



Report on the Methodological Workshop on Global Civil Society Movements: Dynamics in International Campaigns and National Implementation

UNITED NATIONS RESEARCH INSTITUTE
FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT*

THE PROJECT: CORE ISSUES

As part of the first stage of the Global Civil Society Movements: Dynamics in International Campaigns and National Implementation project, a workshop was held in Buenos Aires on 25–26 November 2004 for the purpose of working out a common theoretical and methodological framework for the national research projects that will constitute an important part of this project. The main objectives of the workshop were to clarify project objectives and to discuss the theoretical and methodological guidelines for research projects as well as proposals for the national projects, which were presented by their coordinators.

The main topics discussed during the two-day workshop are presented below.

1. A brief description of the five core initiatives and movements around which the project is oriented, emphasizing the general type of

problems to be approached and the specific questions raised relating to how the project will be carried out.

2. A review of the main theoretical topics of debate regarding how transnational movements are constituted.
3. The proposals for national research projects made by each coordinator with an analysis of the main difficulties arising in each national context.
4. A summary of the main methodological guidelines for the fieldwork for national projects.
5. An attempt to show the contributions of each national project to the objectives of the project as a whole.

The project, organized by the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), aims at investigating the current status and potential of a series of core initiatives and movements around which social movements on a global or transnational scale tend to coalesce.

* Prepared by Sebastián PEREYRA, with input from Alejandro GRIMSON and Kléber GHIMIRE.

Since the 1970s, UNRISD has paid special attention to processes involving popular participation as an important instrument for carrying out strategies for development.¹ Special interest has been paid to the mobilizing dynamics of actors, such as peasant farmers, workers, and labour unions, as well as to movements involving the urban poor, indigenous groups, and women, among others. Since the 1980s, the main focus has been on democratization processes and the capacity of civil society movements to make resources available to excluded groups and to generate a space for intervention in decision making on public policy and its implementation.

This was the foundation for Elizabeth Jelin's introduction to UNRISD-related areas of research into the Global Civil Society Movements: Dynamics in International Campaigns and National Implementation project. With this as a point of departure, and given the growing international importance of certain social movements, this research project aims to examine how this kind of participation should be characterized. Both experiences with international advocacy networks, whose mobilizing capacity for certain topics such as human rights, the environment, and gender inequality has been evident and growing ever since the 1970s, and the wave of anti-globalization protests and campaigns against international financial organizations that began in the 1980s have been acquiring greater visibility since 1999. This clearly shows the growing international importance of civil society activism. However, the different forms of mobilization and their potential for influencing policymaking, however, have not been sufficiently studied.

Given the growing international importance of certain social movements, this research project aims to examine how this kind of participation should be characterized

The aim of the UNRISD project is to analyze how the series of transnational initiatives, networks, and organizations—commonly referred to as the anti-globalization or alter-globalization movement, or simply the Global Solidarity Movement—have functioned and developed in recent years (Bandler et al. 2004). The core initiatives and movements selected for the project all state, more or less explicitly, their rejection of the globalization processes inspired by neoliberal ideology and its consequences. Their origin is usually situated in the protests in Seattle in 1999, although some researchers point to other precedents,² while yet others indicate the existence of transnational elements in diverse types of movements from the nineteenth century on.³

If a global movement can indeed be said to exist, it needs to consist of an enormous variety of initiatives linked by intermediate structures, such as social forums, counter-information networks, and the like, which provide points of encounter for mobilizing movement components (Rucht 2004). From this

¹The notion of popular participation refers to "... organized efforts by the hitherto excluded to increase their control over resources and regulative institutions" (UNRISD 2003:69).

²Bandler et al. (2004), for example, maintains that these movements began at a counter-summit called "The Other Economic Summit" in London in 1984. For their part, Seoane and Taddei (2001) relate them to the Zapatista uprising in Mexico in 1995.

³Part of the discussion regarding the project was concerned with the novel elements typifying this type of protest and movement in contrast to the "classic" forms of transnational mobilizations, such as the international workers' movement in the nineteenth century or the ecologist and feminist networks along with those linked to human rights, which were very dynamic during almost all the second half of the twentieth century.

heterogeneous group, five specific initiatives of significant relative weight around which international movements have crystallized in recent years will be examined. As was indicated by Kléber Ghimire, the project's coordinator, these are not the only issues that have given rise to international campaigns and continue to do so, but they do represent a good sample of the main aspects of common interest that serve to draw organizations and activists together.

The issues selected for the project are: debt relief, trade rules and barriers, global taxation, anti-corruption and fair trade. These have the following elements in common: (a) they are defined as value-oriented movements (upheld by ethical arguments and essentially reformist in nature); (b) they seek to attract public attention and generate solidarity in their particular areas of interest; (c) as movements they are unstructured and heterogeneous; (d) they are mainly composed of middle-class people from Northern countries; (e) their mobilizing strategies make use of the latest technology; and (f) they combine advocacy activities by drawing up specific proposals (Ghimire 2004).

The first of these five issues arose and gained importance in connection with the foreign debt crisis in the Latin American countries in the early 1980s and the economic austerity programmes applied in the region on the recommendation of international organizations.⁴ However, outside of the debate which took place in peripheral countries, international campaigns on the subject did not appear until the late 1990s. Undoubtedly, the most important initiative on the issue⁵ was the Jubilee 2000 campaign, which involved the mobilization of 122 organizations in 50 countries.⁶ The objectives of the campaign were to gain prominence on the subject of foreign debt

on the international political agenda, and to generate debate and activity around it in countries in both hemispheres. The main idea of this campaign was that the foreign debt of Southern countries should be cancelled or reduced as compensation for the moral (as well as the ecological and social) debt contracted by countries in the North after decades of colonial and imperialist relations with countries in the South.

Initiatives on trade rules and barriers have existed since the 1970s, with discussion centering on the problem of protectionist barriers in the North to free trade with the South. At present, a leading movement is the Trade Justice Movement, based in the United Kingdom and consisting of around 50 organizations with 9 million members throughout the world (Ghimire 2004:7). Another important organization, Oxfam International, has recently launched a campaign demanding market access for poor producers by removing protectionist barriers in developed countries. These and other organizations, such as Focus on the Global South, Third World Network, Global Trade Watch, International Forum on Globalization, Foundation for Science and Ecology, Trade Observatory, and the World Development Movement, have

The issues selected for the project are: debt relief, trade rules and barriers, global taxation, anti-corruption and fair trade

⁴ We have based our analysis of this subject on the work of Reyes Tagle and Sehm Patomäki (2004).

⁵ The parallel summit which took place in Birmingham in May 1998 to protest against a G7 meeting also included a demand related to foreign debt.

⁶ According to several analyses, the idea was advanced in a significant manner in 1996 in the United Kingdom (UK) and was initiated by Oxfam, Christian Aid and the Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD) (Rucht 2004). There is also a general consensus according to which the campaign resonated much more strongly in the Northern countries than in the Southern hemisphere.

sought to bring globalization and trade issues to the forefront. On the one hand, because changes in the global economy have made industrialized economies more vulnerable, relatively speaking, demanding the elimination of protectionist barriers and subsidies for certain activities confronts these organizations with the consequences that a restructuring of non-

competitive productive sectors would bring in its wake in the North. On the other hand, potential alliances with peripheral country governments—which would allow for a stronger negotiating position to achieve the proposed objectives and therefore make resources more available—may place the international organizations at odds with the civil society organizations in peripheral countries that oppose government policy and activity.

The global taxation issue has primarily involved the effort to put into effect the Tobin tax on foreign currency transfers proposed by the *Association pour une taxation des transactions financières pour l'aide aux citoyens* (ATTAC)⁷. Founded in Paris in 1998 following the debate generated by the Asian economic crisis, this association has gained strength in Europe (there were 180 committees registered with a total membership of around 24,000 in France in 2000). But, to date, growth has been limited primarily to Europe, although in recent years 38 branches have been opened in Europe, Africa, and Latin America.

Corruption has also become a subject for transnational mobilization in recent decades. The type of problems included in this category involve large-scale corruption with severe economic



implications and political governance. Transparency International (TI) has significantly monopolized public opinion around international anti-corruption issues and is probably the best structured of all transnational organizations, with the greatest amount of resources at its command. Its international office is in Berlin, with branches in approximately 100 countries (Rucht 2004). The organization's main activity is the publication of a corruption index, along with specific recommendations for reducing corruption in the governments of different countries.

The fifth and final core issue deals with discussions and initiatives related to fair trade. Several organizations and networks have been established around this issue since the 1970s. Fair trade has a dual objective. On the one hand, it is oriented toward eliminating intermediaries that increase costs to the detriment of both producers and consumers, and on the other, it is concerned with organizing producers in poor countries, especially by creating cooperatives, in order to help them gain a foothold in the international marketplace.

There are two types of organizations that intervene specifically on this subject: those that label products, certifying their origin, and those that are dedicated to

⁷Other important but less well-known initiatives are Halifax (Canada), International Cooperation for Development and Solidarity/CIDSE (Belgium), War on Want (United Kingdom) and Tobin Tax Initiative (United States).

What role do the new forms of action (forums, counter-summits, etc.) occupy when defining the features that characterize a movement? What is the degree of continuity and dispersion among activists participating in movements? How are professional and reformist orientations and tactics combined with more radical and even revolutionary ones?

importing products as well as developing and maintaining contact with producers. Among the most important are the following: International Federation of Alternative Trade, European Fair Trade Association, Network of European World Shops, and Peoples' Global Action (PGA) (Rucht 2004; Yilmaz 2004:9). In 2001 there were 2,700 specific shops and around 43,000 supermarkets selling "fair trade" labelled products worldwide (Yilmaz 2004:8).

Beyond recognizing that some organizations have gained a degree of visibility, it was recognized that certain pertinent questions needed to be asked. To begin with, did these initiatives and organizations constitute movements and, if they did, what are their key characteristics? In general, there was a relative consensus for drawing up

guidelines in order to define the very nature of these movements and the political space they seem to occupy. On the other hand, there is little empirical evidence on the following subjects. What role do the new forms of action (forums, counter-summits, etc.) occupy when defining the features that characterize a movement? What is the degree of continuity and dispersion among activists participating in movements? How are professional and reformist orientations and tactics combined with more radical and even revolutionary ones?

At the same time questions were raised regarding how new these movements really were; their main characteristics quite closely reflected the type of conceptualization used to analyze the new social movements that appeared in Europe and the United States during the 1970s. What did appear to be new, nevertheless, was the existence of mass media with an international scope, such as Cable News Network (CNN), which provided an international scenario of visibility for the protests in Seattle, for example. In the same category can be placed such important new technological resources for communication and visibility as the internet and e-mail, which serve not only as resources but also as ways to create the conditions for action.

Finally, an important topic for reflection was how to overcome drawing a too arbitrary dividing line between global and non-global movements. Several proposals suggested concentrating on the dynamics of action of movements or contention politics connected with the different issues, and on how these are linked to different scales of action. Of the many issues involved in the present project, the most important would seem to be the relationship between national (and sub-national) levels of action and international ones. For this reason, in addition to selecting a series of mobilization actions for analysis, it was proposed to follow up the study of the international dynamics of certain initiatives and movements with an

examination of their impact in specific national contexts.

The key questions underlying this research project are:

1. how these mobilizing initiatives are organized on a global scale;
2. to what degree they become crystallized in transnational-type organizations;
3. how they operate and what their intervention strategies are when defining conflicts beyond national borders; and finally
4. to what degree these issues or conflicts are expressed, more or less clearly, in determined national contexts in countries in which there are few historical precedents for this type of movement (France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, the United States, among others).

The first step was to define the scope and characteristics of these new movements, seeking the theoretical factors required to define a social movement, along with its analytical singularities and the challenges posed when debating these issues on a transnational terrain. Secondly, the empirical scope of certain specific campaigns, events, and organizations and their impact on international public opinion were considered, along with their capacity for confronting supranational institutions whose political role is on the increase.

From the perspective of theories on collective action and social movements, two main problems are presented by both global solidarity and anti-globalization movements, the first historical in nature, and the second, conceptual. With

regard to the first problem, Marco Giugni presented an approach that involved using periodization as a mobilization process, the point of departure for this being the series of classical analyses made by Charles Tilly on the transformation from an old to a new repertoire of political confrontation (Tilly 1978; Tarrow 1994). Being derived from the corporative structure of feudal society, the old repertoire was segmented and focused on a particular objective. The new repertoire, on the other hand, was centrally organized on a national political scale, with autonomous (in the sense of having no patron) subjects of confrontation, and was more flexible. This transformation continued through successive phases, leading up to the rise and consolidation of the working-class movement between the early nineteenth century and the mid-twentieth, which, in turn, has resulted in the present situation where certain transnational mobilizing initiatives and movements have begun to come to the fore (Bandler et al. 2004). Obviously, the question is whether this new situation corresponds to a new historical moment or phase in the processes of social mobilization. Does the global solidarity movement represent an important change in the repertoires of collective action? In order to consider this question, reference must be made to its conceptual dimensions.





Regarding the conceptual problem, contemporary theories on social movements—which are not devoid of criticism and debate—are organized around three main concepts: (1) political opportunity; (2) mobilizing structure; and (3) framing processes (McAdam et al. 1996). These concepts represent a basic consensus on the problems facing studies on contention politics. Now, is this conceptual framework suitable and efficient for approaching the main dimensions of present-day transnational movements?

Evidently the notion of political opportunity has always been linked to the analysis of collective movements in a national context, thus giving it a strong state-centred configuration. How can the comprehension or analysis of the concept of political opportunity be broadened to cover transnational movements? Indeed, this problem simply brings to the fore a question that is always present when analysing collective movements: scales of action. The degree to which local, national and international contexts intervene positively or negatively in mounting collective action has to do with the scale of the intervening action and the way movements define conflicts and antagonists.

With regard to mobilizing structure, the problem posed by transnational movements is that mobilizing structures

have become exceedingly complex, making them difficult to analyse and measure their volume; the same problem arises when evaluating mobilization resources. There do exist, however, a few studies in which the rise and functioning of transnational advocacy networks are analysed (Keck and Sikkink 1998).

Finally, the analyses done on the notion of frames have produced important results in recent years; the problem here is to conceive or define the master frames representing shared meaning that crisscross the global solidarity movement. Some authors state, for example, that struggles against neoliberalism or the question of global democracy constitute shared issues for these movements (della Porta 2004; Rucht 2004; Bandler et al. 2004). Even so, the degree to which these general topics link up with particular demands emerging in the mobilizing processes of these movements, or in the more important events—counter-summits or social forums—that constitute moments of interchange and high visibility, remains to be explored (Badler et al. 2004). Key events are also occasions for linking these dimensions with the ones mentioned above, for example, the problem of the national anchorage of participating organizations or the question of the heterogeneity of a movement's social base (della Porta 2004).

In sum, more empirical evidence needs to be gathered before collective actions on a transnational level can be defined. These dimensions have as much to do with the type of relations established among organizations (whether lasting and broad-based in their respective countries or not) as with the ways conflict and antagonists are defined (locally or transnationally) (Tarrow 1999).

One of the characteristics of the present project is that it explicitly sets out to examine this type of question, including how to problematize the relationship between Northern and Southern or peripheral countries. In this sense, analysing the dynamics of mobilization in connection with the core initiatives and movements studied in this project in the context of the selected countries will allow us to study the impact of the campaigns mounted by transnational movements. Contrary to what one might think, international campaigns and transnational organizations do not appear to play a significant role in many Southern countries. In some cases, some of these initiatives and movements do occupy an important place on the public or government agenda. But the issues are not the core object of protest by local movements, nor are specific demands formulated around them. How can this dissociation or gap between the dynamics of transnational movements and the relatively slight impact produced in peripheral countries be overcome? What type of factors should be sought to understand this particular relationship between the dynamics of transnational movements and local civil society dynamics?

NATIONAL RESEARCH

Each national coordinator presented research proposals for the selected countries: Argentina, Bolivia, the Philippines, Senegal and Turkey. The object of these presentations was to show the approach and particular slant proposed by each of the national research projects, along with the particularities of each country's recent experience with social mobilization, which is necessary if valid comparisons are to be made.

Argentina

The strategy proposed for the research project on Argentina was to combine a survey and analysis of organizations and movements with five core issues covered by the project—the Argentine branches of

ATTAC or TI, for example—with an investigation of how these issues have been handled and contentiously problematized in recent years in Argentina. The purpose of this study is to analyse the activity of leading actors in the local context. Within the framework of political democracy and the end of the cycle alternating civilian governments with military dictatorships, on the one hand, and on the other, of neoliberal reform, the panorama offered by social mobilization in Argentina has changed enormously in recent years. In the first place, having suffered from internal strife, labour unions (historically a protagonist in any social movement) have seen their membership, political weight and mobilizing capacity greatly reduced. Secondly, a great deal of social mobilization in the 1990s was carried out by weakly structured, scantily organized social actors. And finally, a singular aspect of the Argentine case has been the emergence and consolidation of important movements of the unemployed, which have gained a prominent position in local political dynamics in recent years.

Within this context the sociogenesis of the core issues with the longest tradition in local politics—undoubtedly foreign debt and corruption—will be depicted in order to avoid the danger of losing the thread when analysing multiple actors

A singular aspect of the Argentine case has been the emergence and consolidation of important movements of the unemployed, which have gained a prominent position in local political dynamics in recent years

with only circumstantial contact with the issues and initiatives under study. Secondly, various actors, movements and mobilization campaigns specifically related to the project's core issues will be studied (ATTAC, Poder Ciudadano, Autoconvocados contra el ALCA). Finally, the evolution of the five core issues and initiatives will be traced with regard to the following actors: (1) organizations of the unemployed or piqueteros; (2) reopened factory movements; (3) indigenous movements; (4) human rights organizations linked to the fight against police repression (the Coordinadora contra la Represión Policial e Institucional/ CORREPI and the Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales/CELS); and (5) the Central de Trabajadores Argentinos (a new umbrella union organization created in the 1990s).

Studying these actors will demonstrate how the core initiatives have unfolded in the Argentine political context. One qualification is that local social actors do not necessarily mobilize around issues according to the way they are defined or problematized by transnational initiatives and movements. Thus, for example, while on the international level corruption is purely and exclusively a problem in the relationship between civil society and the political class, discussions on corruption in Argentina have historically included state organizations, such as the police, which are questioned by human rights organizations. Also notions like fair trade have little relevance in the local context, although terms such as "economy of solidarity" do carry weight, along with various experiences of social mobilization against neoliberal reforms and demanding compensation for their negative outcomes.

Bolivia

The proposal for the case of Bolivia centres around an analysis of the new social movements that have emerged and are playing a leading role in Bolivia today; the majority of these movements are based on demands related to the

The proposal for the case of Bolivia centres around an analysis of the new social movements...based on demands related to the cultivation of coca, water, land and hydrocarbons

cultivation of coca, water, land and hydrocarbons.

This study will examine the transformations that have occurred in the Bolivian social mobilization scenario in recent years. These transformations are linked to two specific confrontation scenarios: the "water war" that took place in April 2000 in Cochabamba, and the "gas war" that took place in October 2003. These two episodes marked the consolidation of new social actors, which then went on to gain power in national politics. These actors include movements made up of Aymara and lowland native people, coca cultivators and the landless, as well as the movement coordinating the defence of water rights.

On the basis of the definition discussed earlier, the case study in Bolivia will analyse the mobilization dynamics linked to each one of the five core issues and initiatives proposed for the project. The impact of the Jubilee 2000 National Forum, which in Bolivia convoked a wide spectrum of social organizations, will be discussed in conjunction with the subject of foreign debt. Among other things, this initiative gave rise to a government-run anti-poverty programme and the creation of a permanent national forum, called the Mecanismo de control social, which monitors government policies. For the core issue of international trade barriers, the mobilization efforts of the Bolivian Movement against NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement), which

came into being as a result of the water war in 2000, will be studied. This movement, which opposes NAFTA (ALCA in Spanish), the Law of Andean Tariff Preference and the Eradication of Drugs (ATPDEA in Spanish), and the Free Trade Treaty (TLC in Spanish), organized a series of encounters that took place in 2002, 2003, and 2004. Thirdly, as is the case of all the initiatives linked to a global tax, ATTAC, whose attempt at operating in Bolivia was not successful, will be studied in order to understand why it failed. The fair trade issue will not deal with trade per se, but instead with land use and ownership, subjects that resonate strongly in Bolivia. These demands are raised principally by the diverse *campesino* and indigenous movements that have grown rapidly in number and importance in recent years. In addition to the study of these movements in themselves, their interaction with *Vía Campesina* and FIAN International (FoodFirst Information and Action Network) with regard to the topic of fair trade will be examined. In all cases, the following three dimensions will be analyzed: (1) How each organization, movement, and network was formed and how they function; (2) a description of specific initiatives or modes of direct action the movements use; and (3) the impact of direct action on the movements.

The Philippines

Employing a similar format, the Philippine study will analyze the emergence, development, and impact of movements related to UNRISD core initiatives and issues. The main objective will be to analyze the structure, institutional values and forms of action of transnational social movements, paying special attention to the modes of action employed in the local context, characterized by the transformations in ways of mobilizing that followed the fall of the Marcos dictatorship in 1986. Transformations include the important role and subsequent institutionalization of peasant movements agitating for agrarian reform. In addition, democratization has made possible local research on the mobilizing capacity of civil

society and its relationship to social movements and globalization.

Within this context, the project will analyse three dimensions of mobilizations that have taken place in connection with core issues and initiatives: the institutional context and political environment for civil society mobilization; an analysis of movement networks, resources and strategies; and the framing processes for collective action and collective identity formation.

These dimensions will be described in the cases selected on the basis of their relationship to core issues and initiatives. Regarding foreign debt, the Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC), which was created a year after the fall of the Marcos regime out of the heat of post-dictatorial discussions during the transition to democracy—as was the case in the

*The Philippine
study...will...analyse the
structure, institutional values and
forms of action of transnational
social movements, paying special
attention to the modes of action
employed in the local context,
characterized by the
transformations in ways of
mobilizing that followed the fall
of the Marcos dictatorship in
1986*

majority of countries that suffered long dictatorships—will be examined. The movement, which is currently made up of 79 organizations with diverse histories, has been the prime mover on the subject of foreign debt; it also played an important role in the Jubilee 2000 National Forum campaign, which was one of the most important initiatives on this topic in the Philippines, as was the case in many other countries. Trade barriers and foreign trade regulations will be studied in connection with different initiatives that appeared during the period when the Philippines was being incorporated into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in 1994. Specifically, three of the many anti-GATT organizations that arose have been singled out for special study, namely, PUMALAG, FTA and SNR.

In the global tax field, support for the Tobin tax, although weak, has given rise to considerable debate and initiatives to reform the local tax system. In this area the case study will become broader by taking into account three types of organizations: (1) NGOs that have participated in the debate; (2) independent think-tanks linked to international initiatives; and (3) several political coalitions (BISIG and BAYAN). Under the anti-corruption theme, both the local branch of TI and a recently formed NGO with a technical-professional profile (TAN) will be examined. Finally, an organization specifically related to fair trade, the Philippines Fair Trade Forum (PFTF) was formed in 2002. It has carried out several initiatives, including a series of alternate trade organizations (ATOs). The achievements of this forum will be critically examined.

Senegal

The interest in the proposal for Senegal is centred around the filters linking local and global conflicts. The analysis will concentrate both on how transnational movements impact on Senegalese politics and on the agenda-setting capacity of local movements in their relationship with international ones. Regarding the latter, priority will be given to locally tracking topics with international repercussions

The interest in the proposal for Senegal is centred around the filters linking local and global conflicts... both on how transnational movements impact on Senegalese politics and on the agenda-setting capacity of local movements in their relationship with international ones

and analysis of Senegalese movements in places where transnational movements are typically found.

Once again, as was the case with the other countries, the core issues and initiatives proposed by the general project have their own weight and history in Senegal. Some of them are firmly rooted locally, while others appear in a more diffused way, intermixed with other sources of conflict. According to the present research proposal, the subject of foreign debt is the most important local issue. The *Conseil des organisations non-gouvernementales d'appui au développement* (CONGAD) has close ties to international organizations and NGOs that deal specifically with the subject, such as the *Conseil pour l'annulation de la dette du tiers monde* (CADTM) and the *Centre national de coopération au développement* (CNCD), both with headquarters in Belgium. Spaces of encounter, such as Dakar 2000: Cancelling Africa's Debt, may offer the best opportunity for analysing the outcome of transnational

relations for mobilizing local forces on a particular issue.

The other subject of growing importance in the Senegalese context is corruption. Since 2003 the *Forum civil sénégalais* (the local branch of TI) has been pushing for the establishment of a government anti-corruption council. The other core issues and initiatives are much more loosely linked to activism in Senegal, where the main mobilizing effort is against privatization.

Turkey

Reorganizing political and social life following a dictatorial process and the implementation of an important wave of neoliberal policies characterize the context within which the impact of transnational movements will be analysed in Turkey. This context is very important because, in the first place, a large part of political projection and visibility of the Turkish civil society is linked to the democratization process. Secondly, many of the issues dealt with by transnational movements are linked to the conflicts generated by the wave of economic liberalization sweeping the country. In particular, the following movements will be considered to examine the traces left by anti-globalization movements in civil society: (a) socio-professional associations; (b) trade unions; (c) non-governmental organizations; and (d) independent political platforms.

As was mentioned above, altermondialista slogans and demands turn up systematically in the national mobilizations against neoliberal policies. This is particularly true with regard to the growing protests against government policy and the international financial organizations that inspired it on the part of professional associations and labour unions. Certain specific mobilization campaigns, such as the Ankara Anti-Globalization Initiative, show how the anti-globalization discourse intersects with opposition to national economic policy.

The panorama is more complex regarding the issues around which NGOs mobilize, where anti-globalization

campaigns have only recently begun to take place. However, the area of independent platforms is where these issues are strongly present. The first of these initiatives, which appeared in 1998 in a campaign opposing the Multilateral Agreement on Investment, has united various NGOs and labour unions that are attempting to generate areas of resistance to certain negative facets of globalization. Their slogans are anti-capitalist, and they defend the independence of political parties. The second, the Global Peace and Justice Commission (or BAK), which has a more professional profile than the first, has been more closely associated with opposition to the war in Iraq than other issues since it was founded in 2003. And a local forum operating in Istanbul since 2002 completes the spectrum of anti-globalization initiatives in Turkey. Besides these initiatives, which are difficult to analyze due to their highly flexible structures, an interesting way of tracing the impact of this type of protest in local politics might be to analyze the makeup of demonstrations protesting relatively specific issues in the country during recent

Reorganizing political and social life following a dictatorial process and the implementation of an important wave of neoliberal policies characterize the context within which the impact of transnational movements will be analysed in Turkey

years, given the fact that even the leading international organizations like ATTAC or TI have very limited presence in Turkey.

In all the case studies, an analysis of the repercussion of specific themes will be combined with an examination of the particular movements present in each national context; the most significant conflicts and most relevant actors will also be studied, along with the way they express differences, distances or absences with regard to the five core issues and initiatives proposed. Above and beyond clarifications and specific questions, each presentation generated questions regarding the criteria for selecting the actors and mobilization campaigns that will be used in each study. Once again, the basic problem that appeared was how the concept of civil society is defined and understood in each country and how close or far this concept is from the theoretical models defining political relevance. The histories, compositions, and political significance of the numerous and various social movements are not always the same in different contexts, and this means close attention will have to be paid to the way actors appear in each study.

METHODOLOGICAL PROPOSALS

Some authors have observed certain factors in the dynamics of mobilization that suggest the rise of new transnational movements (Bandler et al. 2004; della Porta 2004; Rucht 2004). Nevertheless, they all recognize the strong influence national contexts continue to exercise on the development of the movements mentioned, the organizing of their actions and mobilizing campaigns. Consequently, with the incorporation of new transnational dimensions that generate new occasions and resources for contention activity, evaluating political opportunities has become more complex. New frameworks for common action—opposition to the spread of neoliberal-inspired economic policies, for example, or criticism of the non-democratic functioning of the main supranational organizations (Bandler et al.

Defining the dynamics of possible relations between actors, issues and conflicts would seem to be one of the basic problems to be studied in this type of investigation

2004)—have created new forms of action, such as social forums, counter-summits and global action days (Bandler et al. 2004). Organizations and activists, however, continue to have a strong national origin that shows the preeminence of local conflicts and activist traditions linked to national politics in these contexts.

But the growing presence of these new actors and organizational and contention action modalities makes it necessary to take one basic factor into account: the relationship between a movement's different scenarios for action—in a word, between its different scales of action (Jelin 2003). This problem can cover a gamut of issues that run from the general question of how organizations or networks (Keck and Sikkink 1998) whose activists come from different countries function to the more specific problem of how to articulate conflicts—meaning how to define demands or objects of protest, as well as antagonists—that involve actors or problems “situated” in different political spaces (local, national, supranational, etc.). Viewed in this light, defining the dynamics of possible relations between actors, issues and conflicts would seem to be one of the basic problems to be studied in this type of investigation.

At another level, one goal of this project is to explore in greater depth the impact of transnational issues on the

national or sub-national contexts in Argentina, Bolivia, the Philippines, Senegal and Turkey. As we have seen, in this area the proposals set forth by the coordinators suggest two different analytical approaches. In the first, the characteristics transnational campaigns and organizations assume in local political contexts are examined by asking such questions as: What is the relationship between the branches and the headquarters of a transnational movement or organization? How is networking handled in the different organizations? How are actions at different nodes in the network coordinated? How important are local conflicts in defining an organization's agenda? The second approach analyses the ways in which these initiatives and contentions are defined or expressed in different spaces with different scales of action, comparing the results with the activity of actors firmly anchored in the local or national political context with little international relevance. Here some of the questions asked are the following: How are general mobilizations translated into action in local contexts? How do prior history and conflict definitions influence the mobilization efforts of certain actors? How do actors arising out

At another level, one goal of this project is to explore in greater depth the impact of transnational issues on the national or sub-national contexts in Argentina, Bolivia, the Philippines, Senegal and Turkey

of a local context import issues from other conflicts and make them their own?

From a more strictly methodological point of view, the significance of the factors indicated above were linked to the kinds of approach used in national studies, and the problems involved in assuring that results are comparable. The presentation of these methodological aspects emphasized five main factors.

The first was the way each of the five core issues and initiatives defined for the project would be adapted to each national context. The idea was not to predetermine the relevance of the core issues based on the repercussions of certain specific campaigns or the presence or impact of certain transnational actors, but instead to take into account how the initiatives were translated into action in each national context and how they related to local conflicts. In other words, how the cultural and political conditions of each country help or render more difficult to mobilize around certain initiatives or to concentrate on some issues at the expense of others.

The second factor to be taken into account has to do with giving priority to whether specific actors exist and analysing their main dimensions.

Third, the way mobilization campaigns are organized and how certain conflicts are presented and alliances with other actors established are key elements in this type of analysis.

Fourth, priority has also to be given to analysing the kinds of impact mobilizations have, both in terms of setting public or government agendas and passing laws, and in relation to changes in strategy on the part of actors in local conflicts or sectorial protests, setting up networks, the capacity to initiate or maintain protest cycles, etc.

Fifth, as a general rule it is necessary to maintain a certain autonomy and distance while carrying out the projects, since one of the classic problems in this kind of study is the nature of the interaction established between the researcher and actors.

Finally, there is the question of the theoretical (and also political) problems



inherent in the projects. This point refers both to the way in which national studies can contribute to the general discussion on transnational movements (especially by presenting a perspective that is usually underrepresented) and to the contributions of national projects to the broadening of the scope of academic, technical and political debate in the countries themselves. In this sense, a large part of the research results should be useful and merit visibility in the countries themselves, where the present approach should be both theoretically and methodologically interesting to university researchers and professors, and research results could generate spaces for reflection among government officials, social activists, etc., all of which would increase social awareness on the part of the public at large.

The above was the basis for the methodological discussion, which focused, in the first place, on the problem of

participation in, and the organization of, the movements. In this type of movement, mobilization structures are usually a problem, since networks tend to be flexible and participation fluctuates widely. In addition, in terms of mobilization, there is always a gap between claims and actual results involving international movements, including branches, events or encounters and action days. In other words, mobilization takes many changing forms (more or less spontaneous, more or less individual, etc.), and needs to be approached in such a way so as to take these different aspects into account.

The second topic discussed was the importance of considering the national dimension of initiatives and movements. In this sense, national studies were mentioned as a good way to complement investigations that

concentrate on analysing international mobilization events, since it is there where what movements and participants represent in their own context can be seen. It is also nationally and sub-nationally that is determined whether or not initiatives and issues can be reappropriated and in what ways. Focusing on these dimensions means including in the analysis factors extraneous to the research project itself, such as how mechanisms for, and sources of, financing affect the unfolding of a certain initiative or activity, and how national traditions of social contestation translate or influence the transnational movement agenda, etc.

Following this, several operational aspects of the projects were discussed in order to homogenize methodological criteria and delineate common research techniques. All national proposals involve a great variety of objects of study, which makes it necessary to multiply research techniques. Not only actors, their

dynamics, composition and history, but also mobilization campaigns, public debates and scenarios that constitute spaces for encounters among actors should be examined. Given the fact that one indispensable component of each study will be an extended period of field work, the techniques for collecting and analysing data best suited to each particular object of study were also considered.

When analysing actors—in this case social movements—it is important that documents produced by the organizations are analysed, and contact with activists and in-depth interviews or systematic meetings with key informants carried out. For this reason, it may be important to have recourse to direct observation or ethnographic analysis in order to correlate actors' discursive consciousness with its practical effect. At this level, subjects do not present a reflexive view of themselves; instead, the investigator infers how the actor is viewed on the basis of the kinds of knowledge and understanding that the actors utilize or mobilize.

Also, social actors are considered not only in the light of their own definitions, but also in that of the meaning given their actions in public opinion. In general, social movements are identified by other actors on the basis of mobilization campaigns or the organizing of protest action. The meaning of these actions goes beyond the intentions of the actors themselves, and therefore it becomes necessary to analyse the sources where these actions are recorded. The sources are many and not always easily accessible. Furthermore, with few exceptions, they are not simply sources for one actor, but rather the result of the activity of different actors, each with its own interests and points of view. For this reason, what the documentary source is and how reliable it is should be clarified when analysing the available research material—public records, archives, and mass media, among others.

Only the use of multiple research strategies guarantees the reliability of the results, so qualitative methods of this kind may not be the only interesting way to

analyse movements. To the degree possible, the use of questionnaires and the generation of information that can be statistically processed is usually an important way to characterize a movement's makeup, along with the value judgements of its activists, etc.

Finally, the scope of the methodological strategies used for each project will depend on the research plan drawn up by each national coordinator. But a number of central guidelines discussed earlier should be followed in all the studies, and the techniques for collecting and analysing data must conform to certain general parameters in order to insure the comparability of results.

CONCLUSIONS

A variety of conclusions emerged from the meeting. In particular, it was agreed to relativize the idea of a global movement or movements linked to each of the five core issues and initiatives. Within the context of transnational initiatives based in Europe or even of public debates in European countries, it does make sense to speak of a global solidarity or anti-globalization movement, involving a variety of actors, activists or networks. But the diversity and heterogeneity with which those issues and initiatives arrive in the Southern hemisphere are much more problematic. Indeed, it would almost seem to make more sense to speak of an agenda of transnational movements that does not coincide with the agenda of movements at the national or sub-national level in the selected countries. Thus, the basic problem for research is to examine how claims and demands are advanced at global and national levels and how their agendas meet or do not meet. Looking at one level of contentions and movements is clearly not sufficient when seeking to analyze the overall dynamics in contemporary anti-globalization movements in general, and in particular the five movements considered in the research.

In theoretical terms, contemporary discussion of collective action and social movements would seem to be the most fruitful framework for analysing protest movements and solidarity campaigns. A constant effort is required, however, to continue problematizing the way in which its main concepts are applied to diffuse changing and scantily structured contexts, such as those that appear on the international or transnational scale of action. In the light of these fluctuating contexts, problems such as the redefinition of the concepts of political opportunity, mobilization structure or frameworks for action are key to this kind of study; but problematizing the idea itself of social movement in this type of context might be interesting. For example, are networks, organizations or issues (the master framework or specific demands) the primary factor for identifying and characterizing a movement? Is the definition of an antagonist in a conflict as the one responsible for a situation perceived as unjust define a given movement as global or transnational? Or is it the multiplication of a movement's grassroots support in different countries? Or is it the movement's repercussion in international public opinion?

These types of issues should be considered in undertaking national studies. But it is also imperative that local peculiarities do not prejudice the project as a whole and its comparative value. In this regard, preparing short sociopolitical sketches to accompany the final text of the five nation projects would be one way to provide key references, commonplaces and shared codes for each country. The following are some of the points that should be kept in mind to insure comparability. The scope of the concept "civil society" should be specified in order to avoid misunderstanding. Simply referring to the distance separating civil society from state or market rationales is not sufficient, since historical and political variables generally intervene in the scope granted civil society in each context. For example, are unions part of civil society or entrepreneurial organizations? Generally

civil society is thought to be made up largely of NGOs, but NGOs can be markedly heterogeneous in nature. Associations can be financed by private enterprise rather than the state or different branches of government. Do minimum levels of shared solidarity what serve as the core of movements and organizations? Is there a link between movements and a project of transition to democracy or of democratization in different countries?

The complexity is infinite, and a certain clarification would seem indispensable regarding the political history of each country and that of its social movements. In this regard, taking into account the presentations and discussions during the workshop, the role played by certain factors in a movement's activity should be considered. For example, is neoliberalism characterized in the same way in all contexts? Does it always apply the same policies for the same type of social and economic reorganization? Is the same kind of social inequality always produced? In order to depict the dynamics of cooperation and confrontation that civil society movements and organizations maintain with the state and the market, some kind of political characterization and history, brief but specific, is needed.

In operational terms, it was agreed that in each of the five countries the final version of research outlines would be ready by the end of February 2005. As proposed in the UNRISD project, during 2005 each country will carry out fieldwork and data analyses, with a preliminary report of results to be submitted to UNRISD between November and December 2005. At this time the first of the three newsletters that each country will put together in order to make known its activities and the specific materials used for ongoing investigation will appear (the second should appear in April 2006, and the third, in September of the same year).

On the basis of the preliminary research reports, a new meeting will be planned, the tentative date being January 2006, coinciding with the time of the World

Social Forum. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the harmonization of the results produced in each country and the development of common issues and instruments for analysis and greater visibility of research results.

At the national level, a major stakeholder meeting will be held between July and August 2006, in which representatives of public organizations, universities, movements, and other social actors will be invited. Taking into account the comments at this meeting and from other sources, the national report will be finalized for publication during the second half of 2006.

The debates, discussions, and conclusions drawn during the two days of this meeting in Buenos Aires resulted in—as we have attempted to show in this report—the accumulation of an important common store of work that made possible the synergy between objectives, theoretical points of interest, and methodological approaches for the UNRISD project, along with clarification of the proposals made by national research coordinators and the main challenges and important contributions contained in these proposals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bandler, M., N. Eggert and M. Giugni. 2004. *The Global Solidarity Movement: How Far Does the Classic Social Movement Agenda Go in Explaining Transnational Contention?*, mimeo.
- della Porta, D. 2004. *The Social Bases of the Global Justice Movement*, mimeo.
- Ghimire, K.B. 2004. *The Contemporary Global Social Movements: Emergent Proposals, Connectivity and Development Implications*, mimeo.
- Jelin, E. 2003. "La escala de la acción de los movimientos sociales." In E. Jelin (ed.), *Más Allá de la Nación: Las Escalas Múltiples de los Movimientos Sociales*. Libros del zorzal, Buenos Aires.
- Keck M.E. and K. Sikkink. 1998. *Activists beyond Borders*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- McAdam, D., J. McCarthy and M. Zald. (eds.). 1996. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Reyes Tagle, Y. and K. Sehm Patomäki. 2004. *The Rise and Development of the Global Debt Movement: A North-South Dialogue*, mimeo.
- Rucht, D. 2004. *Transnational Movements: Challenge of and Adaptation to a Changing Environment*, mimeo.
- Seoane, J. and E. Taddei (eds.). 2001. *Resistencias Mundiales*. De Seattle a Porto Alegre. CLACSO, Buenos Aires.
- Tarrow, S. 1994. *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Mass Politics in the Modern State*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Tarrow, S. 1999. *International Institutions and Contentious Politics: Does Internationalization Make Agents Freer or Weaker?* Presented to the Panel on Coping with World Transitions, American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Tilly, Ch. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Addison-Wesley (Mass.), Reading.
- United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD). 2003. *Research for Social Change*. UNRISD, Geneva.
- Yilmaz, M. 2004. *Le Commerce Equitable*. UNRISD, Geneva, mimeo.

ANNEXI: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Carina BALLADARES
 Directora Ejecutiva del Programa
 de Liderazgo Comunitario del
 Centro Cultural Konex
 Avenida Córdoba 1235
 Ciudad de Buenos Aires C1055AAC
 Buenos Aires, Argentina
 tel + 54-11-4813 1100, int. 251 y 253

plc@centroculturalkonex.org

Kléber B. GHIMIRE
United Nations Research Institute for
Social Development (UNRISD)
Palais des Nations
1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland
tel + 41-22-917 29 74 • fax + 41-22-917
06 50
ghimire@unrisd.org
Marco GIUGNI
Department of Political Science
University of Geneva
102 Boulevard Carl-Vogt
1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland
tel + 41-22-379 9914 • fax + 41-22-379
8364
marco.giugni@politic.unige.ch

Alejandro GRIMSON
Instituto de Desarrollo Económico y
Social/Universidad de San Martín
Aráoz 2838/C1425DGT
Buenos Aires, Argentina
tel + 54-11-4804 4949 • fax + 54-11-
4804 5856
agrimson@fibertel.com.ar

Elizabeth JELIN
(UNRISD Board Member)
Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones
Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET)
University of Buenos Aires
Buenos Aires, Argentina
tel + 54-11-4831 7423 • fax + 54-11-
4833 1220
elijelin@mail.retina.ar

Fernando MAYORGA UGARTE
Director General
Centro de Estudios Superiores
Universitarios/
Universidad Mayor de San Simón
(CESU/UMSS), Calama 0235, Casilla
5389
Cochabamba, Bolivia
tel + 591-4-4252951/4116866; + 591-4-
4246367 (home); + 591-71721743 (cell)
fax + 591-4-4254625
fermayorgau@hotmail.com;
cesu@pino.cbb.entelnet.bo
fer.mayorga@cesu.umss.edu.bo

Teresa S. Encarnacion TADEM
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
College of Social Sciences and Philosophy
University of the Philippines-Diliman
P.O. Box 210
Quezon City 1101, The Philippines
tel + 63-2-9280110 • fax + 63-2-
9283014
tsetadem@surfshop.net.ph
Sebastián PEREYRA
Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones
Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET)
Universidad de Buenos Aires
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Ibrahima THIOUB
(CODESRIA)
Université Cheikh Anta Diop (UCAD-
FLSH)
BP 5005
Dakar – Fann, Senegal
tel + 221-860 05 26 (home); 221-569 20
09 (cell)
tel + 221-824 39 77 (office) • fax + 221
8240741
ceddo@tekrur.org

Nuri Zafer YENAL
Sociology Department
Bogaziçi University Lojmanlari
A-Blok No. 22
Cengiz Topel Cad., Ucaksavar-Etiler
Istanbul, Turkey
tel + 90-212-358540/ext 2316
fax + 90-212-2656357-4494
zyenal@boun.edu.tr