March

An international day of action for peace is marked around the world on the anniversary of the start of the war in Iraq.

21-25 March

'Acting Together for a just World' the CMCUS fifth biennial World Assembly, takes place in Gaborone, Botswana.

7 April

Hundreds of protesters, including people from international peace groups, take part in demonstrations against the building of the barrier wall under constructions by the Israeli government to keep Palestinians out.

Resources:

Yearbooks of The Center for the Study of Global Governance,
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global/yearbook04chapters.htm>;

F. Levent Şensever, *Dünya Sosyal Forumu: Aşağıdan Küreselleşme Hareketi ve Küresel Direniş* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003).

APPENDIX C

World Social Forum Charter of Principles-April 2001 Version

1. The WSF is an open meeting place for reflective thinking, democratic debate of ideas, formulation of proposals, [and the] 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 centered on the human person.

2. The WSF 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 WSF stand in opposition to a process of capitalist globalization commanded by large multinational corporations and by 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 international systems and institutions at the service of social justice, equality and the sovereignty of peoples.

5. The WSF 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 WSF do not deliberate on behalf of the WSF 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 WSF undertakes to circulate such decisions widely by the means at its disposal, without directing, creating hierarchies, censoring or restricting them, but as deliberations of the organizations or groups of organizations that made the decisions.

8. The WSF is a plural, diversified, nonconfessional, 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 WSF 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 WSF 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 WSF 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 WSF 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 WSF 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 WSF 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 WSF 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, Brazil, April 9, 2001

Resource: *The World Social Forum: Challenging Empires*, eds. Jai Sen, Anita Anand, Arturo Escobar, Peter Waterman (New Delhi: The Viveka Foundation, 2004)

APPENDIX D

World Social Forum Charter of Principles-June 2001 Version

1. The WSF 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 directed towards fruitful relationships among humankind and between it and the Earth.

2. The WSF 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 WSF 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 WSF stand in opposition to a process of globalization commanded by large multinational corporations and by governments and international institutions at the service of those corporations’ interests, with the complicity of national governments. 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 international systems and institutions at the service of social justice, equality and the sovereignty of peoples.

5. The WSF 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.

6. The meetings of the WSF do not deliberate on behalf of the WSF 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.

7. Nonetheless, organizations or groups of organizations that participate in the Forums 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 WSF undertakes to circulate such decisions widely by the means at its disposal, without directing, creating hierarchies, censoring or restricting them, but as deliberations of the organizations or groups of organizations that made the decisions.

8. The WSF is a plural, diversified, nonconfessional, non-governmental and non-party context that, in a de-centralized fashion, interrelates organizations and movements engaged in concrete action at levels from the local to the international to build another world.

9. The WSF will always be a forum 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, ethnicities, cultures, generations and physical capacities, providing they abide by this Charter of Principles. Neither party representations nor military organizations shall participate in the Forum. Government leaders and members of legislatures who accept the commitments of this Charter may be invited to participate in a personal capacity.

10. The WSF is opposed to all totalitarian and reductionist views of economy, development and history and to the use of violence as a means of social control by the State. It upholds respect for Human Rights, the practices of real democracy, participatory democracy, peaceful relations, in

equality and solidarity, among people, ethnicities, genders and peoples, and condemns all forms of domination and all subjection of one person by another.

11. As a forum for debate, the WSF is a movement of ideas that prompts reflection, and the 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 proposed to solve the problems of exclusion and social inequality that the process of capitalist globalization with its racist, sexist and environmentally destructive dimensions is creating internationally and within countries.

12. As a framework for the exchange of experiences, the WSF encourages understanding and mutual recognition among its participant organizations and movements, and places special value on the exchange among them, particularly on all that society is building to centre economic activity and political action on meeting the needs of people and respecting nature, in the present and for future generations.

13. As a context for interrelations, the WSF seeks to strengthen and create new national and international links among organizations and movements of society, that — in both public and private life — will increase the capacity for nonviolent social resistance to the process of dehumanization the world is undergoing and to the violence used by the State, and reinforce the humanizing measures being taken by the action of these movements and organizations.

14. The WSF is a process that encourages its participant organizations and movements to situate their actions, from the local level to the national level and seeking active participation in international contexts, 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 in solidarity.

Approved and adopted in São Paulo, Brazil, on April 9, 2001, by the organizations that make up the World Social Forum Organizing Committee.

Approved with modifications by the World Social Forum International Council on June 10 2001.

Resource: *The World Social Forum: Challenging Empires*, eds. Jai Sen, Anita Anand, Arturo Escobar, Peter Waterman (New Delhi: The Viveka Foundation, 2004)

APPENDIX E

Participants in the International Council

DELEGATES

50 Years is Enough!

50years@50years.org

www.50years.org

ABONG - Associação Brasileira de ONGs

abong@uol.com.br

www.abong.org.br

Action Aid International – AAI

mail.jhb@actionaid.org

www.actionaid.org

ACTU - Australian Council of Trade Unions

mailbox@actu.asn.au

www.actu.asn.au

AFL-CIO - American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations

feedback@aflcio.org

www.aflcio.org/home.htm

Africa Trade Network

aidc@iafrica.com

<http://africatradenetwork.com>

AIDC - Alternative Information on Development Center

aidc@iafrica.com

<http://aidc.org.za>

ALAI - Agencia Latinoamericana de Informacion

info@alainet.org

www.alainet.org

ALAMPYME – Assoc. Latino Americana de Pequenos e Médios Empresários

apyme@rcc.com.ar

www.apyme.com.ar

Aliança Por Um Mundo Responsável e Solidário

lille@alliance21.org

www.alliance21.org

All Arab Peasants & Agricultural Co-operatives Union

F76arab@maktoob.com

ALOP - Assoc. Latino Americana de Organismos de Promoção
info@alop.or.cr
www.alop.or.cr

Alternative Information Center
sergio@alt-info.org
www.alternativenews.org

Alternatives
alternatives@alternatives.ca
www.alternatives.ca

Alternatives Rússia
dhrr@online.ru

Amigos da Terra
foe@foe.org
www.foei.org

APRODEV
aprodev@aprodev.net
www.aprodev.net

Arab NGO Network for Development
annd@cyberia.net.lb
www.annd.org

ARENA - Asian Regional Exchange for New Alternatives
arena@asianexchange.org
www.asianexchange.org

Articulación Feminista Marco Sur
mujeresdelsur@mujersur.org.uy
www.mujeresdelsur.org.uy

ASC - Aliança Social Continental
sri_cut@uol.com.br
www.ascahsa.org

Asemblea de los Pueblos del Caribe (APC)
habitatcarib@hotmail.com, pedroarg@tricom.net
<http://movimientos.org/caribe/>

Assemblée Européenne dès Citoyens
cedetim@globenet.org
www.cedetim.org/AEC

Assembléia das Nações Unidas dos Povos
flavio@perlapace.it

Associação para o Progresso das Comunicações
anriette@apc.org
www.apc.org

ATTAC- Brasil
attacsapaulo@attac.org
www.attac.org/brasil

ATTAC France
attac@attac.org
<http://attac.org>

Babels
wfsfm@babels.org

Bankwatch Network
jozseff@bankwatch.org
www.bankwatch.org

CADTM- Comité pour l'Annulation de la Dette du Tiers Monde
cadtm@skynet.be
<http://users.skynet.be/cadtm>

Canadian Council
Jdunn@canadians.org

Caritas Internationalis
caritas.internationalis@caritas.va
www.caritas.org

CBJP - Comissão Brasileira de Justiça e Paz
intercom@cidadanet.org.br
www.cbjp.org.br

CEAAL – Cons. Educação de Adultos da Am. Latina
ceaal@laneta.apc.org
www.ceaal.org

CEDAR Internacional
cedar@asser.nl
www.cedarinternational.net

CEDETIM- Centre d'Etudes et d'Initiatives de Solidarité Internationale
cedetim@globenet.org
www.cedetim.org

Central de Trabajadores Argentinos
cta@rcc.com.ar
www.cta.org.ar

CES – European Trade Union Confederation
etuc@etuc.org
www.etuc.org

CETRI
cettri@cettri.be
www.cettri.be

CIDSE

postmaster@cidse.org

www.cidse.org

CIOSL - Confederação Internacional de Organizações Sindicais Livres

internetpo@icftu.org

www.cioslorit.org

CIVES

cives@cives.org.br

www.cives.org.br

CLACSO

clacsofsm@clacso.edu.ar

www.clacso.org

CLC - Canadian Labour Congress

sbenedict@clc-ctc.ca

www.clc-ctc.ca

CMT – Confederação Mundial do Trabalho

info@cmt-wcl.org

www.cmt-wcl.org

Coligação para a Justiça Econômica

viriatot@zebra.uem.mz

COMPÁ – Convergência de los Movimientos de los Pueblos de las Américas

colectivoredom@hotmail.com

rgf@alum.vassar.edu

<http://www.sitiocompa.org/compa/index.php>

CONAIE

info@conaie.org

<http://conaie.org>

Congreso Nacional Indígena do México

ceatl@laneta.apc.org

Conselho Mundial de Igrejas

info@wcc-coe.org

www.wcc-coe.org

Coordinación del Foro “El Otro Davos”

Page2@fastnet.ch

Coordenadora de Centrais Sindicais do Cone Sul

eduardof@aebu.org.uy

<http://www.sindicatomercosul.com.br/>

Corpwatch
corpwatch@corpwatch.org
www.corpwatch.org

COSATU - Congress of South African Trade Unions
cosatu@wn.apc.org
www.cosatu.org.za

CRID – Centre de Recherche et d'Information pour le Développement
info@crid.asso.fr
www.crid.asso.fr

CUT – Central Única dos Trabalhadores
sri-cut@uol.com.br
www.cut.org.br

Encuentros Hemisféricos contra el ALCA
joel@mlking.sld.cu

ENDA
taoufik@enda.sn
www.enda.sn

Euralat
Criera@aepdc.org

Euromarches
euromarches@ras.eu.org
www.euromarches.org

FAMES
rabia@enda.sn

FECOC - Frente Continental de Organizações Comunitárias
mlongoria@laneta.apc.org

Federación Mundial de Juventudes Democráticas
wfdy@wfdy.org
www.wfdy.org

Fédération démocratique internationale des femmes (FDIF)
fdif@fdif.eu.org
www.fdif.eu.org

Fundación per la Pau/International Peace Bureau (IPB)
mailbox@ipb.org
www.ipb.org

FIAN – Food First International Action Network
fian@fian.org
www.fian.org

FIDH – Fed. Internacional Direitos Humanos
rsanchez@fidh.org
www.fidh.org

Focus on the Global South
admin@focusweb.org
<http://focusweb.org>

FORIM – Forum des Organisations de Solidarité Internationale issues des
Migrations
forim@forim.net
forim@free.fr

Fórum Dakar
Residel.kaolack@sentoo.sn

Forum Mondial des Alternatives
ftm@syfed.refer.sn
www.alternatives-action.org/fma

Forum of the Poor
fopthai@asiaaccess.net.th

Fórum Social Italiano
vagnoletto@lila.it

GLBT South-South Dialogue
dialogo@fedaeps.org

Global Exchange
admin@globalexchange.org
www.globalexchange.org

Global Policy Network
gpn-listowner@epinet.org
www.globalpolicynetwork.org

Global Progressive Fórum
info@globalprogressiveforum.org
www.globalprogressiveforum.org

Grassroots Global Justice
ggj@ggjalliance.org
www.ggjalliance.org

Greenpeace
greenpeace.brazil@dialb.greenpeace.org
<http://www.greenpeace.org/>

Grito dos Excluídos
gritoexcluidos@uol.com.br
www.movimientos.org

Grupo de Trabalho Amazônico
www.gta.org.br

Habitat International Coalition
hic-al@hic-al.org
<http://www.hic-net.org/>

IATP – Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
khoff@iatp.org
www.iatp.org

IBASE
ibase@ibase.br
www.ibase.br

ICAE – Conselho Internacional de Educação de Adultos
icae@icae.ca
<http://www.icae.org.uy/spa/sindex.html>

IFAT - International Federation of Alternative Trade
info@ifat.org.uk
www.ifat.org

IFG – International Forum on Globalization
ifg@ifg.org
www.ifg.org

International Alliance of Habitants
info@habitants.org
www.habitants.org

International Gender and Trade Network
secretariat@coc.org
www.genderandtrade.net

International Network of Street Papers (INSP)
l.maclea@bigissuescotland.com
irn@irn.org
www.irn.org

Instituto Paulo Freire
ipf@paulofreire.org
www.paulofreire.org

IPAO – Institut Panos Afrique de l’Ouest
info@panos-ao.org
www.panos-ao.org

IPS – Inter Press Service
kosi@ips.org
www.ips.org

Jubilee South – Asia
vinod.raina@vsnl.com
www.jubileesouth.org

Jubileo South – África
aidc@iafrica.com
www.jubileesouth.org

Jubileu 2000
kitazawa@jca.apc.org

Jubileu Sul América Latina
keeneba@wamani.apc.org
www.jubileusul.hpg.com.br

KCTU - Korean Confederation of Trade Unions
inter@kctu.org
www.kctu.org

Kenya Debt Network
sodnet@sodnet.or.ke

KOPA
kopa@jinbo.net
<http://antiwto.jinbo.net/eroom/index.html>

Land Research Action Network
wellington@nlc.co.za
wellington@nlc.co.za

MST – Movimento dos Trabalhadores Sem Terra
srimst@uol.com.br
www.mst.org.br

Narmada
subbu@narmada.org
www.narmada.org

National Network of Autonomous Women's Groups
shahnandita@redifmail.com

NIGD - Network Institute for Global Democratization
katarina@nigd.u-net.com
www.nigd.org

North-South Centre
Fifi.BENABOUD@coe.int
www.coe.int/T/E/North-South_Centre

OCLAE - Continental Organization of Latin America and Caribbean Students

oclae@jcece.org.cu
www.oclae.org

Oneworld

jason.nardi@unimondo.org
www.unimondo.org

Organization of African Trade Unions Unity

oauiu@ighmail.com

ORIT – Org. Regional Interamericana de Trabajadores

info@cioslorit.org
www.orit-ciosl.org

OXFAM Internacional

information@oxfaminternational.org
www.oxfam.org

Palestinian grassroots Anti-Apartheid Wall Campaign

mobilize@stopthewall.org
www.stopthewall.org

Peace Boat

y-nami@peaceboat.gr.jp
www.peaceboat.org

Plataforma Interamericana de Derechos Humanos, Democracia y Desarrollo

regional@pidhdd.org
www.pidhdd.org

PPEHRC – Poor People’s Economic Human Rights Campaign

kwru@kwru.org
www.economichumanrights.org
www.kwru.org

Projeto K

Salvatore.cannavo@flashnet.it
ilpanelerose@hotmail.com

Public Citizen

tgeron@citizen.org
www.citizen.org

Red Latinoamericana Mulheres Transformando a Economia

mleon@interactive.net.ec
remte@fedaeps.org
<http://movimientos.org/remte>

Rede APM – Agricultures paysannes, sociétés et mondialisation

pvuarin@fph.fr
www.zooide.com/apm

Rede CONSEU (Conferencia de Naciones sin Estado de Europa)
activitats@ciemen.org

Rede Dawn de Mulheres
dawn@is.com.fj
www.dawn.org.fj

Rede de Solidariedade Ásia Pacífico
intl@dsp.org.au

Rede Latino-Americana e Caribenha de Mulheres Negras
criola@alternex.com.br
www.criola.org.org

Rede Mulher e Habitat
gem@agora.com.ar
<http://www.redmujer.org.ar>

Rede Mundial de Mulheres pelos Direitos Reprodutivos
office@wgnrr.nl
www.wgnrr.org

Rede Palestina de ONGs
bisanrd@palnet.com
www.pngo.net

Rede Social de Justiça e Direitos Humanos
redes@social.org.br
www.social.org.br

Rede Transforme!
elgauthi@internatif.org

Redes Socioeconomia Solidaria
creintjes@ideas.coop
www.reasnet.com

REPEN – Rede de Educação Popular entre Mulheres
repem@repem.org.uy
www.repem.org.uy

Réseaux Sous -régional sur la Dette et les DSRP
jubilecad-mali@cefib.com
baryaminatou@yahoo.fr

SIGTUR - Southern Initiative on Globalisation and Trade Union Rights
rlambert@ecel.uwa.edu.au

Social Watch
socwatch@chasque.net
www.socialwatch.org

SODNET – Social Development Network

sodnet@sodnet.or.ke
<http://www.sodnet.or.ke>

Solidar

solidar@skynet.be
www.solidar.org

Solidarity Africa Network in Action

njoki@igc.org

The International Federation Terre des Hommes (IFTDH)

info@terredeshommes.org
www.terredeshommes.org

TNI – Transnational Institute

tni@tni.org
www.tni.org

TWN – Third World Network

tw@igc.apc.org
www.twinside.org.sg

UBUNTU - Foro Mundial de Redes de la Sociedad Civil

ubuntu@ubuntu.upc.es
www.ubuntu.upc.es

Union Internacional de Estudiantes

ius@cfs-fcee.ca
www.ius-uie.org

Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam Network

vk-finland@kaapeli.fi
www.democracdialogues.org/
www.demokratiafoorumi.fi/wsf.html

Via Campesina

viacam@gbm.hn
<http://ns.rds.org.hn/via/>

World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters (Amarc)

amarc@amarc.org
<http://www.amarc.org>

World March of Women

www.ffq.qc.ca/marche2000/en/index.html
dmatte@ffq.qc.ca

Znet

sysop@zmag.org
www.zmag.org

OBSERVERS

Organizing Committee of the African Social Forum
taoufik@enda.sn

Organizing Committee of the Americas Social Forum
fsmcontinental@fsmecuador.org
www.forosocialamericas.org

Organizing Committee of the European Social Forum
wsf@fse-esf.org
www.fse-esf.org

Organizing Committee of the Mediterranean Social Forum
activitats@ciemen.org
fsmmedi@terra.es

Organizing Committee of the of the Pan-Amazonic Social Forum
cri-pmb@belem.pa.gov.br
www.fspanamazonico.com.br

Organizing Committee of the Thematic Social Forum: Democracy, Human Rights, War and Drug Traffic
forosocialtematico@cable.net.co
www.fsmt.org.co

FNTG - Funders Network on Trade & Globalization
mark@fntg.org
www.fntg.org

Resource:

http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/main.php?id_menu=3_2_1&cd_language=2

APPENDIX F

Consecutive Board of Turkish Social Forum

- 1- BARIŞ ANNELERİ İNİSİYATİFİ
- 2- DEMOKRATİK HALK PARTİSİ (DEHAP)
- 3- DEVRİMCİ İŞÇİ SENDİKALARI KONFEDERASYONU (DİSK)
- 4- DEVRİMCİ SOSYALİST İŞÇİ PARTİSİ (DSİP)
- 5- EMEĞİN PARTİSİ (EMEP)
- 6- EVRENSEL KÜLTÜR MERKEZİ
- 7- GÖÇDER
- 8- HALKEVLERİ
- 9- İNSAN HAKLARI DERNEĞİ (İHD)
- 10- İSTANBUL DIŞ HEKİMLERİ ODASI
- 11- İSTANBUL TABİP ODASI
- 12- İSTANBUL VETERİNER HEKİMLER ODASI
- 13- KARAKEDİ KÜLTÜR MERKEZİ (KKM)
- 14- KAMU EMEKÇİLERİ SENDİKALARI KONFEDERASYONU (KESK)
- 15- KÜRESEL BARIŞ VE ADALET KOALİSYONU (KÜRESEL BAK)
- 16- MEZOPOTAMYA KÜLTÜR MERKEZİ (MKM)
- 17- ÖZGÜRLÜK VE DAYANIŞMA PARTİSİ (ÖDP)
- 18- SOSYAL DEMOKRASİ VAKFI (SODEV)
- 19- SOS ÇEVRE PLATFORMU
- 20- SOSYAL DİYALOĞU GELİŞTİRME DERNEĞİ (SODİGED)
- 21- TOPLUMSAL ARAŞTIRMALAR VE KÜLTÜR SANAT İÇİN VAKIF (TAKSAV)
- 22- TÜRKİYE İNSAN HAKLARI VAKFI (TİHV)
- 23- TÜRK MÜHENDİS VE MİMAR ODALARI BİRLİĞİ (TMMOB)
- 24- TUNCELİ DERNEKLERİ FEDERASYONU
- 25- TÜKETİCİYİ KORUMA DERNEĞİ (TÜKODER)
- 26- TÜRKİYE SAKATLAR DERNEĞİ

27- TÜRKİYE TARIMCILAR VAKFI

28- YEŞİLLER

Resource: <http://www.sosyalforum.org/site/belgeler/cagiricilar.htm>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akinhay, Osman, Özcan Özen, eds. *Dünyanın Bütün Sokakları İsyanda*. Istanbul, Everset Yayınları, 2003.
- Amin, Samir. "Unity and Changes in the Ideology of Political Economy." *Cultural Studies: From Theory to Action*. Ed. Pepi Leistyna. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.
- Appadurai, Arjun. "Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination." *Public Culture* 12:1 (Winter 2000).
- Arrighi, Giovanni, Terence K. Hopkins, and Immanuel Wallerstein. *Antisystemic Movements*. London: Verso, 1989.
- Beck, Ulrich. *The Reinvention of Politics: Rethinking Modernity in the Global Social Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997.
- . *What's Globalization*. Trans. Patrick Camiller. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000.
- Bell, Daniel. *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Bevington, Douglas, Chris Dixon. "Movement-relevant Theory: Rethinking Social Movement Scholarship and Activism." *Social Movement Studies* 4:3 (December 2005): 185-208.
- Biccum, April. "The World Social Forum: Exploiting the Ambivalence of 'Open' Spaces." *Ephemera* 5: 2 (2005): 116-133.
- Blee, Kathleen M., Verta Taylor. "Semi-Structured Interviewing in Social Movement Research." *Methods of Social Movement Research*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- Bora, Aksu and İlknur Üstün. *Sıcak Aile Ortamı: Demokratikleşme Sürecinde Kadın ve Erkekler*. Istanbul: TESEV Yayınları, 2005.
- Bora, Tanıl. *Yeşiller ve Sosyalizm*. Istanbul: İletişim, 1988.
- . "Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler'e Dair Notlar." *Birikim* May 1990: 49-53.
- Boyer, Robert. "The Political in the Era of Globalization and Finance: Focus on Some *Régulation* School Research." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24:2 (June 2000): 274-322.

- Buğra, Ayşe. *İktisatçılar ve İnsanlar: Bir Yöntem Çalışması*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1995.
- Burbach, Roger. *Globalization and Postmodern Politics: From Zapatistas to High-Tech Robber Barons*. London; Sterling, Va.: Pluto Press; Kingston, Jamaica: Arawak Publications, 2001.
- Calhoun, Craig. “‘New Social Movements’ of the Early Nineteenth Century.” *Readings in Contemporary Political Sociology*. ed. Kate Nash. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2000.
- Cassen, Bernard. “On the Attack.” *New Left Review* January-February 2003: 41-60.
- Castells, Manuel. *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.
- . “Materials for an Explanatory Theory of the Network Society.” *The British Journal of Sociology* 51:1 (January/March 2000).
- Castoriadis, Cornelius. *The Imaginary Institution of Society*. Trans. Kathleen Blamey. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997.
- . *World in Fragments: Writings on Politics, Society, Psychoanalysis, and the Imagination*. California: Stanford University Press, 1997.
- . “Öznenin Bugünkü Durumu.” Trans. Ertuğrul Başer. *Birikim* April 1998: 64-87.
- Comaroff, Jean and John L. Comaroff. “Millennial Capitalism: First Thoughts on a Second Coming.” *Public Culture* 12:2 (2000): 291-343.
- Crossley, Nick. “Global Anti-corporate Struggle: A Preliminary Analysis.” *British Journal of Sociology* 53:4 (December 2002): 667-691.
- Currier, Nuchhi R.. “World Investment Report 2002: Transnational Corporations and Export Competitiveness.” *United Nations Chronicle Online Edition*. 2003. 22 July 2006
http://www.un.org/Pubs/chronicle/2003/webArticles/031803_wir.html
- Çayır, Kenan, ed. *Yeni Sosyal Hareketler: Teorik Açılımlar*. İstanbul: Kaknüs, 1999.

- Çelebi, Aykut. "Kamusal Alan ve Sivil Toplum: Siyasal Bir Değerlendirme." *Kamusal Alan*. ed. Meral Özbek. İstanbul: Hil Yayın, 2004.
- De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. trans. Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Demirağ, Dilaver. "Kaçış Çizgileri: Küreselleşme ve Muhalefetin Geleceği." *Umran* February 2002: 69-73.
- Falk, Richard. "The Making of Global Citizenship." *Global Visions: Beyond the New World Order*. eds. Jeremy Brecher, John Brown Childs and Jill Cutler. Boston, MD: South End Press, 1993.
- Faulks, Keith. "New Social Movements." *Political Sociology*. New York: New York University Press, 1999.
- Flood, Andrew. "French Strike Wave: Why not here?." *Workers Solidarity*. 1995. 21 June 2006 <http://struggle.ws/ws/france47.html>.
- . *A Report on the First Encounter for Humanity and against Neoliberalism*. 22 June 2006 http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/andrew/encounter1_report.html.
- . *A Report on the Second Encounter for Humanity and against Neoliberalism*. 22 June 2006 http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/andrew/encounter2_report.html.
- Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: The MIT Press, 1996.
- Graeber, David. "The New Anarchists." *New Left Review* January-February 2002: 61-73.
- Hall, Stuart and Martin Jacques, eds. *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1990.
- Hardt, Michael. "Today's Bandung?." *New Left Review* March-April 2002: 112-118.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001.

- Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1995.
- Held, David, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Perraton, eds. *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999.
- İnsel, Ahmet. "Mayıs '68: Trajedisiz Bir Devrim." *Birikim* May 1998: 45-48.
- . *İktisat İdeolojisinin Eleştirisi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1993.
- . *Neo-liberalizm: Hegemonyanın Yeni Dili*. İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları, 2004.
- Juris, Jeffrey S. "Social Forums and Their Margins: Networking Logics and the Cultural Politics of Autonomous Spaces." *Ephemera* 5: 2 (2005): 253-272.
- Kentel, Ferhat. 'Yumuşak' ve 'Sert' Küreselleşme ve Türkiye. 31 March 2005. 27 August 2006 <http://www.gazetem.net/fkentelyazi.asp?yaziid=214>
- Keskin, Ferda. "Kamusal Alan ve Yalın Yaşam." *Doğu Batı* 2: 5 (November, December, January 1998-9): 105-110.
- Keyman, E. Fuat. *Türkiye ve Radikal Demokrasi*. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 1999.
- Klein, Naomi. "Reclaiming the Commons." *New Left Review* May-June 2001: 81-88.
- Kluge, Alexander, and Oscar Negt. *Public Sphere and Experience: Toward an Analysis of Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere*. Foreword by Miriam Hansen. Trans. Jamie Daniel, Peter Labanyi, and Assenka Oksiloff. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.
- Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso, 1996.
- Laçiner, Ömer. "Anti/Alternatif Küreselleşme." *Birikim* 148 (Ağustos 2001): 23-28

- Lazzarato, Maurizio. "Immaterial Labor." *Radical Thought in Italy*. Ed. Michael Hardt and Paolo Virno. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *Critique of Everyday Life*. London: Verso, 1991.
- . *Everyday Life in the Modern World*. London: Athlone, 2000.
- Lipietz, Alain. *Towards a New Economic Order: Postfordism, ecology, and democracy*. Trans. Malcolm Slater. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993.
- Marchart, Oliver. *Staging the Political: (Counter-) Publics and the Theatricality of Acting*. 2004. 13 July 2006
http://www.republicart.net/disc/publicum/marchart03_en.htm.
- Mertes, Tom. "Grass-roots Globalism." *New Left Review* September-October 2002: 101-110.
- Nalçaoğlu, Halil. "Devrimci Öğrencilerin Özgül Fantezi Uzamı: 'Seattle'a Selam Olsun!'" *Toplum ve Bilim* 93 (Summer 2002): 142-172.
- Nash, Kate. "The Politicization of the Social: Social Movements and Cultural Politics." *Contemporary Political Sociology: Globalization, Politics and Power*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000. 100-155.
- Negri, Antonio. *Kamusal Alanının Yeniden Ele Geçirilmesi*. Trans. Özgür Gökmen. 11 June 2006 <http://www.corotonomedia.net/cor/index.php?id=7,61,0,0,1,0>
- Özbek, Meral, ed. *Kamusal Alan*. Istanbul: Hil Yayınları, 2004.
- Polanyi, Karl. *Great Transformation: The political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Foreword by Robert M. McIver. Boston: Beacon Press, 2001.
- Ritzer, George. *The McDonaldization of Society: An Investigation into the Changing Character of Contemporary Social Life*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press, 1996.
- Sader, Emir. "Beyond Civil Society." *New Left Review* September-October 2002: 87-99.
- Sanlı, Leyla, ed. *Toplumsal Hareketler Konuşuyor*. Istanbul: Alan Yayınları, 2003.

- Scheuerman, William. "Globalization." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. ed. Edward N. Zalta. Summer 2006. 08 June 2006
<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2006/entries/globalization/>
- Sen, Jai. "A Tale of Two Charters." *The World Social Forum: Challenging Empires*. Eds. Jai Sen, Anita Anand, Arturo Escobar and Peter Waterman. New Delhi: The Viveka Foundation, 2004.
- Somay, Bülent. "68: İsrail'in Sûru mu, Bahar Ayini mi?." *Birikim* May 1998: 85-87.
- . *Tarihin Bilinçdışı*. Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2004.
- Starr, Amory. *Naming the Enemy: Anti-Corporate Movements Confront Globalization*. London and New York: Zed Books; Australia: Pluto Press, 2000.
- Sullivan, Sian. "An *Other* World is Possible? On Representation, Rationalism and Romanticism in Social Forums." *Ephemera* 5: 2 (2005): 370-392.
- Şensever, F. Levent. *Dünya Sosyal Forumu: Aşağıdan Küreselleşme Hareketi ve Küresel Direniş*. Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003.
- Thompson, Edward Palmer. *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Vintage Books, 1966.
- Tormey, Simon. "From Utopian Worlds to Utopian Spaces: Reflections on the Contemporary Radical Imaginary and the Social Forum Process." *Ephemera* 5: 2 (2005): 394-408.
- Touraine, Alan. *Post-Industrial Society*. New York: Random House, 1971.
- Daniel Bell, *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. *Handbook of Statistics 2005 On-line*.
<http://stats.unctad.org/Handbook/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=142>.
- Vanaik, Achin. "Rendezvous at Mumbai." *New Left Review* March-April 2004: 53-65.

- Wallerstein, Immanuel. "New Revolts Against the System." *New Left Review* November-December 2002: 29-39.
- Warner, Michael. "Publics and Counterpublics." *Public Culture* 14:1 (Winter 2002): 49-90.
- Whitaker, Chico. "The WSF as an Open Space." *The World Social Forum: Challenging Empires*. Eds. Jai Sen, Anita Anand, Arturo Escobar and Peter Waterman. New Delhi: The Viveka Foundation, 2004: 111-121.
- Wright, Colin. "Opening Spaces: Power, Participation and Plural Democracy at the World Social Forum." *Ephemera* 5: 2 (2005): 409-422.
- Yenal, Zafer and Biray Kolluođlu Kırılı. "Distopyalar ve Ütopyaalar Arasında Karşı Küreselleşme Hareketleri." *Birikim* September 2005: 10-17.
- Yin, Robert K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Foreword by Donald T. Campbell. New Bury Park: Sage Publications, 1989.
- Zekâ, Necmi. *Batı Almanya'da Alternatif Hareket*. Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1985.

