Nike for its workplace practices in contrast to its huge executive salaries and payments to sports stars, and the high profit margin on each pair of shoes sold (Grenfell 2001, p. 243). Students in North America and Australia are obviously not as disadvantaged as the workers in the Nike factories of Indonesia, whose material interests are championed by these students in the United Students Against Sweatshops (USA and Canada) and the regular Friday evening blockades of Sydney's and Melbourne's Nike stores, which involve 'lively and creative' street performance as a means to protest the 'appalling exploitation' of workers in Nike factories throughout Southeast Asia (*Green Left Weekly*, 27 June 2001, pp. 5, 27). Yet today's protesters are also expressing their own grievances. The demands they pose are as suitable for their situation as were the very different demands posed by the students in the ascendant era of the new social movements.

At a time when socio-economic differences have become more rather than less marked, it seems appropriate that the new anti-capitalist movement is choosing to encourage identity in the way the old anti-capitalist movement did and in the manner of the new social movements. Both the old anti-capitalist movement (the pre-war labour movement) and the more recent new social movements utilised effectively the power of language to present claims and articulate needs. The new anti-capitalist movement, like its predecessor, is mobilising people by voicing grievances which are primarily socio-economic (Burgmann 2001a). This class consciousness of 'a new and hitherto undreamed of kind' is a form of class identity politics and, with the aid of the technology associated with globalisation (Dyer-Witheford 1999, pp. 42–71; Shostak 1999), could well have far greater potential for mobilisation than the burgeoning labour movements of a century ago.

New styles of protest?

> [A]n advance rather than a retreat from earlier traditions of Australian protest . . . S11 was technologically-wired, decentralized, internationally-connected, carnivalesque, and able to supplement 'traditional protests' with a range of electronic and 'virtual' interventions.[11]

The new technology
A common theme in denunciation of anti-capitalists is their use of new communications technologies to coordinate their mobilisations. The

implication is that acceptance and use of this technology ought to entail uncritical appreciation of all aspects of globalisation and gratitude towards capitalism for developing it. The anti-capitalists respond that labour also produced this technology, that its benefits have flowed disproportionately to capital and that its potential for greater social usefulness is restrained by capital's ownership and control of it.

The computer technology that has made globalisation possible could be applied in ways that reduce working hours and/or increase wages and salaries through productivity gains. However, because this technology is undergoing rapid expansion at a time when neo-liberal orthodoxy allows capital uncontested freedom, it is used not only to facilitate global financial speculation but also to downsize workforces and to eliminate or weaken unions, frequently resulting in increased working hours and workloads for those remaining. The benefits of the new technology are not shared with those working with it but used by employers to increase levels of exploitation and control over employees. Ken Hirschkop argued in 1996 that the democratic and liberating potentials of the new technology are fettered by the fact that 'the form of the network and the structure of computing equipment is determined first and foremost by the needs of the state and capitalist corporations' and that, for corporations, this new mode of communication is also a new mode of exploitation (Hirschkop 1996, pp. 92–93).

Moreover, the new technology will only be rendered compatible with democratic imperatives when everyone has access to a computer. Not only are the power structures of society replicated in cyberspace, but 95 per cent of cyberspace activity is still related to the hold of capital on the human condition (Prince 2000, pp. 2–3). The outcome of the political struggle mounted by the anti-capitalist movement will determine whether the new technology can be used for the benefit of all rather than the enrichment of the few. Technology will have a role in this struggle, but it offers no shortcuts: one cannot download democracy from a website (Hirschkop 1996, p. 98).

The new technology is nonetheless proving useful in the struggle against the power of corporations for whom the new technology is primarily a means to increase exploitation. For Ken Hirschkop:

The true political claims for the new technologies lie in the belief that they make possible an access to information, and an international form of interaction that is not politically neutral, which is inherently democratizing. For if informed discussion of a more or less unhindered kind is critical to democratic life, then a

technology that fosters it can only work to the advantage of the forces of democracy (Hirschkop 1996, p. 25).

The usefulness of the new technology for the anti-capitalist movement first became evident with the rise of the Zapatistas. Utilising the Web and the Internet, Subcomandante Marcos became a compulsive communicator, constantly reaching out, drawing connections between different issues and struggles. There are now at least 45 000 Zapatista-related websites, based in 26 countries, and Marcos's communiqués are available in fourteen languages (Klein 2000b, p. 25). The new technology enables the internationalism of the anti-capitalist movement to flourish. Peter Waterman argues that global information capitalism provides 'favourable terrains' for internationalist social movements, which utilise these 'spheres of information' for truly useful and democratic purposes—unlike their opponents. Moreover, 'the relational principle of networking is the one appropriate to social movements today, particularly insofar as they are concerned with an international/ist challenge and alternative to capitalist globalisation' (Waterman 1998, pp. 214–16; 2001, p. 1).

Recently, Jonah Peretti's argument with Nike was spread around the world courtesy of the Internet, becoming one of many tales of individual electronic resistance. As such stories accumulate, they contribute to collective online mobilisation. Nike offered to personalise shoes with an individually chosen word or phrase, stating that this program was 'about freedom to choose and freedom to express who you are'; accordingly, Peretti sent Nike $50 to stitch 'sweatshop' on to his shoes. Nike persistently refused his repeated request that Nike respect his freedom of expression—a refusal that, as one forwarder commented, would go round the world much farther and faster than any of the advertisements for which Nike paid Michael Jordan more than the entire annual wage packet of all their sweatshop workers in the world.

The new technology adds a diversity of *tactics* to a movement already diverse in terms of organisations and individuals. This movement, as Trish Stringer (2001) notes, contains the activist hacker who engages in virtual sit-ins, clogging access to a website maintained by corporate interests, but also the Indian peasant group that burns a field of Monsanto terminator seed cotton. New technologies such as the Internet, email and fax are greatly strengthening the ability of 'netwar' groups to communicate rapidly with each other, disseminate information to target audiences and collect intelligence on their opponents, but these technologies are not simply

replacing older technologies such as the photocopier, press, shortwave radio, face-to-face meetings and couriers, which still play very important roles. What is occurring is 'an admixture of different technologies, that allows the group the most effective and efficient communication possibilities' (Stringer 2001, pp. 12, 4).

Cyberpunk techniques have been adopted and practised worldwide by political 'hactivists'. One of these is adding messages to official websites, such as a hack of China's human rights agency's new website in October 1998 which read: 'China's people have no rights at all, never mind human rights.' Another technique is 'cyber civil disobedience' or 'electronic civil disobedience', which takes the form of flooding or blocking traffic to a given website, an art perfected by the Intercontinental Cyberspace Liberation Army and the UK Electro Hippies, who organised a 'virtual sit-in' as part of the Seattle protests, and had over 137 000 participants on 1 December (Starr 2000, pp. 77–78). More conventional 'e-protest' takes the form of email and fax jamming, where large faxes (e.g. protest letters written one word per page) and email messages are sent to targets to disrupt routine flows of information (Smith, J. 2001, p. 15).

The Internet is crucial in organising each anti-capitalist mobilisation. Susan George notes of the lead-up to Seattle:

> Throughout 1999, thanks primarily to the Internet, tens of thousands of people opposed to the . . . WTO united in a great national and international effort of organisation. Anyone could have a front seat, anyone could take part in the advance on Seattle. All you needed was a computer and rough knowledge of English (George 2000, p. 53).

The eruptions at Seattle appeared like a spontaneous explosion to the outside world; however, it was in fact electronically well-planned and coordinated — evidence of the benefits of the new technologies in organising resistance to those who would monopolise the benefits of those technologies.

Although only 5 per cent of the world's population has access to the Internet, 42 per cent of the Australian population in 2001 had Internet access from home and more, presumably, from their workplace or an Internet café. A 'key tool' in the success of S11, according to the *Australian* (16–17 September 2000, p. 4), was 'its sophisticated use of the www' (Iveson and Scalmer 2000, p. 4). Jason Gibson and Alex Kelly maintain that creative applications of Internet technology during the S11 protests demonstrated the

ability of the Net to function not only as an organisational tool, but also as a form of civil disobedience in cyberspace (Gibson and Kelly 2000, p. l0).

For example, in mid-2000, an elegant piece of hacking diverted all those who logged on to Nike.com to the protest site run by the S11 Alliance (Powell 2000, p. 4). Over the next nineteen hours, www.s11.org received almost 90 000 hits. S11 'cyber-warriors' also set up a site using the name 'Melbourne Festival', as well as sites that attracted those mistyping 'Olympics—<olympisc.com>—or searching for the 'Melbourne Trading Post—<melbournetrading post.com>. 'In all of these cases,' record Iveson and Scalmer, 'surprised browsers were faced with announcements on the protest action, analysis, and links to further information.' The advance publicity became an avalanche: 'Net surfers barrelled to the S11 site.' In the first two weeks of September, the S11 website was the 400th most popular website in the world (Iveson and Scalmer 2000, pp. 6–7).

New technology not only provides the anti-capitalist movement with improved organising capacity, but also alternative means of communicating with those outside the movement. Trish Stringer has examined the Independent Media Center sites (www.indymedia.org), a network that has grown from the one original site that opened in Seattle in November 1999. The movement argues that the mainstream media are pawns of corporate interests and that they regularly reveal bias in selection of stories, the omission of important information and the falsification of news information. According to http://www.indymedia.org: 'The main stream media has consistently lied about the growing wave of anticapitalist protests.' Stringer notes:

> While corporate media coverage of the manifestations of this movement focuses on the so-called black-clad anarchists destroying property, the independent media centers give a more holistic view of events, and allow for a more democratic version of the media, where anyone can post news, thoughts, images, analysis. These sites are a central location of the discourse of the antiglobalization movement (Stringer 2001, pp. 4–5).

The bulk of the Australian media that covered the S11 protests against the WEF meeting are owned by members of the WEF (Gibson and Kelly 2000, p. 11). As the S11 protesters discovered, the movement could not trust the mainstream, especially commercial, media to report accurately its ideas and actions. There was a stark discrepancy between the protesters' personal

experiences at the protest and the media reportage. The media, according to *Australian Options*, 'chose to present the protesters as a group of marginalised, wild and radical luddites determined to stand in the way of progress'. Many who participated felt that the media coverage distorted the true nature of the event, encouraging further scepticism about the capacity of the media to report accurately (*Australian Options* no. 23, November 2000, p. 1). An Adelaide lawyer stated: 'It would seem that the eyewitnesses and the mainstream media were at completely different events . . . It was like a well orchestrated propaganda exercise.' The upshot was that the majority of Australians were left with impressions that unruly mobs with no real idea of what they were protesting about were disrupting a lot of respectable people trying to hold an important meeting about how to make things better for everyone, including the world's poor (Mead 2000, p. 29).

New technology provides protesters with a comeback. Recognising the need for independent media coverage of S11, a coalition of individuals and people from different community media organisations formed Melbourne IndyMedia—an online media channel which allowed and encouraged everyone to be a journalist by a simple click on the 'publish' button. (Unfortunately, IndyMedia Melbourne worked unfunded, whereas the Seattle IndyMedia Centre had a budget of over US$70 000.) Within minutes, photographs, text, video and audio material could be uploaded for all to see, reply to and add to within the one website: 'Creating this space for audience control has harnessed the inherent qualities of hypertext—unlike the majority of online news services, which remain overwhelmingly one-way in their transmission' (Gibson and Kelly 2000, pp. 10–11). Protesters were able to proclaim alternative versions of S11 on the melbourne.indymedia.org website (Iveson and Scalmer 2000, p. 12).

An S11 website also carefully articulated the meaning and importance of non-violent direct action. Although journalists and police referred to this website to destabilise the plans for the demonstration, and critics of S11 continually republicised information openly available at www.s11.org as if it were part of a secret, sinister plot, Iveson and Scalmer maintain that the S11 movement managed to use this site to publicise an independent interpretation of the protests and garner advance publicity—even notoriety—both in Australia and overseas. The strategies were varied, but united by a technological aptitude and by a sensitivity to the interests and tastes of the mainstream media for news (Iveson and Scalmer 2000, pp. 5–6). As Gibson and Kelly concede, the old media was important in publicising and drawing attention to the new—highlighting the fact that, although the Net is an

important new tool, activists still largely rely on coverage in the traditional media and cannot rely solely upon the emerging communications networks (Gibson and Kelly 2000, p. 10).

The new technology has provided the movement with novel means to organise, mobilise and communicate its views directly to the public it seeks to influence. However, the new technology has not displaced older forms of organisation, mobilisation and political communication. The organisers interviewed by Bramble and Minns were adamant that the traditional face-to-face meetings were more important for planning the protests than the Internet or email. They also emphasised the role of leafleting, postering, stalls, speaking in university lecture theatres, graffiti runs, press conferences, media releases and benefit gigs—all long-standing methods of building protests (Bramble and Minns 2002, p. 10).

Jeff Sparrow disputes the depiction of S11 as 'a complete break from the traditions of the past . . . a new paradigm of protest, in which computer savvy culture-jammers took to the information superhighway rather than the street'. In fact, he argues that S11's organising took place in campaign meetings in overheated rooms, where organisations and individuals debated and declaimed and harangued until they hammered out a consensus, a process familiar to the activists of the 1960s. During the Forum itself, blockaders confronted a trifecta of issues the left has long faced: the violent role of the police; the bias of the media reporting; and the Labor government siding with the powerful, even against its own supporters. The significance of S11, he concludes, stemmed not from the novelty of information technology—useful though that technology was—but because S11 'forced something of a return to first principles' (Sparrow 2000, pp. 19–20).

The S11 movement also defended itself in the face of this trifecta of problems, not just in cyberspace but also in time-honoured ways like writing letters to newspapers about the misreporting. According to Iveson and Scalmer, it worked the mainstream media with skill, anticipating the conflicts that erupted over police tactics. Legal observers were present throughout the three days, and dozens of protesters carried photographic equipment to capture evidence of police aggression. Video footage was distributed to mainstream television stations (Iveson and Scalmer 2000, p. 9). At least three documentary videos of S11 have been produced (SKA TV 2000; Socialist Alternative 2000; Actively Radical TV 2000). On behalf of S11, the Fitzroy Legal Centre is preparing a response to the Ombudsman's inquiry into police violence.

Perhaps the most far-reaching effect of the new technology is that it

facilitates the ultra-democratic organisational inclinations of the movement. Writing about the Melbourne IndyMedia coverage of S11, Gibson and Kelly emphasise the importance of speedy feedback for a movement where all protesters are equal: 'Unlike radio, television or newspapers, where feedback is slow or non-existent, electronic forums such as this ensure quick interaction among all participants' (Gibson and Kelly 2000, p. 11). This movement, Stringer notes, 'is composed of small-scale decentralized groups integrated into a network which is supported by dense communication and organized through collective ideologies and ethics about the evil nature of the corporate state and the need to protect citizens and the environment from exploitation through democratic action'. It is organised through non-hierarchical models, and has no central location or leadership (Stringer 2001, p. 12).

Ultra-democracy

> These mass convergences were activist hubs, made up of hundreds, possibly thousands, of autonomous spokes. The fact that these campaigns are so decentralised is not a source of incoherence and fragmentation. Rather, it is a reasonable, even ingenious, adaptation both to pre-existing fragmentation within progressive networks and to changes in the broader culture.
>
> One of the great strengths of this model of *laissez-faire* organising is that it has proven extraordinarily difficult to control, largely because it is so different from the organising principles of the institutions and corporations it targets. It responds to corporate concentration with a maze of fragmentation, to globalisation with its own kind of localisation, to power consolidation with radical power dispersal (Klein 2000a).

The protesters' emphasis on democracy is a logical corollary of their arguments about the undemocratic nature of corporate power. The statement by the S11 protest movement read out by Vandana Shiva stated:

> The World Economic Forum (WEF) claims that it is not a decision-making body. We know that this is untrue. The WEF includes the richest corporations in the world, which have a huge and disproportionate influence not only on government decisions but on the food we eat, the air we breathe, whether we have a living wage or not. The WEF doesn't need to be a 'decision-making body'

to affect our lives and the lives of people all around the world (Shiva 2000).

The S11 Alliance emphasised that: 'The WEF exemplifies decision making at its worst—big business and governments making decisions behind closed doors with little or no involvement from the people affected by their actions' (poster quoted in Grenfell 2001, p. 241).

Very different is the protesters' commitment to participation, transparency and decentralisation. Although the precise manner of organising protests against corporate power has little impact compared with the manner of corporate decision-making, the movement is dedicated to expanding democracy and pursuing means that are in complete harmony with its desired ends of increasing people's power and control over matters that affect them. Graeber argues that this movement aims to reinvent democracy and that it is not lacking in a coherent ideology, as many detractors claim:

> Those new forms of organization *are* its ideology. It is about creating and enacting horizontal networks instead of top-down structures like states, parties or corporations; networks based on principles of decentralized, non-hierarchical consensus democracy (Graeber 2002, p. 70).

In practice, mobilisations typically comprise a multitude of 'affinity groups'. S11 explains that:

> Affinity groups are small (3–20 people), autonomous groups of people with a common identity or cause, who take part in actions and support each other. Their actions can take place within mass demonstrations or on their own (S11 Alliance/S11–AWOL, n.d., p. 8).

Each affinity group is represented at spokescouncil meetings that decide the general plan of action for the each protest; but each affinity group is autonomous and decides collectively for itself the nature of its contribution to the protest. Andrew Ure describes the process:

> Affinity groups, or clusters of affinity groups, delegate one person to be a 'spoke'. The 'spoke' is not a 'representative'—someone with the authority to formulate policy on the group's behalf—but a 'delegate'—someone whose job it is to enunciate the group's policy.

The purpose of a spokescouncil is to allow the various groups from which it is formed to exchange ideas and to communicate their intentions. It can be a lengthy process, involving continual consultation between the affinity group, its spoke, and the spokescouncil. All 'decisions' are by mutual consent; there is no 'voting' other than as a means to determine how different groups think or feel about particular proposals. This constitutes one important difference between the spokescouncil and the mass meeting (Ure 2002, p. 5).

According to S11, advantages of affinity group structures include: elimination of feelings, and dangers, of isolation; provision of support (emotional, physical, tactical, etc.); they are harder to infiltrate by undercover police and corporate-sponsored saboteurs; greater flexibility in responding to changing conditions during the action; and they are 'highly democratic and autonomous' (S11 Alliance/S11–AWOL, n.d., p. 8). Affinity groups resemble strategies used in earlier movements—notably the late nineteenth-century Spanish anarchist movement (Smith, J. 2001, p. 10; Ure 2002, p. 2). That they are emphasised by the anti-corporate movement as an organisational principle indicates the important contribution of anarchist theory and practice to the new anti-capitalism. Indeed, David Graeber insists: 'Anarchism is the heart of the movement, its soul; the source of most of what's new and hopeful about it' (Graeber 2002, p. 62).

The use of computer technology has facilitated and enabled the tendencies of the movement to ultra-democratic organisational forms. However, more than this, as Naomi Klein has argued, the decentralised networking is imitative of the patterns of computer-based systems of communication:

Although many have observed that the recent mass protests would have been impossible without the Internet, what has been overlooked is how the communication technology that facilitates these campaigns is shaping the movement in its own image. Thanks to the Net, mobilizations are able to unfold with sparse bureaucracy and minimal hierarchy; forced consensus and laboured manifestos are fading into the background, replaced instead by a culture of constant, loosely structured and sometimes compulsive information-swapping. What emerged on the streets of Seattle and Washington was an activist model that mirrors the organic, decentralized, interlinked pathways of the Internet— the Internet come to life (Klein 2000a).

Klein's analysis of the problem — capitalism — is Marxian to a degree and she is insistent upon the crucial role of unions, of workers organising collectively to contest their exploitation: 'The most important principle in a labour context is the right to form unions' (Klein 2001b, p. 12). Yet she, too, is heavily influenced by anarchist theory, hence her enthusiasm for the decentralised method of organising, the diversity of the groups working together and the lack of a 'party line' (Rea 2001, p. 40). She asks that Marxists involved in the movement meet the anarchist types halfway: 'I see some groups co-operating with some of the street-level activists, but they're still waiting for them to see the light, and that's just co-optation, not co-operation' (Klein 2001b, p. 12). However, she concedes that the decentralised method of organising has its weaknesses, and recalls a moment during the anti-World Bank/IMF protests in Washington on 16 April 2000 when some affinity groups decided to attempt to maintain the blockade and others decided to join a march elsewhere. The lack of coordination contributed to the weakness of both options (Klein 2000a).

Amory Starr has no reservations. She stresses the importance at Seattle of the principle of 'coexistence' — the acknowledgement that groups with different messages, tactics and skills can coexist without centralised organising:

> That coexistence was the material of the blockade's success. Everyone who participated has now experienced the anarchist alternative to bureaucratic top-down systems. We saw self-organization at work and it worked (Starr 2000, p. 16).

Anarchism has achieved a new lease of life, aided by new technology suited for realising its organisational inclinations. It is appropriate that the major anarchist presence within the S11 movement — S11-Autonomous Web of Liberation — should choose a name redolent of this technology. It describes itself as a 'non-hierarchical, decentralised and autonomous network' (S11 Alliance/ S11–AWOL n.d., p. 2). It is committed to consensus-based decision-making, supporting affinity groups and individual actions, working in solidarity with other S11 groups, opposing corporate globalisation and capitalism, shutting down the world economic forum, and celebrating freedom, creativity and life ('S11–AWOL' leaflet; see also www.antimedia.net/s11awol).

The cell-like organisational structure of S11 proved, according to Amartya Sen, a successful way of bringing together 'a convergence of different agendas and ideas together in one forum' (cited in Mier 2000, p. 27). At S11, affinity groups included: Buddhist Peace Fellowship; Monsanto Clause — jolly

fat men; Feminist avengers; Snuff puppets; Plant seeds—guerilla gardening; AWOL performance paratroopers; S11 stencil—Stencilling the Eastern Suburbs; Shut Up and Shop; Rapid Response Team—theatre crew; Victorian Greens; Queer; Unite; Revolutionary Valley Girls; Neo-luddites; Critical mass; and Benevolent Action for Neo-Humanism. According to Tracey Mier, the organisation of the WEF blockade via affinity groups, the cell structure and the use of the Internet confirmed the S11 Alliance's 'commitment to promoting and adhering to democratic principles and practices, which focus on individual participation and rights'. Had the S11 Alliance not adhered to such democratic principles, 'one of the core ideologies behind the blockade would have been undermined' (Mier 2001, pp. 23, 27).

Consonance of form with content is indicated here in the insistence that protests affirming the importance of democratic accountability must be organised on the most thoroughly democratic principles possible. Moreover, such consistency of organisational method with political purpose is in fact a prerequisite for practical success, as Mier stresses. If the organisation of the blockade were undemocratic, not only would it defy its own principles, but 'it would have failed to attract the diverse groups and the number of participants required to undertake the WEF blockade' (Mier 2001, p. 27).

S11, according to Guy Rundle, was the first protest in the anti-capitalist series in which the decentralised affinity group structure meshed effectively with a tightly coordinated marshalling structure throughout the protest. This occurred despite some mistrust between the command-structure organisations (such as the socialist groups) and the decentralised and participatory groups. Many people in the latter groups believed the marshals were overstepping their defined role of keeping the crowd informed as to the balance of forces around the various entrances and exits, and were actively commanding, yet the marshalling system was largely adhered to, which minimised confusion and ensured effective blockading. He believes this 'clear tactical advance on Seattle' is due to the lesser degree of hyper-individualism of Australians, who therefore modified the affinity group model that was developed as a way of accommodating the fragmented nature of American identity politics (Rundle 2000, p. 2). Some degree of centralised organisation also overcomes the problem that the affinity group structure discourages and disadvantages unattached individuals who have no affinity group. However, participants on the AWOL side of the S11 movement remain critical of residual 'vanguardist' tendencies of those sections of the S11 Alliance that have come from socialist movements with a Trotskyist heritage, such as the Democratic Socialist Party and the International Socialist Organisation (personal communications).

There is the possibility, too, that dedication might counteract some of the disintegrative effects of anarchic organisation. The true novelty of the ultra-democratic method of organisation is not so much the anarchic methods in themselves but the marrying of these forms of organisation with an urgency of political commitment and anger. The more anarchic and libertarian protests of the 1960s, which Julie Stephens has characterised as 'anti-disciplinary politics', engaged in a language of protest which rejected hierarchy and leadership, strategy and planning, bureaucratic organisation and political parties; but it was also distinguishable from the New Left of its time—and from the contemporary anti-capitalist movement—by its ridiculing of political commitment, sacrifice, seriousness and coherence (Stephens 1998, p. 4).

Nearly three months before the event, on 24–25 June, S11-AWOL ran 'Direct Action Skill Sharing Workshops' on 'urban activism, non-violent blockading and tactics, puppet making, your legal rights, and how to organise with your friends to make an affinity group'. Through such intensive activities, it aimed to facilitate action and provide support and empower people with information and tools to enable them to most effectively shut down the WEF:

> S11 AWOL is a non-hierarchical, decentralised and autonomous network. We are committed to taking direct action for social and environmental justice through creative resistance to capitalism. ('S11–AWOL' leaflet; see also www.antimedia.net/s11awol).

One cannot imagine the 'psychedelic Bolsheviks' of the 1960s bothering to attend training workshops in non-violence, first aid and legal observation—or even those promoting intensive skills in puppet-making and banner hanging. The greater seriousness amongst anti-capitalists today—flamboyant and theatrical styles and anarchic organisational methods notwithstanding—reflects a heightened sense of despair about the state of the world.

A 'global carnival against capital'

> The movement uses celebration as a form of protest, creating moments in which people control public space . . . There are constant efforts to educate fellow global citizens through fliers, symbolic challenges to corporate franchises, performances and dialogue (Starr 2000, p. 99).

In mid-2000, in preparation for S11 and to take advantage of the Olympic Games, the Sydney-based Campaign Against Corporate Tyranny United in Struggle (CACTUS) arranged an anti-Nike protest in a shopping mall with a monster papier-mâché head of Juan Antonio Samaranch (with a swastika tie and a dummy) running a race between the demon Olympic sponsors: Nike, Shell and Coca-Cola (Powell 2000, p. 4).

Theatrical forms of protest have long been a common feature of social movement action, requiring a kind of cultural analysis known as 'dramaturgical analysis' (derived from anthropology, performance studies or literary studies) and applied to the more dramatic or ritualistic dimensions of movements. However, the new anti-capitalist movement appears to have raised the theatrical component to a new level:

> Guerilla theater played an important role in the Seattle protests and took several forms . . . The Direct Action Network promoted puppet making, contributing to the festive atmosphere while providing opportunities for creative, irreverent, and often humorous activism. Finally activists risked arrest and safety by scaling buildings and scaffolding to display massive banners (Smith, J. 2001, pp. 12–13).

S11 protesters, Melbourne 2000 (Susan Hawthorne, copyright 2000).

> I stood in the oil capital of Canada at the world petroleum
> conference demonstrations and watched as Edmonton's troupe of
> gender-bending cheerleaders waved pompons and went about their
> impeccably choreographed routines, the Queers Against Oil
> chanted anti-development slogans, fifty activists pulled their pants
> down spelling out 'wind power now!' and later organised Team
> Earth to play against Team Shell at the base of the company's
> glimmering skyscraper in a traffic-stopping hockey game for the
> fate of the planet (Couch 2001, p. 39).

Commentaries on S11 also emphasise the carnivalesque elements of the
protest:

> There were clowns, ten-foot puppets and twenty-foot dragons.
> There was an effective blockade. Dance music blared from mobile
> speakers (*The World Today*, 11 September 2000, quoted in Iveson
> and Scalmer 2000, p. 4).

> A mass blockade with street parties, music and performances
> surrounded crown casino during a week of counter conferences,
> events and celebrations (*Farrago*, vol. 79, no. viii, p. 21).

> The collaboration of community artists for S11 brought a vibrant,
> creative element to the protests, which celebrated humanity.
> Cyclists for Sustainability, Valley Girls, giant puppets, percus-
> sionists and the Monsanta Claus proved that while S11 protesters
> were deadly serious about the business going down inside the
> Casino, they could still have a laugh (Krishnapillai 2000, p. 8).

Such stunts and gimmicks have developed in part out of 'culture jamming'—
the practice of using the tools of commercial culture against it, in an effort to
raise awareness about the grip that consumerism has on Western culture
(Szeman 2001, p. 1). In the United States, mock ads in the quarterly
magazine *Adbusters* have for some time highlighted issues such as the lies of
the killer tobacco lobby, the reality behind the destructive body images
perpetuated by the media and advertising, and the environmental
destructiveness of an automobile-obsessed culture (http://adbuster.org/
spoofads/misc). Kalle Lasn argues that the glut of images and information in
the 'mental environment' today produces a widespread social malaise that has

S11 protesters, Melbourne 2000 (Susan Hawthorne, copyright 2000).

to be confronted in order to restore human 'Being' to a more natural, harmonious balance (Lasn 1999).[12] However, as Imre Szeman points out, culture jamming is a fundamentally aesthetic practice that focuses on the cultural at the expense of the political (Szeman 2001, pp. 7, 9). On its own, culture jamming does not confront the power of those who produce the images parodied; in harness with a political movement that does, the ability of such techniques to encourage people to ponder the nature of the world created by those forces could be more productive.

Kevin McDonald suggests that the place of puppet-making in the anti-corporate movement indicates it is an 'experience movement', where the struggle for subjectivity is at the centre of the struggle for relationship, rather than a 'social movement'. For McDonald, the new movement defies social movement analysis because it is an experience movement characterised by resistance to deindividualisation—opposition to new uncertainties about the experience of selfhood. He argues that the puppet-making is 'performative action, constituting and expressing an experience' aimed at recovery of 'personal wholeness', which can be analysed in terms of an experience of connection yet autonomy that allows a process of reconnection with the self and the other (McDonald, K. 2001, esp. pp. 2, 15).

S11 protesters, Melbourne 2000. (Susan Hawthorne, copyright 2000).

However, puppet-making is a collective and highly political project directed towards achieving social and political change: identifiable social movement ends. Gigantic puppets are created because they contribute to the success of anti-corporate mobilisations. If making them also assists protesters' psychological well-being, this is partly because the protesters think they are worthwhile creations because they make a political difference. Jenrose Couch argues that art, symbolism and humour are no longer just ornaments, 'but are now an integral part of contemporary resistance' (Couch 2001, p. 39). Writing about S11, Damian Grenfell and Anita Lacey explain:

> Activists frequently create a sense of playful irony in order to undermine the legitimacy of their targets. Light-hearted props and costumes, such as puppets and clowns, are at times accompanied by shoulder-to-shoulder resistance to create dramatic spectacles (Grenfell and Lacey 2000, p. 9).

Apart from the intended effect of the images created on the viewing public, the process of making these enormous puppets brings activists together and

therefore encourages solidarity; they are also a much-needed form of entertainment necessary to encourage participation and sustain protests such as blockades of high-level meetings, which require a degree of fortitude not normally demanded of simpler demonstrations.

Melbourne's S11 protesters join the global carnival against capital, September 2000 (Susan Hawthorne, copyright 2000).

Moreover, there is nothing entirely new about such creations and processes of creation as an accompaniment to social movement action. Use of grotesque effigies as protest is centuries old (Rollison 1992). The flamboyant style of 1960s radicalism and its enduring legacies are well documented (Stephens 1998). As Couch notes, if you examine the movement 'you will find borrowings everywhere'. For social movements do not spring from a void: 'Ideas and repertoires, however novel they may seem, always grow out of what has gone before' (Couch 2001, p. 40). For example, the preparation and sharing of food, which McDonald also emphasises as indicative of a novel 'experience' movement, has historically been a common feature of strike actions—an important function that both affirms identity/solidarity and is practically helpful to the outcome of the strike. Most recently, at the MUA picket lines and at the S11 protest, the Food Not Bombs collective performed this *traditional* role. Furthermore, Food Not Bombs offers a more rather than less political inflection to this time-honoured function by announcing: 'If the Government sends in the Army what better message can we send than Food Not Bombs' (S11 Alliance/S11–AWOL n.d., p. 4).

Serious political activism is contained within the carnivalesque, and these theatrical tactics draw on previous generations of protest. This is illustrated by Jenrose Couch in the following story:

> Two people dressed in elaborate carnival costumes sat thirty feet above the roadway, perched on scaffolding contraptions that were covered by huge hoop skirts. The police standing by had no idea that underneath the skirts were guerilla gardeners with jackhammers, drilling holes in the highway and planting saplings in the street. The Reclaim the Street-ers had made their point 'beneath the tarmac a forest', a reference to the Paris 68 slogan 'beneath the cobblestone a beach' (Couch 2001, p. 40).

Although a puppet-maker from the Art and Revolution collective insists that the traditional protest, the march, the rally and the chants are 'bad theatre' (quoted in Couch 2001, p. 40), in practice they remain part of the anti-corporate repertoire—one of the many ways by which the movement is able to draw in a range of activists, including those more comfortable with the 'bad theatre' of earlier styles. Thus the theatrical styles of protest not only have antecedents; they *supplement* rather than *replace* more staid forms of mobilisation. Most importantly, the carnivalesque tactics are put to earnest political purpose. Couch notes of the Reclaim the Street incident that to some passers-by this was

probably seen as kids with nothing better to do cutting up the street, 'but to others this new era of theatrical DIY politics is distinguished by creativity, self-organisation, coalition building and the will to take on global capitalism'. She argues further that the theatre and dances and music that have punctuated both the Zapatista rebellion and the anti-corporate movement enables maintenance of a movement that will not be compromised (Couch 2001, pp. 39, 41).

That earnestness motivates the dramatic is especially apparent when anti-capitalists stage events that are structured around the borrowing of official templates. At Seattle, there was the 'People's Assembly' to parallel official deliberations and the 'Global People's Tribunal on Corporate Crimes Against Humanity' to 'bring to trial' corporate practices around the world, with witnesses such as a sweatshop worker from the Philippines and a farmer from India discussing the effects of Monsanto's seed-marketing practices (Smith J. 2001, p. 14). Such stunts bring to mind feminist parodies of momentous documents, such as Olympe de Gouges' 1790 'Declaration of the Rights of Woman and Citizen' and the 1848 Seneca Falls Declaration of Independence of the American women's movement. In Melbourne, Public First, Earthworker, South Movement and the S11 Alliance sponsored 'The People's Conference', presented as 'The Alternative to the World Economic Forum', on 9 September from 8.00 a.m. to 5.30 p.m. Its workshops focused on Labour & Trade Union Rights; The Environment; Social Security/Basic Minimum Income; International Issues; Alternative Economics; Gene Ethics/GM Food; Health; Education; Democratic Rights; Public Housing; and Protecting Communities. Its keynote speakers were from the CFMEU, the Gene Ethics Network and the Australian Fair Trade & Investment Network. Now, on a massive international scale, there are the annual meetings of the 'World Social Forum' in Porto Alegre in Brazil, which have grown each year since they commenced early in 2000.

Seriousness of purpose is in fact generally behind the theatrical and carnivalesque. Iveson and Scalmer note that reporters on the scene at S11 found it difficult to categorise the actions going on around the Crown Casino. ABC journalist Damien Carrick observed:

> It was like a carnival most of the time. And yet every now and again the atmosphere turns when buses or cars try to enter, and the protest becomes quite serious and the atmosphere changes quite dramatically. And then five, ten minutes later it changes back again, so the atmosphere is really quite strange (quoted in Iverson and Scalmer 2000, p. 4).

The 'party-protest combination', described by Iveson and Scalmer, proved successful in helping to mobilise people for the protest and in keeping them entertained during long days of blockading the Casino (Iveson and Scalmer 2000, p. 11).

The press emphasis on the allegedly *novel forms* expresses media preference for the novel. This much is obvious. Less obvious is the way in which the emphasis on *form* serves to some extent to enable the media deliberately to pay less attention to the *content* of the demonstration. For example, the papers reported more fully the content of the speeches at the trade union rally at S11 because its form was, frankly, less interesting. Obviously, the demonstrators do not wish the medium to drown the message. The world might well be watching, but is it able to hear? Amidst the sound and fury of those three days that stirred—if not shook—Melbourne, the protesters' precise arguments about the iniquitous consequences of neo-liberal globalisation scarcely registered in coverage of the events, with the exception of the trade union rally.

However, although the protesters themselves could hardly be heard, the issues they raised were nonetheless placed in the public arena. The three days of blockade, protest and carnival made the entire event a contested site, according to Rundle, and 'filled the newspapers and conversations of the city with discussions of globalisation, labour rights, Nike, the state and civil disobedience, trade unions and social movements' (Rundle 2000, p. 2). And the spectacular nature of the protest ensured the issue would remain in the public consciousness. To this extent, the theatrical garb in which the messenger was dressed—distracting and disturbing though it initially was—ultimately made it easier for the messenger to be heard, because the messenger could not be ignored. Scalmer and Iveson note that 'although coverage of the protest itself focused overwhelmingly on the action itself, it also created a new space for discussion and debate about globalization in the wider public sphere' (Iveson and Scalmer 2000, p. 12).

In the final analysis, the theatrical styles are a politically appropriate retort to the extremist parades of neo-liberal capitalism. The images by which capitalism now markets itself as a system and as a way of life are arguably grotesque in their arrogant celebration of the fact that capitalism enriches the few, yet impoverishes the many. Increasingly ostentatious displays of corporate wealth are flaunted without embarrassment; the lives of the enormously rich are the staple fare of uncritical media commentary while the misery of the millions in poverty is either ignored or depicted as somehow their own fault. The fate of share markets is now reported on television news

in the same manner as the weather, an example of the absurdist way in which the most parasitic and speculative aspect of capitalism presents itself both as a natural phenomenon and as one worthy of broad public interest. The monstrous imagery of the system is necessarily countered with equally fantastic counter-imagery. The global carnival of capitalism has created its own spectacular antithesis in the global carnivals against it.

The problem of police violence

There are clear dangers ahead for the movement against corporate globalisation, highlighted by the killing of a protester by a paramilitary police officer at the mobilisation in Genoa in July 2001. Earlier, in Gothenburg in Sweden, live ammunition was fired without warning against protesters whose cause was supported by tens of thousands there in the streets and millions throughout the world. Several people were seriously wounded (Bircham and Charlton 2001, p. 1). At the 'Battle of Seattle', the thousands who captured the streets sustained clouds of tear gas, volleys of rubber bullets, concussion grenades, high-powered bean cannons and straightforward beatings with riot batons (St Clair, pp. 82, 85–86). At the same time, a barrage of media condemnation denounced the protesters and associated them with 'violence' (McNally 2002, p. 25).

Australia had its taste of extreme tactics at S11 on the part of the police guarding the WEF. The S11 website was at pains to explain the benefits and objectives of direct non-violent protests and to emphasise that non-violence not only entails refusal to comply with injustice but also refusal to act in a violent manner (Mier 2001, p. 29). Yet, even before the protests began, S11 was painted as unlawful, reckless and set to engage in an activity that was framed as morally indefensible. Such reporting not only encourages police to get their retaliation in first, but serves to excuse them if they do. Grenfell and Lacey's analysis of the press coverage of S11 argues it was bound by parameters that served to challenge the validity of the protests (Grenfell and Lacey 2000, p. 9; see also Cahill 2001). 'SHAMEFUL', blared the *Herald Sun* headline reporting of the first day, which went on to explain that police were 'forced to use their batons during clashes with violent sections of the crowd' *Herald Sun*, 12 September 2000, p. 1). The *Australian* claimed thousands had 'laid violent siege' to the Crown Casino and its editorial accused the protesters of 'hypocrisy' for their 'violence and denial of free speech' (*Australian*, 12 September 2000, pp. 1, 10). Reality and representation bore little relation to each other. Iveson and Scalmer note that 'the S11 protest was anything but

Police at the S11 protest, Melbourne 2000 (Susan Hawthorne, copyright 2000).

the violent, derivative, stupid, incoherent action that the media, the State and business wanted it to be, prophesied it would be, and tried to claim that it was' (Iveson and Scalmer 2000, p. 12).

Thus, while the press played up the possibility of violence perpetrated by protesters, police wielded batons against passive demonstrators. Reverend Dr Peter Matheson of the Uniting Church said he had never witnessed such police 'brutality' (*Australian*, 21 September 2000, p. 29). An eye-witness described the 'state-sponsored police riot' that occurred on the evening of the Tuesday, which the newspapers declined to report:

> Just after sunset some 500 police, mainly in riot gear, and what appeared to be every mounted copper in the State attacked a group of protesters without warning. The police, devoid of name tags, issued no warnings . . . This completely unprovoked assault, with the use of batons to the head and deliberate trampling of people resulted in at least 18 serious injuries, 13 people were taken to St Vincents and the Alfred Hospital ('S11: Through Their Eyes Only' 2000, p. 20).

A five-foot-three inch nurse who was injured in a similar police charge at dawn, recalls that, without warning, 'the police had turned on us, the majority of us women, with a sharpness and violence that was terrifying . . . I was dragged

along Spencer Street by my hair, dodging vicious kicks and thumps to the back of my head . . . from batons and men twice my size' (Lyell 2000, p. 17).

A few empty plastic bottles were hurled by a small number of protesters, but there was no throwing of dangerous objects such as stones. Fewer than

Police at the S11 protest, Melbourne 2000 (Susan Hawthorne, copyright 2000).

twenty people, including several nude streakers, were arrested. Yet, over the three days, the legal team took over 500 statements from people assaulted by police or witnesses to such mistreatment. One of these lawyers, Damien Lawson, summarised the incidents that 'shocked' the legal team:

> Nearly four hundred people were injured by police with over fifty requiring hospital treatment. Injuries included broken and fractured bones, concussion and people losing consciousness, neck and back injuries, extensive bruising and shock. Actions by the police included charging the crowd with horses, the use of batons to hit and jab people, punching, kicking and even biting. In a number of cases police drove their vehicles through crowds at high speed; in one case police ran over a young woman and then sped off.

The Victorian *Crimes Act* 1958 (s. 462A) allows police to use reasonable force to prevent an indictable offence; it does not give police the right to use force to prevent a summary offence. The people concerned were committing, at most, summary offences; therefore the police action was unlawful. Significantly, the legal team noted 'the systematic removal of identification badges by almost all police throughout the protest' (Lawson 2000, pp. 14–15).

An ABC television journalist reported:

> The police say that they have been provoked through the day. They claim that protesters had showered them with urine on one occasion, and thrown ball bearings and things. But at the protest last night where the police charged I saw none of that. A few protesters threw empty plastic bottles, but that was the only protester violence that I saw (quoted in Iveson and Scalmer 2000, p. 9).

When commercial media outlets alleged protester violence, the Indymedia site provided a different account, 'of creative and non-confrontational actions overlooked; of a successful blockade; and of police baton-charges and provocation'. Demonstrators told their own stories: 'The only thing that I've seen that was violent today has been instigated by police.' According to the *Australian*: 'Premier Steve Bracks authorised the crackdown after protesters kept up to 200 delegates out of the conference at Crown Casino on Monday' (all quoted in Iveson and Scalmer 2000, pp. 8–9). Clearly, Bracks was rattled by the success of the S11 action on the first day and was anxious to present Melbourne as a place where the world's rich and powerful could meet and

greet each other without inconvenience. Trades Hall secretary Leigh Hubbard alleged the police crackdown was the result of political pressure following WEF threats to abandon the conference (Iveson and Scalmer 2000, p. 11; *Australian*, 15 September 2000, p. 26).

Notwithstanding the dubious nature of the police action and the restraint of the protesters, Bracks condemned the protesters as 'un-Australian' and said they 'deserved everything they got'. He promised a barbecue to congratulate the officers involved in policing the forum, an idea abandoned after disquiet in Cabinet and condemnation from Labor Party branches (*Australian*, 21 September 2000, p. 29). New South Wales Labor Premier Bob Carr signalled agreement with the journalist who equated the S11 protesters with Nazi street thugs in 1930s Germany. Federal Labor leader Kim Beazley also stood up for Bracks' handling of the S11 protests (Iveson and Scalmer 2000, pp. 8, 12). When the Victorian State Conference of the Labor Party voted down a motion to censure Bracks over his praise of police violence and condemnation of S11 demonstrators, the first newsletter of a new organisation called Socialist Democracy insisted: 'The protest exposed the Labor government as indistinguishable from the Liberals' (Socialist Democracy 2000).

On 12 June 2001, the Report of the Ombudsman, *Investigation of Police Action at the World Economic Forum Demonstrations September 2000* generally endorsed the police conduct while conceding individual officers had acted in an undisciplined way. S11 representatives condemned the findings and argued the report effectively gave police the go-ahead to employ violent tactics against demonstrators (*Age*, 13 June 2001, p. 1). It is also of note that the Ombudsman's report (2001) described the three-day policing by 24 000 officers as 'the biggest police operation' in Victoria for many years (cited in Mier 2001, p. 33). Police wore riot helmets and garb for the first time in Australia's history (Mier 2001, p. 51).

According to Jude McCulloch, globalisation has created a context in which the military capacity of nations has been turned inwards, frequently against dissenters who threaten profits by insisting upon minimum standards for corporate behaviour: 'To depict anti-globalisation protesters as terrorists or the enemy within suits the interests of multinational capital.' The use of police paramilitary units in the policing of protests and new pieces of legislation to facilitate the quelling of protests indicate that globalisation involves the danger of a race to the bottom, not just in labour and environmental standards, but also in terms of the value states put on the lives of their citizens (McCulloch 2001, p. 3; McCulloch 2000/01, pp. 10–11). The implications for democracy are profound.

The behaviour of the police at the S11 protest, Melbourne, September 2000, became the subject of much controversy (Susan Hawthorne, copyright 2000).

Revolution versus reform

The real divisions at Seattle and Melbourne were not the ones the media played up to suggest incoherence. The significant tensions were not *between* participating social movements, but between radicals or revolutionaries on the one hand and moderates or reformists on the other hand. In other words, the real division cut through some of the participating social movements, new and old; and the position of the radicals and revolutionaries within these movements was fortified greatly by the many protesters who now identify themselves primarily as 'anti-capitalists' rather than adherents of any pre-existing social movement: 'Many protesters were clearly anti-capitalist and ready to overthrow the system,' observed Chris Carlsson at Seattle. 'But a number of organizers and participants seek to reform the system, to the point of beseeching the globalizing technocrats for a seat at the table' (Carlsson 2000). Jeff St Clair details the machinations of labour leaders as well as the devious smugness of 'environmentalists in suits'. He emphasises that the events at Seattle made the moderates look silly:

> In the annals of popular protest in America, these have been shining hours, achieved entirely outside the conventional arena of orderly protest and white-paper activism and the timid bleats of the professional leadership of big labour and environmentalism. This truly was an insurgency from below, in which all those who strove to moderate and deflect the turbulent flood of popular outrage managed to humiliate themselves (St Clair 1999, pp. 84, 89, 91–92, 96).

Specifically, Jackie Smith notes there was no clear consensus amongst the Seattle protesters about whether the WTO should be abolished or reformed (Smith, J. 2001, p. 3). Some sectors of the movement believe the WTO agreements could be rewritten and improved, according to the ideology of 'fair trade' rather than 'free trade', but most of the movements comprising the anti-capitalist movement eschew negotiation, because coming to the table often means accepting the corporate project; therefore negotiation tends to benefit corporate interests (Starr 2000, p. 157).

Prior to the WEF meeting in Australia, James Goodman (2000) charted the rise of dissenting voices within the WEF since about the mid-1990s, when it became apparent that neo-liberal prescriptions had brought unprecedented levels of global inequality and undreamed-of degrees of financial instability, environmental exhaustion and social dislocation: 'The neo-liberal triumph has created new sources of opposition, the impacts and responses have been unremitting, and advocates have been forced onto the defensive.' Many of the most powerful players in global capitalism are questioning the 'dictatorship of the market'; the WEF has left behind its market fundamentalism and is charting a new agenda for corporate globalism that embraces rather than rejects 'the social'. Crises within capitalism and 'dramatic public explosions against neo-liberal globalism' since the mid-1990s are driving these challenges from within the WEF.

> For the first time in many years, 'anti-capitalist' protest has returned to the capitalist heartland, and to the global stage. These protests open up the ideological space for the articulation of alternative guiding principles, putting on the agenda the possibility of transformation away from the current malaise. As the promotion of capitalist discipline is questioned, protest targetted at the agents of neo-liberal globalism gains remarkable political leverage (Goodman 2000, p. 46).

Goodman notes that reformist organisations, such as the ICFTU, are participating in discussions with the WEF, taking heart in the WEF's apparent willingness to become an advocate of 'globalisation with a human face'. He asks, however, whether a forum dominated by corporate interests should be encouraged to take on the role of mapping out future frameworks and granted legitimacy in this agenda-setting process, or whether its role should be challenged and alternative sources of legitimacy asserted (Goodman 2000, pp. 45–47).

In Melbourne, the WEF invited ACTU president Sharan Burrow and prominent eco-feminist Vandana Shiva to address the conference. Both spoke in uncompromising terms about the human and environmental costs of neo-liberal globalisation. On behalf of a community forum of churches, aid agencies, green groups and unions, Burrow conveyed to the WEF the priority initiatives these groups believed would build 'a more socially equitable, environmentally and culturally tolerant vision of global development'; these included: faster, more effective debt relief; increased aid; fair trade; a more democratic system of global economic management; a tax on capital flows; a code of conduct for multinationals; and respect for human rights. Burrow informed the WEF that it could play a significant part in reshaping global-isation to ensure that people matter, but it would require 'reform of international institutions such that the voice of, and the solutions posed by, unions and civil society are heeded' (Burrow 2000, pp. 2–5).

Speaking at the Convergence Conference in the lead-up to the S11 mobilisation, Walden Bello described the new 'globalisation with a conscience' or 'globalisation with compassion' as follows: 'instead of being run over by the globalization express, people will be asked to quietly and peacefully roll over and adjust to the constant and unpredictable change wrought by the Transnational Corporations' search for profitability'. Given the manifest failure of IMF-imposed monetary regimes and structural adjustment programs and the 'crisis of legitimacy' rocking the WTO, Bello suggests that, instead of trying to reform the multilateral institutions, it would be more realistic and cost-effective to move to disempower, if not abolish, them and create totally new institutions 'that do not have the baggage of illegitimacy, institutional failure, and Jurassic mindsets that attach to the IMF, World Bank, and WTO'. But more is needed. He is not suggesting reregulation of the transnational corporations, 'but of eventually disabling or dismantling them as fundamental hazards to people, society, the environment, to everything we hold dear'. His alternative route to the future is 'deglobalization', which is not about withdrawing from the

international economy but subordinating the logic of the market to the values of security, equity and social solidarity, 'reembedding the economy in society, rather than having society driven by the economy' (Bello 2000, pp. 12–15).

Within the S11 movement, David Glanz of the International Socialist Organisation argues that a Marxist analysis could cut through the confusion that abounds in the various solutions aimed at reform of global capitalism, whether of the 'fair trade' variety or the nostalgia for locally based, traditional economies: 'While we need to fight every manifestation of injustice or of environmental damage, we must link these local struggles to a global challenge to the system.' This raises the question of agency. Since the problems flow from a system based on exploitation, even the most militant demonstration outside a WEF summit can do no more than temporarily rally the anti-capitalists and demoralise the capitalists:

> We have to move beyond protesting against the symbols of the system and begin organising against the system itself. We need to link the vitality, imagination and daring of the new generation of young activists to the power of the organised working class . . . encouraging those horrified by the impact of the market in the developing world to take up struggles here . . . we need to make explicit how every local, partial fight against Howard or the boss forms part of the bigger picture . . . we can put the socialist alternative to a sick system back at the centre of political debate and political life . . . the choice is socialism or barbarism. Our actions now can help determine the outcome (Glanz 2000, p. 9).

The record of social movement action in Australia suggests that reforms and concessions are won not by the moderates, but by the militants, through extremist postures and activities and the making of extravagant political claims. By carving out political space for themselves, the more defiant within any movement manoeuvre the less defiant into an advantageous political position. Moderate gains are accordingly achieved not so much by moderate and respectable means, but by militant and disrespectful activity. It has been the more implacable, more truly oppositional sections of social movements—new and old—that have destabilised the prevailing bases of power and challenged conservative ideological certainties to the point where the consensual mechanisms of capitalist democracy accede to the more moderate demands of other

sections of the same movement. In making these concessions, the system protects itself from political developments which are considerably more dangerous: it reforms and modernises itself and, at the same time, raises the political profile of the least threatening sections of the social movements, further encouraging the interrelationship with the state that has tended, increasingly, to shape the movements themselves. What has been good for the nation-state might also be good for globalising capitalism.

In the Australian context, large and angry mobilisations will undoubtedly raise the political profile of reforming coalitions, such as the Fair Trade Alliance. Comprising people involved in unions, churches, aid and community development, human rights and civil liberties organisations, farming and environmental groups, the Fair Trade Alliance seeks to contest the way in which the concept of free trade is used to justify the removal of limitations on foreign investment, changes to quarantine regulations, stronger competition policy measures, the application of market forces to social services, and intellectual property laws which favour transnational corporations. By convening meetings, making submissions and other appropriate actions, the Fair Trade Alliance aims to make proposed trade agreements subject to the requirement of democratic decision-making and subject to wider scrutiny and participation: 'It is vital for social and economic development and for democratic politics that elected governments retain the power to regulate the economy in the public interest' (*Forum*, no 27, September 2001, pp. 4–5).

If the moderates within the anti-capitalist movement truly desire to force the hand of governments or transnational institutions to make concessions, they need not be alarmed about the 'maddies' misbehaving, as they would see it. At Seattle, there were victories at the table, for what was happening in the streets stiffened the resolve of the African delegates inside the WTO. They refused to buckle to US demands and coaxing. They hung together and the talks collapsed (St Clair 1999, p. 96). The extremist project of rejecting altogether the WTO and similar transnational insitutions constitutes the best means to prompt internal reform, if there is any prospect at all for such a development. In an address to staff and students at the University of Warwick in December 2000, Clinton argued that failure to address poverty in developing nations could lead to 'rejection of the open economic and social order upon which our future depends' (quoted in Hill 2001, p. 36). Conversely, perhaps only 'rejection' of this order will persuade those in power that issues such as increasing inequality and poverty must be tackled.