

THE ANTI/ALTERNATIVE-GLOBALIZATION MOVEMENT: A CASE STUDY
ON TURKEY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

MÜJGAN ERGÜL-YILMAZ

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
MASTER OF SCIENCE DEGREE
IN
SOCIOLOGY

December 2006

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger Tılıç
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Okyayuz (METU, ADM) _____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu (METU, SOC) _____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger Tılıç (METU, SOC) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Lastname: Mjgan ERGL YILMAZ

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE ANTI/ALTERNATIVE-GLOBALIZATION MOVEMENT: A CASE STUDY ON TURKEY

Ergül Yılmaz, Müjgan

M.S., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger Tılıç

December 2006, 206 pages

This thesis explores the framing processes within the Anti/Alternative-Globalization Movement through a case study on Turkey. The purpose of the study is to supply a descriptive analysis of the diagnostic and prognostic framing processes within the movement which identify the targets, goals and the strategies of action for the movement. This is an exploratory research based on a purposive sample achieved through snowball sampling and qualitative data gathered through semi-structured interviews.

The movement in Turkey has not been able to propose a concrete goal for the movement. The participating organizations or activists have different visualizations of the “alternative futures” they are fighting for; there is no consensus on the strategies of action to be followed, but there is a belief in an evolutionary “becoming” process which eventually will provide a totally new alternative. There are many frame contestations besides power claims existing within the movement; however, there are two major consensus points supplying the basis of solidarity within the movement: According to the movement the cause of the current discontent within the world’s societies is globalization, which is mostly equated to neoliberalism or capitalism, and secondly the movement is seen as being able to shape a better future. It is possible to conclude that the movement has a potential to

bring about concrete social changes, and therefore the new organizational forms and strategies of action -developed within the movement- which do not fit to the existing conceptions of the social movement literature should be evaluated with different theoretical perspectives.

Keywords: anti/alternative-globalization movement in Turkey, framing theory, diagnostic / prognostic frame, activists, Istanbul Social Forum.

ÖZ

KÜRESELLEŞME KARŞITI HAREKETLER: TÜRKİYE ÜZERİNE BİR ÇALIŞMA

Ergül Yılmaz, Müjgan

Yüksek Lisans, Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Helga Rittersberger Tılıç

Aralık 2006, 206 sayfa

Bu tez Türkiye üzerine bir çalışma aracılığıyla Küreselleşme Karşiti Hareketler içerisindeki çerçeve oluşturma süreçlerini incelemektedir. Tezin amacı hareketin hedef, amaç ve eylem yöntemlerini tanımlayan diyagnostik ve prognostik çerçeve oluşturma süreçlerinin betimleyici bir incelemesini sunmaktır. Bu çalışma kartopu yöntemiyle ulaşılan amaçlı bir örneklem ile gerçekleştirilen yarı-yapılandırılmış mülakatlardan elde edilen niteliksel verilere dayalı bir keşif araştırmasıdır.

Türkiye'deki hareket, hareket için belirgin bir amaç tanımlayamamıştır. Katılan örgütlenmeler ya da bireyler için uğrunda savaştıkları farklı bir "alternatif gelecek" söz konusudur, ayrıca izlenmesi gereken eylem yöntemleri konusunda da bir uzlaşma söz konusu değildir; ancak tamamen yeni bir alternatif üretecek evrimsel bir "olma" sürecine inanç tamdır. Hareket içerisinde çerçeve oluşturma konusundaki birçok çekişmenin yanı sıra güç iddiaları da sürmektedir; ancak hareketin içindeki güçlü dayanışmayı sağlayan iki önemli uzlaşma noktası bulunmaktadır: Harekete göre dünya toplumlarının bugünkü rahatsızlıklarının nedeni çoğu zaman neoliberalizm ve kapitalizmle eşanlı kullanılan küreselleşmedir ve hareket bugünden daha iyi bir gelecek oluşturabilecek güçtedir. Hareketin belirgin toplumsal değişiklikler

yaratabilecek potansiyele sahip olduđu sonucuna varılabilir, bu nedenle hareketin içerisinde geliştirilen, var olan toplumsal hareketler literatürünün tanımlamış olduđu kavramların tam olarak karşılayamadığı, yeni örgütlenme modelleri ile eylem yöntemleri farklı kuramsal yaklaşımlarla değerlendirilmelidir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Türkiye'deki küreselleşme karşıtı hareket, çerçeve oluşturma kuramı, diyagnostik / prognostik çerçeve, eylemciler, İstanbul Sosyal Forumu.

To My Beloved Husband

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç, who has introduced me to the subject matter of this thesis, for her guidance, advice, criticism, encouragements and insight throughout the research as well as endless patience.

I am also grateful to examining committee members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Okyayuz for their valuable support, suggestions, encouragement and understanding.

I would like to thank the respondents, whom I have contacted during the research process, for their kind attitude and helps in providing me necessary data, and documents, as well as for introducing me to other members of the movement society in that they have supported to the formation of the eventual research sample.

My thanks are for the members of Middle East Technical University Department of Sociology for their helps throughout my graduate education.

And my friends, who I have ever found nearby anytime I need, thanks for your friendship and sorry for not being able to write all your names here.

My special thanks are for my family for their patience, understanding and supportive helps during my studies.

At the end, but not least, I want to express my grateful sense to my husband Ümit Oktay Yılmaz, who always has been supportive and helpful throughout my studies, for his patience, understanding and encouragement.

This thesis was partially supported by Middle East Technical University, The School of Social Science Grant No: BAP-2003-07-03-00-03.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION: THE MOVEMENT	1
1.1. ‘The Event’- the “Battle of Seattle” and the AGMs	2
1.1.1. Background of the Event.....	5
1.2. Strategic Framing Processes: The ‘Diagnosis’	10
1.2.1. Theoretical Conceptualizations.....	12
1.2.2. “Naming the Enemy”: Identifying Neoliberal Globalization as the Problem	14
1.2.3. A Master Frame against Neoliberal Globalization?.....	20
1.2.4. From Global Framing to Global Mobilization.....	25
1.3. The ‘Prognosis’: Alternative Futures – Unity of Diversities?	29
1.3.1. The World Social Forum.....	29

1.3.2. Responses to the movement and the challenges of 9/11	32
1.3.3. Main trends for the alternative futures	36
1. 4. Some Preliminary Conclusions.....	48
2. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	55
2.1. The Framing Theory	55
2.1.1. Overview of the Prevalent Social Movement Theories	55
2.1.2. The Framing Theory	58
2.1.2.1. Characteristic Features of CAFs	59
2.1.2.2. Variable Features of CAFs.....	63
2.1.2.3. Frame Diffusion Processes.....	65
2.2. Methodological Considerations	66
2.2.1. The Sampling Process.....	70
2.2.2. Further Methodological Considerations.....	72
2.2.3. Final Remarks about Sampling and the Sample	73
3. THE CASE STUDY ON TURKEY	77
3.1. Genealogy of the AGM in Turkey	77
3. 2. The Case Study: AGM in Turkey	85
3.2.1. Globalization.....	86
3.2.2. AGM and the Enemy	97

3.2.3. Alternative Future Visions and Strategies of Action	114
3.2.4. Class Issue.....	136
3.2.5. State and Representative Democracy.....	148
3.2.6. Violence	154
3.2.7. Turkey	162
4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	172
4.1. Conclusions about the Case Study.....	172
4.2. Framing Theory vs. Complexity Theory	184
4.3. General Conclusions about the AGM.....	190
REFERENCES.....	196
APPENDIX	
A. DERİNLEMESİNE MÜLAKAT FORMU	204

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

9/11	September 11, 2001 Events in United States
AFLCIO	American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations
AGM	Anti/Alternative Globalization Movement
AKAP	Antikapitalist
APEC	Asia Pacific Economic and Cooperation Forums
ART	Alliance for Responsible Trade
AST	Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu
ATTAC	Association pour la Taxation des Transactions pour l'Aide aux Citoyens
CAF	Collective Action Frame
CTC	Citizens Trade Campaign
CUSFTA	Canada-US Free Trade Agreement
CMC	Computer Mediated Communication
DİSK	Devrimci İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu
DSİP	Devrimci Sosyalist İşçi Partisi
ESF	European Social Forum
EU	European Union
EZLN	Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional (Zapatista National Liberation Army)
FTA	Free Trade Agreement
FTAA	Free Trade Area of the Americas
G8	Group of 8 (USA, Japan, Germany, United Kingdom, France, Italy, Canada, Russia)
IFG	International Forum on Globalization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
İSF	İstanbul Sosyal Forumu
KESK	Kamu Emekçileri Sendikaları Konfederasyonu
MAI	Multilateral Agreement on Trade and Investment

MEDSF	Mediterranean Social Forum
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NDP	New Democratic Party (Canada)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NSMs	New Social Movements
ÖDP	Özgürlük ve Dayanışma Partisi
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
RMALC	Mexican Action Network on Free Trade
S26	September 26, 2000 Prague Anti-Globalization Protests
SF	Social Forum
SM	Social Movement
SMO	Social Movement Organization
SODEV	Sosyal Demokrasi Vakfı
SWP	Socialist Workers Party
POS	Political Opportunity Structure
RM	Resource Mobilization
TMMOB	Türk Mühendis ve Mimar Odaları Birliği
TNAN	Transnational Advocacy Network
TTB	Türk Tabipler Birliği
TWN	Third World Network
UNRISD	United Nations Research Institute for Social Development
WB	World Bank
WEF	World Economic Forum
WSF	World Social Forum
WTO	World Trade Organization

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. THE SAMPLE.....	76
----------------------------	----

CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION: THE MOVEMENT

Globalization processes and the changes societies live during these processes have been the core concept of academic works in social sciences in the last decades. The globalization processes which are lived in social, cultural, economic, political, and technological spheres bring about new structures which change the societal structures in an irreversible manner. These structural changes shake the existing sensitive equilibria of the previous order and cause radical changes in the survival strategies of the world's societies. Naturally, the societies which are affected by these processes develop various resistance mechanisms in order to resist these changes; to change the direction of the ongoing processes for their benefit, or at least to have the least harm during these transition processes. Actually, the Anti/Alternative Globalization Movements (AGMs) are a resistance to these changes as well as a mechanism for affecting the changes, which the world's societies exhibit against the unavoidable globalization processes with the aim of operating these changes for the benefit of the societies. With these features, AGMs contain the evidences of the discontents of societies about the globalization processes as well as the clues necessary for the shaping of the future directions of the globalization processes. In that way they put a light on the current globalization processes, and help to understand the future directions of globalization.

In order to let the reader be able to figure out or visualize the type of the actions what we are talking about; first, a description of the events which have been designated as the starting point of the AGMs, namely the "Battle of Seattle" will be presented below. After this presentation the discussion of the background of the events and their following echoes will be discussed mainly following the analysis of Jeffrey Ayres (2004). The work of Ayres has been chosen intentionally for the analysis due to the theoretical approach Ayres has followed. Actually, it is possible to find out

many works on the subject area¹, but the focus of attention of most of these works is not supportive for the planned study in this thesis, where the researcher is interested in the “framing processes” (which will be discussed briefly in the following parts and explained in detail to an extent in the second chapter of the work) in the movement. The one and only single work focusing on the “framing processes” within the so called AGMs has been the work of Ayres during the planning stages of this study, and our analysis here will follow the footprints of Ayres due to intentional reasons. Now let us start with the presentation of the events in Seattle which will guide the reader in order to figure out the scene, where the nurturing of the AGMs has started. Then the historical background that has brought about ‘the Battle of Seattle’ will be discussed in order to supply the ‘backstage’ information.

1.1. ‘The Event’- the “Battle of Seattle”² and the AGMs

Monday, Nov. 29

- **4 a.m. crane occupied:** Five environmental activists climb a 170-foot-tall construction crane on Aloha Street to hang a banner.
- **Building occupied:** Homeless activists occupy an abandoned building on Virginia Street.
- **2:35 p.m.:** Several hundred protesters gather in front of the McDonald's restaurant at 6th avenue. A few scuffles break out. An hour later, the group starts to break up with strong urgings from the police, who are out in force with an armored vehicle called "The Peacemaker."
- **5 p.m. Kingdome:** Marchers form a human chain around the Kingdome while a reception for WTO members is being held at the Stadium Exhibition Centre next door.
- **7 p.m. Key Arena:** Protesters come together at a People's Gala to listen to live music and celebrities of the left. Mayor Paul Schell makes a guest appearance and encourages protesters to remain peaceful.

Tuesday, Nov. 30, Morning

¹ For the interested reader some examples about the subject area are listed below: Ashman, Sam. 2004. **Resistance to Neoliberal Globalisation: A Case of ‘Militant Particularism’?**. *Political Studies Association* 24(2): 143-153.; Crossley, Nick. 2002. **“Global Anti-Corporate Struggle: A Preliminary Analysis”**. *British Journal of Sociology* 53(4):667-691.; Epstein, Barbara. 2001. **Anarchism and the Anti-Globalization Movement**. *Monthly Review* 53(4): <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0901epstein.htm>; Gill, Stephen. 2000. **Toward a Postmodern Prince? The Battle in Seattle as a Moment in the New Politics of Globalisation**. *Millennium: Journal of international Studies* 29(1): 131-140; Johnston, Josée and Gordon Laxer. 2003. **Solidarity in the age of globalization: Lessons from the anti-MAI and Zapatista struggles**. *Theory and Society* (32): 39-91.; O’Neill, Kate. 2004. **“Transnational Protest: States, Circuses, and Conflict at the Frontline of Global Politics”**. *International Studies Review* 6 (2):233-251.; Podobnik, Bruce and Thomas Ebrlich Reifer. 2004. **The Globalization Protest Movement in Comparative Perspective**. *Journal of World-Systems Research* 10(1): 3-11; Rhoads, Robert A. 2003. **Globalization and Resistance in the United States and Mexico: The Global Potemkin Village**. *Higher Education* (45): 223-250.; Sancar, Nuray. 2001. **Küreselleşme Karştı Hareketler (AGMs)** . *Evrensel Kültür* 114 <http://www.evrenselbasim.com/ek/yazi.asp?id= 293>. Accessed 05.03.2003.

² Kaldor (2000) first used the term to denote the events in Seattle in December 1999.

- **6 a.m., Victor Steinbrueck Park:** Protesters march on the downtown.
- **7 a.m., Seattle Center Community College:** Protesters march to the Convention Center and Paramount Theatre.
- **8 a.m. to 10 a.m., downtown:** Protesters block intersections and sidewalks leading to the Convention Center, Paramount Theatre and major hotels. Buses are used to shield the Westin Hotel and the Convention Center along Pike Street. The opening ceremonies are postponed.
- **10 a.m., Memorial Stadium:** 20,000 people attend the largest rally of the week.
- **A little after 10 a.m.:** Police use gas to disperse demonstrators. Protesters respond by throwing sticks. Police move into the intersection with an armored vehicle and use pepper spray and rubber bullets.
- **10:30 a.m.:** Police use gas to clear out demonstrators.

Tuesday, Nov. 30, Afternoon

- Student March from University of Washington.
- AFLCIO members along with other demonstrators march from the Seattle centre downtown at about 1pm.
- Peoples' Assembly march from south of the city to the downtown.
- The marches reach the downtown and meet with other ongoing rallies. As many as 35,000 protesters occupy Seattle's downtown core.

Tuesday, Nov. 30, Night

- 3:10 – 4:30 pm: Protesters become more defiant with each gas attack. Mayor Shell declares a civil emergency, authorizing a 7:00 pm to 7:30 am curfew. The National Guard is called in.
- 5:00 – 9:00 pm: Police clear the downtown with gas, rubber bullets and concussion grenades to the edge of the curfew zone.
- 9:00 – 11:00 pm: A large group of protestors retreat to Capitol Hill. Riot police follow, trying to disperse the crowd with gas and rubber bullets. After a series of standoffs the police leave and the protestors eventually go.

Wednesday, Dec. 1, Morning

- No Protest Zone: Established and enforced by police and National Guard Troops.
- 9:00 am: Hundreds of protesters slip past police and National Guard lines to enter the restricted zone. Most gather at Westlake Centre and offer non-violent resistance when they are arrested. Another group moves up Pine Street to Sixth Avenue and is met by riot police. When police move forward many demonstrators are arrested for pedestrian interference and refusal to disperse.
- Noon: Some protesters return to help cleanup the damage and graffiti in the downtown area.

Wednesday, Dec. 1, Afternoon through Night

- **2 p.m.:** Steelworkers march to piers 62 and 63.
- **4 p.m.:** More than 800 protesters gather near Pike Place Market. Police use gas and concussion bombs to disperse the crowd. The crowd returns and reassembles several times.
- **5-6 p.m.:** 300-400 protesters engage in a cat-and-mouse game with police through the downtown. Police sweep the area to enforce a second night's curfew. Most protesters flee to Capitol Hill, where a group several hundred strong assembles and marches down Broadway.
- **9 p.m.-2 a.m.:** A police vehicle is swarmed by protesters as it tries to move through an intersection. For the next five hours police with gas canisters and concussion grenades, and protesters with bottles and rocks engage in a chase along Broadway.

Thursday, Dec. 2

- **10 a.m.:** WTO protesters are escorted by police from Capitol Hill to a rally at Victor Steinbrueck Park.
- **1 p.m.:** Several hundred protesters from Victor Steinbrueck Park march to King County Jail to demand the release of more than 500 protesters.
- **3 p.m.:** No protest zone reduced to an area of restricted protests
- **7 p.m.:** Protest leaders, along with a defense attorney, meet with the King County sheriff's captain in the King County Jail. Following the urgings of the protest leaders, the crowds leave peacefully³.

³ <http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/wto/maps/monday.html>

The Seattle Protests which have marked the canceling of the Millennial Round of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in December 99 have been summarized in the Seattle Times with these words.

On 30th of November 1999 the world met with a “new” mass protest. The protesters blocked delegates' entrance to WTO meetings in Seattle, and the protests forced the cancellation of the opening ceremonies and lasted the length of the meeting until December 3. After the ‘blockade’ of the WTO meetings in Seattle a new spirit of social movement has started to spread from Seattle to different parts of the world. This spirit resulted in the mobilization of wide varieties of protesters all over the world, which developed into a worldwide mass protest.

On 16th of April 2000 the protesters gathered around the millennial meetings of International Monetary Fund (IMF) in Washington DC. On September 26 they were in Prague for protesting the regular yearly meetings of IMF and World Bank (WB). To count on others, the protesters were in Davos, Switzerland, on January 27th 2001 to protest the World Economic Forum (WEF); at the same time (25-30th of January) they also were organizing the First World Social Forum (WSF) in Porto Alegre in order to discuss the alternatives to globalization with 40 thousand participants (Şensever, 2003: 197). 80 thousand protesters were on streets in Quebec, Canada on 20th of April to protest the Summit of the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTTA) (ibid.). In Gothenburg on 15th of June the police used gunfire against the protesters gathered to protest the European Union (EU) Summit, and in Genoa, Italy on 20th of June Carlo Giuliani among the protesters against the G8 Summit was shot by the police. This chain of mass protests went on around each meeting of IMF, WTO, WB, WEF, EU and G8.

After the September 11 terrorist attacks of Al-Kaide many thought that the repressive politics of the Bush government which have taken many of the world’s governments under influence would wipe the global protest wave, but the protests did not disappear. They lost some of its dynamism, however the growing ‘warrior attitudes’ of the conservative Bush government brought about the movement’s incorporation of anti-war discourses to the framing, and continuing its road with highly growing

public support. In November there have been mass protests in London and Italy with 100,000 and 300,000 participants respectively (Sensever, 2003:197). The protests around the meetings of the global elites continued, but the anti-war discourse has dominated the movement for a long time. September 26 2002 has been announced as the global action day against the war through various telecommunication mechanisms, especially via the internet, and many of the big-cities like New York, Washington, Munich, Roma, Sydney, Mexico, as well as Istanbul faced mass protests with remarkably high numbers of attendances. But the global protest wave has not ended, and it seems that the activists will not leave the scene for a long time.

When the movement first appeared on the historical scene on November 30 1999, the corporate media started to call these protesters from the very first day as the “anti-globalizers” and the movement was labeled as the “Anti-globalization Movement”, due to their opposition to the transnational and supranational political and economic bodies generally. Actually, the movement does not have a homogeneous character and it is not easy to define it with a single name, however the “anti-globalization movements” got stuck, but as Ashman points out “The movement is considerably more complex than the label ‘anti-globalization’ suggests” (2004: 144). One of the defining features of this movement is its diversity. There are trends in the movement which also favor globalization, but are against the neoliberal form of globalization, and want to alter the current neoliberal globalization (Ashman, 2004: 145). To cut the discussion short at this stage the “Anti/Alter-Globalization Movement” label which has been used in the literature for the “Anti or Alternative Globalization” demands will be preferred throughout the text.

1. 1.1. Background of the Event

Neoliberal restructuring and the so-called process of “globalization” are inevitable facts of the current world system. Until very recently promoters of neoliberal globalization were sure that the globalization of the world economy and the expansion of free-trade areas, hand in hand with the neoliberal restructuring processes, would enhance economic growth even in the least developed countries and bring welfare to the world societies. However, the history has proved this

expectation not to be true, so that even the most prominent figures among the supporters of the neoliberal economic restructuring have started to talk about a “human face of globalization”, which should ensue solutions for the problems of those who were not happy with the widely known “unexpected” consequences of globalization. The honesty or dishonesty of the proposals about the “human face of globalization” is out of concern here. Rather the attention will be focused on some historical events which paved the way for the “Battle of Seattle”.

Epochal changes can be difficult to grasp –especially when you are in their midst. Those who lived through the rise of capitalism or the industrial revolution knew something momentous was happening, but just what was new and what it meant were subjects of confusion and debate (Brecher et al, 2000: 1).

From a world systemic vision there has been a global economy for 500 years. But the last decades of the twentieth century saw a transformation of the global economic system, in which global economic integration took new forms. In the last 20 years the “globalization” has been exhibited as a brand new and marginal phenomenon with examples like the development of the Euro-Dollar market, off-shore export platforms, and supply-side economics. There were some newer aspects of globalization, like the growth of international trade regimes and the development of international economic institutions, which could be used to defend the isolated economic character of globalization, but it is not possible to see it as an isolated economic phenomenon. The growing interconnectedness of the world’s societies, changing structures, and democratic practices interacted in ways that changed virtually every aspect of life, and strengthened the definition of globalization as a “new global configuration” (Brecher et al, 2000: 1).

It is debatable whether globalization was a plan or it has been the result the capitalists’ intended seeking for new economic opportunities. Bourdieu (1998) takes it as a planned action, but Brecher et al. (2000) think that it was not intended, especially some side effects were not calculated, but could not be avoided. For Bhagwati (2004) who has been one among the defenders of globalization the globalization has been a phenomenon going on starting from the earlier 1800s but what makes the globalization of today different from the earlier versions of

globalization is the unintended consequences which have brought about the dissatisfaction of the people about some aspects of globalization, and these unintended consequences could not be avoided due to the changing socio-economic conjunctures. However, whether globalization has taken the current form due to a planned program or due to the unintended and unavoidable actions on the way is the subject of another work which requires deep and detailed analysis⁴. Therefore let us cut this discussion here short and mention the features of globalization which the AGM discourse finds to be important and note during the framing processes within the movement.

Production: During the 1970s stronger backed corporations have started to build factories and buy manufactured products in low-wage countries of the third world, and this process has been continuing with growing intensity. As Brecher et al. (2000: 2) rightly indicate this tendency converted the world into a “global assembly line”, in which the components of an ordinary trouser or a car may be made and assembled in a number of different countries.

Markets: Corporations started to see the world as a global market where they can produce, buy and sell goods as well as services and labor.

Finance: Starting with the rise of the Euro Dollar market in the 1970s, international capital markets have globalized at an accelerated rate. The capital has become rapidly mobile, which brought about financial speculative markets able to shake a nation’s economic equilibria in incredibly short times, and live long-term negative effects behind.

⁴ For the readers interested about ‘globalization’ and its consequences: Brecher, Jeremy and Tim Costello, 1998, **Global Village or Global Pillage**, South End Press: Cambridge; Bhagvati, Jagdish, 2004, **In Defense of Globalization**, Oxford University Press: New York; Bourdieu, Pierre, 1998, **Acts of Resistance: Against the New Myths of Our Time**, Translated by R. Nice, Cambridge: Polity Press; and Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1999, **The End of the World as We Know It**, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis.

Technology: The rapidly developing information, transportation, and communication technologies wiped away distance as a barrier to global economic integration.

Global Institutions: The World Trade Organization (WTO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank (WB), and similar multilateral institutions at a regional level have developed far greater powers and have used them to accelerate the globalization process.

Corporate restructuring: While corporations have always operated on an international level, during the 1980s they have started to restructure in order to adapt to the operations in a global economy. They started to develop new corporate forms by strategic alliances, global outsourcing, captive suppliers, supplier chains, and increasingly, transnational mergers, which allowed for what the economist Bennet Harrison has called the “concentration of control with the decentralization of production (qtd. In Brecher et al, 2000: 2).”

Changing structure of work: Globalization processes favored “flexible” workers in Sholte’s terms (2000: 223). This “flexible” worker lacks a job for life, but instead moves and retrains to altered market demands. To facilitate such mobility most of the OECD countries have loosened labor laws on hiring and firing (Sholte, 2000: 223). “Flexible” workers are also expected to be “flexible” in working hours, wages, benefits, and health and safety standards. In an economy where workers are “flexible” jobs are expected to be “flexible” also. “Flexible” jobs are often casual, part-time and temporary, with few if any benefits beyond the wages offered. “Flexibilization” showed itself with the deterioration of the working conditions, especially for less skilled labor, and increased insecurity in the workplace (Sholte, 2000: 223). To sum up the benefits gained during the Fordist era with the provision of the welfare state got lost, and workers have lost everything except the right to sell their labor power.

Neoliberal ideology and policies: Starting with monetarism and supply-side economics, globalization has been accompanied –as well as accelerated –by an

emerging neoliberal ideology, which mainly argues that markets are efficient and government intervention in the markets is almost always unwanted and has negative consequences. The main features of the policy implications of neoliberal ideology that are imposed on governments all over the world are; privatization, deregulation, open markets, balanced budgets, deflationary austerity, and the dismantling of the welfare state.

Changing role of the state: While some governments actively encouraged globalization and most complied, because globalization considerably reduced the power of the nation state, particularly their power to serve the interests of their own people. As mentioned above capital mobility undermined the power of national governments to pursue full employment policies or regulate corporations. International organizations and agreements increasingly restricted environmental and social protections. In Brecher's terms "neoliberal ideology reshaped beliefs about what governments should do and what is able to accomplish (Brecher et al, 2000: 3)."

Neo-imperialism: Globalization has reversed the post-World War II movement of Third World countries out of colonialism toward economic independence. Globalization brought much of the global dominance of the former imperialist powers back. With the collapse of communism that dominance has also spread to the formerly communist world. Globalization has taken the control of economic policies away from the hands of the nation states, especially the poor third world states, and handed it over to the capital. While it has enriched some Third World elites it has subordinated them to foreign corporations, international institutions, and dominant states. It has intensified economic competition among the rich powers, and intensified the economic interdependencies, so that it is almost impossible to isolate one nation from the global economy and develop an independent self-sufficient economic system.

Movement of people: People with sufficient assets have always been able to cross borders, but globalization has accelerated migration in two different ways: First, globalization has resulted in the development of a professional class which follows

the capital and travels with the capital. Second, with the economic disruptions and accompanying job losses globalization has created an illegally migrating class (due to the border barriers of developed nations to the poor people) in search of jobs and subsistence.

Cultural homogenization: Globalization has undermined the economic base of diverse local and indigenous communities all over the world. Growing domination of global media based in a few dominant countries and companies has led to an increasingly uniform culture.

Having these historical conditions in the background⁵, let us focus on the backstage of the “Battle of Seattle”. In other words; in order to understand the events we should focus on the “strategic framing processes” which brought about first the “Battle of Seattle” and then the spreading global protests, namely the AGMs.

1. 2. Strategic Framing Processes: The ‘Diagnosis’

Ayres (2004: 11) points out that one of the means of understanding the recent trajectory of this protest movement is to understand that its dynamics have been shaped by an underlying and quite ferocious contest over people’s interpretations and understandings of the supposed benefits of neoliberal economic policies. How people interpret and frame understandings of current economic globalization processes—and how these conceptual framings combine to structure a global protest—is a process at least as important as how political-economic changes associated with globalization have provoked collective action. In fact, part of the framing contest surrounding the globalization debate has centered on the label “anti-globalization.” Ayres (2004: 12) interprets it as “what we have really been witnessing over the past several years is a maturing of a protest movement against contemporary neoliberal globalization processes.” According to him:

⁵ For alternative discussions on globalization and its effects, as well as different analyses of the reasons of mobilization for the movement look at: Ashman, Sam, 2004, **Resistance to Neoliberal Globalization** *Politics* 24(2): 143-153, and Bhagwati, Jagdish, 2004, **Anti-globalization Why?** *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 26: 439-463.

Critical to this contentious mobilization has been the crystallization of a broadly interpretive, increasingly transnationally-shared diagnostic frame that attributes a variety of social ills to the past 15–20 year span of neoliberal ascendancy (Ayres, 2004: 12).

Similar to Ayres, Bourdieu (1998) who has been a symbol of the anti-globalization in recent years in France states that the resistance is against the “invasion of neoliberalism”.

That the world’s economy has been undergoing a neoliberal transformation over the decades is hardly in dispute. Responding to the global economic slowdown as well as increased international competitiveness for markets, which characterized the 1970s, political and business leaders in several key Northern developed states undertook dramatic political economic reforms designed to channel the globalization of the world’s economy in a so-called neoliberal direction. Proponents of neoliberalism, perhaps most notably the Reagan and Thatcher governments of the 1980s, thus pushed for more liberalized trade and investment, tax cuts and concurrent cuts in public spending on social services, deregulation and the privatization of state-owned industries or services⁶. Particularly, such a policy direction was at odds with the initial legitimizing basis for the post-World War II Breton Woods international economic management system, in which government regulation, social welfare systems and full employment policies were considered an acceptable compliment to essentially still market-based fundamentals (Scholte, 2000: 220). However, the break with the Breton Woods regime in the 1970s and the resulting neoliberal turn in the global economy played an important role in shaping the incidences of national, regional and at times apparently transnational protest, which erupted in the 1990s to challenge the neoliberal globalization paradigm. Rising criticisms and mounting public demonstrations directed at neoliberal policies and institutions had been occurring globally for some time, but gained particular attention after the 1999 World Trade Organization (WTO) protests in Seattle, raising the specter of a potential legitimacy crisis within the neoliberal paradigm (Smith, 2002: 209-11; Starr, 2000: 16-18; Brecher et al, 2000: 11-14; Wilkin, 2000: 24-28). Proponents of neoliberal policies insisted that there remained few alternatives to neoliberal

⁶ For a detailed discussion, look in Scholte (2000), Yalınpala (2002), and Wallerstein (2000).

globalization, while the protestors asserted that the globalization of the world's economy in fact need not inevitably follow a neoliberal template. Rather, many varied proposals for what was argued to be a more socially, economically and ecologically equitable globalization process began to emerge and to be debated (Smith, 2002: 209-11; Starr, 2000: 16-18; Brecher et al, 2000: 11-14; Wilkin, 2000: 24-28).

1.2.1. Theoretical Conceptualizations

The concept of “framing processes” is analytically useful for highlighting how the development and spread of mobilizing ideas are integral to social movement dynamics (Snow et al, 1986; Snow & Benford, 1988, 2000). For movement activists, framing is “meaning work”: an active and debatable process where actors are trying to produce and disseminate meanings that differ from and may in fact challenge existing socio-political conditions (Snow & Benford, 2000). As such, when movement participants “frame” a particular social condition:

They frame, or assign meaning to and interpret events and conditions in ways that are intended to mobilize potential adherents and constituencies, to garner bystander support and to demobilize antagonists (Snow & Benford, 1988: 198).

Framing processes thus provide a useful conceptual guide for understanding the ongoing struggle to produce and disseminate mobilizing ideas critical of neoliberal globalization.

“Collective action frames” (CAFs) result from this meaning production processes and serve some crucial functions for movements. CAFs are

constructed as movement adherents negotiate a shared understanding of some problematic condition or situation they define as in need of change, make attributions regarding who or what to blame, articulate an alternative set of arrangements and urge others to act in concert to affect change (Snow & Benford, 2000: 613).

Ayres (2004: 14) states that “collective action frames provide diagnostic attribution, which is concerned with problem identification, and prognostic attribution, which is concerned with problem resolution.” As Ayres (2004: 14) points out “master frames” serve similar functions to movement specific CAFs. However, master frames provide

broader interpretive paradigms for multiple movements, shaping the viewpoint of activists and movements (Ayres, 2004: 14, Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 52). When faced with what are interpreted as unjust social conditions, activists, then, develop movement specific, and sometimes “master collective action frames”, to highlight the unjust character of events or conditions which are no longer tolerable and are now framed as non-defendable (Snow & Benford, 2000: 615). Such frames then provide “legitimizing accounts” (Zald, 1996: 269) shaping and sustaining mobilization campaigns.

Activists by the late 1990s successfully developed a contentious, increasingly transnationally-accepted “master collective action frame” to challenge the prevailing neoliberal orthodoxy as it existed in such institutions as the WTO, the IMF and regional trade agreements such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). The construction of such an anti-globalization CAF involved an especially long, debatable and difficult process, as movement activists faced two discouraging challenges: a powerful and wealthy set of interests in those states, corporations and other social actors supportive of neoliberal policies; and the diversity of different regions, states, languages, cultures and popular experiences affected by neoliberal globalization. For example, where Canadian social activists in the mid-1980s may have crafted one of the earliest CAFs in the developed North against neoliberalism in their protest movement against the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (CUSFTA) (Smith, 2002: 210, Ayres, 2004: 14-15) , the experiences of these Canadians differed considerably from the socially disruptive effects of the IMF’s structural adjustment programs, which had encouraged numerous incidents of riots, strikes and other acts of heightened collective action across states in the developing South⁷. Thus, while various movement and region-specific collective action frames were emerging throughout the 1980s and early 1990s in different parts

⁷ For a detailed discussion of uprisings against the SAPs in the South look in Devlin, John F. & Nonita T. Yap, 1994, *Structural Adjustment Programmes and the UNCED Agenda: Explaining the Contradictions* in Thomas, Caroline ed. **Rio: Unraveling the Consequences**. Frank Cass Co. Ltd.: London, pp: 65-79; Haggard, Stephen and Robert Kaufman eds. 1992, **The Politics of Economic Adjustment**, Princeton University Press: New Jersey; and Ellis-Jones, Mark, 2002, **States of Unrest II: Resistance to IMF and World Bank policies in poor countries**, World Development Movement.

of the world, it would require the development of a more inclusive master frame to bind disparate actors into a protest movement against neoliberalism that increasingly had achieved international scope.

1.2.2. “Naming the Enemy”: Identifying Neoliberal Globalization as the Problem

As I have mentioned above by the early-to-mid-1990s, many regions of the world had witnessed contentious political debates and social conflicts between opponents and proponents of neoliberal globalization policies. Across these different areas, activists were increasingly linking a variety of social, political and economic problems with some of the major developments in the global political economy. In particular, activists labeled international institutions and regimes associated with the advancement of neoliberal policies (in narrower frame) and with the globalization (in broader frame) as those actors responsible for some of the economic deficits and political conflicts of recent decades. Thus a process of “diagnostic framing” –in Ayres’ (2004) words – or a “definition of the axis of opposition” –in Çoban’s (2002) words –or “naming the enemy” –in Starr’s (2000) words –was appearing, serving to motivate individuals through movement specific CAFs that attacked policies imposed by neoliberal globalization.

It is not implicitly possible to tell where in the history this mobilization has first started. For some these movements are a continuation of the spirit of the revolutionary movements of the 1968 or “new revolts against the system” (Wallerstein, 2002, and Wilkin, 2000). According to Wennerhag (2002: 3) it is possible to conclude that the AGMs form the second step in the evolutionary ladder of the social movements, starting from the old class struggles between bourgeoisie and the proletariat, which has marked the historical period after the industrial revolution and modernity (Buechler, 1999: 13), and evolved into the so called ‘new social movements’ with the *revolutionary* winds of the 1968, and emerging post-modern discourses hand in hand with the post-fordist transformations in the production (Buechler, 1999: 15). As Klein states;

Many say that it started in Seattle. Others maintain it began five hundred years ago—when colonialists first told indigenous peoples that they were going to have to do things differently if they were to ‘develop’ or be eligible for ‘trade’. Others again say it began on 1 January 1994 when the Zapatistas launched their uprising with the words *Ya Basta!* On the night NAFTA became law in Mexico. It all depends on whom you ask (Klein 2001:81).

However, as we mentioned above the strategic framings of the movement did not encompass the globalization and neoliberal policies, until we come to the last decades.

Ayres (2004: 15) finds the first developments of the global discourse framing in the movement across Western Europe, in the oppositions to the European Monetary Union proposals implicit in the Maastricht Treaty. According to him these first resistances evolved into the tens-of-thousands strong EU summit protests in recent years. He insists that the massive and disruptive French general strike against the then Juppé government’s economic proposals in the winter of 1995 was the most dramatic example of this public discord. More widespread and mainstream concerns about an emerging Maastricht-induced European democratic deficit linked constraints dismantling the sovereign policy-making capacities of EU-member governments, and fed growing popular perceptions of the detached elites of European business and political elites more concerned with maximizing continental economic efficiency than with addressing mounting social insecurities such as rising unemployment (Habermas, 2001).

However, by 1990, a series of popular campaigns against neoliberal policies have started to appear in Latin America. In 1990 the Sao Paulo Forum bringing the radical left groups opposing neoliberalism in Latin America together was established with the efforts of the Brazilian Workers Party (Sensever, 2003: 196). In Canada, widespread public opposition to the proposed Canada-US Free Trade Agreement (CUSFTA) coalesced in 1988 into a cross-country anti-free trade movement (Ayres, 2002 and 2004: 15, Smith, 2002: 210). Canadian social activists and nationalists feared liberalizing trade with the U.S. would result in the flight of jobs, pressure to harmonize social programs and the possible loss of cultural identity. The anti-free trade movement that emerged played a highly public and intrusive role in the Canadian Federal Election that autumn, which turned into a de facto referendum on

the proposed agreement. Despite the eventual approval of the CUSFTA, due in no small part to the breakage of the anti-free trade opposition party vote in the federal election, the Canadian cross-country coalition-building campaign provided a useful model for U.S. and Mexican groups to adopt in the subsequent campaign against the NAFTA (Ayres, 2002: 196-7 and 2004: 16, Johnston & Laxer, 2003). Anti-NAFTA mobilizing drew from national-level campaigns as well as trilateral strategizing and protest actions mounted between Canadian, U.S. and Mexican civil society groups (Ayres, 2002: 196-7, Johnston & Laxer, 2003). According to Ayres (2004: 16) while national groups may have had different mobilization agendas, there was an emergent trilateral CAF rooted in a distrust of NAFTA as a “thinly veiled neoliberal document”. On the national level innovative new coalitions emerged, such as the Alliance for Responsible Trade (ART) and the Citizens Trade Campaign (CTC) in the U.S. (Ayres, 2002: 198-9 and 2004: 16, Smith, 2002: 210, Johnston & Laxer, 2003), and the Mexican Action Network on Free Trade (RMALC) in Mexico, which has modeled itself after the Canadian Anti-Free Trade Coalition (Ayres, 2002: 198).

NAFTA’s eventual approval, despite persistent public doubts and civil society organizing, has not been the end of popular discontent. The Zapatista Guerrilla movement in the southern Mexican state of Chiapas began its uprising on behalf of the majority poor indigenous people of Chiapas on January 1, 1994, specifically targeting NAFTA and its neoliberal economic prescriptions for continentally liberalized trade and investment.

On January 1, 1994 the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN) came out of the jungle and occupied several towns in the highlands of the state of Chiapas (Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 41, Şaylan, 2003: 17). This event was unexpected, and created a shock effect in Mexico and in other parts of the world, because the Mexican Government was implementing the neoliberal restructuring policies almost with full obedience and Salinas was announcing the world that the restructuring processes were on the road without any discontent in the Mexican society (Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 41, Şaylan, 2003: 17-18, Cleaver, 1994). However, the Chiapas uprising started at the same day with the implementation of the NAFTA in Mexico (Johnston

& Laxer, 2003: 41-42, Şaylan, 2003:17-18, Cleaver, 1994, Klein, 2001: 81). As many others along with Şaylan (2003: 17-18) point out there were no “external forces” present to be blamed for the armed conflict –the Soviet Bloc has collapsed, and Cuba, who was supportive of the armed civic movements in Latin America, was trying to survive after the collapse of the Socialist Bloc due to its enormous dependence on Soviet assistance (Ergül and Gümüşel, 2001: 20-21). Additionally, Subcommandante Marcos, the leader of EZLN was announcing the cause of their uprisings as for a more just and equitable world (Marcos, 2001: 73). He was opposing to the “rising values of globalization” by declaring that the NAFTA will bring only poverty and underdevelopment to the currently poorer rural workers of Mexico.

The Chiapas uprising was repressed with military power in a couple of days, but the effect of this uprising, and the world wide support it has gained through the effective use of sophisticated telecommunication apparatuses of the capital, has been very wide. So the Mexican government had to accept to sit at table with Subcommandante Marcos for negotiations (Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 41-2, Marcos, 2001: 73-74). Undoubtedly this was a lesson for the supporters of the neoliberal globalization, and the attempts to give the process a “human face” have started to be discussed after this event. But the effect of the Chiapas uprising did not remain with this. The circulation, discussion and dissemination of information about the Chiapas uprising throughout the new rapid telecommunication mechanisms have generated wide public support, especially with the help of the anti-NAFTA organizations, which had been on the struggle for a couple of years (Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 42, Cleaver, 1994, 1998a, and 1998b). The computer networks supporting the rebellion have evolved from providing vehicles for the familiar, traditional work of solidarity (e.g., material aid and the defense of human rights against the policies of the Salinas and Zedillo administrations) into a kind of electronic fabric of opposition to much wider policies. Growing networks providing the nerve system of increasingly global challenges to the dominant economic policies of the current period disseminated the spirit of activism present in the Zapatismo. Although the anti-NAFTA coalition was merely North American in scope, the influence of the pro-Zapatista mobilization has

reached across at five continents and dozens of countries generating a much, much wider activism, which gave its fruit at the end of 1999 in Seattle.

As European and North American CAFs, which focused on the “negative effects” of liberalizing economies, supported these continental-level protest campaigns, state actors and civil society organizations across the developing South had been mounting their own protests for years against the social dismantling caused by IMF’s Structural Adjustment Programs, the repressive policies of brutal dictatorships or the generalized inequities of the post-World War II Breton Woods system. Starting from the immediate post-war period until the breakdown of the Breton Woods system in the early 1970s, many state actors frequently in partnership with business associations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), followed state-driven policies such as import substitution, industrialization or cartels, in actually useless efforts to alter the international division of labor, improve the terms of trade, or improve developing states’ positions relative to the global economy (Wallerstein, 2000: 250-6). The United Nation’s sponsored New International Economic Order Project also represented an attempt by state and civil society actors from the developing South to negotiate new and more favorable economic arrangements with the wealthier Northern industrialized states. But the oil shocks of the 1970s and the emergence of the debt crisis in the early 1980s largely shifted the locus of resistance in the developing South to civil society actors (Ayres, 2004: 17, Görenel, 2002: 323-4, Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 44).

Most of the states across Africa, Latin America and Asia were trying to hinder fiscal collapse. Structural Adjustment Programs arranged with the IMF laid the burden of the negative effects mostly on the more vulnerable societal members. Experiencing deep internal economic crisis, and being in urgent need of the foreign capital and depressed by debt obligations, many countries of Africa and Latin America (as well as some indebted countries in Asia and the Arab world) accepted stabilization and adjustment programs in the 1980s. Pressure to do so grew stronger as a wide range of bilateral donors and development agencies insisted upon economic reform and the World Bank developed lending activities in support of structural adjustment agendas.

The creation of such networks of cross-conditionality meant that receipt of official development aid, as well as loans became dependent upon progress in adopting adjustment measures, and that consortia of donors were eventually responsible for shaping significant areas of macro-economic and social policy in indebted Third World Countries (UNRISD, 1994: 10, Ayres, 2004: 17, Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 44). Under these circumstances the states operationalized the IMF prescribed deep budget cuts to social spending, a lowering of taxes, increases in interest rates and a general liberalization of trade and investment policies to encourage states across the South to become more hospitable to the arrival of multinational corporations and capital. Mostly, lacking institutional allies within the affected polities or organizational resources, including independent labor unions, societies often responded to these austerity programs with much less organized acts of resistance and protest, including food riots, strikes and other sometimes violent urban street actions (Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 44, Ayres, 2004: 17). Those groups who were unable to mount better organized grassroots responses to this so-called “shock therapy” also found themselves under force if not shut down by the military dictatorships and authoritarian regimes which were frequently on the receiving end of IMF loans.

By the mid-1990s, a number of regional protest campaigns were structured around CAFs that blamed neoliberal policies and institutions for the rising inequalities and disturbances of the post-Breton Woods era. In fact, the history of neoliberalism around the world was full of complaints and destructions and made it easier for activists to assign blame: the total external debt of developing countries had skyrocketed, the gap between the richest and poorest states had grown demonstrably, poverty had increased in many developing states, and the average per capita income growth rate was significantly lower across the developing South than had been the case in the roughly twenty years before the onset of the debt crisis and the policy generalization of the neoliberal model. Furthermore, the international economy had become increasingly unstable, shaken by a number of financial shocks developed by unregulated capital flows (Wallerstein, 2000: 257, Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 44). These shocks in Mexico, and then eventually East-Asia, Russia and Brazil, which had evolved out of a globally deregulated market for currency speculation, would

further add to the sins of the neoliberal record. Even across portions of the developed North, especially in Western Europe, rising unemployment and the depressive effects of increasingly financially dismantled welfare systems provoked more widespread public unrest.

The neoliberal policies which destructed the subsistence strategies of the world's societies have been increasingly promoted and imposed on states in order to protect and liberalize trade and investments. These processes brought about heightening amounts of social discontent, which turned into new expressions about the impossibility of the globalization process in the existing direction. The creation of the WTO added the last drop to the shaking and full glass of societal discontent.

As the world's leading institution concerned with the rules and regulations of international trade the WTO is the crucial site of global trade policy formation and decision-making in the new millennium. It is such an effective international organization that its procedures for settling trade disputes is binding on all parties. The disciplinary mechanisms that the WTO possesses to use against those members guilty of breaking its rules are forced to protect the interests of the most powerful members, the group of Japan, the EU, Canada and the USA. In truth it is the USA that benefits most from these rules and this has been illustrated in some of its trade disputes with the EU in the past few years. The rules of the WTO enable the injured party to strike back against the guilty member by imposing punishing sanctions of their own, even in an area of trade unrelated to the specific case brought before the WTO (Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 50, Wilkin, 2000: 26, Smith, 2002: 208, Starr, 2000: 19-20). Such a system is fine if you are a powerful member of the WTO, with plenty of potential weapons at your hand. It is less helpful if your economy is less diverse.

1.2.3. A Master Frame against Neoliberal Globalization?

In this historical scene while the development of different regional protests with similar CAFs; the shared critique of the neoliberal globalization and its institutions has been spreading. As the neoliberal globalization processes received more widespread and vocal criticism, opportunities opened up and developed for civil

society networking, collective bargaining and political lobbying across a number of developing states, especially across Latin America and South-East Asia, where many states had made transitions to electoral democracies over the previous decade. Additionally, national civil society organizations from developing states were increasingly networking transnational organizations from the developed North at the counter-summits as well as through the Internet. Especially, the “People’s Summits,” became new scenes for social activists to meet to share experiences, workshop, strategize and align their national frames against the perceived inequities of neoliberal globalization and institutions (Ayres, 2004: 18 and 2002: 200-1, Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 49-50, Smith, 2002: 210-11, Starr, 2000: 100-1, Wilkin, 2000: 43). These summits, and the increased availability of the Internet, set the stage for the crystallization of an increasingly transnationally-shared “master frame” against neoliberal globalization, which Ayres (2004) prefers to label as a “diagnostic master frame”, mostly due to the alternative character of the developing master frame, in that it is not only composed of a description of the ills of neoliberal globalization. Rather this master frame, which is still in the evolution phase, contains sketches of alternatives to the current neoliberal globalization processes, and this content has also been supportive in the development of this master frame. I will turn to the “diagnostic” content of this master frame later during the examination of the alternative future proposals of the movement.

People’s Summits were held parallel to trade minister and heads-of-state gatherings negotiating the proposed Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) in Chile, Brazil and Costa Rica. Similar summits were being held to counter the Asia Pacific Economic and Cooperation Forums (APEC) in Vancouver and Manila. But the anti-MAI (Multilateral Agreement on Trade and Investment) protests and coalitions have developed the core of the master frame of the AGMs. According to Johnston and Laxer (2003: 52) there have been three key events in the development of the master frame against neoliberal globalization during the anti-MAI protests, which evolved into the “Battle of Seattle” later: the discovery of the secret text, early opposition at the OECD meetings, and the ways anti-MAI activists organized, coordinated, and mobilized.

International coordination of opposition did not spontaneously materialize. When opponents issued a joint NGO Statement on October 27, 1997 in Paris where they met MAI negotiators, they built on pre-existing TNANs [Transnational Advocacy Networks]⁸. The most important of these was the International Forum on Globalization (IFG), formed in January 1994. ... Despite its Northern preponderance, the IFG linked leading Northern activists with leaders of the South such as Martin Khor, head of the Third World Network based in Malaysia, and Vandana Shiva, Indian author and ecological activist. The IFG also provided key contacts among country-based MAI campaigns in OECD countries, and coordinated efforts led by Tony Clarke of Canada, and Lori Wallach, of Public Citizen Global Trade Watch in Washington. In the United States and Canada, the IFG held international Teach-Ins, activist workshops, coordinated activities, and shared information about impending moves to implement another piece of the global capitalist constitution. The IFG met often by teleconferencing and closed Internet links to strategize international opposition to the MAI, and helped plan the 1999 battle in Seattle. Key constituent organizations within the IFG include Public Citizen, led by Ralph Nader, and The Council of Canadians, the 100,000-member veteran of nationalist battles against the FTA and NAFTA. Their memberships and campaigns are nationally oriented. Acting for the IFG, they supplied much of the organizational muscle, leadership, and expertise to wage effective opposition to the MAI.

Forging North-South links was key to finding the secret MAI text. In the fall of 1996, Martin Khor warned his IFG colleagues about secret talks on the MAI already underway at the OECD. Unlike anti-globalism groups in the North who are distant from their own governments, the Third World Network (TWN) meets regularly with sympathetic Southern governments. ... As parties to international negotiations, friendly governments share information with the TWN, which in turn informs its Northern activist allies. It was through this state-TNAN exchange that Northern activists discovered what their own governments were secretly negotiating.

How did Canadian activists find the MAI text? According to Clarke, after Khor's warnings some IFG members decided they could do little without the text. Clarke agreed to lead the search in Canada, spoke to Canadian anti-free trade veterans, and sent out feelers to friendly contacts inside government and parties, particularly the New Democratic Party (NDP, Canada's social democratic party). In late February 1997, Clarke got the draft text through a Canadian Member of Parliament, who accidentally came across it at a meeting in Europe. Public Citizen, other U.S. groups, and a few European activists looked for, but never found the text. Instead of releasing the text right away, Clarke and Barlow shared it with Public Citizen and both groups analyzed it separately. Clarke framed the MAI as a "Corporate Rule Treaty," so activists could make a compelling case and the public understand its implications. The strategy worked. Clarke's analysis was front-page news in the *Globe and Mail* on April 3, 1997. Public Citizen and the *Multinational Monitor* in Washington put the draft text on their websites for worldwide distribution a few days later (Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 52-3).

The strategic framing process evolved first around the national level framing where the fear of the withering away of the nation state power has been used as a basis for

⁸ Transnational Advocacy Networks (TNANs) is a term developed by Keck & Sikkink (1998). TNANs involve a small number of morally motivated activists, and do not usually engage in mass mobilizations. They are a "set of relevant organizations working internationally with shared values, a common discourse, and dense exchanges of information." The goal of TNANs is not just to influence outcomes, but to change the terms of the debate, substituting unacceptable positions with more inclusive, democratic normative structures. While TNANs may operate across vast territorial divides, they can be thought of as political spaces where meanings, norms, and frames are negotiated. They are both structures and agents, and have grown substantially in the last three decades.

regional solidarities, but also the transnational networks helped to bring the MAI negotiations to a collapse when France pulled out, and credited its decision in part to what it referred to as a “global civil society” of anti-MAI activists (Ayres, 2004: 18 and Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 60).

According to Johnston and Laxer (2003: 60) the country based strategy was successful because, when enough pressure is exercised, governments sometimes listen to their own citizens. They rightly point out that transnational publics do not elect the governments (ibid.). For them the fact that states make decisions at the OECD increased the salience of national mobilizations. However, they also add that the country campaigns were greatly enhanced by the transnational sharing of information and the strategic leadership of individuals like Clarke and Wallach (ibid.). Their critical role was not as leaders of global civil society, but as key individuals within transnational advocacy networks that catalyzed and supported national movements (ibid.).

Ayres (2004: 19, and 2002: 201) states that the explosive use of the Internet by thousands of NGOs has also in fact served as a key means of bridging a variety of national and regional anti-neoliberal CAFs. Through the use of listservs, e-mail and web sites, international NGOs as varied as the International Forum on Globalization, the Third World Network, the Hemispheric Social Alliance and the Focus on the Global South, shared information and developed similar critiques of neoliberalism. Hundreds of more nationally-focused NGOs, which were either members of or linked to such larger international organizations, also shared information and critical perspectives gleaned from the Internet in more face to face grassroots settings. Hemispheric civil society groups crafted the Alternatives for the Americas text, a social-democratic and sustainable-developmental alternative to the proposed FTAA, during parallel People’s Summits to the FTAA negotiations, and subsequently edited and revised it via Hemispheric Social Alliance member Internet exchange (ibid.).

However, Johnston and Laxer (2003: 62) insist on the significance of the earlier networking operations between the involved NGOs (transnational advocacy

networks) and face to face contact, and state that internet has just been a tool for the development of face to face contacts and alliances:

The Internet was important in developing this shared discourse. ... While this discourse may have flowed along transnational lines of electronic communication, it grew out of the network of established activists who knew each other. Anti-MAI leaders met face-to-face before they used the Internet. 'We learned to care about each other as human beings. We built that trust up and there is nothing to take its place. Once you've got it, then you can use your technology in a very specific way.' In short, Barlow disagrees with the idea that the Internet killed the MAI: '[w]e killed it using the Internet as a tool.'⁹ (Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 62).

In addition to the collapse of MAI negotiations opponents of neoliberal globalization were also encouraged by U.S. Congressional opposition to the renewal of fast-trade authority, which authorizes the U.S. President to negotiate trade accords with foreign countries, by downgrading the Congress to a reduced role of simply approving or rejecting the proposed agreement (Ayres, 2004: 20). Every president since Richard Nixon in the 1970s enjoyed this privilege, and with this historical background Clinton sought congressional renewal in 1997. However, Clinton had to withdraw the request due to the strong resistance from labor unions who were disturbed by his strong-arming of NAFTA through Congress in 1993, as well as opposition from grassroots lobbying efforts from the Citizens Trade Campaign (CTC) and Alliance for Responsible Trade (ART) coalitions (Ayres, 2004: 20). In the following years the Clinton Administration's efforts to reframe the debate over fast-track, by renaming it "trade promotion authority," thereby putting a more kind turn to what was otherwise a tool to promote neoliberal policy proposals, had failed to win reauthorization (Ayres, 2004: 20), and this brought about a significant victory about trade policies for the growing number of civil society organizations across the U.S. who have been showing increased skepticism of the supposed benefits of neoliberal globalization.

According to Ayres (2004: 20) during the end of the 1990s a "master diagnostic frame" critical of neoliberal globalization slowly crystallized and gained a wider international acceptance. It was not a completely hegemonic counter frame since there were still regional and national level variations present. However, for Ayres

⁹ Johnston & Laxer, 2003 - Barlow interview, August 4, 1999.

(2004: 20) the strength of this master frame against neoliberal globalization was lying in its breadth and capacity to absorb and accommodate the variety of movement and region specific frames that encouraged collective action against neoliberal agreements and institutions over the previous several years. In fact, this master frame clearly took on a sufficiently broad interpretive scope in its inclusiveness, cultural reach and flexibility to function as a master “injustice frame” accusing neoliberalism for a variety of perceived injustices: from environmental degradation, the shifting of jobs to low wages production sites, human rights abuses in sweatshops, and still growing poverty and persistent indebtedness across the developing world (ibid.). Thus, on the eve of the autumn 1999 protests against the WTO millennial round in Seattle, the parameters of a more clearly transnational “diagnostic master collective action frame” that would help guide the spreading waves of large and geographically-varied anti-globalization protests became apparent (ibid.).

Although Ayres (2004) is sure about the development of a master frame which has provided the continuation of the anti-globalization protests until very recently, Johnston and Laxer (2003: 75) are skeptical about it. They emphasize that; a common frame must be shaped from the bottom up, but this is difficult when ideas and outlooks fail to transcend local boundaries. Although theorists may assume that globalization makes increased cross-cultural communication inevitable, people continue to be divided by cultural barriers, linguistic gaps, material inequalities, tactical differences, and radically different life-worlds; and these differences bring about the skeptical character of the master frame against neoliberal globalization, in that; unity of the still divergent framings is highly debatable (Johnston & Laxer, 2003: 75-6).

1.2.4. From Global Framing to Global Mobilization

The WTO protests in Seattle have been the result of a long series of actions and national as well as transnational alliances, so they did not initiate organizing and mobilizations against neoliberal globalization. However, what was important in the ‘Battle of Seattle’ was that it has taken place in the United States, the most active

promoter and the imposer of free trade and neoliberal globalization. In order to have a clearer picture of the scene in Seattle let us refer to Wallerstein for a while:

The decade of the 1990's has seen one long political drive to remove interstate barriers to the free flow of commodities and capital. This has been preached as the inevitable coming of globalization. The chief preachers have been the U.S. government, many of the largest transnational corporations, and a few interstate organizations. ...

Initially, the main instrument of pressure on states was the International Monetary Fund (IMF) which made its own financial assistance to governments conditional on their acceptance of such free flows (as well as on curbing various internal welfare state provisions). This instrument was at first effective, but the so-called Asian financial crisis brought the IMF itself under political pressure. What happened was that IMF requirements for aid during this crisis worsened the situation in a number of states and this had immediate political consequences ... This led various conservative Western forces (the World Bank, Jeffrey Sachs, Henry Kissinger, George Schultz) to question the *political* wisdom of the IMF's policies. As a result, the IMF withdrew into the background.

The locus of pressure shifted to the World Trade Organization (WTO). The U.S. government and the transnationals sought to get the WTO to draw up treaties that would make it impossible for signatory states to be protectionist. First, there was an attempt to adopt a Multilateral Accord on Investments (MAI), which would have tied the hands of the states in curbing the role of foreign investment in their states. Its adoption was quietly proceeding when a combination of uproar by social movements, opposition from some European governments (particularly France), and some governments of the South stopped the juggernaut.

It was to overcome this double defeat that President Clinton hoped to overcome by getting the WTO to initiate at Seattle a new "Millennial Round" of negotiations on free flows (Wallerstein, 1999: 1).

In this "scene" "Seattle was to mark for Clinton a great achievement" (ibid.). However, the "game" did not go according to the "scenario". After a week at Seattle the WTO Millennial Round had to announce a total defeat. Of course, there was no single reason for the defeat of the round; the US position was strongly opposed by the EU powers (except Great Britain) and Japan, in that the triad have been competing "to be the locus of the monopolies that will be the major beneficiaries of the expansion" (Wallerstein, 1999: 2); besides this, there were the street demonstrations which did indeed get much media coverage.

It is reasonable to understand the trouble of the US government having difficulties in negotiations during the WTO Millennial Round sitting on the same table with the EU and the Japanese governments competing to be the beneficiaries of the expansions, but why have been the street protests so important in pushing it to a back step?

Wallerstein's (1999: 2) answer to this question is very simple: There were two important groups present in the street protests besides the usual groups of left-wing activists; the US trade unions and the middle class environmental movements.

The trade unionists had a simple demand: an accord on minimal labor conditions worldwide as the price of free flows. And the environmentalists asked for an accord on minimal environmental protections enacted worldwide as the price of free flows. President Clinton could not afford to ignore such protesters, since labor and the environmentalists provide two of the indispensable pillars of a Democratic victory in the elections of 2000. So Clinton decided to swim with the tide, at least ostensibly, and he called upon the WTO to include provisions of the type the U.S. trade unions and environmentalist groups had demanded (ibid.).

The "game" was going on in an unwanted direction and the US government who had to act against a triple of opponents could not fight back. This was important in that it showed that "even when the U.S. government throws all it has into a major international economic struggle, it runs into obstacles so great that it has to retreat (Wallerstein, 1999: 1-2)." Although, there were other opponent actors on the "scene" the "actors" on the street have tripled the opposition, and played a crucial role in the defeat of the "enemy".

Besides this, Seattle events have been significant in disseminating the signals of the widening discontent both within and outside the US over the neoliberal globalization processes. This has been mainly achieved by the high visibility of the protests, drawing upon the "eclectic repertoire of tactics" (Smith, 2002: 215-221): weeks of strategic Internet usage prepared activists with immediate and clear knowledge of Seattle's downtown layout and WTO delegate's schedules; cell phones aided activists while they had been spreading out across the city in order to engage in traffic blockading affinity groups; black bloc anarchists resorted to property damage to highly visible corporate symbols of neoliberal success, such as Nike and Starbucks; as thousands of people participated in union rallies and marches.

Additionally, Ayres (2004: 21) –along with many other scholars –states that Seattle brought together a collection of diverse, international groups¹⁰, whose protests were

¹⁰ There are different views about the composition of the protesters in Seattle. According to Kaldor (2000: 109) Third World civil society was underrepresented, and most of the participants who have access to electronic communications or can travel are inevitably part of the elite. Ulagay (1999: 26) is

supported by the highly visible and now “transnational master collective action frame” against neoliberal globalization. The protestors complained about the hierarchical, elitist and closed-door character of the WTO negotiations, and argued that WTO decisions aided and assisted corporate rule over popular sovereignty, and facilitated a global race to the bottom, where corporations exploited conditions of liberalized trade and investment by constantly relocating production to areas with low wage costs and limited government enforcement of social or environmental regulations.

There are in fact numerous examples of what could be considered attempts at both *diagnostic* and *prognostic* frame alignment processes in books activists produced and disseminated after Seattle (Danaher and Burbach 2000; Starr 2000; and Barlow and Clarke 2001¹¹). Beyond such books, Internet web sites, activist listservs and the Independent Media Centre outlets established throughout the world after Seattle served crucial frame dissemination roles. These activities thus challenged the inevitability thesis of neoliberal globalization, stirred what would become a more widespread public debate about the supposed benefits of related policies, and put business and political elites on the sudden unexpected defensive against a newly aggressive master frame that challenged the underlying precepts of neoliberalism (Ayres 2004:21).¹²

It is undeniable that the “Battle of Seattle” has served to the clarification of the meaning of “globalization”, however; the struggle did not end with Seattle, rather it got harder, since more and more bystanders should be convinced about the destructive nature of the neoliberal globalization and the movements frame should be evolved in more mature directions in order to supply the continuity of the movement. This is natural in the continuing evolution of social movements. As Gamson and Meyer (1996: 277) point out the political context for framing processes frequently

supporting Kaldor’s conclusions by stating that most of the protesters are not among the ones who have had the strongest defeat from globalization, they are mostly from the North America and Europe where the labor unions and NGOs have a strong background. Additionally; there are other complaints about the color representation of Seattle, which are analyzed in detail in Starr’s (2004) recent work; **How Can Anti-Imperialism Not Be Anti-Racist? The North American AGM** *Journal of World System Research*, 10 (1): 119-151.

¹¹ The author refers to the following works: Danaher, Kevin and Roger Burbach, 2000, **Globalize This! The Battle Against the World Trade Organization and Corporate Rule**, Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press; Starr, Amory, 2000, **Naming the Enemy: Anti-Corporate Movements Confront Globalization**, London and New York: Zed Books; and Barlow, Maude and Tony Clarke, 2001, **Global Showdown: How the New Activists are Fighting Global Corporate Rule**, Toronto: Stoddard.

¹² My italics.

changes dramatically between the early and the more mature phases of the collective actions, particularly when a “movement has established itself as a serious force for social change”. It is evident that the AGM has posited itself as a radical force for change, and this evolution of the strategic framing processes was inevitable for the movement.

1. 3. The ‘Prognosis’: Alternative Futures – Unity of Diversities?

It was not an easy process to develop a movement frame which mobilized millions¹³, but in order to supply continuity and hinder the possibility of resolution the problem identification is not enough. If you identify the problem only and do not propose any solution to the problem, there will be no hope for the future of the movement. Although the goal may not appear to be an important component of the initial strategic framing processes, the continuity of the mobilization is strictly tied to the goals of the movement; the cognitive sequence follows this pathway. In other words; the diagnosis of the illness would lose the meaning if the doctor does not have any way of prognosis. It is possible that sometimes the doctors do not know the right treatment, however; even under these conditions the doctors will try to develop various treatment methods based on the existing treatment procedures. Irresistibly, the strategic framing process of the movement evolved in this direction.

1.3.1. The World Social Forum

Although, the first responses against the movement have been strongly leaning on the lack of the alternative solutions, the First World Social Forum¹⁴ (WSF) on 25th of January 2001 demonstrated that the movement did not lack alternative proposals for the future of the worlds’ societies. Immediately before the opening ceremony of the first WSF Ignacio Ramonet the head editor of *Le Monde Diplomatique* was announcing that “a new century was beginning in Porto Alegre”, and he went on:

¹³ I have summarized some of the important mass mobilizations in ‘The Event’ part, but for a detailed chronology of the global actions the interested reader might refer to Şensever, 2003: 196-200.

¹⁴ For a detailed explanation of the emergence of WSF look at Teivainen (2002); Şensever (2003); and Baiocchio (2004).

“The people meeting in Porto Alegre do not only reject the capitalist moral values, they go a step further and start working to build the bases of a ‘resistant power’ (qtd. in Şensever, 2003: 46).”

The WSF first held in Porto Alegre, represents one of the most lively and exciting developments among global social movements. Baiocchi (2004: 208) finds it to be one of the most successful efforts at coalescing transnational civil society actors and networks in modern history. According to Bernard Cassen (2003: 48-49), leader of ATTAC and one of the editors of *Le Monde Diplomatique*, the idea of the WSF emerged from European anti-globalization activists who approached the Porto Alegre administration about hosting such an event. While neither of Brazil’s two largest social movements were present among the organizing committee, then made up largely of European anti-globalization groups and Brazilian NGOs, the WSF quickly grew into a participatory space where civil society organizations are able to collectively imagine “another world” (Baiocchi, 2004: 209). In addition to workshops, lectures, testimonials, and other public events, the Forum included innumerable opportunities for the activists to network and build bridges among their various causes as well as exchange experiences and strategies.

After the first gathering, the WSF charter, whose rules explicitly “de-emphasized” the participation of governmental agencies, and those representing political parties, was approved (Baiocchi, 2004: 209, and Şensever, 2003: 34). The Forum’s charter describes the WSF as:

an open meeting place for reflective thinking, democratic debate of ideas, formulation of proposals, free exchange of experiences and linking up for effective action ... by groups and movements in civil society that are opposed to neoliberalism and to domination of the world by capital and any form of imperialism seeking to build global relationships (qtd. in Şensever, 2003: 34-35).

Furthermore, it is a “plural, diversified, non-confessional, non-governmental and non-party context” that brings together organizations and movements (ibid.).

By 2003, the WSF had expanded in numbers and in themes, as participants attended at least 1,500 official workshops (Baiocchi, 2004: 209, and Şensever, 2003: 54). The six-day gathering opened under the shadow cast by possible US invasion of Iraq, but

nonetheless a festive atmosphere retained during the meetings. The Forum opened and closed with a march for peace and its last panel was dedicated to the theme (Baiocchi, 2004: 209, and Şensever, 2003: 55). Before the third gathering of the WSF, a number of Social Fora had come into being¹⁵: European, Asian, and African versions had taken place in earlier months. Also, a number of allied events took place along side the WSF: the World Education Forum, the Forum of Local Authorities Against Social Exclusion, and the World Judicial Forum, not to mention the innumerable parallel meetings that took place, such as the meeting of the US-Based “Life After Capitalism” group (Baiocchi, 2004: 209, and Şensever, 2003: 56).

The WSF process continued its way with the fourth WSF held in Mumbai in January 2004. According to Wallerstein (2004: 1) in five years WSF has become a major actor on the world scene. Although, there were problems Wallerstein (ibid.) admits that the recent 4th meeting of the WSF in Mumbai was a big step forward in the steadily rising strength of the World Social Forum. According to him the three biggest problems were:

(1) a tension between those who insisted on retaining the formula of an open forum and those who wished to see the WSF become a "movement of movements," perhaps eventually another "International"; (2) an inadequate degree of participation from Asia, Africa, and east-central Europe; (3) debates about the internal structure and the funding of the WSF - how democratic and how independent was it as a structure (ibid.)?

Wallerstein concludes that all three problems were tested at the Mumbai meeting, the first to be held other than in Porto Alegre:

... it was an "open meeting place" for "groups and movements of civil society that are opposed to neoliberalism and to domination of the world by capital and any form of imperialism." Its theme was "another world is possible." It was a "process," not an organization. It would not take positions as such, or make proposals for action, but it might generate such positions and proposals by some or all of those taking part in the WSF. It was "plural, diversified, non-confessional, non-governmental and non-party" and acted in a "decentralized fashion." In short, there was to be no hierarchy or organizational discipline (ibid.).

As Teivainen (2002: 622) points out “while reactive protests may play an important role in democratic transformations, the concrete initiatives for the transformations

¹⁵ For a detailed discussion of the emergent regional Social Fora look at Şensever (2003) Chapter 3 on Social Fora.

are more likely to emerge from proactive meetings.” Although, there are various contradictions about the nature of the evolving WSF (whether it is an emergent international institution embodying the seeds of global democracy or it provides a space for actors who may construct democratic projects in different contexts, both local and global) there are prospects of various approaches towards global democratization that could be found in the meetings, including the organizational aspects of the World Social Forum itself (Teivainen, 2002: 624).

With this structure the WSF is serving as a ground for interchanging experiences and forming stronger alliances as well as developing new forms of global democratization, and helping the prognosis of the “illness”; namely the neoliberal globalization.

1.3.2. Responses to the Movement and the Challenges of 9/11

Framing processes in a maturing movement are the “subject of intense contestation between collective actors representing the movement, the state, and any existing counter movements (Gamson & Meyer, 1996: 279).” In fact, the continuing mobilizations accompanied by a rapidly developing literature about the alternative proposals against neoliberal globalization brought about hard debates between the global powers, the supporters of the neoliberal globalization, as well as the bystanders from the Left and the movement. However, the critiques coming from those parties strengthened the development of alternative proposals in that they pointed to the deficient arguments of the proposed plans and forced them to be corrected and matured in the most perfecting direction.

The terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001 (9/11) had a dramatic and immediate effect on the mobilization potential for activism against neoliberal globalization. The consequences of the attacks uncovered weaknesses in the collective frame against neoliberal globalization, temporarily reduced enthusiasm, at least in the US, for large-scale contentious protest, and illustrated forcefully the continued relevance of the state in the structuring of movement activity. The repressive actions of the states, especially the US government, gave

some fruit for a short time, in that they hindered mass attendance of particularly the sympathetic bystanders as well as the more conservative component parts of the movement, because after the passage of the USA Patriot Act –which has been accompanied by similar legislations or provisions by the EU as well as other national governments –has enabled governments “to criminalize dissent” (Ayres, 2004: 25, Ayres & Tarrow, 2002). Although it predated the September 11 attacks to the police clashes with anti-globalization demonstrators from Seattle to Genoa, the repressive threat has started intensifying.

Just as sobering for activists is the increased penchant for state authorities to equate protest against neoliberal policy initiatives with the violent terrorism of September 11. Italy's Prime Minister Berlusconi, smarting from international criticism of his crackdown on peaceful demonstrators at the Genoa summit, saw a "singular coincidence" between the anti-globalization protestors and the terrorist attacks in Washington and New York City. Praising the superiority of "our [read: Christian] civilization," Berlusconi equated the anti-globalization movement with radical Islamic terrorist groups for their hatred of "Western civilization and the Western way of life,"¹⁶ as his government was ironically moving away from Italy's traditional pro-European stance (Ayres & Tarrow 2002).

As Ayres (2004: 26) states the state responses to the terrorist attacks as well as to anti-globalization protests, posed “a challenge to prognostic frame dissemination”, since the activists now had to engage in a public relations battle in order to convince the global public –particularly the US society –that the AGM did not have any relation to terrorism, and that it does not accept terrorist strategies in order to achieve its goals. Additionally, the naturally growing anti-war activism—first as the U.S. invaded Afghanistan to overthrow the Taliban regime, and then the Bush Administration quickly refocused for a possible war with Iraq—posed a challenge to sustaining a CAF against neoliberal globalization. The energy devoted to straightening out the protest movement’s identity and the meaning behind any new demonstrations was draining, since most of the protest groups had to struggle to reconcile being both opposed to neoliberal globalization and pro-peace.

At this point I should open a parenthesis and clarify some conceptual misunderstandings with the help of Tarrow’s useful analysis: “There are a number of

¹⁶ The authors quote from Steven Erlanger, "Italy's Premier Calls Western Civilization Superior to Islamic World," *The New York Times*, 27 September 2001.

forms of transnational contention and it is not always clear that the actual targets of these actions –as opposed to their framings by activists –can be usefully connected to globalization (Tarrow, 2002: 231).” As Tarrow points out globalization can be linked to so many different kinds of contention. This results in part from the concept’s multiple origins, some of them analytical others political. According to Tarrow (ibid.) this is derived from four positions: (1) from enthusiasts for globalization like the *Economists*, who see it solving many of the problems of both North and South in the world economy; (2) from an overabundance of domestic activists who are trying to frame their claims in global terms; (3) from world systems and neo-Polanyan theorists who habitually see the world in core/periphery terms and tend to combine the political and the economic¹⁷; (4) from the academic models of sociological institutionalists who posit the formation of a world polity from the diffusion of Western norms¹⁸.

These divergent academic and activist origins have given “globalization an intellectual and ideological magnetism” in both positive as well as negative terms, which Tarrow (2002: 232) finds to be similar to the attraction and repulsion that “modernization” and “development” had during earlier decades. This has brought together activists working in a wide variety of areas; but it had done so at the cost of “lumping” together numerous forms of interstate and transnational connections that may have not much to do with one another and has hidden the differences among the many forms of transnational contention that we see in the world today.

In Addition to the “intellectual and ideological magnetism” of globalization Tarrow (2002: 233) insists that the scholarly works about the transnational social movements have shaped their project with “panache and enthusiasm”. According to him with

¹⁷ Here Tarrow refers to the following works: Arrighi, Giovanni.1994. **The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times**. London: Verso; McMichael, Philip. 1996. **Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective**. Thousand Oaks CA: Pine Forge; and McMichael, Philip. 2002. **Globalization Countermovements**, unpublished paper presented to the Workshop on International Studies in Planning, Cornell University, January.

¹⁸ Here Tarrow refers to the following work: Meyer, Boli and Thomas. 1998. **World Society and the Nation State** in *American Journal of Sociology* 103:144-181.

respect to transnational contention, “their work suffered from four major flaws that prevented them from providing an effective bridge from globalization to resistance” (Tarrow 2002:233-4): First, it concatenated forms of transnational contention that have a great deal to do with globalization with those whose connection to globalization is indirect and with those whose connection is improbable (ibid.). Second and related to the first point, seldom was the concrete casual mechanisms connecting globalization to contentious outcomes specified theoretically or demonstrated empirically (ibid.). Third, and related to the second point, the role of states and international institutions remained problematic in plotting the casual relations between globalization and resistance through global civil society (ibid.). Fourth, most of the work in the global civil society tradition focused on four areas in particular: the international human rights movement, the environmental movement, indigenous people’s rights, and, most recently, campaigns against the international free trade regime (ibid.) These campaigns are made up of actors who are largely secular, mostly progressive, and usually linked to Northern sources of funding, expertise, and political influence. For Tarrow (2002: 234)

... there is nothing wrong with this focus on secular, progressive, and Northern-supported campaigns as long as it is made explicit that they are but one peak in the transnational archipelago of transnational interactions, many of which are not secular, not progressive, and would be profoundly hostile to the groups supporting the global civil society project.

Most important for our purposes, *these two organizations* [the Christian aid workers whose members had been arrested by the ruling of Taliban in August 2001 on charges of spreading Christianity among the countries’ Muslim population, and the Al Qaeda network who converged on Afghanistan in the 1990s], with financial and activist sources from opposite sides of the globe, *cannot in any meaningful sense be traced to globalization* unless we are willing to stretch that concept to cover forms of missionary activity that began in the sixteenth century and Islamist reactions to the corruption of the west. That would be quite a stretch even for an umbrella concept like globalization. Moreover, the term “*resistance*” *hardly begins to capture either the activities of each group or their interaction without more careful specification of these concepts*. Though the young women who were arrested by the Taliban were indeed proselytizing for Christianity, their major activity was service to the impoverished people Afghanistan, while the Al Qaeda fighters were using the country to prepare attacks on the West and the corrupt regimes of the Middle East –aggression, not resistance.

If a single episode in Central Asia can reveal such a conundrum of causes and processes of transnational conflict and interaction, the simple dichotomous pairing “globalization” and “resistance” should be refined into a finer set of orienting concepts (Tarrow 2002:234-35).¹⁹

¹⁹ My italics.

Admitting the immeasurable diversity of the component actors in the current AGMs Tarrow's warnings are worth to be taken into consideration. Thus, while I focus on the main trends for the alternative futures, I tried to consider the movements that do not have the issue of "aggression" –especially aggression in the form of terror –in their strategic framing²⁰.

1.3.3. Main trends for the alternative futures

As one of the leading names among anti-globalization activists Johan Ehrenberg²¹ states, everyone in the movement tries to define anti-globalization from their movements' or ideologies' perspective; "This is so, and there is no solution for this (Ehrenberg, 2001: 141)." Thus the answers to the question 'what will be the alternative to the prevailing form of globalization' of the movement are varied. Although categorizations are not much wanted in the social sciences mostly due to the risk of data lose during categorization processes, sometimes it is inevitable to use categories in order to have a more understandable and manageable picture of the subject in consideration; in other words, categorization is necessary just for analytical purposes.

In the literature, there are various types of categorizations present about the alternative future visions of the movement. Most of the present categorizations are based on the approaches of the constituent movements to the state, and state apparatuses, however there are also categorizations based on different criteria. Here my aim will be to summarize some of the prevailing categorizations, which will shad

²⁰ Here I should admit that I do not take the term "aggression" in the meaning that Tarrow tends to use. According to Tarrow(2002:237) the violent actions of the Black Block of the Anarchists that we have witnessed during some of the anti-globalization protests are not very different from the terrorist attacks of Al Qaeda, and he rejects to take these kinds of resistances into the same category with the civil disobedience and mass protests. However, I object that these kinds of violence actions do not have any resemblance except the damage of property in that; terrorism is endangering humans' lives, but the violence the Black Block uses as an expression of discontent does not target humans' lives. I think that this distinction should be made clear, and thus I do not tend to disregard the Black Block framings due to their action repertoires, because they form an integral part of this huge 'coalition'. From my point of view neglecting the Black Block during the analyses of this movement would result in an incomplete or worse than this in a 'subjective' –in a negative sense –study.

²¹ A Swedish economist, he is the editor of the collective publishing company and journal ETC.

“some” light on what the possible “another world” of the AGMs will look like, and then it will be time to make some preliminary conclusions based on the ‘global’ overview of the strategic framing processes of the movement.

Let me start with the most prevailing categorization, namely the categorization based on the differences in the approaches to state. Although there are many prominent names that explicitly make this categorization I would like to refer to Çoban (2002) who has been the one and only researcher focusing attention on the responses to globalization in Turkey²², for the explanation of the issue, since this will help us to understand the prevailing explanations in the movement in Turkey, in the following parts of this text.

Çoban (2002: 124) distinguishes between two forms of anti-globalization; (1) the approaches which are based on the defense of the nation state on the struggle, and (2) the ones which disclaim²³ the nation state. Let us start with the first form of anti-globalization.

According to Çoban (2002: 124) Bourdieu’s approach, who has been one of the most prominent figures of the AGM in France in recent years (whom we lost in 2002) is a good example for this form. In this approach the resistance is against the “occupation” of neoliberalism (Bourdieu, 1998a). Here Bourdieu identifies three levels of resistance which combine in the defense of the welfare state (ibid.): First level of resistance is being against the destruction of a civilization; the second level encompasses being against neoliberalism which proposes to be the only alternative except barbarism, and the third one is being against the myth, the strong discourse of globalization. Resistance should be against these three levels because the gains like

²² In the literature from Turkey or on Turkey there are many other works taking the term “anti-globalization” in to the titles they produce but the analyses are not based on the responses to globalization in Turkey, rather the analyses and conclusions drawn are based on the global reflections of the movement. Therefore, it is no surprise that Çoban appears to be the single scholar quoted throughout the text.

²³ Here I have experienced a difficulty in finding the right translation for the expression “devleti devre disi birakan yaklasimlar” in that ‘exclusion’ does not cover the intended meaning of the word. Therefore, I decided to use the expression ‘disclaiming’ which is much more close to the expressions of the author.

public services, education, health, culture, research, art, and working rights which are connected to the welfare state are being dismantled in the name of unreal reasons like competence, efficiency and flexibility (Çoban, 2002: 125). Çoban (ibid.) states that, for Bourdieu neoliberalism is much more than a doctrine devoted to the realm of thoughts; it is a political action program directed to the reconstruction of society as well as an effort to institutionalize the market economy theories like the retreat of the state from the socio-political realm in the society. However, Bourdieu does not attempt to show the relation between globalization and the neoliberal program, and therefore we are facing a neoliberalism which remains to be a program imposed by the external elites to the society that the anti-globalizers want to transform (Çoban, 2002: 126). Resultantly the relation of globalization to the nation state remains to be consisting of the relationship with the welfare state.

In his interview to Bourdieu for the *New Left Review* Grass (2002: 71) also supports the idea about the defense of the nation state which faces attacks of neoliberalism. What Grass expects from the society is “to intervene to restore welfare and social provision via the State (Grass & Bourdieu, 2002: 71).” For Çoban this understanding has two main problems (2002:127); First, this approach is not going beyond a limited “mending” of the social welfare state. When they are insisting on the dismantlement of the state, actually they are complaining about the dismantlement of the social welfare state, not the nation state. At this point Çoban (ibid.) states that in this approach anti-globalizers are resisting the globalization as well as defending the “Capitalist State”. The second problem is that the role of the state in the “capitalist system” is reduced to the use of police power, as if there remained no intervention of state to the social realm except the disciplinary role in the form of police force (ibid.).

Coming to the approaches which ‘disclaim’²⁴ the nation state in the struggle, according to Çoban (2002: 128) Hardt and Negri’s highly vocal work *Empire* is the most prominent representative of this approach. In order to explain this approach

²⁴ Refer to footnote 23 for the explanation.

first we should make clear whether this approach has a stance against or pro-globalization. In *Empire* Hardt and Negri (2001: 43) explicitly accept globalization as a fact and emphasize that this fact contributes to the development of the emancipation potential of the “multitude.” However, besides this they search for the mechanisms and perspectives that will establish the “counter-empire” in the same work. Çoban (2002: 129) states:

The thoughts of the two authors in *New York Times* on 20th of July 2001, on the eve of the Genoa Protests indicate that they take the protests of the “multitude” in Genoa as a resistance against the prevailing forms of globalization and point to the possibility of a better future.

So, with these explanations Çoban describes this approach to be against the prevailing forms of globalization, and tending to the reconstruction of an alternative globalization based on the grounds that globalization opened up (2002: 129).

Connected to this understanding there is another question to be discussed according to Çoban (ibid.): “Are they against capital?” In the AGM it is possible to identify a differentiation between taking a stance against the capital and a stance “partially” besides the capital in the search of reconciliation with it. In his article “*Today’s Bandung*”, where he evaluates the second edition of the WSF, Hardt (2002: 114) differentiates between two types of stances against globalization: The first one is the anti-globalization stance based on “national sovereignty”, and the other is the stance based on “international sovereignty”. The former stance incorporates the idea about strengthening of the nation state as a defense mechanism against the sovereignty of capital. According to Hardt (2002: 115) the explicit enemy of this stance is the weak state intervention and global capitalist activity freed from constraints. For the latter stance the enemy is the capital whether it is under state control or not (ibid.). This stance is against any type of national solution, for this stance the only solution is democratic globalization (Hardt 2002:117). Here Çoban (2002: 130) identifies the problem as follows:

Will the second stance keep being against capital if the globalization process which also contributes to the free flow of capital as well as emancipation potential of the multitude, is democratized? Will it keep being an alternative form of globalization? If we think that this alternative does not pose a real alternative, is it meaningful to differentiate between this stance and the former stance which stands against the globalization around the axis of constraining capital activities for the public benefit? We should point out that these and other

matching problems remain not to be only theoretical, they also have their equivalences in the so-called AGMs in practice.

When we consider the diversity of the groups, organizations and the social movements contributing to the AGM, it does not seem possible to accept a double categorization. The above categorization, which is mainly based on the ‘left side’ of the movement is not able to encompass all of the contributing visions, since there are groups having similar approaches to the state but do not share the same ideologies, or goals with the identified categories. Therefore, let us review some of the other types of categorizations.

Another categorization about the alternative visions of the AGMs had been posed by Fotopulos, prominent academics from the ‘left side’ of the political arena. According to Fotopulos (2001: 262-267) main trends within the movement are as follows:

- The ‘**direct democracy/direct action**’ trend, which is usually adopted by libertarian groups (Peoples’ Global Action, Reclaim the Streets, Ya Basta! and others) that were mainly responsible for the anti-globalization events in London, Seattle, Prague and elsewhere. This is the only trend within the AGM which clearly supports *anti-systemic demands*, although some currents within it adopt also reformist demands bringing them close to the next trend (ibid.).
- The ‘**reformism-as-a-strategy**’ trend, which is supported mainly by the statist Left (Marxist-Leninists, Trotskyites –like the British Socialist Workers Party – some Third World activists and the like) who *adopt reformist demands*, not necessarily in the belief of a gradual transformation of society, but as a strategy to bring about a systemic change (ibid.).
- The ‘**postmodernist**’ trend, which has been adopted by some activists, particularly feminists, environmentalists and others belonging to the so-called ‘new social movements’. Supporters of this trend adopt *a post-modern attitude* which rejects any idea of a ‘universal’ political project and collective ‘interests’ and ‘needs’—a thesis which inevitably ends up with *a reformist strategy of alliances and coalitions* between and amongst heterogeneous groups (ibid.).

- The ‘**social democratic**’ trend, which today is mainly supported by trade unionists, NGOs and ex-Marxists who have moved to social democracy, after the move of social democrats to social-liberalism. Supporters of this trend *adopt the reformist Left’s analysis of globalization* and, inevitably, end up with *reformist demands*. The strategy behind such demands is the old social democratic strategy of pressing for reformist demands, in the hope of gradually reforming society through building political alliances around such demands (ibid.).

For Fotopulos (2001: 30) –as it is obvious from the above descriptions –the reformist trends are clearly dominant and give the AGM the present overall picture of a “reformist movement.” He insists, it is obvious that for the anti-systemic trends within the AGM to be enhanced, and to really get rid of their “stratospheric character”, (which already leads to a dwindling of the numbers of activists involved), a truly anti-systemic mass political movement against the market economy and representative ‘democracy’ has to be created. Such a movement would not clearly distinguish itself from the various reformist Left trends, which can only offer utopian demands that can be met within the existing institutional framework, nor can they lead to the creation of an anti-systemic consciousness (Fotopulos, 2001: 264).

As it is obvious from the above categorizations, the “right-blindness” of the analyzers is a common phenomenon. Although, I should admit that most of the anti-globalizers belong to the “left wing” of the political spectrum, it is not justifiable to disregard the attempts of the social movements and organizations as well as community groups from the “right wing” of the political spectrum. The church based community groups defending national sovereignty and moral values of Christianity have been one of the main frame dissemination mechanisms during the framing process, and also their efforts during the global mobilization process, especially in Seattle by local participant mobilization has considerable worth (Smith, 2002: 212-213). Therefore, the categorization Fotopulos offers does not seem suitable for analytical purposes with its exclusion of the groups who do not have a leftist political stance.

The categorization of Starr (2000), which she uses during her analysis of the anti-corporate movement,²⁵ is one of the most encompassing approaches. In this categorization Starr (2000: xi) distinguishes between three “modes of anti-corporate ideology”: (1) “Contestation and reform,” (2) “Globalization from below,” and (3) “Delinking / Relocalization and Sovereignty.” Now let me try to explain what Starr means with these categories.

The first of the three modes of anti-corporatism is composed of movements that seek to impose regulatory limitations on corporations or force them to self-regulate (ibid.). These movements challenge the legitimacy of neoliberal restructuring of the role of the state and the necessity of subordinating social priorities to international competitiveness (Starr, 2000: 45). Starr (ibid.) explains that the use of the word “reform” to describe this mode does not mean that these movements take a liberal approach to capitalism. On the contrary they reject growth, prioritize non-economic concerns, and critique dependency and consumption, which are stances not allowed in liberal reformism. Here “reform” signifies a strategic approach commonly taken by this mode, mobilizing existing formal democratic channels of protest, seeking national legislation, mounting judicial challenges, mobilizing international agencies, boycotting and protesting (Starr, 2000: 46). In this mode peace and human rights movements joined the movements fighting structural adjustment and seeking land reform, cyberpunks, and some movements that describe them explicitly anti-corporate (Starr, 2000: xi). For all of these movements, “corporate rule” is wrong because it is undemocratic (Starr, 2000: 46). Most projects of this mode attempt to recover the authority of the state to regulate capital, and constrain its abuses as well

²⁵ Starr’s analysis is based on the anti-corporate movement. However, the idea that during the strategic framing processes the anti-corporate stance has evolved into the anti-globalization stance is supported throughout the text. Additionally, although Starr prefers to call her work as a research on anti-corporate movement at the beginning, in the further parts of the work, after she discusses the dynamics of corporate domination she connects the process to the neoliberal policies, and ends up with the following words that signify that actually the anti-corporate movement is not different from the AGM: “Since I am studying *resistance to globalization*, [my italics] I shall retain the concern with the disempowering effects of a totalized vision of the enemy (Starr 2000:29).” Therefore, we do not mind to adopt this categorization to the current AGM, which demands only some rephrasing of the words. (Since Starr uses the term ‘anti-corporate movement’ in this part, the terms anti-corporate and anti-globalization are used sometimes interchangeably.)

as deliver social benefits (Starr, 2000: xi). Actually, it should be admitted that Bourdieu's approach would most probably appear here in this categorization.

Starr (2000: 78) states that movements in this mode sometimes fail to challenge fully the consequences of the neoliberal economic domination, opposing only specific behaviors or state collaboration with corporate priorities. They attempt to organize national governments to regulate corporate activities more effectively; or they mobilize people to demand standards or concessions from corporations themselves. According to Starr (2000: 79) this type of progressive movements does slowly gain moral ground, but they offer corporations methods of re-legitimizing themselves.

Additionally, the major challenge for first world movements in this mode is to commit themselves to the material consequences of their humanitarian sympathies (ibid.). Some of the explicit anti-corporate movements seem to fantasize that First World citizens can maintain their current living standards, consumption and technology while relieving third world debt, destroying the military-industrial complex, and rescuing Third World workers from inhumane working conditions on the global assembly line. If First World citizens are to support Third World land reform they will have to change their eating practices considerably. What is the material relationship between First World social justice and Third World social justice? Calls for a renewal of the social contract to provide First World justice can be achieved only on the back of third world resources and markets, so Third World survival depends on a new approach to justice in the first world (ibid.).

Some of the movements which are counted under this category are single-issue or interest-based movements that are expanding to general anti-globalization perspectives in the face of relatively recent advances in the strategic framing processes against neoliberal globalization; the Bergama Movement against the gold-mining with cyanide in the Ovacik Village of Bergama district can be an example of this type of movements. Although, it is possible to object that these type of single issue movements can not pose a threat to the neoliberal globalization, and that they most probably would not be interested in the transformation of the existing mode of globalization, Starr (2000: 80) states that the strengths of the movements in this

mode are their emerging clarity about the enemy and their growing willingness to challenge the assumptions that empower corporate hegemony, which are also the bases of neoliberal globalization process.

The basic idea of “people’s globalism” or “globalization from below”, the second mode in Starr’s analysis, is that people all over the world are commonly threatened by environmental degradation, abuse of human rights and un-enforcement of labor standards, and that powerful global alliances can be formed to make corporations and governments accountable to people instead of elites (Brecher et al., 2000: 10). Instead of wielding the nation-state as a defense against globalization, these movements perceive the need to globalize resistance to match the globalized structure of neoliberal exploitation (Brecher et al., 2000: 34). They call themselves as “global” or “postnational” (Starr, 2000: xiv).

This approach to anti-globalization is consonant with Marxist and international humanitarian hopes: “Workers of the world unite and rebuild the world!” It is a hopeful vision that assumes the possibility of international, democratic, non-violent revolution to be achieved by the rising up of peoples’ movements everywhere. The movements of this mode are devotedly democratic, holding Western democratic ideals as fundamental goals for their movements. Although Starr (2000: 85) indicates that the labor movement, rapidly globalizing its capacities, is often positioned as the natural leader of “globalization from below”, Brecher et al. (2000) do not use such an expression in their work, which is laying the bases of this approach. This mode also includes two “new social movements”, the particularly effective international movement against free trade agreements and Zapatismo, which may be the most sophisticated practice of “globalization from below”²⁶ (Starr, 2000: 84).

The movements of this mode are organizing very significant new forms of internationalism (Brecher et al., 2000: 26). In response to NAFTA, collaborations

²⁶ For detailed information on Zapatismo movement look at: Morton, Adam David, (2002), ‘**La Resurrección del Maíz: Globalization, Resistance and the Zapatistas**, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 31(1):27-54; Johnston and Laxer (2003); Cleaver (1994, 1998a, 1998b); Görenel (2002); and Marcos (2001).

have emerged between Mexican and US labor organizations, farmers' organizations and people of color. These organizations are working to educate themselves about the similarities of their situations across the First World-Third World border (Brecher et al., 2000: 11). The Zapatistas' courageous stance catalyzes international commitments from First World social justice allies and Fourth World indigenous peoples groups. The anti-FTA movements show the strong base of international solidarity that has been built by development scholars and activists through years of challenging WB and IMF policies (ibid.). Critical frameworks and knowledge developed in North-South collaboration enable the rapid development of analyses and international campaigns that focus on the concerns of the poorest of the poor.

According to Brecher et al. (2000: 66) a program for the alternative futures needs to perform four basic functions in relation to diverse elements within the movement, the wider public, the opposition, and the world to be changed: First, it must unify the concerns and approaches of different parts of the movement; second, it should appeal to the uncommitted of their support; third, it needs to help fragment, neutralize, de-legitimate, or even win over parts of the opposition; and finally, it must propose good solutions to the problems of the real world.

Brecher et al. (2000: 67-80) do not forget to propose a draft of a possible program for the formation of the "another world" they are fighting for. Their sketch of a program for "globalization from below" is organized around seven basic principles (Brecher et al., 2000: 68-69):

1. Level labor, environmental, social, and human rights conditions upward;
2. Democratize institutions at every level from local to global;
3. Make decisions as close as possible to those they affect;
4. Equalize global wealth and power;
5. Convert the global economy to environmental sustainability;
6. Create Prosperity by meeting human and environmental needs;
7. Protect against global boom and bust.

The recognized strategy for the achievement of these goals is based on identifying the violation of generally held norms, demanding the power actors to conform to those norms and threatening the bases of consent on which they depend if they fail to do so (Brecher et al., 2000: 108). This strategy is summed up in the popular

movement slogan “fix it or nix it”. The movement strategy also involves the coordination of different elements and different styles of action (Brecher et al., 2000: 109). Ideally, this coordination is achieved by synergy according to Brecher et al. (2000: 109). We have witnessed the fruits of this type of synergy during the Battle of Seattle at first. The combination of extremely militant non-violent direct action and large numbers of supportive but militant demonstrators have created a force far more powerful than either one would have been by itself.

Finally, we have come to the third mode, namely “delinking, relocalization and sovereignty”. Long-term solutions to today’s social and environmental problems require a range of small, local initiatives that are as diverse as the cultures and environments in which they take place. The third mode of anti-globalization articulates the pleasures, productivities and rights of localities (Starr, 2000: 111). Corporations appear as threats to locality whose powers can be evaded only by “delinking” the local economy from the corporate-controlled national and international economies. Intruders must not be allowed in. According to Starr (*ibid.*) while Samir Amin (1985)²⁷ coined the word “delinking”, the concept was not new, since she states that the movements considered under this category are long-term movements with well-developed philosophies. Like movements in the other modes, they are democratic, but they articulate a different form of democracy - the practice of local sovereignty and the refusal of distant authority (*ibid.*).

Starr (*ibid.*) adds that while scholars have been complaining about the need for an “alternative political economy”, little attention has been paid to the many ongoing practices of what she calls “relocalization”. According to her there are three distinct concerns that contribute to “relocalization” (Starr, 2000: 112): The first is the need for economies in dialogue with their ecological bases and limits; the second concern is the need for community economic health. Anarchists, a family of socialists, have long insisted on local-scale economies. But they share with sovereignty movements and religious nationalists the third concern, political autonomy and the assertion of

²⁷ Samir Amin, 1985, **Delinking: Towards a Polycentric World**, Translated by M. Wolfers, London: Zed Books.

peoples' right to govern their own lives (ibid.). The three concerns are mutually reinforcing, leading anti-globalization scholars to draw on "[j]effersonian/Iroquois democracy", "Swiss *gemeinde*" (commune, the sub-canton unit), and "Gandhian *swadeshi*" in articulating a theory of local political authority founded on economic independence and local mutuality (ibid.).

The Non-Governmental Organizations' meeting at Rio alongside the United Nations Earth Summit in 1992 issued the People's Earth Declaration, which conveyed "broadly shared consensus" on a series of principles, includes 'organizing life around decentralized relatively self-reliant local economies'. Leading grassroots organizations, working through a consensus process, insist that sustainable development is to be achieved through delinked relocalization (rather than through an improved corporate economy) (Starr, 2000: 144).

These groups do not only see global market logic as illegitimate, they insist that such huge interdependent economies, which threaten the survival strategies of especially the poorer small communities have no place in the future.

Like movements in the other modes, the movements in this mode try to re-embed the economy in a socio-moral framework (Starr, 2000:145). Obviously, religious nationalism is not the only movement crying out for moral order. It is not the only movement that calls out to people to rediscover their most basic values, to value tradition and community and to refuse the luxuries of modernity. In the small business movement, business people are turning against larger capitalists, using moral terms, emphasizing externalities, defining business as in service of a community, avoiding convenience and low prices and denying the legitimacy of corporate acts (ibid.). Their ideology amounts to an attempt to change the rules of capitalism without actually resigning - yet it certainly goes beyond reformism according to Starr (ibid.). There are several different paths to the vision of a small-scale economy. All of these movements point to existing models that provide technical and institutional tools and on this basis insist that small-scale economies are extremely realistic (ibid.).

Defending an independent economy will require political autonomy. As Starr (ibid.) emphasizes separatism carries the threat of "xenophobic nationalism" but it may also carry the hope of returning economic and political structures to human scale. According to Starr (ibid.) taking this mode seriously as a social movement

immediately raises concerns about a number of feared meanings and consequences of local autonomy. She states that because first world social justice and social equity struggles have long been focused on “universalistic legislation and jurisprudence”, the left often responds to both national and local autonomy with panic (ibid.). Indeed, leftists seem to panic more about local autonomy than they do about the destruction of national politics as a site for civil rights (ibid.). She points out that religious nationalism is a particular “flashpoint” for left concerns about autonomous movements (ibid.). Like indigenous sovereignty movements, it seeks to reassert moral order over the political economy, and requires local political autonomy in order to protect cultural integrity. Starr (2000: 146) emphasizes that like indigenous movements, with which the left is more sympathetic, religious nationalism is anti-colonial, questions the notion of “progress”, and prioritizes local social life over capitalist goals. If this is the case, why should analyzes leave this component of the AGMs outside categorizations? Is this so, just because they frame their issues on “religious” moral values?

1. 4. Some Preliminary Conclusions

Having this “broad” and “shallow” descriptive picture of the “global” AGM in our minds attention should be returned to the role of the “agent” in the formulation of the future. The agent has the power in its hands to shape the future of the society, where sometimes the structure is less significant. In this age of “globalization”, where we should admit that the history is evolving in the direction of transforming existing structures the agency is central in this process. In one of the earliest responses to the “Battle of Seattle”, which has put the discontent of the agency with the existing patterns of structure in to the forefront, Gill (2000: 137) calls this agent the “Postmodern prince” following Gramsci and Machiavelli²⁸:

I advance the following hypothesis: the protests form part of a world-wide movement that can perhaps be understood in terms of new potentials and forms of global political agency.

²⁸ Here Gill refers to the following works: Gramsci, Antonio, 1971, **Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci**, New York: International Publishers; and Machiavelli, 1950, **The Prince**.

And following Machiavelli and Gramsci, I call this set of potentials ‘the postmodern Prince’ which I understand as something plural and differentiated, although linked to universalism and the construction of a new form of globalism, and of course, something that needs to be understood as a set of social and political forces in movement (Gill, 2000: 137).

Here what Gill calls “the postmodern Prince” is a collective agent, a political agent who mobilizes around the concepts of democracy, global economic inequality, societal reproduction and environmental concerns (Gill, 2000: 138). This agency comprises the societal gender, race and class dimensions within itself, and has the potential to develop an alternative policy to neoliberal globalization (Gill 2000: 137). Workers, global justice defenders, indigenous populations, religious representatives, small farmers, students as well as others belong to this agent. According to Gill these movements are beginning to form what Gramsci called “an organism, a complex element of society (qtd. in Gill, 2000: 138)” that is beginning to point towards the realization of a collective will, in that it is a transnational political party away from centralization and non-institutionalized as well. It is growing out of the global civil society, and tends to bring together the varieties of collective identities and solidarities among civil societies (ibid.). The global actions of “the postmodern Prince” are multiple, differentiated as well as democratic and inclusive. And similar to Hardt and Negri (2001: 206) who left the emergence of the organizational form of the “multitude” without discussion stating that “it could only emerge in practice”, Gill (2000: 139) states that the organizational form will arise from the experiences of the movement.

What does the “multitude” of Hardt and Negri look like? Does it have a transformative potential like “the postmodern Prince” of Gill? For Hardt and Negri (2001: 380) the real struggle against the empire depends on the “multitude” which emerges in emancipating and productive practices. The alternative will grow out of the “multitude’s actions”. The “multitude” is mobile and flexible and it conceives the future only as “a totality of possibilities that branch out in every direction (ibid.)”. But how will this “multitude” arise? The answer of Hardt and Negri is as follows:

The formation of the multitude of exploited and subjugated producers can be read more clearly in the history of 20th century revolutions... Far from being defeated, the revolutions of the 20th century have each pushed forward and transformed the terms of class conflict,

posing the conditions of a new political subjectivity, an insurgent multitude against imperial power.

The constitution of Empire is not the cause but the consequence of the rise of the new powers. It should be no surprise, then, that Empire, despite its efforts, finds it impossible to construct a system of right adequate to the new reality of the globalization of social and economic relations. This impossibility (...) is not due to the wide extension of the field of regulation; nor is it simply the result of the difficult passage from the old system of internal public law to the new imperial system. This impossibility is explained instead by the revolutionary nature of the multitude, whose struggles have produced Empire as an inversion of its own image and who now represents on this new scene an uncontrollable force and an excess of value with respect to every form of right and law (Hardt & Negri, 2001: 394).

The “multitude” is not just a form of resistance or “counter-empire” in Hardt and Negri’s words. It also has political demands. The first of these political demands is “the right to global citizenship”, which demands legal security of the global free flow and migration as well as a full right to citizenship to everyone in the country where they live (Hardt & Negri, 2001: 396-400). According to the authors “the right to global citizenship” is the tool for the “reappropriation of space” (Hardt & Negri, 2001: 400). The second political demand of the “multitude” finds its explanation in the “right to a social wage”, which means that every citizen should have the security of a citizen’s wage, as well as a social wage and a guaranteed income for all (Hardt & Negri, 2001: 401-403). In this way the multitude will fade away the distinctions between the production and reproduction times, which will enable it to take the time under its own control (Hardt & Negri, 2001: 403). And finally, the third political demand of the multitude is expressed as the “right to reappropriation”. It means free access to and control over knowledge, information, communication and affects—because these are some of the primary means of “biopolitical production” (Hardt & Negri, 2001: 403-407). The “right to reappropriation” is really the multitude’s right to self-control and autonomous self-production (Hardt & Negri, 2001: 407).

According to Çoban (2002: 156) the political program of the Empire is an extended democracy program; equitable to a program demanding the democratization of the globalization, rather than transforming it into a new system. This comment reveals the main question which the left is dealing under the heading of AGM; will it bring about a revolution, which will dismiss the capitalist world system, therefore; most of the analyses coming from the left focus on the anti-systemic potential of the

movement. Although, they admit the potential of the movement in projecting alternative politics, they are cautious about its nature and the potential outcomes. In an environment, where the direction of the history cannot be seen it is wise to take cautionary steps.

Another cautionary argument comes from Scholte, but this time about the potential of the agency; the so-called “global civil society”:

This popular mobilization has made an impact. Civic action has pushed issues of social justice and democracy high up the agenda of global economic governance. ... Yet ‘victory’ in the ‘Battle of Seattle’ is no occasion about the future of globalization or the role of civil society in shaping its course. Halting a new round of trade liberalization is not the same thing as building a better world order. Nor have civic initiatives in the Seattle scenario provided full confidence in the contributions of civil society to progressive global politics (Scholte 2000a: 115-116).

According to Scholte (2000a: 116) we should take three “cautionary notes” on “the Battle of Seattle”. First, we should not overestimate the significance of Seattle in terms of policy change, since social movements of the kind represented on the streets of Seattle have achieved only marginal reforms of global economic governance to date (Scholte, 2000a: 117). Secondly, we should not romanticize civil society as an inherently powerful and progressive force; in that the limitations in the practices of civil society regarding global economic governance are obvious, and romanticism will do little to advance actual reform, as well as encouraging detrimental complacency (ibid.). And finally, Scholte (2000a: 116) states that we should look beyond the dismantlement of neoliberal globalization to the construction of something better, which points to the need of developing new forms of globalization.

At this point Scholte (2000a) should be asked who the builder of the new forms of globalization will be. If there are no actors on the “scene” we cannot watch a “play”. If the civil society does not have the power to build the future, to whom we will trust in the building of our future, to the global elites, or to the states. Or should we hand our future to the global capital, which does not consider anything except ‘surplus value’? Being cautious in overestimating the significance of the civil society can be accepted, but we also should be cautious about ‘underestimations’. And about the building of alternative futures, it should be taken into account that Scholte (2000a)

has written these comments immediately after the “Battle of Seattle” in the first months of the new millennium. At that time there were just premature thought embryos about the future of the movement as well as its goals. It had the frame of an opposition to the neoliberal globalization process. However, looking to the movement from today, the continuity and the efforts about the building of a new future should be admitted.

Coming to the framing processes; the social movement frames are volatile things, which can melt into air if there is not sufficient effort to keep the frames alive. However, the social movement frames are not just dependent on the efforts of the activists; there are also other conditions that affect the frames. Zald (1996: 261) identifies six factors contributing to the framing process: (1) Repertoires of contention and frames are cultural constructs; (2) Cultural contradictions and historical events contribute to framing in providing opportunities; (3) Framing is a strategic activity; (4) There are competitive processes that represent the context in which frames are selected and come to dominate; (5) Frames are transmitted and reframed in the mass media; and finally (6) We must understand how political opportunity and mobilization intersect to shape the outcomes of framing competition.

Wood (2004) analyses a set of 467 local protests that took place against neoliberalism on 5 ‘global days of action’ between 1998 and 2001 and finds that the targets of protest differ on each continent. The majority targets either the global institutions of neoliberalism, such as the IMF, World Bank, World Trade Organization or the Group of 8, or neglects to identify a single institutional target. However, according to Wood (2004) the most popular local target in Africa and Asia is national or local governments. In Latin America protests are most likely to target banks or stock exchanges, and in the US, Canada and Europe, corporations. The sources of such variation lie in pre-existing political repertoires, transnational organizational networks, and processes of structural equivalence that underlie diffusion patterns (Wood, 2004). Keeping Zald’s (1996) theoretical formulations and Wood’s findings in mind it is not surprising that we trace differences in the framing processes and targets during the ‘global days of action’ across various countries. For

example, during the ‘global day of anti-war’ actions we witnessed that the framings in the Christian countries and the countries with Muslim populations differed in content, where the Christian countries were emphasizing the “human rights” concept and the Muslim countries were formulating slogans based on “global intifada”.

In order to understand why the targets of anti-globalization protests differ on each continent, we need to look at pre-existing repertoires, networks of organizations and the processes that underlie diffusion. As we have seen, the economic and political context of different regions influence the existence and activity of political organizations, their issues, campaigns and of course their choices of tactic and target. With the increasing visibility of transnational institutions, these pre-existing domestic networks transpose contention to the international level without liquidating it locally or nationally. This shift is a contingent process that depends in part on relationships between domestic social movements and transnational authorities. As a result, there are regional and temporal differences within the struggles against neoliberalism (Wood, 2004: 82).

Additionally, the change in the direction of the movement framing from being against globalization to being against war in the aftermath of 9/11 shows us that the political opportunities are as well very effective in changing the frames of the movements. However, it should be added that the changing political opportunity structures after 9/11 pose a direct challenge to the strategic framing process of the AGM. After the terrorist attacks to US symbolic figures of political and economic hegemony, the framing process against neoliberal globalization has entered a recession period. Although, the movement showed itself on the streets with “anti-war” slogans, it should be admitted that these slogans are not fully consonant with the original frames at the beginning and do not contribute much to the theoretical and practical goals of the movement.

At this point, in order to draw an epilogue to this part I should return to Çoban’s comments once again. Çoban (2002: 135) admits that the political practice and the theoretical questionings of globalization of the movement supply new opportunities in the struggle against neoliberal globalization in four ways: First, the rising “resistant waves” have removed the depressive aura of “no alternative” vision (ibid.). Secondly, they have provided the emergence of a series of alternative policy proposals, although their relevancy, suitability and applicability are debatable (Çoban, 2002: 136). Thirdly, whether in the form of resistances against the dismantlement of the welfare state, hindering the meetings of the WTO, the

theoretical and practical resistances of the movement provides a barrier in front of the deepening of the inequalities of neoliberal globalization and contributes to the expansion of the sites of the alternative seekers (ibid.). And finally, it contributed to the coming together of various actors from various areas, which seemed to be impossible to come-together (ibid.). So, what we should do at this point?

Yet the dynamics of the resistance are shaped and the “no alternative” myth is demolished. At this point affirmative approaches with the reason of “better than nothing” and condemning the critical approaches by labels like naive, sectarian or orthodox is a false interpretation of the movement. At the same time it is a barrier against the movement’s developing potential (Çoban 2002: 136).

Therefore, the movement as well as the contributing intellectuals, and theoreticians of alternative forms of globalization or alternatives to globalization should combine their forces, for a better future.

CHAPTER 2

2. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In the first chapter the framing processes within the global AGMs have been discussed before going into the analysis of the case study some theoretical and methodological considerations which form the bases of the research should be made clear. First, the theoretical considerations about the “framing theory” which is utilized as an analytical toll throughout the research will be discussed and then methodological issues will be explained in the following parts of this chapter.

2.1. The Framing Theory

2.1.1. Overview of the Prevalent Social Movement Theories

Throughout the modern era, diverse groups have banded together in explicit efforts to transform the social order. Although such efforts rarely met with complete success, their cumulative impact has been substantial. Alongside other influences, the contemporary social world is the product of prior collective efforts to transform old social orders into new ones (Buechler, 1999: xi).

Social change has always been a dominant area of research in the sociological literature since social change periods generally develop environments where the social scientists try to find out data that will help to get clues for the outcomes of the social change process. As many scholars point out social movements have been central to the development of contemporary society and the shaping of modern sociology (Buechler, 1999: xii; McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1996: 1; della Porta & Kriesi, 1999: 3; Maheu, 1995: 1; Tarrow, 1998: 2). In such an environment it is no surprise that the social movements (SMs) have merited wide ranged attention of sociology researchers.

There are mainly three different theoretical traditions emphasizing three different factors for the analysis of emergence and development of SMs. McAdam, McCarthy and Zald (1996: 2) define these three factors as; (1) the structure of political opportunities and constraints confronting the movement; (2) the forms of organization (informal as well as formal), available to insurgents; and (3) the

collective processes of interpretation, attribution, and social construction that mediate between opportunity and action. For the sake of simplicity I would prefer to use the conventional shorthand designations dominantly used in the social movement literature; respectively, “political opportunities”, “mobilizing structures” and “framing processes”.

The theoretical approach focusing on the “political opportunities” has been mainly developed by the “political process” theorists of the United States. These theorists like Charles Tilly, Dough McAdam and Sidney Tarrow were focusing on the relationships between institutionalized politics and SMs (Buechler, 1999: 167; McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1996: 2-3; Jenkins, 1995: 16). Inspired by the works of these scholars some European scholars like Hanspeter Kiresi, Herbert Kitschelt, Ruud Koopmans, and Jan Duyvendak brought a comparative dimension to the “political opportunities” approach with the “new social movements” (NSMs) tradition (McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1996: 2-3; della Porta & Kriesi, 1999: 8-12). In order to make a short and comprehensive summary of this approach let us refer to McAdam, McCarthy and Zald (1996: 3):

Most of the early work by American Scholars sought to explain the emergence of a particular social movement on the basis of *changes in the institutional structure or informal power relations of a given national political system*. More recently, European scholars have sought to account for *cross-national differences in the structure, extent, and success of comparable movements on the basis of differences in the political characteristics of the nation states in which they are embedded*. ... In Both cases, however, the researcher is guided by the same underlying conviction; that social movements and revolutions are shaped by the broader set of political constraints and opportunities unique to the national context in which they are embedded.²⁹

Following the way paved by the “political opportunities” approach “resource mobilization” approach states that the influence of the social movements and the forms they take is not independent of the various kinds of “mobilizing structures” through which groups seek to organize. The term “mobilizing structures” refers to the “collective vehicles, informal as well as formal, through which people mobilize and engage in collective action” (McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1996: 3). In the “resource mobilization” approach emphasis is put on the variety and sources of

²⁹ Italics are original.

resources to be mobilized, relationship of SMs to the media, authorities and other parties, interactions among movement organizations, dependence of SMs upon external support for success, and the tactics used by authorities to control or incorporate SMs (McCarthy, & Zald, 1977: 1212-1241).

Within this perspective the main point of departure for the theorists is the necessity of external resources –especially elite support– for the emergence, development and the survival of the social movement organizations (SMO). According to the theory the masses are powerless, and external support is necessary for mobilization, where this external support is coming from the elites who have the political participation opportunities, wealth and other required resources. They see the SMs from a production perspective, the goals of a SMO is presented like a consumer product, that should be promoted in order to be sold, that is; SMO should promote its goals in order to get as more resources as possible. This also makes manipulation of grievances possible (McCarthy & Zald, 1977: 1215-1220).

The third approach in the study of the SMs, namely the “framing processes” approach, tries to find answer to a problematic issue which has been not shed light on by the political opportunities and mobilizing structures approaches. Mediating between opportunity, organization, and action there are the shared meanings and definitions that bring people together and direct them to action. At least people need to feel aggrieved about some aspects of their lives and they should believe in the possibility of changing their situations by acting collectively³⁰. It would have been

³⁰ *Relative Deprivation Model* has been one of the first attempts to explain the collective actions. It is possible to find the origins of the framing perspective within this theory whose main argument can be summarized as below: When a prolonged period of economic and social development is followed by a sharp reversal the rising expectations of the people during the economic and social development can not be satisfied and people develop an anxiety and fear about their ability to satisfy their needs. This “dissatisfied” state of mind in society brings about political instability and may result in revolutions (Davies, 1962: 6). According to Davies when a society is generally impoverished individuals withdraw from society in order to save their physical and mental energies for their immediate survival, and therefore societal contact and consequently social action is not possible. Under these conditions any kind of repression may not be overcome because people would prefer to keep their chains rather than death. When the repressive conditions begin to loosen only after then people take the risks of an insurgency (Davies, 1962: 7-8). But what the framing perspective adds to the relative deprivation model is that the latter takes the grievances as granted, whereas the latter implies a social construction process for the grievances to become an instrument for the fostering of collective action.

illogical to expect any collective action organization when all of the resources are available at hand and the political opportunity structure (POS) favors mobilization of masses, but there are no grievances within the society about one or more problems. This area which actually lies on the borderline of sociology and psychology draw the attention of many scholars³¹ but let us mention Snow and Benford (1986) as the dominant scholars of SM research in this area.

2.1.2. The Framing Theory

Although these two perspectives [mentioning the RM and POS theories] differ in terms of focal considerations and levels of analyses, both tend to treat meanings or ideas as given, as if there is an isomorphic relationship between the nature of any particular set of conditions or events and the meanings attached to them. Since meanings are produced in the course of interaction with other individuals and objects of attention, it strikes us as foolhardy to take meaning and other ideational elements for granted or to treat them purely descriptively in any equation attempting to account for movement participation. Movements function as carriers and transmitters of mobilizing beliefs and ideas, to be sure; but they are also actively engaged in the production of meaning for participants, antagonists, and observers. This productive work may involve the shaping and structuring of existing meanings. Movements can thus be construed as functioning in part as signifying agents and, as such, are deeply embroiled along with the media and the state, in what Stuart Hall (1982) has referred to as the “politics of signification”. (Snow and Benford, 1988: 198)

The difference framing perspective brought into the social movement research lies in the emphasis on the role of the actors, and this is the reason why we have chosen this perspective for the analysis of the AGM. At this point let me elaborate this perspective in detail to some extent, where I will try to figure out the basics of this perspective and clarify the core conceptions which have been used in the first chapter during the descriptive analysis of the AGM, and will be applied for the analysis of the case study in the following parts.

³¹ According to McAdam, McCarthy and Zald (1996: 5) Snow and Benford were not alone in asserting the importance of the more cognitive, or ideational elements of collective action. They point out two more streams which have called attention to the role of ideas and culture; the NSM scholars and the POS models. They state that “for many of the NSM scholars it was the centrality of their cultural elements that marked the NSMs as discontinuous with the past” (McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1996: 5). Therefore, many of the works of most influential NSMs theorists like Melucci and Touraine focused primarily on the sources and functions of meaning and identity. Some POS theorists like Gamson, Tarrow and Tilly have also “acknowledged the critical catalytic effect of new ideas as a spur to collective action” (McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1996:5). Especially McAdam’s (1982, **Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press) discussion of the necessity for “cognitive liberation” as a prerequisite for mobilization has been considerably supportive for the development of the framing perspective.

First of all the term “frame” has been borrowed from Goffman (1974: 21) to denote “schemata of interpretation” that enable individuals “to locate, perceive, identify, and label” occurrences within their life space and the world at large. By depicting events or occurrences meaningful, frames function to organize experience and guide action. Starting from this point the key concept in the framing perspective becomes the “collective action frames”. Collective action frames perform the above mentioned interpretive function by simplifying and condensing aspects of the “world out there”, but in a way that is “intended to mobilize potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystander support, and to demobilize antagonists” (Snow & Benford, 1988: 198). In other words, collective action frames are “action oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of a SMO” (Snow & Benford, 2000: 614). But the development of such a collective action frame does not advance out of the existing ideologies, beliefs, values or schemata on its own; this requires an active process of meaning construction operation performed by real active agencies. This action which “denotes an active, processual phenomenon that implies agency and contention at the level of reality construction” is called “framing” (ibid.), and the resultant product of this framing activity is the “collective action frames” (CAFs).

2.1.2.1. Characteristic Features of CAFs

In their comprehensive overview Snow and Benford (2000: 614) identify two sets of characteristic features for the CAFs. In order to keep the discussion short and give systematic information let us go step by step for the elaboration of these two types of characteristic features: (1) Characteristic features concerning the action oriented functions of CAFs, which the authors call “**core framing tasks**”, and (2) Characteristic features concerning the generative functions of the CAFs, which they call “**interactive-discursive processes**” (Snow & Benford, 2000: 615).

(1) Core Framing Tasks

During the construction process of the CAFs Snow and Benford (2000: 615; 1988:199) identify a three stepped way: First, activators develop a shared

understanding of some problematic condition or situation, that they define to be in need of change and make attributions regarding who or what to blame for the current situation; then they “articulate an alternative sets of arrangements”, where they finally, urge others to act together to affect change. Following Wilson’s³² decomposition of ideology into three components (qtd. in Snow & Benford, 1988: 199, and 2000: 615) they suggest that there are three core framing tasks: (1) “diagnostic framing” involves identification of a problem and the attribution of blame or causality, (2) “prognostic framing” whose purpose is not only to suggest solutions to the problem but also to identify strategies, tactics, and targets, and (3) “motivational framing” provides a call to arms or a rationale for engaging in ameliorative collective action, including the construction of appropriate vocabularies of motive where it entails the development of the agency component of CAFs (Snow & Benford, 1988: 200-203; 1992: 137; 2000: 615-617).

(2) Interactive and Discursive Processes

These are processes that try to explain “how frames get made” (Snow & Benford, 2000: 623). Frames are developed, generated, and elaborated on not only via attending the three core framing tasks briefly defined above, but also by way of three sets of overlapping processes that can be conceptualized as “discursive, strategic, and contested”.

“Discursive processes” refer to the talk and conversation, i.e. the speech acts, and written communications of movement members that occur primarily in the context of, or in relation to movement activities. Here the authors identify two basic discursive processes: (1) “frame articulation” involves the connection and alignment of events and experiences so that they hang together in a relatively unified and compelling way, and (2) “frame amplification” involves accenting and highlighting some issues, events or beliefs as being more salient than others (Snow & Benford 2000: 623, Snow et al., 1986: 469-472).

³² Wilson, John. 1973. **Introduction to Social Movements**. New York: Basic Books.

“Strategic processes”, designate the framing processes that are “deliberative, utilitarian and goal directed” (Snow & Benford, 2000: 624). Frames are developed and deployed to achieve a specific purpose, for example; to recruit new members, to mobilize adherents, to acquire resources, and so forth. Strategic efforts by social movement organizations to link their interests and interpretive frames with those of prospective constituents and actual or prospective resource providers were initially conceptualized as “frame alignment processes” (Snow et al., 1986). In their latest work Snow and Benford (2000: 624) identify four basic alignment processes: “frame bridging”, “frame amplification”, “frame extension”, and “frame transformation”.

“Frame bridging” refers to the linking of two or more “ideologically congruent but structurally unconnected” frames regarding a particular issue or problem. Bridging can occur between a movement and individuals, through the linkage of a movement organization with an immobilized sentiment pool or public opinion cluster, or across social movements. According to the authors this is among the most prevalent of framing strategies (Snow and Benford, 2000: 624, Snow et al., 1986: 467-469).

“Frame amplification” involves the “idealization, embellishment, clarification, or invigoration” of existing values or beliefs (Snow & Benford, 2000: 624). As Snow et al. point out (1986: 469); generally, the meanings of events and their connection to peoples’ immediate life situations are covered by indifference, deception or production by others and by ambiguity or uncertainty. In order to garner support and mobilize participants the meanings of these events had to be made clear and “an interpretive frame” has to be reinvigorated (ibid.). The authors identify two types of “frame amplification”; “value amplification” and “belief amplification”. “Value amplification” refers to the identification, idealization, and elevation of one or more values presumed to be basic to prospective constituents but which have not inspired collective action for some reasons³³ (Snow et al., 1986: 469). “Belief amplification”

³³ Among the reasons for the inability of values for the inspiration of collective action Snow et al. State that: “They may have atrophied, fallen into disuse, or have been suppressed because of the lack of an opportunity for expression due to a repressive authority structure or the absence of an organizational outlet; they may have become taken for granted or clichéd, they may not have been sufficiently challenged or threatened; or their relevance to a particular event or issue may be ambiguous (Snow et al., 1986: 469).”

covers making “the beliefs discernible in the movement literature³⁴” more visible to the targets of amplification (ibid.).

“Frame extension” involves depicting a SMO’s interests and frames as extending beyond its primary interests to include issues and concerns that are presumed to be of importance to potential adherents (Snow & Benford, 2000: 625, Snow et al., 1986: 472). According to the authors empirical examinations of frame extension indicate that although movements often employ this alignment strategy it is subject to various hazards and constraints in that “frame extension” activities generate increases in intramural conflicts and disputes within movements regarding issues of ideological “purity,” efficiency, and “turf” (Snow & Benford, 2000: 625). For some individuals in some movements, “frame extension” is but a “hooking” process that functions as an initial step along the path to the more thoroughgoing type of strategic alignment, namely the “frame transformation”.

“Frame transformation”, the final “strategic alignment process”, refers to changing old understandings and meanings and/or generating new ones (Snow & Benford 2000: 625, Snow et al., 1986: 473-476). The programs, causes, and values that some SMOs promote may not resonate with, or may even be antithetical to conventional lifestyles, beliefs, and values. In that case, new values may be required to be developed; old meanings need to be changed, and irritating or invalid beliefs or “misframings” reframed in order to garner support and secure participants. What maybe required is a transformation of frame.

The development, generation, and elaboration of CAFs are “contested processes”. There are a variety of challenges confronting all those who engage in movement framing activities. Snow and Benford (2000:625) identify three forms of these

³⁴ According to the authors “beliefs are ideational elements that cognitively support or impede action in pursuit of desired values”, and there are “five kinds of beliefs discernible in the movement literature that are especially relevant to mobilization and participation processes (Snow et al., 1986: 470)”: (1) “beliefs about the seriousness of the problem, grievance in question”, (2) “beliefs about the locus of causality or blame”, (3) “stereotypic beliefs about antagonists or targets of influence”, (4) “beliefs about the probability of change or the efficacy of collective action”, (5) “beliefs about the necessity and propriety of ‘standing up’.”

challenges take. First one is the “counterframing” by movement opponents, bystanders and the media. These are attempts to disprove, undermine, or neutralize the SMO’s myths, versions of reality, or interpretive framework. Such “square-offs” between movements and their enemies have been referred to as “framing contests” (Snow & Benford 2000:626). Framing contests not only take place between movements and their opponents, they can also occur internally. Following Goffman’s (1974) use of the term, Benford referred to intramovement disagreements regarding diagnoses and prognoses as “frame disputes” (qtd. in Snow & Benford 2000: 626). These are essentially disputes over reality (present or projected). A third type of dispute, referred to as “frame resonance disputes,” involves disagreements regarding “how reality should be presented so as to maximize mobilization” (ibid.). “Frame disputes” are a pervasive aspect of the movements’ dynamics shaping the movement structure, inter-organizational relations, and collective identity construction. These types of intramural conflicts can be both detrimental and facilitative of movements and their SMOs.

2.1.2.2. Variable Features of CAFs

Thus far we have discussed the “characteristic features of CAFs” however; scholars have also identified some variable features of CAFs. Let us now discuss these features briefly.

(1) The most obvious way in which CAFs vary in terms of the problems or issues addressed and the corresponding direction of attribution. (2) CAFs may also vary in the degree to which they are relatively exclusive, rigid, inelastic, and restricted or relatively inclusive, open, elastic, and elaborated in terms of the number of themes or ideas they incorporate and articulate. (3) The scope of CAFs associated with most movements is limited to the interests of a particular group or a set of related problems. However, some CAFs are quite broad in terms of scope, functioning as a kind of master algorithm that colors and constrains the orientations and activities of other movements. Such generic frames are referred to as “master frames” in contrast to more common movement specific CAFs that may be derivative of “master frames” (Snow & Benford, 1992: 138-139). (4) The fourth way in which CAFs can

vary is in terms of the “degree of resonance”. It is related to the effectiveness or mobilizing potency of proffered framings. Why some framings seem to be effective or “resonate” while others do not? There are two sets of interacting factors accounting for the resonance: (a) “credibility” and (b) “relative salience” (Snow and Benford, 2000: 619-620).

The “credibility” of a CAF is a function of three factors; frame consistency, empirical credibility, and credibility of frame articulators or claim makers. Here “frame consistency” refers to the congruency between a SMO’s articulated beliefs, claims and actions (Snow & Benford, 2000: 620, 1988: 208). “Empirical credibility” designates the apparent fit between the framings and events in the world. The issue here is not whether diagnostic and prognostic claims are actually factual or valid, but whether their empirical referents lend themselves to being read as real indicators of the diagnostic claims (Snow & Benford, 2000: 620, 1988: 208). The final factor affecting the “credibility” of a CAF is related to the perceived credibility of the frame articulators. Simply stated, speakers who are regarded as more credible are generally more persuasive. Variables such as status, knowledge about the issue in question, status and/or expertise of the frame articulator and/or the organization they represent from the perspective of the activators or adherents are effective factors for the persuasiveness of the claim makers.

In addition to issues of “credibility”, the resonance of a CAF is affected by its “salience to targets of mobilization”. Three dimensions of salience have been identified: centrality, experiential commensurability, and narrative fidelity (Snow & Benford, 1988: 208-211, 2000: 621). “Centrality” has to do with how essential the beliefs, values, and ideas associated with movement frames are to the lives of the targets of mobilization (Snow & Benford, 1988: 205). “Experiential commensurability” answers the questions of whether the movement framings are congruent or resonant with the personal, everyday experiences of the targets of mobilization, or are they too abstract and distant from the lives and experiences of the targets (Snow & Benford, 1988: 208-209). “Narrative fidelity” gives the answer to the questions to what extent are the proffered framings culturally resonant, to what

extent do they resonate with the targets' cultural narrations, or its "myths", "domain assumptions", "inherent ideology" in contrast to its "derived ideology" (Snow & Benford, 1988: 210-211).

2.1.2.3. Frame Diffusion Processes

Thus far I have tried to give the basic conceptions about the "framing processes". Now it is time to turn the attention to the role of the framing in diffusion processes. How do movement ideas, CAFs, and practices spread from one movement to another and from one culture to another? How do framing processes affect the diffusion of movement beliefs, objects and practices? Framing is most relevant to SM diffusion processes when only one party in the process –either the transmitter or the adopter–takes an active role in the process, or when the conditions of similarity and/or compatibility between transmitters or potential adopters are not given but are problematic and need to be constructed. When these conditions are present there are two ideal types of SM diffusion processes in which the objects of diffusion (cultural ideas, items, or practices) are framed so as to enhance the prospect of their resonance with the host or target culture: (1) strategic selection/adoption, and (2) strategic fitting/accommodation (Snow & Benford, 2000: 627).

In "strategic selection/adoption" there is intentional cross-cultural borrowing with the adopter or the importer taking the role of an active agent in the process, strategically selecting and adopting the borrowed item to the new host context or culture (Snow & Benford 2000: 627). In "strategic fitting/accommodation" there is an intentional cross-cultural promotion with the transmitter being actively engaged in tailoring and fitting the objects or practices of diffusion to the host culture (Snow & Benford, 2000: 627).

Since framing is a dynamic ongoing process, it is not possible to think about this process as occurring in a structural or cultural vacuum. Rather, framing processes are affected by the elements of the socio-cultural context in which they are embedded. This is the area where the previous theories in the social movement theory come to the fore to be applied in complementation with the framing theory, because

movements are not possible to nurture when suitable political, cultural, as well as material conditions are not present, although there may be considerably successful framing efforts.

2.2. Methodological Considerations

This study is inspired by Starr's (2000) work about the anti-corporate movement. In the introductory part of her work Starr (2000: x) identifies the research questions of the book as follows: "Beyond documenting deductively that such movement exist; this book focuses on two crucial aspects of the movements' discourses: how they understand their enemy, and how they envision rebuilding the world."

Taking this work as a starting point the research questions have been framed as follows:

1. How do the AGM in Turkey frame their issue; in other words how do they define their target, to whom they attribute the blame (the diagnosis), and
2. How do they frame the goal of the movement; in other words what are their strategies to defeat their target (the prognosis).

This is a "broad" and a "shallow" study. It is broad study in the sense that it tries to encompass all the possible varieties present in the movement in the political spectra from left to right. And, it is shallow in the sense that it is not possible to analyze all components of the movement in detail due to two reasons. Firstly, frames are volatile issues, which change rapidly; and this poses time based constraints on the study. And secondly, deep analyses of frames require strong financial as well as conditional resources like strong connections to the movement, which endangers the intruder position of the researcher, where these pose resource based constraints on the study.

According to Johnston (2002: 69) frame and discourse analyses commonly utilize qualitative methods of data reduction and presentation because qualitative data reduction orders a wide variety of written or spoken textual materials by categories that represent more general factors. Qualitative frame analysis lends itself to certain

theoretical questions, such as strategic framing by social movement organizations, consciousness raising, building collective identity and fostering collective solidarity through mobilizing frames. According to Johnston (*ibid.*: 75) these are processes that are best revealed by the in-depth focus and high validity that qualitative frame analysis offers. Frames and discourse become available to the researcher through texts, either documents or transcriptions of speech. Johnston (*ibid.*: 87) states that to make sense to the broader community of scholars who may be less persuaded about the utility of cultural analysis, concepts should be linked with empirical observation in a clear and convincing way. He emphasizes that frame and discourse analyses must not journey too far from the original texts on which they are based, and should maintain a continual dialogue with them (*ibid.*).

Following this theoretical background which has been prevailing in the social movement research area it has been preferred to perform the study with qualitative methods of analysis, which supplies more flexibility and has the potential to gather data that can be utilized without any restrictions posed by categorized quantitative data.

Here the unit of analysis is “the movement”, “but this is not pursued with textbook consistency” similar to the study of Starr about the anti-corporate movement (Starr, 2000: xiii). Because the definition of “social movement” is a flexible issue, and although most of the researchers accept the existence of social movements in the national sphere, the existence of such social movement acting in the global sphere is debated recently. It may appear that the movement plays in the national sphere; however, the global network structure of the ‘global’ AGM makes the movement a part of the whole.

Since there are no previous studies focusing on the subject area, due to the relatively recent and premature character of the AGM in Turkey, the researcher tended to use a method as less structured as possible, with the theoretical consideration that an exploratory research should not be based on rigidly structured data collection methods. Therefore, it has been decided to use semi-structured interviewing technique. For the benefits as well as constraints this method will supply to the

researcher let us refer to Blee and Taylor (2002). According to Blee and Taylor (ibid.: 92) in contrast to high rigidity of structured type of interview, in a semi-structured interview the interviewer relies on an interview guide that includes a consistent set of questions or topics, but the interviewer is allowed more flexibility to digress and to probe based on interactions during the interview. Semi-structured interviews are particularly useful for understanding social movement mobilization from the perspective of movement actors or audiences in that they provide greater breadth and depth of information, the opportunity to discover the respondent's experience and interpretation of reality, and access to people's ideas, thoughts and memories in their own words rather than in the words of the researcher, but at the cost of a reduced ability to make systematic comparisons between interview responses (ibid.: 93).

Blee and Taylor summarize the advantages of semi structured interviewing method as follows: First they (ibid.) comment that through interviewing methods, scholars can gain access to the motivations and perspectives of a broader and more diverse group of social movement participants than would be represented in most documentary sources. The propaganda and internal documents of social movement organizations, as well as the personal testimonies and recollections of participants, are often produced by official leaders and those who are articulate, educated, and confident about the historic importance of their movement activities (ibid.). Therefore the data that semi structured interviewing will reveal may be very different then the ones based on documentary material.

Second, semi-structured interviewing strategies make it possible to examine the semantic context of statements by social movement participants and leaders (ibid.: 94). It is often valuable to understand activists' talk in the context of wider social understandings and discourses.

Thirdly, semi structured interviewing allow inspection of meaning, both how activists regard their participation and how they understand their social world (ibid.: 95). According to Blee and Taylor (ibid.) social movement scholars have found such attention to subjective meaning particularly useful for understanding how social

movement participants make sense of and justify their actions. Through semi-structured interviewing, researchers can gain insight into the individual and collective visions, imaginings, hopes, expectations, critiques of the present, and projections of the future on which the possibility of collective action rests and through which social movements form, continue, or split (ibid.).

Fourth, semi-structured interviews are able to provide a longitudinal window on social movement activism (ibid.). They can capture the rhythms of social movement growth and decline, and participant involvement and withdrawal over time. In addition to providing information on how activists become involved when social movements are strong, semi-structured interview can illuminate how activists are mobilized or politically sustained during periods of relative quiescence or inactivity. Moreover, Blee and Taylor (ibid.) indicate that such interviewing strategies permit social movement researchers to probe complexities of cause and effect that are often neglected in cross-sectional data.

Fifth, semi-structured interviews allow social movement scholars access to such nuanced understandings of social movement outcomes as the construction of collective and individual identities. According to Blee and Taylor (ibid.: 95-96) rather than assuming that identities are simple reflections of background characteristics, scholars have become increasingly attentive to how social movement identities are formed and how they relate to social and political activism.

Sixth, semi-structured interviews bring human agency to the center of movement analysis (ibid.: 96). Qualitative interviews are a window into the everyday worlds of activists, and they generate representations that embody the subjects' voices, minimizing, at least as much as possible, the voice of the researcher. To the extent that qualitative interviews seek in-depth data that record subjects' own descriptions and understandings of events, they are particularly useful for discovering why the theory being tested may not fit the data well (ibid.).

Finally, semi-structured interviewing allows scholars to examine the ways in which messages of social movements are received by members, targeted recruits, intended

audiences, and others (ibid.). Studies of media reception find that people understand, assimilate, and use messages very differently, depending on their own identities, social positions, values, relationships to the broadcaster, and other factors (ibid.: 97). This finding suggests the importance of analyzing both the messages of social movements and their reception by intended audiences and others.

2.2.1. The Sampling Process

Johnston (2002: 72) states that framing studies typically rely on convenience samples of movement activists as the database. Although, this is acceptable in the current research sample, there has not been such a thing like “convenience sample” present. Therefore, the “snow ball” method has been utilized in the sampling process. Actually, when the diversity of the participant social movements to the AGM is considered it is not possible to talk about a probabilistic sampling. However, when we take the amount of “sympathizer activists” (who appear to be participating to the movement according to newspapers and first hand material that they produce themselves) into account, we will end up with a probabilistic sampling process, since the “real activists” who cross the line between sympathizing a movement and acting as a ‘real activist’. Therefore “snow ball” method was the most convenient sampling method for the current research purposes.

During the sampling process, some groups that were the most visible ones according to the textual, as well as visual data collected from the internet were contacted. These contacts were sometimes face to face sometimes in the realm of the virtual space, which enabled the respondents to have confidence and keep anonymity, especially when activists from gay and lesbian groups as well as some anarchist groups are considered. In this process lengthy preliminary interviews have been performed, which have led the researcher to the “purposive sampling” process, in order to get the most fruitful information from the most suitable respondents.

In semi-structured interviewing, interviewees are chosen in a deliberate, but rarely random, sampling process. Individuals are selected because they have particular experiences in social movements, such as different forms of activism or participation in different factions of a movement, rather than because their experiences are representative of the larger population. ... Sampling for qualitative interviews follows two principles. First, sampling should strive for

completeness. Social movement researchers choose respondents who are knowledgeable about the topic under investigation, and continue to add new interviewees until the topic is saturated, that is, the interviews are garnering the same kinds of narratives and interpretation. Second, sampling should follow the principle of *similarity* and *dissimilarity*. Interviewees are chosen to see how the interpretations or accounts of similarly situated respondents compare, as well as to ascertain how those respondents with very different characteristics or in different circumstances differ (ibid.: 100)³⁵.

Considering the importance of variety and diversity as many social movements as possible have been contacted and it has been tried to find the appropriate interviewees to be talked to in order to supply “completeness” as well as “similarity and dissimilarity”. The sampling efforts revealed a sample size of 23 interviewees, most of whom were participants on the European Social Forum in Florence in January 2003.

Another consideration to be mentioned about the sampling process is the purposive intention of staying away from the “strictly defined” SMOs or NGOs. With this emphasis the organizations which have a “strictly defined” hierarchical organizational structure and where it is almost impossible to get any deviant response compared to the written declarations of the considered organization are mentioned. When such organizations are the object of analysis the researcher gets an interviewee selected by the central head of the organization, and the answers of the respondent are totally word by word overlapping with the written texts of the organization, which can easily be downloaded from the internet without time lose³⁶. Therefore, contact with such organizations has been intentionally discarded and the researcher tried to choose respondents who can add their personal responses, thoughts and ideals to the interviews, which are more informing than formal strict interviews.

³⁵ Italics are original.

³⁶ During the initial field research some interviewees from formally organized NGOs were contacted and some preliminary interviews were performed, where the researcher was trying to formulate the semi-structured interview questions. However, a short investigation of the responses revealed that this effort was just a consumption of time from the researcher’s side.

2.2.2. Further Methodological Considerations

Due to conditional impossibilities, and sometimes due to interviewees' choice, some of the interviewees could not be contacted directly face to face and in this case the semi-structured interviews turned into virtual space chat discussions or written responses to e-mailed interview questions. This was for some instances a hindering condition, because for some responses the tones of the voice, mimics, gestures or body language of the respondent inform you about the tendency of the respondent to respond in a normative manner or whether s/he is honestly answering your questions.

Previously, the advantages of semi-structured interviewing have been mentioned; however, according to Blee and Taylor (2002: 111) it is important to keep in mind that even the most non-directive interviews ultimately produce data derived from artificially constructed realities. We should admit that interviews are highly situational conversations; respondents can engage in retrospective interpretation, the interviewer can fail to establish the level of rapport necessary to obtain accurate data; they can conceal or distort the information. These type of examples have been experienced during the field work; for example most of the time the activists over exaggerate the number of attendants and the effects of their actions.

As Blee and Taylor (ibid.) comment; because semi-structured interviews, like every method, reveal slightly different facets of social life, most scholars of social movements use a combination of several data collection techniques (typically interviews, observation, and documentary evidence). "Triangulation" is the term used to refer to the combination of different kinds of data (usually three) (ibid). According to Blee and Taylor (ibid.) "triangulation" both increases the amount of detail about topic and counteracts threads to validity associated with any one of the single method.

Following the "triangulation method" two additional sources of data, which are mainly based on internet research have been used. The second data source following semi-structured interviewing was the websites, as well as the publications, posters, and some visual material like photographs, and films produced by the engaged social

movements and their activists. The third data source for the analysis of the subject has been the media coverage of the events in especially three sources. The first source has been indymedia.org, which describes the events and processes mainly from the perspective of the movement. The second and third sources of this type of documentary data were the daily newspapers.

2.2.3. Final Remarks about Sampling and the Sample

The most important thing during the field research was to keep strict anonymity. Most of the organizations involved in the social forum process and attending to the local as well as global actions had difficulties in expressing themselves where they had serious critics about the process and involved organizations. Considering the political environment in Turkey, especially the sharp distinctions between the political groups at the left wing and their bad fortune experiences about coalitions and solidarity efforts have to be emphasized. When the first efforts to contact people that were supposed to form the purposively developed sample started, it had been decided to make some preliminary interviews to have a broader picture which would guide the researcher through the research process. However, due to the fear of being labeled as a “provocateur”, actually some of them the researcher knew before the research process, did not want to attend the interviews, or offered to be interviewed off-the record. Most of the preliminary interviews were performed off-the record until a considerably small but important sample size which would direct the research has been reached. However, the researcher had to promise complete anonymity to the respondents in order to convince them to perform a recorded interview. The only respondent who did not demand any anonymity was an individual respondent who was attending the social forum processes not under the heading of any organization, although the respondent had direct connections to some of the organizations involved in the process. Nevertheless, it has been intentionally decided not to mention any respondent’s name throughout the text.

In addition to the difficulties regarding anonymity, there have been serious contact difficulties. Most of the persons directed at did live outside Ankara and had very busy time schedules. It should be mentioned here that some of the targeted

respondents dated the researcher more than three times, but they did not attend their schedule. Therefore, it should be admitted that some of the people who should belong to this purposive sample are missing in the eventual sample.

One of the contacted organizations did not permit a face to face interview. Although the reasons for this demand are not very clear to the researcher, their demand had to be accepted in order to keep the sample size safe. The interviews with these group members were performed in a considerably relaxed environment but two respondents had to be interviewed together where one was a senior and the other was a junior respondent. At the beginning it was thought that this would hinder the expression of some critiques, especially by the junior respondents, but during the interviews such an event has not been experienced. On the contrary, the senior respondents were directing the junior respondents to be more critical and supported to fill the gaps in the interviews of the junior respondents.

It should be also mentioned that some of the preliminary interviews have been performed in the internet environment. Although the data from those preliminary interviews are not used directly, the difficulties in such interviews should be mentioned briefly. In the internet environment you can not see the faces of the people you are contacting, and this virtual reality might prevent the interviewer from identifying some facial and bodily responses, which give considerable information about the responses. Additionally, some of the respondents contacted through the internet gave some information which the researcher was not able to verify but only after some efforts for verification absorbed considerable amount of time and energy. This is another disadvantage of such interviews which shakes reliability and forces the researcher to operate a reliability filter mentally. Still it has to be considered as an important source, because what is of crucial importance is, that although it is not possible to guarantee that somebody lies or misinforms the researcher, the cyber environment allows anonymity and eventually a more critical way to express opinions.

The reached sample remained limited and it includes 23 respondents –which are presented below- only from five of the groups which have been taking part actively

in the movements and one individual participant, although there appear more than 20 groups involved in the written materials of the social forum and the newspapers, as well as in the internet material. It is also worth to mention here that the groups appearing in the written materials do not represent the whole, because there are some “illegal” groups attending the process at this or that stage, but nobody mentions their existence. Naturally, the contact with these groups was impossible for the researcher.

Although the eventual sample size cannot bear the critiques about the validity and representativeness of the research we should keep in mind that this was an exploratory research, and the data revealed a general picture of the AGM in Turkey. But this is only “a snapshot in time not a continuous film”. We are aware of the fact that a considerable continuity is needed in social movement research, because the frames, strategies, as well as targets of social movements are not static entities, they evolve and change with time depending on historical, political, cultural, social and economic conjectures. However, the aim of this research was to develop a snapshot picture of the movement during the anti-war protests on the eve of the “global” war of the United States against “terrorism”.

Let us here define our eventual sample shortly, in order to supply the reader a visual picture. Again it should be mentioned that the original organization and respondent names will not appear here as well as throughout the text, and the pseudo names do not have any connection with the real names. Only some basic information about the type of organizations and their occupations will be supplied below in order to make the reader able to figure out the sample.

TABLE 2.1. THE SAMPLE

ORGANIZATION	AGE & GENDER	OCCUPATION	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL
ORGANIZATION 1: A revolutionary, socialist, and Trotskyist social movement organization organized against capitalism. Does not have any vertical hierarchy or any membership system.			
Respondent A	46-Female	Journalist	BA Degree
Respondent B	22-Female	University Student	Working for B. Sc. Degree
Respondent C	24-Male	University Student	Working for B. Sc. Degree
Respondent D	22-Male	University Student	Working for B. Sc. Degree
ORGANIZATION 2: An internationalist political party with social democratic orientations. It has a formal hierarchical organization and a membership system, but does not operate strictly hierarchically.			
Respondent E	42-Male	Mechanical engineer	B. Sc. Degree
Respondent F	39-Female	Mechanical engineer	B. Sc. Degree
ORGANIZATION 3: A students' social movement organization with anarchistic tendencies and an anti-capitalist perspective. Does not have any vertical hierarchy or any membership system.			
Respondent G	25-Female	Assistant Researcher at University / Graduate Student	Working for M.A. Degree
Respondent H	28-Female	Nurse / Graduate Student	Working for M.A. Degree
Respondent I	37-Male	Unemployed / Ceramics Artist	B. A. Degree
Respondent J	22-Female	University Student	Working for B. Sc. Degree
ORGANIZATION 4: A socialist and Trotskyist political party. Have a formal hierarchical organization and a membership system, but does not operate strictly hierarchically.			
Respondent K	46-Male	Unemployed	Left High-school
Respondent L	44-Female	Graphic designer	High-school graduate
Respondent M	42-Female	Journalist	B. A. Degree
Respondent N	37-Male	Unemployed	Left University
ORGANIZATION 5: A syndicate confederation with a formal hierarchical organization and a membership system.			
Respondent O	42-Female	Syndicate Administrative Member / Economist	B. Sc. Degree
Respondent P	44-Male	Syndicate Administrative Member / Economist	B. Sc. Degree
Respondent R	51-Male	Syndicate Administrative Member / Lawyer	B. Sc. Degree
Respondent S	45-Male	Syndicate Administrative Member / Mining Engineer	B. Sc. Degree
ORGANIZATION 6: An initiative fighting for the good and the rights of homosexuals within the Gay and Lesbian Liberation Movement. Does not have any hierarchical organization or any formal membership system, works on a voluntary basis.			
Respondent T	23-Male	University Student	Working for B. Sc. Degree
Respondent U	29-Male	High-school teacher	B. Sc. Degree
Respondent V	27-Male	Organizations Administrative member	High-school graduate
Respondent Y	22-Male	University Student	Working for B. Sc. Degree
Individual respondent			
Respondent Z	35-Male	TV Reporter / Journalist	B. A. Degree

CHAPTER 3

3. THE CASE STUDY ON TURKEY

3.1. Genealogy of the AGM in Turkey

Up to this point we have referred to the “global” or mostly visible part of the AGM. However, the primary focus of this study is the AGM in Turkey. Before going further for explaining the progress of the field work let us have a look at Turkey, and give the answer to the question ‘where Turkey stands in the AGM?’ In order to understand the position of Turkey first we should have a broader picture that describes the political environment in Turkey in the wake of globalization.

Since the academic as well as journalistic analyses regarding the AGM originating from Turkey focus on the “global” movement for evaluation disregarding the presence of an attendance from here it is not possible to find literature concerning the responses to globalization from Turkey. Therefore in this part our evaluation will focus on the single work about the subject matter. In his analysis about the political resistances to neoliberal globalization Somel (2002: 39) identifies two types of political stances, which come from the left wing of the political spectrum. The first stance is the “Liberal Leftist Reaction” which Somel (ibid.) understands as a stance expecting a social revolution without coming to power. This stance emphasizes the struggles of the oppressed people besides struggles based on class identity. Somel (ibid.: 40) identifies this stance as an extension of the “worldwide tendency of liberal leftization.” According to him the most prevalent representative of this stance in the political realm is ÖDP (Özgürlük ve Dayanışma Partisi / Freedom and Solidarity Party) (ibid.).

For Somel (ibid.) the program of ÖDP is a struggle program rather than a power program, in that they do not attribute the power to themselves in seeking transformation. As a result of this approach this stance is always looking for alternative power bases like EU as well as NGO’s outside the country (ibid.: 41).

The second stance according to Somel (ibid.: 47) is the “Nationalist Left Reaction” which looks at the democratization demands in the country as demands which have been involved by the imperial powers that want to divide the country. In this stance Somel (ibid.) identifies the belief in the unifying character of the Turkish nationalism, Kemalism and symbols of the National Independence War. According to Somel (ibid.) IP (İşçi Partisi/Workers Party) is the most prevailing representative of this stance. In the program of this party the visible agent is the working class, however, this stance is expecting a leading role from the national army in the struggle to take Turkey out of the control of the cores of the world system (ibid.:48). According to Somel (ibid.: 48) the real leading powers in this stance are youngsters, intellectuals and soldiers. And he adds that this political party does not have wider support since they do not recognize the democracy and equality demands of the society (ibid.:48).

In this environment, Somel does not see the possibility of any resistant forces against the neoliberal globalization and the countries’ possible “delinking” from the capitalist world system, with the existing political stances. When we consider the other political parties, which have taken part in the parliament during the last decades in Turkey we do not see any existence of leftist stances. The latest governments have been very keen to implement the neoliberal policies of the global order, which dismantled the minimal gains of the ‘traces’ of welfare state provisions of the developed countries. The results of the last elections showed that the public was looking for an alternative to the existing political parties in the parliament, in that a ‘brand-new’ party (it is the subject of another work whether this party is a brand-new one or not) won the elections with a considerably high vote ratio. Actually, in this environment, and under the influence of the widely spreading global protest waves it is natural to expect to see the expressions of discontents from the civil society. But, except some minor protests we did not experience any considerable action. So where was the civil society in this environment? Were there any mobilizations which were affected by the influences of the “Battle of Seattle”?

Actually, the attendance of the civil society and social movements to the ongoing process of AGM has been very late. While the world societies, especially the ones in the developed countries were mobilizing, there were only minor attempts in Turkey. The first visible attempt has been the formation of the “Ankara Anti-globalization Initiative” which consisted of TMMOB (Turkish Architects and Engineers Association Consortium), unions of KESK (Public Employees’ Unions Confederation), Halkevleri (Folk Houses), AST (Ankara Art Theatre), Can Şenliği Actors, a group of anarchists, Social Ecology Group, Antikapitalist (AKAP), ÖDP (Freedom and Solidarity Party), TTB (Turkish Doctors Association), Free University, and Ankara Branch of DISK (Revolutionary Workers Unions Confederation) (Uzun, 2001: 179). The aim of this initiative was to send a delegate to the protests against the yearly meetings of the IMF and WB taking place in Prague, as well as organizing a solidarity campaign. However, the participants did not show any considerable attendance in Prague, and the solidarity campaign was not wide reaching. After Prague, some activists from Antikapitalist attended the protests in Genoa with their individual efforts (Uzun, 2001). Primary data reveals that this type of individual attendances did not bring about a considerable attendance and contribution to the general movement, until the initiatives of Istanbul Social Forum (ISF).

According to Şensever (2003: 59) the organization of the European Social Forum (ESF) has started to be discussed with the decision of the second edition of the WSF International Council for the formation of regional and thematic forums due to the impossibility of WSF to include all social movements over the world. After the formation of ESF the initiative of ISF has started with the efforts of the ones who have arranged campaigns like “Prague 2002” “Drop the Debt” and “Genoa 2001” before in April 2002 (Şensever, 2003: 85). Preparatory works, where the initiators sent a call to unions, NGOs and various civil society organizations for attendance continued until June 2002, and the first meeting was held on 6th of June 2002 in SODEV’s (Social Democracy Foundation) office (ibid.). After this first meeting the activists started to perform weekly or twice a week meetings. However, according to

Şensever (ibid.) the process was not well understood and this slowed the organic efforts towards the formation of a social forum.

Turkey's attendance to the ESF process happened at a later stage, during the third preparatory meeting in Thessalonica on 12-14 July 2002 (Şensever, 2003: 59). There were ten participants from ISF initiative to Thessalonica preparatory meetings (ibid.: 89). After these attendance 45 activists from the ISF initiative applied for visa in order to attend the first edition of the ESF in Florence, however, only 27 were able to get visas, due to the strict inspections of the Berlusconi Government (ibid.: 91).

Şensever (ibid.: 92) states that "only after we attended the ESF, we recognized that our preparations and experience were inadequate." However, the social forum experiences in Florence affected youngsters and the rising anti-war movement in Turkey. On 15th of February 2003 the ISF initiative coordinated the 'Global Anti-war Day' protests in Istanbul. Following this on 1st of March 2003 the ISF initiative together with many other national social movements and civil society representatives marched to the parliament in order to resist the passage of the 'license' which would enable the government to send and base military power to Iraq. The parliament did not pass the 'license' and according to Şensever (ibid.) this supplied a great prestige to the ISF among the international movement, which encouraged the participants. However, the defeat of the left in the parliamentary elections before this event had detrimental effects on the ISF processes (ibid.: 93).

The 'global war' environment after 9/11 have spread to the country and considering the geographical position and the demographical composition of Turkey it was so natural that the framing process started to evolve in a disempowering direction. On 22nd of February ISF has organized an anti-war meeting where some prominent figures like Mehmet Ali Alabora, Ece Temelkuran, Tonguç Çoban, Tan Morgül, and Ahmet Öncü, of the current anti-war movement were present (ibid.: 94). During these anti-war protests the movement started to have some fragile touch with the movements from the right wing of the political spectrum. However, these relations, who even could not be called a coalition, did not last long, due to this fragile

character³⁷. Another important event which gives information about the framing of the movement was the visit of 100 social movement representatives from Italy on 17th of March who had come to the Newroz activities (ibid.: 94).

Considering the so-called alliance with the Islamic based social movements during the anti-war protests and the Newroz visit of the activists from Italy indicates that the movement was trying to send signals to different parts of the society, about their inclusive character for all varieties. However, primary data reveal that this inclusive character is not deeply embedded in most of the movements constituting the ISF, rather this type of strategies appear only when there is a strategic need to mass mobilizations (like in the anti-war protests), or when there is a need to send some signals to some communities, due to reasons of prestige.

In Berlin, on 24-27 April 2003 during the second preparatory meeting of the second edition of the ESF the ISF proposed to held one of the preparatory meetings in İstanbul. According to Şensever (2003: 71) this was important because of two reasons. First, the gathering of the strongest European Summits in Turkey, their interaction with the Turkish social movements and experience exchanges would speed up Turkish movements' inclusion to the ESF process. And second, this would accelerate the SF process in Istanbul and Turkey as well. (ibid.: 75)

In May 2003 restructuring discussions started in the social forum, and the initiators sent the first serious call for Turkish Social Forum (ibid.: 95). During this process a working group was formed, which performed preparatory studies until the meeting on restructuring on 18th of June 2003 (ibid.). The restructuring preparations ended in July.

During these preparatory works ISF prepared a campaign with the newly formed Peace and Justice Coalition directed to support the mobilizations of the European social movements' resistances against the EU summit in Thessalonica on 20-22 June (Şensever 2003:95). 45 participants from this coalition together with the participants

³⁷ Primary data.

from KESK and DİSK attended the Protests in Thessalonica. In July 2003 two representatives from ISF took part in the Mediterranean Social Forum (MEDSF) in Napoli, where ISF took part in the extended secretary (ibid.: 96). Additionally, on 17-20 July 2003 in the third preparatory meetings of ESF, ISF showed attendance with three representatives (ibid.).

On 17-20 July 2003, during the third preparatory meetings of ESF in Genoa, the prominent meeting speakers, which were very important for the organizers of ESF, were determined. The French Organization proposed 4 speakers from Turkey, but after the negotiations this number has been raised to 6. (Şensever, 2003: 75-76). Şensever (ibid.: 76) states that the number of speakers is determined according to the power of the social movements and their weight in the global movement, rather than the size of the country. However, the speeches of the representative did not have any media coverage in Turkey.

According to Şensever (ibid.: 96), who is the most visible name in ISF, there are three problems in the strategic farming process of ISF as well as the AGM in Turkey. First one is the slow development process, the second one is the happening of activities in closed spaces, and the third one is the political practice types of Turkish left (ibid.: 97). The slow development process is due to various reasons ranging from financial difficulties, to political opportunity structures of the country. However, why have the activities been happening in closed spaces? Şensever's (ibid.: 96) answer to this is since they had a wrong social forum understanding as well as practice, and since there has been limited attendance from the leftist parts only; it was not possible to include various parts to the movement. The answer to the impossibility of including varieties in the movement lies in the third problem. According to Şensever (ibid.: 97) the left in Turkey can not understand "the unity of diversity" understanding of the İSF and try to put their political agendas in front of the movement, which results in the hindering of the attendance of a great mass with their "deficient" understandings. Şensever (ibid.: 100) states that most of the leftists in Turkey see themselves as the only possible agent of the resistance against neo*liberal globalization, and this discourages great masses who are trying to find

ways of resistance mechanisms by trial and error and resist the classical organizational methods due to a numerous justified reasons. Margulies (2003) indicates similar comments on the problems of Turkey's late and slow attendance to the AGM, in the preface of Şensever's useful work about the World Social Forum:

The serious attendance from Turkey to the World Social Forum movement has taken a long time. One reason to that were the practical and financial problems undoubtedly. It is not easy to go to the far away Brazil to Porto Alegre or to Seattle to the North West coast of America. Back and forth tickets, passports, visas, airport taxes, these are not affordable amounts to the people earning their livings in Turkey and taking their salaries in Turkish Liras (in Şensever 2003:7)

The problem was not only financial because if there is determination the financial problems are always possible to overcome. The more important and more difficult to be overcome problem was politic.

Firstly, the nationalism, introverted attitude as well as the un-interest in the world except the national borders of the Turkish Left (in the widest meaning) has hindered us seeing that a new movement was rising in the world for a long time. Areas which were expected to be the most interested ones to the movement did not even recognize the movement. The ones who recognized the movement did not take it important, could not recognize the dimensions and the historical importance of the movement.... This year a Turkish "socialist" attending the preparatory meeting of the second European Social Forum insisted on talking Turkish despite his/her good English knowledge, and we found someone to translate. When we asked him/her why (s)he did behave like this in a meeting where ten to fifteen languages were spoken, and we tried to communicate with our ground school level English, (s)he replied "I provided Turkish to be heard on Social Forum platform. Sometimes I think that the last thing to be globalized in the world should be Turkish left.

Secondly, the pessimism, which shadows the Turkish left whenever it is recognized that something is happening in the world, showed itself.... [After Prague protests] I met 3 friends from the Anti-MAI group of Turkey. While we were drinking our coffee they said "so what happened now?" "The WB and IMF are staying there, they will take the decisions they want and put them in operation. Didn't the same things happen after Seattle? Didn't they do what they want? "I tried to tell them that the movement had a step forward, it grew with each step and every protest encouraged the ones resisting the neoliberal policies all over the world. They replied "But, in Europe the labor union movement is near to disappearance" I got shocked. On the contrary, the labor union movement in Europe, who had a 15-20 years long defeat period, had started to enter a more resistant period in recent years. (Three years after Prague has continued to prove this) Then I asked "So, why did you come here?" I couldn't get an answer to my question. I am still curious about the answer.

The pessimism arises from the limited look that focuses on Turkey that does not see the rest of the world and can not understand when it sees. And these two features; introverted attitude and pessimism bring about a third one together; "So, Seattle is good, but there is no movement in Turkey (in Şensever 2003:7-8).

Although, this may seem to be a long quotation in such a text, it was necessary to complete our general descriptive picture for the AGM in Turkey from the perspective of an insider. The picture is not giving much hope. However, in a country with a real

pessimistic character as well as a repressive political background this environment is not much surprising.

Actually, the main discussion about the AGM in Turkey goes between reformism and radicalism, similar to the rest of the world. There are mainly two stances outside the movement; the first stance is cautious but not sectarian, and the second stance is susceptible rather than cautious, and uses a sectarian discourse showing their mistrust in coalitions between diversities. Let us quote two representative examples of these stances and lump up the epilogue for this part.

Although the movements of 68 have been defeated as a movement excluding the working class and the structure and agency discussions, it stands in a position that the left should hold as a mirror to itself. Because we should admit that the classic leftist approaches cannot produce convincing solutions to the cyclic problems of the living practices. However, the explicitly resistive responses of today's movements which do not take the proletariat into consideration are handicapped. They will get rid of the modernist perspective, and to stand against the exclusion of the cultural and ethical transformations by appropriating the labor-capital struggle means being thrown to another side (Yedibela 2002).

It seems to be obvious that the mobilization of the world civil society, which appears to be the alternative to the class based struggle, and keeping the emerging spirit in Prague is essential in order to reproduce the system and to keep the resistance, which can get radical, under control. The reflection of the idea of organization; the direction of the political demands to an agent on slippery grounds; the appropriation of the class-struggle to floating masses, which do not show class characteristics, in the name of increasing multiple subjective identities: the AGMs, which are supported and provoked explicitly by the multi national capital, are a prove of all the above. All of these make the AGM, which could be seen as the postmodern. Political projects of the international capital, and whose ideology had started to be shaped even before the cold war, susceptible. Therefore, since it is obvious that the nation state will continue troubling the proletariat for a long time, and since the possibility of the resistance of proletariat to the international capital, whose opportunities have grown now, is being masked by ideological trickery, we should think about the moral we got from the mobilizations once again. I should remind that the proletariat has walked under the same flag with bourgeoisie several times, and the result had been a total defeat; you can not wash in the same river twice (Sancar 2001).

Being cautious about alliances with the once counter movements is understandable, but this should not lead to a perspective that ends up with conspiracy theories. We do not live in the world of George Orwell's 1984 or in 'Truman's World'³⁸, there may

³⁸ The researcher refers to **The Truman Show** which is a 1998 movie directed by Australian Peter Weir, written by New Zealander Andrew Niccol, and starring Jim Carrey. The film chronicles the life of a man who does not know that his entire life is a constructed reality designed for the purpose of a television show. The plot takes many ideas from Philip K. Dick's 1959 novel *Time Out of Joint*, as well as the 1960 *Twilight Zone* episode *A World of Difference* (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Truman_Show. Accessed 20.12.2006).

be some traces of the supports to some components of the current AGM from the capital³⁹, however a reasonable understanding would not burn the house to frighten the mouse. Therefore, the analyses about the present and future of the movement in Turkey have an important role in that they will reveal the ‘facts’ about the movement, and in this way they will contribute to its evolution process. Additionally, they might be helpful in information dissemination which would eventually lead to an increase in the sympathizers at least. I hope that this study will form an initial step, and encourage further attempts about research in this area.

3. 2. The Case Study: AGM in Turkey

Thus far the more visible parts of the AGM in the North America and Europe have been discussed in order to pave the way for our case study. At this point our research questions which guided our research should be mentioned briefly one more time. Inspired by the work of Amory Starr (2000) the main research questions have been formulated as follows:

- How do the AGM in Turkey frame their issue; in other words how do they define their enemy (the diagnosis), and
- How do they frame the goal of the movement; in other words what are their strategies to defeat the enemy (the prognosis).

Here the aim is to perform a content analysis based on the results of the qualitative semi-structured interviews. The interested reader can refer to Appendix for the semi-structured interview questions, but it should be noted that in a semi structured interview the interviews are not kept strictly within the limits of the guiding questionnaire.

During this analysis the aim of the researcher is to present the different perspectives of the respondents, and elaborate the content of the responses based on a structure formed with the “framing perspective”. Here it should be kept in mind that the

³⁹ MacDonald, Sam, 2002, *Delicious Irony*, *Reason* 33(8): 12.

respondents are not analyzed as individuals, their organizational connections are taken into consideration during the analyses, although they are not treated as ‘stereotype’ representatives of the organizations they belong.

When we consider the genealogy of the AGM in North-America and Europe we can find evidences for a more structured (although this structuring is not in a hierarchical manner in organization and in the goals) consistency then it is in Turkey. This finding has a considerably important consequence for this study. Considering the SMs, NGOs, and SMOs in North America and Europe it is possible to draw almost coinciding divides between the attending organizations considering their goals or strategic tactics to achieve their goals, which enables the researchers to apply useful categorizations. However, in Turkey when we consider the goals and the tactics it is not possible to apply let the strict categorizations even flexible categorizations. Taking this difficulty into account and keeping the exploratory character of the research in mind, it has been decided not to apply any categorization according to the goals or tactics.

The analysis will be summed up under seven headings which have been generated during the deep inspections of the qualitative data. These headings do not indicate any categorization; rather they indicate the thematic areas which together form the so-called “frame” of the movement. These thematic areas are mainly based on the content of the guiding semi-structured interview questionnaire, and the “diagnostic” and “prognostic” framing concepts of Snow and Benford.

3.2.1. Globalization

“Globalization” is the buzz-word of the last decades. It is possible to find out thousands of pages of academic as well as literary works trying to explain what globalization is. However, none of those voluminous works was able to produce a widely accepted marking definition. Therefore, most of the respondents made a back-step to think when they faced this question. However, during their back-step they recognized the inevitability of this question, where they were chosen due to their anti-stance to globalization.

The most prevalent conceptualization of globalization in the academic field defines globalization in economic terms, and refers to the neoliberal globalization. This trend is also visible in the AGM in Turkey in their discourses and agit-prop material.

Now, when you say globalization, I understand the dominance of neoliberal policies. In other words, the subordination of cultural and economic values to the global capital... This is it in its most special form. So I see it as the globalization of the capital. It has a negative meaning for me.⁴⁰

These types of respondents belong to more concrete and more structured organizations which are visible in the media and have political interactions like becoming a political party or expanding their political supporters. The explanation of their stance occurs also at the same level. They mostly count on all of the popular concepts in the AGM discourse, without making any coherent analysis and any direct connection to their daily lives. It sounds like they are using some memorized concepts which they have not explicitly analyzed, inspected, and incorporated into their social and political conceptions.

The capital has the tendency to become international even from the start, in other words it has a tendency to globalize. However, since the 90's, especially after the 80's ... maybe in the period starting in 90's the damages globalization caused, I mean the subordination of everything to the advantage of the capital. These damages are nearly causing the total destruction of the planet. At one side these damages cause social catastrophes, at the other side there is the exploitation of the poor, poverty ... it forces people to live at the border, below the starvation level. On the other side there are environmental problems, as you know problems like global warming. On the other side; considering the consequences of poverty like AIDS, child deaths, this could be prevented with cautionary actions... I mean the emergence of different diseases which can be prevented with really little amounts of money... An order that sentences millions to starvation and death... And on the other side there are a few capital owner companies... I mean there are many reasons to stand against globalization.⁴¹

These type of respondents try to *over-emphasize* the importance of the collectivity; collective thinking, but their discourse reveals their tendency to perceive themselves as 'elites' of the society who have the *obligation* to translate the political realm 'correctly' to the 'uneducated public' and teach them how to act, how to respond, and how to live. They are not acting for their well-being they are putting themselves

⁴⁰ Respondent K (46, Unemployed)

⁴¹ Respondent N (37, Unemployed)

in to the service of the society despite the difficulties they live during this tiring and hard process. Although they themselves have not achieved any coherent translation of the globalization or the neoliberal policies to their daily lives, they perceive themselves as the translator of these concepts for the public.

Actually, it is like that... I did not act from the position I stand by looking at the situations from my own perspective. ... Because the people – except the academic environments – do not know anything about the neoliberal policies, what they mean. Therefore, we have to translate their daily lives. This is not an easy job. But someone must have to do it.⁴²

Another example for the “neoliberal” perception of globalization comes from the working class fronts, from the syndicate members.

Globalization is only the globalization of the capital. There is no globalization for the working class. I mean, the capital has the ability to go everywhere over the world, where it wants to go. If the labor costs are increasing anywhere hop the capital jumps to somewhere else where labor costs are lower. If the taxes and other inputs for the production increase here then the capital can easily find new production zones, where it can lower its input costs. But the labor does not have such flexibilities. I mean, the labor cannot travel to places where labor costs are high. I mean there are visas. For example, to get a Schengen visa they let you go through extreme hardships, let going there and working aside. So, this not a globalization for the labor, this is only the globalization of the capital. Let the capital go everywhere it wants, and imprison people to work with lowered wages, eroded social rights, in poverty, in deprivation. This is what they call globalization. I personally, don't know whatever it is, but what the capital owners call globalization is something like this. It is a good thing for them; of course it is a good thing... They lay down in their super luxury offices, smoke their Havana cigars, and enjoy the power of their money. Who cares for the workers who cannot find money to feed their families? This is globalization. This is real globalization, nothing else.⁴³

This perception has very close similarities with the stance against globalization which Çoban (2002) describes as “the approaches which are based on the defense of the nation state on the struggle”, where the respondent expresses dissatisfaction with the social rights, and the barriers of mobilization before the working class, the increasing gap between the capital owners and the other members of the society. From the standpoint of a syndicate member demands regarding the social security and labor rights are natural consequences. Although Turkey has never reached the level of the welfare states of Europe, there have been rights won in the last decades,

⁴² Respondent K (46, Unemployed)

⁴³ Respondent R (51, Syndicate Administrative Member/Lawyer)

and the syndicate members emphasize the loss of these rights within the current development of globalization.

Another thing, which is important on the syndicate members' agenda, is the "individualization" effect of globalization, which tears societies apart, and damages the survival strategies of poor people by loosening the solidarity ties previously existent within the societies:

... poverty is tearing people into pieces. It has removed mutual support. Everyone is thinking about him/herself. It has also removed the collective working tradition coming from the past. And consequently it is only the subsistence economy, the subsistence strategy, subsistence with the ones people do not have... All of these are factors increasing the poverty. It becomes impossible to eradicate these. It becomes more and more individualistic, and it becomes more and more difficult to organize these. There is nothing about this. I mean people are starving. *It is meaningless for them when you say that 'salvation is in socialism', or 'salvation is in Islam'.*⁴⁴

The last words of Respondent S are very important in that it indicates the detrimental effect of globalization on solidarity. The level of poverty caused by globalization has reached such a higher level that the organized struggles become impossible where people are just caring for their own subsistence. In an environment where "the survival of the fittest" rule operates individuals might easily become enemy for the other when the one is hungrier than the other one. This statement becomes much more important since it comes from a syndicate member who is supposed to organize the working class for the struggle. The respondent is so realistic that he can explicitly emphasize that building solidarity is nearly impossible in today's world.

On the one side there are the ones working on their subsistence, and on the other side there are the ones who care for the maximization of their profit:

Globalization, it is rewarding the capital, and the punishment of the labor. It is the flow of the capital from the bases of the society to the roof. Shortly, if you are at the top of the income distribution table, inside the 20% at the top you are the winner. When you climb the ladder your profit will maximize. If you are inside the 80% at the lower levels of the ladder you are the looser, and your losses will increase when you go down the ladder. All of the structural adjustment programs, IMF agreements, WB Projects, organizations like WTO, NAFTA, MAI, etc... these all serve for the maximization of the profit of the ones high up the roof. All

⁴⁴ Respondent S (45, Syndicate Administrative Member/Mining Engineer)

of these establishments are undemocratic establishments, and serve for the ones at the top. Democracy operates just for the ones at the top, for the winners.⁴⁵

Here the emphasis is on income hierarchy, democracy, and multilateral institutions of the system. The respondent indicates the system as an organism using the democracy and institution apparatuses as organelles rewarding the ones at the top of the income distribution ladder. This conception is compliant with the previous conceptions of globalization, in that it accepts that globalization is a process which punishes the working class for the rewarding of the capital. Considering the membership of this respondent to a revolutionary socialist SMO organized against capitalism this conception is not something unexpected. However, we again observe the theoretical conceptions of the socialist literature which have not been internalized on a cognitive and realistic basis.

For this anti-capitalist stance capitalism is not only an economic system:

The crisis experienced after 9/11 has shown an important thing about the nature of the capitalist system. The multinational corporations and economic foundations like IMF, WTO have been the targets chosen by the anti-capitalist movement. But now we see that capitalism is not only an economic system. The capital is intertwined with the state system; the military power the states own and the geopolitical organization which these powers have established. To be an effective anti-capitalist requires also being an anti-imperialist.⁴⁶

The respondent indicates another aspect of capitalism or globalization.⁴⁷ With the development of the war threat after the 9/11 events in the United States, the world has witnessed the militarization of economic interests, where the USA has directed its attention to the Middle East to control the energy resources taking the 9/11 events as a “reason” for military intervention to Iraq. This has had a considerable effect on the AGM’s discourse in that they immediately incorporated anti-war jargon to the movement’s discourse. Most of the respondents have been interviewed on those days when the “war shouting” of the USA was shaking the world, and when the AGM was trying to organize civil disobediences and street protests in order to prevent the war.

⁴⁵ Respondent C (24, University Student)

⁴⁶ Respondent A (46, Journalist)

⁴⁷ Most of the respondents use globalization and capitalism interchangeably.

In the anti-capitalist discourse this war is perceived as a continuation of the “imperialist” tendencies of the capital. Therefore, the respondent is emphasizing that “being an effective anti-capitalist requires being an anti-imperialist”. The movement was emphasizing the systemic interconnectedness of various issues of globalization even before the arising of the war threat, but for most of the bystander public this issue had been something on a theoretical level. Ironically, the realization of the war threat has helped the movement to make the systemic interconnectedness concrete to the bystanders and to themselves as well.

Another aspect of globalization which also shows the systemic interconnectedness is the state interdependencies developed by the global capital:

One of the most important problems is the international labor distribution. America says this country ‘you will grow coffee’ and ‘you will grow bananas’ to the other one. I mean it tries to expertise the states in only one area and then those weaker states become dependent on the stronger countries in order to produce the materials that the richer countries need. ... I mean there is something like a politics that tries to bring the weaker states to a position that they cannot oppose the stronger states on their own.⁴⁸

The globalization is forcing an international distribution of labor for the maximization of profit. This tendency is developing import based economies dependent on the states that have economic and political power. Under these circumstances the import based economies that are dependent on the imported products for their survival lose negotiation powers in the economic arena. Therefore, the multilateral institutions become easily apparatuses of the powerful agents of economy and politics, where the import based economies face extreme hardships in coping up with the global capitals’ demands. It is no wonder that this statement comes from Respondent T representing Organization 6 which is an initiative fighting for the good and the rights of the homosexuals, since this respondent has lost connections with Organizations 1 and 3.

Thus far, the conceptions of globalization have been mainly based on the anti-capitalist or socialist ideologies, and we have witnessed conceptions that mainly remain at the theoretical level, and do not find any direct translation within the lives

⁴⁸ Respondent T (23, University Student)

of the respondents. Actually, most of the previous respondents were not able to give concrete examples from their lives, when they had been asked “how they were personally affected by globalization”.

An independent activator (who does not belong to any social movement or political / social organization in the formal meaning) gave more concrete and coherent responses to questions about globalization.

I like to explain globalization in a deductive manner with metaphors. The car-park keeper, mafia, police station, change office, bank of the district got together, and are making things for their interests wasting the lives of the whole district, and they call this ‘rounding’, I mean globalization. ... This is globalization; I mean the cooperation of the world capital.⁴⁹

This respondent has a more personalized frame about globalization, which indicates a more completed cognitive process, where personal effort is exerted to understand the political realm. Actually, we should admit that this cognitive process makes use of the AGM discourses as a starting point, but for the sake of solidarity it is important to see personal efforts which will secure the collective identity formation. In an environment where the activators do not have internalized the theoretical background of their actions and integrated their sayings into their daily lives the solidarity becomes a considerably fragile thing and collective action loses its grounds very easily. With such an internalized and integrated personal frame the ‘cognitive liberation’ stage is passed and there is no alternative; action is inevitable.

... I am against globalization because I am against the tyranny, domination of the money, and all of the forms of tyranny and domination it causes. Because globalization creates two poles; directors-directed ones, exploiters-exploited ones, capital-laborer, poor-rich... When we think considering these two poles the two poled world serves to the interests of the exploiter, killer, destructor, damager side. Therefore I put ‘Globalize the resistance’ against this.⁵⁰

The conceptions of globalization are mainly based on economic definitions, as I mentioned before, however a translation of these definitions to peoples’ daily lives is needed to conceive globalization as an enemy to be defeated with collective action.

⁴⁹ Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

⁵⁰ Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

Therefore it is inevitable that people develop different conceptions of globalization dependent upon their sexual preferences, social status, and cultural differences.

We are not obliged to think globalization only in accordance with the labor exploitation. At the same time there is an international sexual exploitation... there is an application to exploit sexuality. This is something going hand in hand with economic exploitation. There are side elements making use of sexuality, like pharmaceutical industry, or prostitution sector... its production, its economic operation... All of these have global sides. For example, the American military bases all produce whorehouses in nearby environments, this goes hand in hand with the economy. An economic exploitation, labor exploitation, and a sexual exploitation... all go hand in hand.⁵¹

This respondent emphasizes the sexual exploitation dimension of globalization in his discourse and states that the gay and lesbian liberation movement looks at globalization from this perspective. This is not a deducing approach however. They do not discard the economic dimension as being the key attractor of globalization, but their priority is not the economic dimension of globalization, but the patriarchal system and sexism of globalization. However, for Respondent T from the same organization, the main point in describing globalization is not the patriarchy:

... I mean this is very clear, what benefit the people have, from what they are trying to make profit... As a homosexual I don't need a forced definition based on homosexuality. It suffices to see this. This exploitation has many varieties. From one point the patriarchy is also something that feeds capitalism. The patriarchal system symbols, the consumption materials that capitalism produces using homosexual images to be consumed by homosexuals... These are all interconnected. These exploitation ways touch us in any way. But when I am describing globalization I actually, don't need the word homosexual at the first step.⁵²

Here various interactions people have with various groups becomes important in that as we have mentioned previously Respondent T has also lose ties with organizations 1, and 3, which are labeling themselves as anti-capitalists, and the discourse of this respondent reveals his connections with these anti-capitalist groups. However, the important point here is that even within the same organization we can observe contesting frames about priorities.

Different priorities will produce obviously different demands, as well as different approaches to globalization. Although it is not prevalent, within the gay and lesbian

⁵¹ Respondent U (29, High-school Teacher)

⁵² Respondent T (23, University Student)

liberation movement, there are also perceptions taking some aspects of globalization as an advantage to their movement and goals.

If we think that globalization have an economic and a social dimension. ... Economically we all can say that our buying power has decreased, but there is also the social dimension. Actually this can be called the cultural dimension... When we say the cultural dimension of globalization this does not mean the easier come and go of the people between the borders. There is the imposing of the Anglo-Saxon culture to other countries. This culture is promoted... this western culture is promoted. In countries like Turkey this promotion causes a will of change. From my point of view this change of will has a positive effect. I mean people start to discuss their culture, and in this manner globalization has a positive effect in this manner.⁵³

Maybe the EU process of Turkey can also be thought together with globalization... For example they put some prerequisites to Turkey... They put the freeing of the homosexuals as a prerequisite to Turkey. ... In this manner I can say that globalization forces the Turkish government to put more positive regulations concerning homosexuals in effect.⁵⁴

The most comprising, most holistic perception of globalization comes from ‘the new anarchists’.⁵⁵ These are mostly student movements and some environmental movements, which do not call themselves as anarchists, but have anarchistic goals and discourses. These movements are not really wide ranging, effective, and widely known in the media and public realm, however their ‘effects’ in the AGM is more considerable compared to the other movements or NGOs.

When we say globalization... It is a self peculiar description of power structuring in the historical process of capitalism. ... I mean a large scale, a global scale power structuring of capitalism to secure its self continuity. ... Previously the concept of power could be defined in relation with the state or imperialism; I mean the imperial powers and the comprador states. At the point we have arrived capitalism reproduces itself in all of the social interactions. Naturally, with the globalization capitalism does not need to take the exploitation under a state control. The power constructs itself in all of the social interactions. I mean; the system used to discipline via the established structures before, but now it does not need this. Now the thought system of the people, their dressing styles, spiritual conditions, self reproduction processes, all of them are shaped by the power arms of the system. It uses all of these to reproduce itself without the need to exert any power. It uses everything as a subject of reproduction of the system. Everything in our lives becomes the subject of the power.⁵⁶

⁵³ Respondent Y (22, University Student)

⁵⁴ Respondent Y (22, University Student)

⁵⁵ Epstein (2000) used this labeling first for these social movements.

⁵⁶ Respondent H (28, Nurse/Graduate Student)

This conception does not have any difficulty in translating the effects of globalization into their daily lives. They can see every aspect of globalization working in a great harmony in their surrounding environment. However, they do not perceive these effects as being singular, unconnected processes. They see the operators behind the curtain, in that they are not focused to the actors on the scene; their target is on the backstage, behind the curtain.

In the privatization processes at the university ... I mean there is a privatization going on, the education fees are rising, research and development centers are opened, at the university at every step you take you start to be forced to pay something called 'student fee'. I mean they are making everything money charged, they are privatizing everything. At first we understood this like that, but later we realized that this is also producing another type of culture. This is not only directed to the university, it is something related to the restructuring of the state; I mean all of this is related to the restructuring of the universities in the restructuring process of the state. ... I mean it looked like the description of the state against the market, but in reality this did not have any reality. When we realized this, this provided us a jump. If political realm represents the state, and the economic realm represents the market it doesn't need to be a contingency between these. ... We started from commercialization, where we did not take it only as an economic concept; we took it as the organization of a societal construction; the social self-structuring of the market. ... During this social self-structuring process of the market all of the dynamics of all the institutions are operated to ease this process. We realized such a transformation and decided not to be a part of this.⁵⁷

This systemic approach perceives the forces of globalization operating in every realm of the life. Their social relations, cultural interactions as well as spatial preferences are operating in a total subordination to the market interests. The whole life is being transformed in a direction to ease the operation and the spreading of globalization in every aspect of human life. Even the relations between the students their academic perceptions and efforts are subordinated to the system. Although the system operates in every realm of the human life the perception of this act needs some attention and questioning which inspires the cognitive liberation necessary to act against the system.

We observe the transformation of the relationships between the students, the canteens... The canteens previously organized as a friendship environment is now designed in a more individualistic manner. Previously there were large tables allowing large groups to come together, now the tables are arranged for three or four people. These are naturally not planned in detail, but they are transformations forced by this culture. ... We always use this example, since the students are forced to compete with each other via the curve system, except the close friends –in some departments even the close friends – nobody gives lecture notes to

⁵⁷ Respondent H (28, Nurse/Graduate Student)

others. ... All of these were data about it that the process is not operating only in the economic realm, but in the cultural, social realm.⁵⁸

Realizing the systemic interconnectedness of globalization and capitalism these anarchistic groups develop a stance to struggle against the capitalist globalization.

... At this point, when you ask why we are against globalization; we realize that the relations of domination and exploitation are in a current and most efficacious relation today, and the struggle against the operation of capitalist system should be constructed from an anti-capitalist front. We have to prevent capitalism to hide behind this scene of globalization. We think that any opposition that does not have an anti-capitalist stance does not have any meaning.⁵⁹

However, this anti-capitalist stance is differing from the previous anti-capitalist struggles in some aspects. Today the target is not the capitalist states of the last century. The process of globalization has labeled the national borders meaningless for the sake of the market, but this also has contributed to the development of a new type of anti-capitalist stance which uses the blurring of the national borders within the system, against the system.

... The feature of today's anti-capitalist struggle is that all of the political struggles in the world and their dynamics have entered into a partnership. The fight against capitalism... At this point all of the borders have been done away, I mean for the concept of struggle the borders faded away, all of the inner and outer dynamics, and dilemmas have faded away. The AGM in America and in Turkey are on the same grounds. Actually, all of the fractured parts of the problem require a more organized stance in a communicative network. Previously you were able to organize the political power of the thing you call the target, when you were able to come together with the national dynamics, there were national dynamics. But today, when you construct the struggle with your national dynamics it doesn't have any political resonance. I mean it has to become worldly. I mean the globalization has also such an advantage.⁶⁰

Considering the variety of the AGM it is expected that there would be many contestations about the framings. However, when we consider the framings about globalization we observe a general consensus on the neoliberal conception of globalization. The range of this conception varies according to the background of the respondents and their level of cognitive liberation, but most of the respondents argue

⁵⁸ Respondent G (25, Assistant Researcher/Graduate Student)

⁵⁹ Respondent I (37, Unemployed/Ceramics Artist)

⁶⁰ Respondent I (37, Unemployed/Ceramics Artist)

on the basic definitions, which leads us to think that the concept of globalization is one of the least debated issues among the movement. As a final word to this section, the researcher wants to emphasize that the discourse of the “new anarchists” which does not need anyone to translate the effects of globalization to their daily lives is very inspiring. The movement should inspect the formation steps of this discourse immediately, in order to use it as a basis for the cognitive liberation of the acting masses as well as the bystander publics. This is necessary for the reinforcement of the solidarity among the movement and to empower it.

3.2.2. AGM and the Enemy

After having discussed the frames of globalization it is time to elaborate how the activists frame the AGM and the target, or the enemy it opposes. Let us start here with the independent respondent Z.

Actually, I do not define it [the target of the AGM] with some conceptual words. The things we are standing against are weapon companies whose endorsements can not be grasped within our brains... I mean companies who are people whom I have chosen to be my enemy, their media, the politicians they have brought to power, presidents, parliamentary members, their factories, their all of the things invading all parts of our lives. Their propaganda, ideological bombings... I describe it like this. But besides this there are large masses of people who are supporting them as a result of their propaganda. Actually, we can not talk about two poles, there is another third thing. I mean the globalizing capital there is, and there are also its instruments... Let us say its ideological devices, there are the anti-globalizers, and in between there are people (of course they are equipped with the propaganda of the states until now, since the anti-globalization is a very new thing. They are living as the prudent good-behaved children of the states. They are unconscious, poor, and continue to be exploited) whom we don't know whether we will convince or they will convince. Consequently; the chance of success will be greater if these people will be able to get rid of the propaganda of the states and can support the movement.⁶¹

As an independent activator here we observe a more personalized conceptualization, a discourse that has been shaped by personal experiences not by theoretical documents of any movement or any political party. The enemy has got a totalized vision with the ideological devices at its hands which it also uses for brainwashing the masses. Within the definition of the enemy the respondent realizes the presence of the bystander public, which has the potential of becoming supporters of the movement or which will continue to support the globalization. The open ended

⁶¹ Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

question with two alternative answers about the bystander public is indicative of the independent position of this activator, since the SMOs do not use such a discourse, rather they prefer to overemphasize their role in the convincing process of the bystander publics. At this point it is not surprising that activists use different discourses, but the possibility of acting as an individual and being able to act within the AGM without being a part of any SMO shows one of the most important differences the AGM exerts compared to other SM experiences. Generally, the SMOs do not allow “individual” activists to join and act freely within their processes; they look for a strong solidarity, and demand total not individual actions where they perceive individualism as a threat to the movement’s solidarity. However the AGM is a platform where individualities are not underrated or excluded from the struggle.

Gradually the AGM starts to become a different thing. It is becoming something different, not only a group of activists protesting. It starts to encompass, especially in Europe, syndicates, some revolutionary parties and political parties and gets a movement bringing many militant elements together. But inside this movement there are also seriously reformist elements. I mean they are looking for another world inside this system, straining the borders of this system, for example ATTAC. I mean this corresponds to a political contestation in the movement, and this is inevitable. In such a large movement it is inevitable that some elements trying to direct it to this way or that way, and it is like this also. I mean this is a political process. On one side the movement is fighting against the system, on the other side there is another political contestation process going on in the movement. Both of these live together.⁶²

Despite the presence of many internal contestations there remains however the totalized vision of the enemy and this has to be considered as the main force behind making people oppose. There is a strong trust that the fight against globalization (here set equal with neoliberalism) has started and will take the form of a war against it. What makes so many different groups join the AGM is not necessarily one common ideology, but a common enemy.

The enemy is such an enemy that ... As I tried to imply before, this neoliberal system, the subordination of everything to its interests, the global character of the process... in fact, all of the organs of the global capital makes a contribution that unifies all divisions except itself. ... Either you got lost, or you unify your forces and resist this situation. Now, the enemy is attacking from many fronts. ... but also the movement has taken its guard in all of these fronts, and it has a strong stance. I don’t know whether we can go into the details of this war subject, but let me say this. An important proportion of the AGM has positioned itself as an anti-war movement, and with this consciousness... I mean; if we can not defeat Bush, we are

⁶² Respondent M (42, Journalist)

at the point that another world will not be possible. Let me say one last thing; especially on this war subject there is a really militant struggle going on for the first time in the history, although the war has not started yet. And this shows how effective the AGM is.⁶³

For Respondent M the uniting force is the enemy and the way to fight is actual in a process in continuous flux and spontaneously evolving. The movement has the potential to recognize the new fronts opened up by the enemy and empower the forces within these new fronts.

Realizing the presence of contestations within the movement about the future direction it will take Respondent O emphasizes the need for a restructuring, or an organization that will supply “coherence” within the movement. Again we observe that people coming from organized structures are desperately seeking for organizations in “disorganization”.

The actions after Seattle, I mean the new coalitions and the direction of these new coalitions... There are important problems to be discussed and to be solved in the movement. It is good that lots of people show some resistance, walk in the streets, but there is something that does not go well. The current direction does not show any coherence. I mean, we have to *organize* these actions into a total struggle against capitalism. These types of patchwork like actions all over the world do not make any use for the future. On the other hand, they also decrease the effect of the anti-capitalist struggle, because the visible face of these protests only show a societal opposition demanding a more humane globalization. In order to overcome these problems we have to identify these problems. First of all the AGM appears to have a character that is squeezed in between the practical agendas of the capital. It cannot pass the opposition level, the spontaneity level. Secondly, these types of orientations for acting during the global days of action are somehow hindering the formation of local oppositions. I mean the local organizations put most of their energy to cope up with the global actions, and the local struggles get left behind.⁶⁴

Although the desperate seek of organization is something annoying within the movement’s discourse Respondent O directs attention to important points which also have been mentioned by other respondents. First she indicates about the movement being squeezed within the spontaneous protests organized according to the agendas of the capital, and secondly she indicates that the local struggles get left behind within this rush out for global days of action. Although coming from a different front Respondent H has got similar arguments:

⁶³ Respondent M (42, Journalist)

⁶⁴ Respondent O (42, Syndicate Administrative Member/Economist)

... until now the AGM has been something that defines itself from an opposition. I mean; there is the G8 meeting, EU gathering, or WB conference... They have become a mass gathering to stop these meetings or protest these events. This is annoying.⁶⁵

... Consequently, we have to melt down the local and the global in the same amalgamation pot, at the action level, at the life level. Wherever people go back, to their village, to their city, to their home, to their district, or to their school... And also they may be people who never have joined the actions. But the AGM is not something that only protests the G8 or EU meetings. Besides this we all have to establish alternatives in our daily lives which remove the reflections of the system. The movement can only be successful in this way. The mass protests they have been made in the history, but we should look at what they have brought about.⁶⁶

“Defining itself by the opposition to the other”, this is an important definition, where it brings about the question whether its existence depends on the existence of the opposite or not; a vicious circle that will provide no way out. As we observe in the respondents’ arguments this is a barrier that has to be passed for being able to take further steps within the movement. Also the local struggles which are putting all of their energies in the way for coping up with the non-finishing agendas of the “oppositional movement” should be strengthened in order to integrate the struggle within the lives of the activists and the bystander public also.

Here most probably, Respondent O is not trying to mention the same thing as Respondent H regarding the local struggles, since their conceptions of “struggle” are different. For Respondent O what the “struggle” implies is something formed within the modernist discourse of class struggle and is something not reflecting the actual daily life of the respondent. But for Respondent H the conception of struggle is formed with more post-modernist conceptions, where Organization 3 takes the “daily life” as the real basis of the “struggle”. In order to make the difference between the two conceptions more explicit, let us mention some observations during the interviews. Respondent H lives together with some friends from the same organization in a *gecekondu* (squatter housing) region of Istanbul (although she is able to afford a better house financially), where they have formed a structure similar to a commune. Primary data indicates that they do not prefer to drink “Coca-Cola”,

⁶⁵ Respondent H (28, Nurse/Graduate Student)

⁶⁶ Respondent H (28, Nurse/Graduate Student)

to wear “Levis” jeans, and to watch “American films promoting the ideologies of the capital”. However, when we come to Respondent O she dated the researcher in the syndicate office, where she came with a “Samsonite” hand bag, wearing “Pierre Cardin” sunglasses, and made a date at “Divan” Patisserie at “Taksim Hotel” (luxurious places in Istanbul) with her friends during the interview about the “struggle”. Thinking the conceptions about the “struggle” with this background at the cognitive level the importance the “new anarchists” put on realizing the struggle on a daily life basis becomes much more indicative, where a person carrying a “Samsonite” hand bag and wearing “Pierre Cardin” sunglasses talking about “class struggle” provides a considerably contingent picture and loses persuasiveness.

Respondent O was mentioning about the need for an organization within the movement that will make the movement take a step further towards the goals. But how will this happen? The answer comes from another syndicate member:

The organization of WSF, this is a search for a platform which will remove this cacophony from the scene. I mean ... Actually I am not against the streets protests and global actions, but there should be something that coordinates, that organizes these individual oppositions. If they are not organized, not coordinated what we all have at hand is only a cacophony, and no one understands what we want. We become only daily consumption material for the media of the capital; nobody cares about what there is inside this movement. At this point WSF is something that performs this duty. It is trying to remove the movement from this propagandizing content and tries to form an international movement covering all of the opposing dynamics. They are trying to organize national and from there regional social forums. I mean, global action days, protests against all of the important agendas of the capital, etc... these are good, but not sufficient. We need something that will transform these oppositions into new forms and develop new models. We need a jump from this level to the next one. WSF and the other social forums will do this.⁶⁷

Here the respondent identifies the social forum processes going on as an attempt to organize the movement and take it a step forward towards the goals, where the partitioned global oppositions are interpreted as a “cacophony” which appear to be something “peculiar, amusing, enjoyable”⁶⁸ for another respondent. Respondent P here is more for organization and against any disorganization. At this point it is inevitable to ask “What about the “rhizome” like networking and “disorganization

⁶⁷ Respondent P (44, Syndicate Administrative Member/Economist)

⁶⁸ Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

properties” of the global AGM?” We should take into account that this critique comes from a syndicate administration member, in other words from an “organization” member. Disorganization is not very easy to understand for people acting and living in organized systems as it has been mentioned whenever it was necessary throughout the text. They are trapped in between the organizational forms of modernity. But what the other parts of the movement call for is not an organization that will replace the existing one. Rather they are calling for “disorganization”. It should be admitted that the formal organizations even within the movement, and even we the social researchers should first of all try to grasp the meanings, the content, and duties of “disorganizations”. At this point, the ones for “disorganization” obviously have complaints about the nature of the social forums:

I mean the SFs are *more structured* formations. In Florence⁶⁹ we have observed this. For example they make incredible preparations before organization. They make connections with all of the countries all of the organizations. I guess 3 months before the events they decide who will speak, and what about they will speak during the big meetings and even for the small workshops these are determined during the preparatory meetings. And this is *a style that excludes direct action and direct participation*. We had experienced this there directly. Or being able to make a speech during a small workshop we had to struggle two days long. ... These types of organizations exclude the anti-capitalists especially the anarchists.⁷⁰

From this perspective the social forum processes working to “organize” the movement is excluding disorganizations which favor “direct participation and direct action”. For this respondent social forums do not seem to be all inclusive as they appear to be, because their tendencies for strict organizations prevents the attendance of the “new anarchists”, as well as other small groups who do not have the opportunity for arranging planned and coordinated actions or participations. We have to understand that “organization” is not something solving the problems of the AGM, rather it is deepening the contestations within the movement. Here it should be mentioned that the contestations between the groups favoring organization and the ones favoring disorganization has lead to some such serious splits within the AGM -

⁶⁹ European Social Forum in Florence January 2003.

⁷⁰ Respondent H (28, Nurse/Graduate Student)

especially in Europe- that some groups have started to organize “alternatives” to social forums⁷¹.

In Florence during the ESF they were discussing it, I don't know what they have decided but Europe, especially France (because ATTAC is very largely organized there) ... they had a proposal for establishing a center. For example in Paris, let us rent a building for the forum. When we heard about this we got goose bumps, because this means exactly becoming 'centered'. It is a threat, a concrete threat. I mean, there are two things; the thing we call 'becoming an NGO'... I mean it will start to get projects in a couple of years. Also *there are gossips going around that the Ford Foundation has supported the WSF*⁷². There is a tendency which tries to open up the way for such things. We have to be extremely careful for such tendencies. ... I don't know whether our power will suffice to stop this but we have thought about ISF as a place where we could weave a new tendency against such things.⁷³

Words like hierarchy, center, NGO these are concepts that let those people “get goose bumps”. It is not so easy to blame them for this feelings because when we look at the current system these type of establishments appear to have become a part of the system, and to be operating within the systematic borders, at least we should admit that there are evidences indicating their close connections with the states and the system. Especially in Turkey the connections of NGOs⁷⁴, what they are doing and whom they are serving are highly debatable issues. Additionally, when we consider the political effects of NGOs during the recent so-called ‘post-modern’ “color revolutions” in Ukraine, in the Caucasus, and Kyrgyzstan⁷⁵ this stance is

⁷¹ “The experience of being sidelined and sabotaged at the social forums have left more radical activists wondering whether to “*abandon or contaminate*” (i.e. try to participate and push direct democracy and participatory politics) the Social Forums. On the one hand groups are wary of assisting in the co-option and assimilation of our politics, on the other hand many people are attracted to the social forums because of what they have seen and heard of the anti-capitalist movement and because, in part at least, of our politics and actions, not taking part means abandoning these people to the trots, social democrats and other assorted vampires. Following from this idea groups affiliated to Peoples Global Action (which called the original 'global action days') established the Hub Camp as an autonomous space at the 2002 ESF in Florence '*not in competition*' and '*not anti-ESF*' to facilitate networking between groups and individuals and to '*contaminate by association the ESF with non-hierarchical practices*'. ... *A Libertarian Social Forum will be running alongside the ESF in Paris* (O'Sullivan, 2003).” [Italics come from the original].

⁷² For the interested reader; MacDonald, Sam, 2002, **Delicious Irony**, *Reason* 33(8): 12.

⁷³ Respondent H (28, Nurse/Graduate Student)

⁷⁴ For a detailed analysis of the NGO connections in Turkey look in Mustafa Yıldırım, 2006, **Sivil Örümeğin Ağında** (Entrapped by the Civil Spider Net), Ulus Dağı Yayınları: Ankara.

⁷⁵ For this issue the interested reader can refer to Engdahl, F. William, 2005, **Color Revolutions, Geopolitics and the Baku Pipeline**, *Global Research*, June 25th, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/Print>

understandable. Such organizations that reproduce the system and act within the systematic borders “for” the systems’ benefits look like “old margarine in new package”. If the system is controlling such organizations and producing them in order to supply an emergency valve that gets “the pressured air” of the societies during crisis times this strengthens the “Truman Show”⁷⁶ feeling of the activists, and blockades the mobilization. If people are just acting in a scenario where the roles, the effects, and causes are determined by the scriptwriter the subject is not the subject in reality. That is the “virtual”, and the respondents are clever enough to realize the “virtuality”:

Actually the empire needs an opposition to reform itself. I mean *the SFs will not threaten the empire totally; it is a movement which will show its failures so that it can try to fix them*. I mean the empire tries to structure an oppositional movement that will reform it. Naturally, it has to remove elements that might threaten it directly from the oppositional movements it structures. And terrorism, terror, or violence is the key for this exclusion.⁷⁷

These words indicate serious suspicions about the nature of the social forum processes, who are supposed to “organize” the movements of the masses in a goal directed way. So it becomes no wonder that the “new anarchists” are working on “more libertarian” alternatives (O’Sullivan 2003). The complaints of Organization 3 about the nature of the SFs do not end with that:

SFs also develop their own elites. I mean *there appears to be something like a hierarchy*. I mean they say nice things. I didn’t investigate it in detail, who they are and what they say, but I guess people like Naomi Klein, Susan George, or this name or that name, *there are people who are walking in the front*. There are people who mostly talk during SFs, they go from meeting to meeting, and they state anything for every meeting personally or as a representative of an organization like ATTAC etc... *I feel like distanced*. Susan George comes; I don’t want to listen to Susan George. From one side it is natural that every

Article.php?articleId=518, Accessed 20.12.2006; Karatnycky, Adrian, 2005, **Ukraine's Orange Revolution**, *Foreign Affairs*, March/April, <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20050301faessay84205/adrian-karatnycky/ukraine-s-orange-revolution.html>, Accessed 20.12.2006; Demirtepe, Turgut, 2005, “**Demokratik Devrimler**” “**Sürekli Devrim**”in **Bir Parçası mı?: Gürcistan ve Ukrayna Olaylarının Orta Asya’da Yansımaları** (Are “Democratic Revolutions” a Part of “Continuous Revolution”?: The Reflections of the Caucasian and Ukrainian Events to the Middle East), *Journal of Turkish Weekly*, <http://www.turkishweekly.net/turkce/makale.php?id=59>, Accessed 20.12.2006; and Peters, Andrea, 2005, **US money and personnel behind Kyrgyzstan’s “Tulip Revolution”**, *World Socialist Web Site* <http://www.wsws.org/articles/2005/mar2005/tulp-m28.shtml>, Accessed 20.12.2006.

⁷⁶ Look at footnote 38 for information on The Truman Show.

⁷⁷ Respondent I (37, Unemployed/Ceramics Artist)

movement develops its own people, but we have to look at how this develops, what are the mechanisms developing those people.⁷⁸

For these respondents SFs develop its own elites but this is contingent to the nature of the movement itself, and the way how these elites are developed within the movement should be inspected carefully, since this development a distancing effect for the ones who grasp the nature of the movement more than the ones who are looking for alternatives within the existing knowledge about “systems”.

It is obvious that the respondents from Organization 3 are not satisfied with the current status and the orientation of the AGM. However, they are not withdrawing from the process, and continue to interact with the forces within the movement to whom they do not have total trust. Is it possible to walk together on the way towards the “alternative future” together despite such deep contingencies?

Now the global movement is at the reading stage. This reading will start to be talked after a stage of completion. The ideas about it will be expressed. *We understand the AGM as station where the world is re-read and re-talked, where a new discourse is constructed, where a new language is constructed.* Like 48, like October Revolution, like 68. *We believe that from this AGM a new international or the dynamics of a new global anti-capitalist political process will emerge.* We are very hopeful about it; we do not understand it as a conjectural thing. We think that *it is an important ground which teaches how the basic dynamics or the colors of the 21st century should be read.*⁷⁹

Indicating the processual nature of the AGM, the respondent is mentioning about a “wait and see” policy which prevents them from withdrawal. This policy becomes also evident in the discourse of most of the respondents in the sample. Within the movement, “they” will be able to cope up with the “new language” it constructs on its way. They will not be excluded from the “change” that is happening now, but its end stage is unknown. By being within the movement the activists have the opportunity to develop themselves as forces of change which will shape the 21st century in that *they themselves* also learn *how to change and how to affect the change*. This point is a very important and remarking step in understanding the movement, since it marks the “key concept” that will help us to understand the

⁷⁸ Respondent G (25, Research Assistant/Graduate Student)

⁷⁹ Respondent I (37, Unemployed/Ceramics Artist)

movement. This key concept is called “reflexive framing” by Chesters and Welsh (2005: 198) following Bateson (1973).⁸⁰ At this point it is necessary to explain “reflexive framing” within a manageably large enough parenthesis.

According to Chesters and Welsh (ibid.: 197) “The key elements of reflexive framing ... are recognition of the unique features of network actors, disregard of available political opportunity structures, the primacy of ontological categories of engagement, and the availability and use of CMC [Computer Mediated Communication] techniques.” Breaking with the previous assumptions of the “framing theory” they are suggesting that “the rise of globally interacting, highly mobile social movements contesting globalizing patterns of production, distribution and exchange has been precipitated by actors (networks, organizations and individuals) that do not resemble SMOs typical of the 1970s and 1980s movement milieu (ibid.: 198).”

Therefore, analysis that relies upon access to and evaluation of traditional SMOs is weakly aligned with issues of movement emergence and consolidation within the global milieu. Many actors within the AGM are self-declared ‘disorganizations’, regarding the existing political system as part of the problem not part of the solution. As network actors they lack large-scale institutions, permanent buildings, workers or pension funds. They prioritize direct action as a preferred mode of intervention rather than a tactic of last resort, and as such they require a more nuanced approach than those previously studied under the auspices of frame analysis (ibid.: 198).

...we take reflexive framing to refer to the process through which individual psychological frames are deployed as ‘sense-making’ strategies, leaving an individual with adequate reserves of ‘ontological security’ to retain the capacity to act. This is consistent with recent work emphasizing the increasing importance of ontological citizenship within contemporary societies (Turner, 2001)⁸¹. One important consequence of this is the attempt to maximize the degree of fit between daily personal acts – repertoires of self – and desired social, political and cultural ends. Within the AGM, personal frames thus intersect with elements of the ideological and discursive expressions of both contemporary society and the movement milieu. Reflexive framing articulates individual psychological and subjective experiences of the ‘lifeworld’ of contemporary society with the ideological expressions, discourses and material practices perceived as shaping the personal and planetary milieu. Such ‘frame-work’ articulates frames, ideology and discourse in an attempt at sense-making that renders concrete (in intended and unintended ways) the economic, political and cultural forces affecting person and planet. Clear examples from our data where such ‘frame-work’ occurs

⁸⁰ Bateson, G., 1973. **Steps to an Ecology of Mind**. London: Paladin.

⁸¹ Turner B.S., 2001 **The Erosion of Citizenship** in *British Journal of Sociology* 52:189–209.

include the definition and use of violence, the implications of gender order, freedom of speech, association and movement [Chesters and Welsh, 2004; Welsh, 2004⁸²] (ibid.: 198).

Remember our observational example about the respondent carrying a “Samsonite” hand bag and wearing “Pierre Cardin” sunglasses. This is exactly what Chesters and Welsh (2005) are talking about in the above quotations. There is a two sided “reflexive” process going on within the movement and this is what will shape the movement and its outcomes. Here the point that needs to be emphasized with capital letters and bold characters is that Organization 3 which is one among the representatives of organizations that intentionally label themselves as “disorganization” is completely aware of the fact that this is a “two-sided process” going on, and this process will shape up the direction, the orientation, the goal, the aim, as well as the end state of the movement. Understanding this two sided process and being aware about the fact that all of the organizations and individuals incorporated within the struggle will “change” during this process and “learn” about “how the basic dynamics or the colors of the 21st century should be read” we can conclude that Organization 3 has more things to teach to the other organizations within the sample.

Witnessing the presence of such organizations within the movement in Turkey is very inspiring and hope-giving for the future of the movement. However, if we consider that we could find only one example in such a sample formed via an intensive and hard work it should be admitted that the complaints of these “new anarchists” about the intended exclusion of these type of groups from the movement especially in Europe are getting real in Turkey also. And this is something that shadows the sun on the horizon line. We wish that such organizations do not give up and are patient enough to wait for the “melting down of the icebergs of modernity”, so that the world can realize the importance of the things they can teach us.

⁸² Chesters, Gramem and Ian Welsh, 2004, **Rebel Colours: “Framing” in Global Social Movement**, *Sociological Review*, 52(3): 314–335 and Welsh, Ian, 2004, **Network Movement in the Czech Republic: Perturbating Prague**, *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 12(3): 321–37.

Now let us close our parenthesis here and continue to elaborate the frames of the respondents regarding the AGM and the enemy it opposes. At the beginning of this part we have stated that the enemy to which the AGM opposes has a totalized vision which should hinder mobilization at first glimpse but the respondents have such a trust in the movement and its capacities that they label themselves as the “second super power” although the amount of people attending the movement is a debatable issue:

... Although capitalism has powerful weapons and the system looks like something that could not be changed totally, there are weak elements of the capitalist system. They are I guess the 20% of the world, we are the 80%. The numbers are on our side. I mean this number of people; this is the second super power.⁸³

The power that brings those people from many different areas is this totalized vision of the enemy as we have previously mentioned. For Respondent U “oppression” is the key word that brings different groups together. There is no level for oppression, everyone gets oppressed and the oppressor is the same.

AGM is an area where groups with no similarities come together also. I mean it is not necessary to share the same ideas. There are some groups with whom we share some ideas, but also there are groups which do not have similar and even opposing views regarding the issues we deal. This is due to the fact that the general oppression’s victims are different agents. Some are oppressed due to sexism, some due to racism, some are oppressed economically, and some live different types of oppression. At this point there is nothing like a hierarchy of oppression. There is nothing like who is the most oppressed one. There is no level for oppression. But if we look at it generally there is a structure oppressing everyone. Therefore, we can be together with many groups which do not share the same ideas. At this point we can also come together with groups which have completely opposing views.⁸⁴

Here it should be noted that the respondent coming from organization 6 preferred to use the word “oppression” which would change with “exploitation” when the respondent had a socialist background like the ones from the other organizations within the sample.

But how does such a “patchwork” like mass not get dissolved easily. Here the answer lies in the concept of “solidarity”. The common enemy that brings those

⁸³ Respondent C (24, University Student)

⁸⁴ Respondent U (29, High-school Teacher)

people together also forms the basis of this solidarity, which appears to be very fragile as well as very strong at the same time, where sometimes it allows “dialogue” despite “heart breaking differences and prejudices”.

We have lived incredible experiences of solidarity in Geneva. For example, there I was trying to prepare some banners before the actions. We were in a place where many people were encamping for the protest events. I saw a middle aged woman preparing banners, I think she was from Germany and did not speak English very well. I asked her where she has found the linens and the spray colors in the manner of Tarzan and Jane. She showed me the linens and the spray colors in her bag, and let me use them. No question... Nothing else... I only asked, and she shared all the material with me. This was an incredible moment. There nobody cares who you are or where you come from. This is the solidarity. This is the spirit of the movement. How can the police or others divide such a group of people?⁸⁵

I mean, we might have differences, but despite these differences we can trust each other. Let me tell an anecdote which I had experienced in Geneva. There, which day I don't remember but during the protests and most probably before the attack of the carabineer. I met an English gypsy anarchist. He hated socialists, because of the slaughter of Gypsies in socialist Russia and in Eastern Europe. He was telling me that we were murderers. We discussed nearly one hour, and I tried to convince him. There was no use of talking. After a while he told me ‘you are good man but fuck all the socialists’. I mean, I could not convince him about socialism but despite his bad prejudices about socialists we could be friends. We could discuss our different ideologies without violence. I mean none of us has hit the other one. I mean... this is what supplies the power of the movement.⁸⁶

This spirit of solidarity which excites most of the respondents, the bystander public, and even the researchers is something that gets lost within the “curls of the peoples’ brains” or the “mental black box”. Let us leave the analysis of this “spirit of solidarity” to the social psychology researchers and turn our attention to our last quotation which indicates the perception of members of Organization 6 about the AGM who have different priorities compared to the other groups:

... The society does not get rid of you completely but it opens up breathing spaces. There are some clubs for homosexuals, and the system has placed it on a very well equilibrium. It does not get rid of you; instead it lets you buy your freedom by letting you pay for it excessively. There are homosexual cruises, homosexual shops, homosexual islands like Mikonos, etc... these are shown like freedom, but they are not freedom, they are prisons. Luxury prisons you buy. I don't want these; I want to be present everywhere. I am against the system who limits my existence within these spaces. Therefore I think that the AGM is very useful.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Respondent B (22, University Student)

⁸⁶ Respondent C (24, University Student)

⁸⁷ Respondent V (27, Organization F Administrative Member)

Here the respondent is indicating the systemic character of the enemy one more time. But the difference that exerts our attention to these words is the educational level of the respondent. This respondent is a high-school graduate person who does not have any formal educational or occupational status. He is working within the Administration of Organization 6, and primary data indicates that he faces difficulties in finding a job in the formal meaning (a job with social security and a label) due to his feminine appearance as well as educational level. He has been attending the initiative for two years, and started to work there six months ago. Obviously there are other respondents from the same organization who have given similar responses but they were either university graduates or university students at reputable universities where they have had the opportunities to develop their discourses and frameworks for life. But this respondent shows that the “interactive dialogue” going on within organization 6 is so strong that a low educated person can develop such a framework of life and discourse. Therefore, here it is necessary to emphasize that the “interactive dialogue” tradition prevalent within the Gay and Lesbian Liberation Movement might form the basis of the “dialogue” needed within the AGM.

Another aspect, which the AGM opens up grounds to develop new contacts and exchange experiences, is the gathering of various elements of the movement together during the “Global Days of Action”, continental, regional SFs and WSF. Let us listen to the respondents from Organization 3 and 4 for learning about these opportunities:

... I mean we have had some opportunities for developing new contacts in Florence. I mean, we have some relations going on via e-mails, but none of these relations are in organic character or directed to organize something together. In Thessalonica⁸⁸ we have met many Greek people. We have talked about the student movements there and here and shared our experiences. They invited us to their actions but we could not go due to financial problems. ... With other formally organized formations we don't have such connections. We just receive some news, some informational materials, etc. ... But there is nothing that strengthens the internationalization feeling. There are only connections which have been established personally. ... I mean, there is nothing that feeds the whole, but it might be possible of course.⁸⁹

⁸⁸ The preparatory meetings in Thessalonica in December 2002 for the ESF in Florence in 2003

⁸⁹ Respondent G (25, Research Assistant/Graduate Student)

There is something like ... I mean as a result of the experiences of the international movement, from there some things come to us in theory. For example our understanding of Seattle better than the others has been in this way. Maybe we also could see it but it would take more time. Knowledge is flowing from the international movement with its direct experiences. In England there is the SWP, it is at the center of the 'Stop the World Coalition', and it is the founder of this coalition. We can take its experiences. We have X⁹⁰ in India our brother organization. These kinds of advantages it has.⁹¹

Networking opportunities appear to operate better on informal levels and this is coherent with the nature of the movement, which extensively makes use of what Chesters and Welsh (2005) call Computer Mediated Communication (CMC) technologies. New contacts are loose at the current stage but there is hope for the future. Financial difficulties appear to be an important aspect that hinders some further connections or the strengthening of the existing connections. At this point Organizations like B, D, and E seem to be luckier in that they have formal international connections to prominent organizations in the movement, and are able to afford financial requirements.

Another aspect which has to be considered within the AGM and their frames is the issue of "heterogeneity", which forms the most debated feature of the movement due to the human history full of coalitions that get easily dissolved during historical transition periods, and cause detrimental effects to societies. The respondents indicate that heterogeneity is the realization of the "unity of diversities", which allows the construction of a new culture, new language, and new opportunities for forming stronger coalitions, although the reasons of being there is different for everyone. The common denominator which gets concrete within the discourse of the movement as well as the respondents in the sample with the words like "oppression" and "exploitation" is the force that makes these people to come together.

...Actually, the reasons of being there are different for everyone, but there is a common denominator. I mean, it will be a populist thing maybe but, there is something that had been trendy and I like 'our names are different but surnames are same', 'our names are different but surnames are: globalize the resistance', and here also it is the same thing, 'our names are

⁹⁰ A pseudo name has been used for the mentioned organization for keeping anonymity.

⁹¹ Respondent N (37, Unemployed)

different but surnames are: ‘No to War in Iraq’ like we say in the coordination⁹². This is like that.⁹³

...Being against globalization is not related to the differentiation of the groups and their priorities. I mean this is a common problem for all of them. They have different priorities and try to tell something about their priorities but there is a common problem, and this is exploitation and globalization is busy with the organization of this exploitation meanwhile. This heterogeneity is inevitable from this perspective.⁹⁴

It is persuading to see that the words of two different respondents having two different priorities and two different orientations can complete each other.

At the beginning this variety brings about an incredible richness. It prevents us looking at many things from a one sided perspective. For me it forms a laboratory where we can realize conceptions like human rights, equality, and justice between ourselves, which we cannot realize in our lives. I mean we all are saying similar things maybe but the endurance, the tolerance (maybe the concept of tolerance is also something very debatable philosophically) we will show to our diversity, the understanding, respect... These will give us very important clues about whether another world will be possible or not. Therefore, I put importance to the Coordination for No to the War in Iraq. There are people from the Islamic wing, leftists, anarchists, etc... If we can shape, develop a new culture here, then we can say that another world is possible more easily, more faithfully. We can be more persuasive, more convincing. ... It involves also many difficulties actually, but if can pass this, it is a very enriching thing. However, this is a threshold, if we can pass this healthy, strongly.⁹⁵

Obviously this heterogeneity has advantages and disadvantages. Here Respondent Z identifies this variety as “richness”, however previously we have witnessed respondents labeling this as a “cacophony”. For this respondent “heterogeneity” allows the trial of the unknown in the “laboratory” it forms. The “endurance” the “tolerance” this heterogeneity will show to each other will form the nucleus of the “alternative future” they are fighting for. But there is a threshold to be passed for a strong future, where Respondent Z identifies the “No to War in Iraq Coordination” as a rehearsal for the AGM in Turkey.

The respondents from Organization 3 were previously mentioning about the disadvantages of this heterogeneity, where they emphasized the exclusion of the

⁹² The respondent is talking about the “No to War in Iraq Coalition” which has been established in 2003 in order to supply civic resistance for the prevention of the US troops’ invasion of Iraq.

⁹³ Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

⁹⁴ Respondent T (23, University Student)

⁹⁵ Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

“new anarchists” from the social forum processes by the reformist groups, especially in Europe, as well as in Turkey. However, they are also aware about the advantages “heterogeneity” might bring. In the below paragraph they identify “heterogeneity” as an advantage for getting the ones who do not want to act under the directions of the working class in to the struggle. This is a very strategic look at the movement, but strategic framings are important within such a movement that has strong political argumentations.

... On the other hand it [heterogeneity] has got such an advantage. For example, for the movements who do not want to act under the leadership of the working class this opens up a space. It causes them to develop their own struggle. I mean with this side heterogeneity might be good. But a direction or an organization which will bring all of these individual struggles together should be developed. But I think this will happen in a process, because the cognitive liberation of the individualities will take up some time. ... When the individual struggles realize the wholeness of the struggle the base of what we call the movement will be filled really. The struggle will get rid of from spontaneity. At this point I describe it as spontaneous struggles. I see it as a process where everyone tries to find his/her way from the place where s/he is. If we make connections between these struggles and start to grasp the whole, only after than we will do different things.⁹⁶

This strategic framing about heterogeneity is not peculiar to Organization 3, also Organization 6 which has considerably different priorities considers this “heterogeneity” as something that may contribute to their own struggle and let them take their further steps easier in that the “contingency culture” developed within the movement can open spaces for transformation and change of ideas via interactions between different groups.

...We see the spaces like Anti-War Platform and the Anti-Globalization Platform as an opportunity to reach people from different wings and express them our problems. I mean the oppressed people are coming together there, and they have the potential to think about oppression. ... Those people are more sensitive to the oppression of others and the priorities of the oppressed people. And we take this as an opportunity to tell them something. Of course our problems will take the second line, because the first aim is staying against war or globalization, but if we enter the square there and open a banner, we get the chance to tell something to the people being there. Therefore, the contingencies within this heterogeneity are something very useful for the production of a contingency culture. It is a good opportunity where people may start to question some things and change their ideas.⁹⁷

⁹⁶ Respondent G (25, Research Assistant/Graduate Student)

⁹⁷ Respondent U (29, High-school Teacher)

Within this heterogeneity there have been some feminist groups which could not bear the different priorities and framings and have withdrawn from the “No to War in Iraq Coordination” which is perceived as a reflection or an extension of the AGM. They have declared the reason of their withdrawal from the coordination as the sexist orientations of some groups within the coordination. However, Organization 6 which usually acts in accordance with the mentioned organization did not follow.

... For example Organization X⁹⁸ has withdrawn from the Anti-War Coalition recently, because they were finding it to be very sexist oriented. They made such a declaration. I mean, we as homosexuals... I don't know but homosexuals have to experience and tolerate the explicit exclusions more than they do. We are facing this at every instance of our lives. Therefore, we can find the power to transform or change it. Maybe because of this we did not show the same reaction.⁹⁹

Ironically, being accustomed to “exclusion” has prevented Organization 6 from withdrawal. Here patience, tolerance and endurance become the keys for the continuation of the “heterogeneity” of the AGM. We hope that all of the organizations enriching this colorful picture will be patient, tolerant and enduring enough to see the fruits of the “contingency culture” they are building.

3.2.3. Alternative Future Visions and Strategies of Action

Thus far we have discussed issues which can be considered within our first research question: How do the AGM in Turkey frame their issue; in other words how do they define their target, to whom they attribute the blame? This first research question has been describing us the “diagnostic framing” of the movement. In the following parts we will deal with the issues regarding our second research question: How do they frame the goal of the movement; in other words what are their strategies to defeat their target? And this research question will describe the “prognostic framing” of the movement.

Here we will start with the elaboration of the “alternative future visions” which become apparent within the movement. Actually, when the respondents faced

⁹⁸ The actual name of the organization has been changed for keeping anonymity.

⁹⁹ Respondent T (23, University Student)

questions regarding the “alternative future visions” they are struggling for, the most prevalent response is that nobody within the movement is trying to form recipes for the “alternative future”. Although this response is the common denominator we prefer to inspect the discourse of the organizations one by one so that the cleavage points become more apparent to the reader. Let us start with our independent respondent who does not represent any organization where he acts within the movement as an individual.

For our independent Respondent Z the process is evolving in its way and what he prefers is just joining the process which will form the “alternative future” in its way. For him every step in the process is a brick on the way to the “alternative future” Respondent Z is fighting for, but the future and what it will bring is not visible to him.

... Here I do not expect something like the end of a film actually. I mean the AGM itself is a peculiar amusing, enjoyable thing... an honorable thing... this is inevitable. We will live it as it is. I mean, will the multinational corporations disappear, will their states be demolished, and will there be a revolution? I do not have such foresights actually.¹⁰⁰

... Of course there are revolutionary aspects, revolutionary elements. But if we try to get the AGM together for a revolutionary common denominator, we will be trying to homogenize it, and from my point of view this is the greatest danger for us. Let me give an example for this. In the Coordination for No to War in Iraq some came with proposals like this. ‘We the 156 organizations have come here together. We should put ‘no to isolation’ into our aims.’ Some others said some things like that. I mean when we increase the words that join us the number of people joining under this common denominator will decrease. When our sentences increase the number of people signing under these sentences will decrease. Therefore, ‘another world is possible’ is a very meaningful, adequate, and a unifying slogan. If we put sentences starting with but or however behind this the number of people signing under these words will decrease to a half, we will be divided.¹⁰¹

Here the danger of homogenization is clearly expressed by this respondent and further more it is stressed that there are similar discourses about homogenization. The question remains however of how those people will come together and what kind of an “alternative future” they will develop. If this is such a fragile coalition how will this fragile solidarity resist the incredibly powerful instruments of the globalizing powers? And if this unity gets divided so easily how will an alternative

¹⁰⁰ Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

¹⁰¹ Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

future together be possible? These are key question to be answered but do not find place within the discourse of Respondent Z.

... The number of people following the process is increasing day by day. ... With every new participation, the shape of it [WSF] is changing a little bit. I mean everyone coming there accepts the photograph s/he has seen until then, and brings together a mechanism which will affect the photograph and add his/her color. Consequently, the final words the movement will say might differ with the growth of the movement, but at least this word will be under the heading of 'another world is possible'... The meaning of this slogan is different for everyone. But if you ask for a model there is no such thing for now. We can not see anything yet. The experiences lived in Argentina; these are things to be watched closely. I mean the barricaders, the invaders, folk parliaments, things like these... There a new model is being tried. This is something which emerged very spontaneously, very naturally... This model is being tried. What is important is what it prevents and what this causes. If it is direct democracy, then direct democracy... If it is direct action, then direct action... The shape of this might vary from country to country, or from culture to culture.¹⁰²

In this passage clearly the hope as well as the possibility for an “alternative future” is stressed. The way how this might realize is open to explanation but it seems to be important that there is a strong belief in that there is a hope for change. Instead of pointing at a specific form of end stage or phase to be reached, the movement itself is described as ongoing and constantly changing, integrating different elements, and no clear cut rules identifiable, except that all attempts join into an openly expressed need for change.

The most basic, most ready gain will be this... I mean, and carry on at least I believe, the folks will realize their existence. I mean they will realize that they are a subject, and everything will start after this. ... What will this bring about? I mean, if the folks in Turkey here would have realized their being a subject, their power, this war would stop. This is so definite, concrete. A small rehearsal of this has been lived in Ankara on the 1st of March¹⁰³. In a country with a 70 million population, 100 thousand people gathered in Ankara and... Actually, I do not derive a direct cause and effect relationship, but if there would have been a million people, there could not be any word about the second permit¹⁰⁴. I truly believe this.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

¹⁰³ The respondent mentions about the protests in order to stop the permit the parliamentary has been voting for supplying military and logistic support to the US military forces for the planned invasion of Iraq.

¹⁰⁴ Before the invasion of Iraq by the US troops, the Turkish government had been asked for a permit that allowed the transfer of US troops to Iraq over Turkey, and supplied some military as well as logistics support. The government Party AKP brought this permit license to the parliament for voting, and the result has been dissatisfaction for AKP as well as the US government. However, AKP did not give up and started to work and talk about a second permit, which would at least allow logistic

Although, the form the protests shall take and the final form to be reached are not clearly addressed as seen in the interview passage above an aspect to consider is that there remains an emphasis on the need for a growing self awareness of the individuals, as citizens, being able to position themselves vs. / in the state, but it is also stressed that this should not remain on an individual level but reach a large number of supporters. The question remains in how far this is to be perceived as a collective action or the sum of individual decisions/ protests.

The respondents E and F from Organization 2 -an internationalist political party according to their program- gave the most “formal” responses to our questions, so that finding representative quotations was a really hard and time consuming job. Considering the “alternative future visions” of the AGM like many other respondents Respondent E also stated that “the AGM has not prepared a known plan for the future, but there are discussions going on within the movement about the steps of a plan to be applied.” According to him “the discussions going on” seem to be “very premature things” and “incapable” to address “a global solution”. But the “alternative future” they are fighting for looks like this:

The struggle is for a freer and more egalitarian world. I mean, we are for a non-classed society, a society where there is no exploitation. In this society we expect that the producers will govern themselves, there won't be a police or military repression on this society. The people will govern themselves. We are also for the equality of men and women. We are against every type of exclusion like racism or exclusions based on ethnicity. In the world we are defending, peace will prevail, and every nation will have the right to make its own decisions. In this world we also should care for the environment. ... I don't know what to add. But it is like this. When you ask about how we will reach this society? I don't know. I mean there is not such a plan or program. Internationalism and self governance, and maybe democracy may be the keywords for this future. But I don't believe in revolution. Most probably, the party would not support my argument totally, but this is my own thought.¹⁰⁶

Here we observe very formative statements indicating to a “more humane alternative future” The respondent tries to mention all of the problematic areas of the current world system, which makes the actual demands of the organization invisible.

support for the US troops. The Respondent had been interviewed after the rejection of the first permit, and the second permit had started to be talked about then.

¹⁰⁵ Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

¹⁰⁶ Respondent E (42, Mechanical Engineer)

Additionally, the strategies to be followed for the goal are also unknown for the respondent, we only can get keywords like “internationalism”, “self governance”, and “democracy” which the respondent denied to make explicit during the interview, where he stated that “these are things that everybody can make different definitions. What we have to do is going beyond these discussions and waiting for the future. It will form itself and we will see what it will look like.”¹⁰⁷ Here we observe a peculiar stance which seems to be denying becoming the subject of the proposed change process. It would be hypothetical to conclude that this will represent the organizations actual stance, but let it suffice to state that Respondent E has been on a bad day most probably. Another point that the respondent adds is his distrust in “revolution”, but this is just a personal choice, not representing the organization of the respondent.

Alternative future? It is a hard question. I have not thought about it actually very much. I mean of course it will be a more egalitarian and a humane one, but describing it... For me this is something that should be done in the WSF. I mean, the answer to your question will come from there. What we are for is open. If we can find an opportunity we can express our demands there. But what we will express there is open to discussion. I mean I cannot make any claims representing the party. If you ask my own opinion, as I stated before, I haven't thought about it so much.¹⁰⁸

Respondent F from the same organization identifies the social forum processes as the platform where this “alternative future” will be shaped. But she does not give any clues about this “alternative future”. Here we observe an explicit “representation fear” where she indicates that “she cannot make any claims representing the party”. This explains the formativeness of the responses coming from these two respondents to some extent. According to primary data there were hot discussions going on within the party during the times when the researcher has been performing the interviews, and these discussions focused on the party's attendance to the “No to War in Iraq Coordination” which was percept as a front within the AGM¹⁰⁹.

¹⁰⁷ Respondent E (42, Mechanical Engineer)

¹⁰⁸ Respondent F (39, Mechanical Engineer)

¹⁰⁹ Before the invasion of Iraq by the US Forces there have been many debates about the formations against war. Till the invasion in March 2003, there was the “No to War in Iraq Coordination” organizing the resistances. But after the invasion hard disputes regarding the future of the

Therefore the respondents seem to be feeling uncomfortable although anonymity was guaranteed.

Respondent K from Organization 4 also emphasizes the fragility of the coalitions formed within the movement, as Respondent Z had previously expressed “when the number of sentences that define the movement increase the number of people putting their sign under it will start to decrease”. So a common definition for the “alternative future” seems to be something impossible at this stage.

... Now here, if we start to define ‘another world’ with its frame here in the movement, the movement will start to dissolve immediately. Okay, but this does not mean that the movement is not discussing this. I mean *all of these social forums, WSFs, European Social Forums, other continental social forums, all of these are tools looking for the answer of the question what kind of a world. ...* The movement is doing this, I mean it was a protest movement; it opposed the system, now it is discussing how ‘another world’ will be while repelling this system. If you ask my opinion, I say, I mean; it is not possible to say anything from now on. I mean a synthesis which encompasses all of the richness of the movement... I mean, previously there were these *instructions to be followed after the revolution, the Stalinist system described these in an order and command chain, it is not like this.* This process, which has started now and its end... I see it as an *open ended process.* ... But I am sure that we are going to a better world, I am sure at this point.¹¹⁰

These statements are very similar to the above comments of Respondent Z since both of the respondents indicate that they cannot see the end phase or what the movement will bring about. However, the main difference between the discourses of these two respondents appears to be that Respondent K is indicating the social forum processes where the “alternative future” concept will be elaborated in detail and discussed. The duty of these local, regional, continental and World social forums is to develop a formulation of the “alternative future” which will encompass all the heterogeneity and bring all of the contesting frames to a “consensus”. However, this appears to be an “open ended process”. Again we face an answer which does not indicate a comprehensible vision, however, there is a clue about the character of the “alternative future” within the words of Respondent K: “previously there were instructions to be followed after the revolution, the Stalinist system described these

coordination started. And after three months in January some groups decided to withdraw from the coordination and formed the “Global Peace and Justice Coalition”.

¹¹⁰ Respondent K (46, Unemployed)

in an order and command chain, it is not like this.” This point is important in that it emphasizes the “newness” of the solution, which also may be something which we cannot describe with our existing knowledge. When we consider the whole sample, this framing about the “alternative future” is common to all of the respondents as we will see in the following parts of the text. However, obviously everyone within the movement has some pictures of the “alternative future” they are fighting for in their minds, and every single or collective actor wants to affect the “alternative future”. For Respondent Z this picture was blurred, where he was not able to develop a sketch as an individual activist. However, Organization 4 as a formal hierarchical political party with a Trotskyist background has something better than a sketch to present us. Obviously, the “alternative future” of Organization 4 is a socialist “alternative future”.

... Some make definitions like “liberating socialism” which encompasses all the richness of feminism, environmentalism, etc. We tell that there is not such a socialism which has no sensitivity about the environment, which is sexist, etc. Our socialism conception is already like this. There is no need to put emphasizing adjectives before it.¹¹¹

... There are examples of these. The worker councils in the Soviets and the others... It is very interesting that similar structures arise in very different historical conjectures. I mean the Soviets have a very important feature, for example there are power organs wherein the people there are governing themselves in the factory, in the district, etc. I mean there is no representation. Today there is also such a process. From my point of view the SF process is totally like this. This ISF can have district social forums, and starting from there we can achieve to European social forum, a national social forum, and the WSF, and there also direct democracy, direct action... This is what I have in my mind about the future governance systems.¹¹²

The above words made the researcher experience a “déjà vu”. Nearly five years ago during a discussion about the visions of the socialists regarding the environmentalism and feminism, the respondent had expressed that the belief that “socialism is the cure for every trouble” which has been debated within the SMOs and political arena has been prevailing within the discourse of socialist groups in Turkey. A Social Scientist opposing the researcher has insisted that these discussions have been left in the past and stated that even the most orthodox Marxists have

¹¹¹ Respondent K (46, Unemployed)

¹¹² Respondent K (46, Unemployed)

changed their belief, and were trying to understand the differentiating demands of environmentalists and feminists. After five years the researchers arguments become concrete with the above words of Respondent K. This has been the discussion of the 1970s and the socialists have restructured their understanding in North America and Europe to some extent, but Organization 4 seems to be insisting on keeping the old way. By insisting on keeping the old way and by giving previous examples about the governance system the respondent appears to be contingent with his own words above, where he emphasized the “newness” of the “alternative future” supposed to be developed by the social forum processes. From one point this is a contingency, but on the other side people are not able to describe what they do not know, or what they cannot foresee therefore it is inevitable that the respondents refer to the previous examples.

...what the movement calls *direct action* is a part of our tradition. Consequently, how will ‘another world’ be; it is a world where all the people acting in this movement are governing themselves, a world *where nobody acts in the name of another*. Consequently, we do not tell that ‘Come to the party, and the party will represent you’, this is not our understanding. Becoming a party of masses in time, the governance of the subjects in these structures, a world where people will govern themselves. How we will achieve this? At first *there won’t be private property*, there won’t be capital; I mean *this cannot be achieved with reforms*.¹¹³

The strategy for the achievement of the “socialist alternative future” of Organization 4 is “direct action”, but the definition of “direct action” is blurred, and differentiating from the definitions made by anarchistic groups which will be discussed later under this heading. Abolishment of the private property, which forms the basis of a socialist system, is emphasized here. In the first sentences representation is rejected, but in the following parts the respondent talks about “becoming a political party of masses in time”. This appears to be another contingent statement. Here we have doubts about the nature of the type of “representation” the respondent is against and for. Let us leave the discussion of this issue to the next part and go on.

In the above quotation the respondent clearly expresses a stance against reform favoring revolution. But what kind of a revolution is this, does it have any similarity to those of the anarchistic groups, do they fit in the same frame?

¹¹³ Respondent L (44, Graphic Designer)

There was a writing of Rosa Luxemburg. She is struggling inside it personally. Then she stops, reads, searches, writes, and then she finds out that the revolution is not something to be happened on one day. Then she realizes that she is already *living inside the revolution*. I mean it is a long process, maybe a new revolutionary process has started today. Consequently, we, the Trotskyists always talk about world revolution. Others are kidding us; ‘How will the revolution at the same time all over the world occur?’ The question is not turning on the switch and revolution occurs all over the world. However, *we are still living a global revolution process*, which is totally congruent with our world vision. What forms will this take? This can change; take Suharto, after 32 years of tyranny he was overthrown in a few days. And the eastern bloc, all of those things which were thought to be stout were overthrown like playing cards.¹¹⁴

Let us remember that Rosa Luxemburg (1993) totally denies a revolutionary process following social reforms – on the contrary to syndicates as well as most of the libertarian social movements – so what will happen to the reformist front of the movement is clearly a question to be addressed. The argument about “living inside the revolution” implies a continuing process which is formed within the movement, and will create a “new thing”. But it appears that “living inside the revolution” does not imply the same thing what the “revolution everywhere” slogan of the “new anarchists” implies, since we do not observe an indication of realization of the revolution within the daily lives of people. At this point we should insist on that “living inside the revolution” only indicates a step by step going on process which the respondent finds himself contained within it via his attendance to the AGM. The process has started with the demand of the movement for change, and is flowing in its bed. But this is not the same thing as “revolution everywhere”.

This socialist “alternative future” of Organization 4 implies “a central planning actually, but a democratic but not bureaucratic central planning system.”¹¹⁵ In this system; “... A conception of development grounding on the capitalistic competition is something that should be sentenced even at the beginning. Consequently, a development in an environment where there is no private property, where the capitalist value codes do not apply, where there is no capitalistic competition, most of the prevailing problems today will be done away most probably.”¹¹⁶ It is open that

¹¹⁴ Respondent K (46, Unemployed)

¹¹⁵ Respondent L (44, Graphic Designer)

¹¹⁶ Respondent N (37, Unemployed)

Respondent N is also insisting on socialism being the cure for every trouble, but the question of how socialism will deal with all of the prevailing problems remains unanswered. Now let us go further in order to see whether the “alternative future” of Organization 4 is compliant with the “alternative futures” of other organizations in our sample.

For Respondent S from Organization 5; a syndicate confederation with a formal hierarchical organization, the clues of the “alternative future” they are struggling for are hidden in the localities:

It is possible to say that it [the AGM] has got a meaning considering the people concerned. However, as I told before, *all of the struggles have to stay on a real ground before everything else. It is debatable to do anything missing the problems in this country, without making anything to solve these problems, to build a struggle against globalization. Such a struggle will be weak, powerless, undersized, and ineffective.* Consequently, if we can organize struggles and develop a social resistance movement in our country, over our problems, in our locality, this might become an example to all of the other struggles in other parts of the world and feed them also. ... If we have to form a solution to those globalization problems we have to look at where this goes with all of those relations which have emerged on a global level, and we have to find examples of these in localities.¹¹⁷

Here the totalized vision of the enemy makes it impossible to be defeated at one instance all over the world. The defeat of the enemy at local levels, where it has spread due to its imperialistic tendency, by local organizations will also inspire the global struggle. The local gains might also give inspiration to the passive masses that have chosen inactivity due to the huge dimensions of the enemy. Therefore, it is important to pass to the global level on a way which goes through the localities. Local should not be forgotten and more concrete ideals, more concrete proposals, more concrete organizations are needed.

Here we should make a parenthesis in order to clarify an important point. Although respondents O, P, R, and S are members of the same organization, they are working in three different environments. Respondents O and P are working at a section within the confederation which is at the upper layers of the hierarchical organization. This section, which we can not describe explicitly due to reasons of anonymity, deals with

¹¹⁷ Respondent S (45, Syndicate Administrative Member/Mining Engineer)

international issues and has a more “plaza like” environment. Respondent R, who deals with the juridical issues of the syndicate confederation, is occupying a position considerably lower than the respondents O and P. For this respondent age becomes a considerably important indicator because it indicates a longer period of involvement within the working class struggle, and this is important when we consider the history of the POS in Turkey . When we come to Respondent S, he is working at a much lower position, which has more direct contact with the working class, and he works in a considerably modest office. Additionally, the section where Respondent S is working has been developing a project for the unemployed people living nearby the extinct mining sites since 1998. With this background information it is no wonder that Respondent S, a mining engineer and a syndicate administrator who has been working in localities, and experiencing various strategies of subsistence is emphasizing the importance of the local and concrete solutions. The people with whom Respondent S is dealing within his daily life are people living on incredibly small wages, and minimum sociality. Those people are uneducated, and mostly care only for their subsistence. In such an environment Respondent S has to present concrete ideals and concrete solutions to the immediate solution of the problems of those people who would not listen to “open ended processes” with unknown benefits and results. Therefore the necessity of concrete solutions to concrete problems for Respondent S is inevitable.

Actually, I do not have any intention that socialism will come, and solve all of the problems. I have experienced many things... I mean, *I have been involved in these syndicate works long enough to grasp that even when socialism comes our problems will not be solved with a magic hand.* Therefore, I don't think that the solutions of labor's problems could be thought of in a societal project whose coming time is unknown. If we are interested in building the future from today then we should try to develop *step by step solutions to our current problems, before they don't get insoluble.* I mean, *'it takes more than one person'*. If we can build *strong coalitions that will work on concrete problems* we can make something better than they are today. These AGMs and SFs allow us to build such coalitions world wide. Many of the organizations going there have experiences in such coalition buildings. For example, we had many works done together with TTB and TMMOB. 'Emek Platformu' (Labor Platform) is another good example, although it did not work well due to various reasons. ... What I want to state is that putting targets which we cannot reach in foreseeable times is very utopian. We have made this failure in 60s and 70s. Today, people are tired of hearing about such utopias, *they want to hear and get concrete things.* I mean, it is good that we all get there together and discuss our problems, but *we have to put concrete targets,*

*which we can reach in foreseeable times. After that we can elevate the targets, and more people will believe us.*¹¹⁸

Respondent R is also making similar comments like Respondent S; he also emphasizes the importance of concrete ideals and reachable targets in that he emphasizes the urgency of the solution of current problems. Additionally, he emphasizes his loss of the belief in socialism (obviously respondents from Organization 4 would not like this approach). For the withdrawal of the respondent from the belief in socialism his age becomes an important indicator. For this respondent, building strong coalitions is the key strategy for solving the current problems. But in order to be able to garner bystander support a step by step walk to the goal should be followed, where every step taken on the road will persuade more bystanders than before. This approach is a more realistic one and smells much of reformism, which the “new anarchists” would not like.

Respondent S has further comments on coalitions:

... We are making coalitions with Sustainable Agriculture Society (Sürdürülebilir Tarım Derneği), and Reachable Lives Society (Ulaşılabilir Yaşam Derneği). I mean, in Tavşanlı¹¹⁹ we are making actions directed to the abolishment of poverty, of deprivation, we are making actions for the handicapped people, for women. I think these are important, and *these will form the core of the future actions*. I mean *these kinds of coalitions and activities will feed the global struggle*. Our actions will affect and transform the global struggle. From my point of view, taking a model developed there and trying to put it in use here... This is useless. ... Locality is important. Acting without developing an organization, a politics, a perspective directed to our problems, without stating solutions for our problems it does not have any importance for the ones in power in the country, the ones who are directing this country, and the ones who are playing with the people of this country in the way they want. They will say ‘let them make their social forum’.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ Respondent R (51, Syndicate Administrative Member/Lawyer)

¹¹⁹ Tavşanlı is a region where most of the forest and agricultural areas have been expropriated by the government and the private sector due to the lignite reserves since 1976. In this way the local people lost their way of subsistence which mainly based on agriculture, and forestry. Although the law demands the employment of the local people in the mining sites due to the expropriations the employment rates have never been sufficient enough. Additionally, the decreasing production rates of the lignite reserves near extinction, and the worsened land quality because of irresponsible mining operations started to endanger the subsistence of the local people. The syndicate that the respondent belongs is performing a project in the region for the education, and employment of the local people, where they teach agriculture, and try to increase the land quality for agricultural production.

¹²⁰ Respondent S (45, Syndicate Administrative Member/Mining Engineer)

Compliant with the arguments of Respondent R, he also emphasizes the importance of the current coalitions and emphasizes that experiences developed within the current coalitions can feed to the global struggle. This is also compliant with the prevailing frame within the sample; almost all of the respondents indicate their trust in current coalitions being the draft of stronger future coalitions. However, the point they direct at differs in that respondents from Organization 4 were indicating the international coalitions with international level goals, but respondents from Organization 5 are indicating coalitions within localities with local level goals. Similar to Respondent R, Respondent S is also directing our attention to the importance of localities; because according to him it is not possible to put any solution into operation all over the world because some problems require local and specific solutions. Therefore a model for total salvation seems unrealistic, and this unrealistic vision would serve for the good of the ones governing. Here there is an obvious cleavage between the two organizations, which indicate another frame contestation within the movement. Let us listen to Respondent S in order to learn what he thinks about the “alternative future models” of the AGM, which appears to be promoting a world wide solution:

Actually, I don't think that these kinds of structures have a societal project for the future. ... *I mean, I see the societal opposition in a total defeat regarding the model.* There is no such things like the 1st International, 2nd International, or like the confederation structures of the past where all of the left wing syndicates had been acting together. ... There are only structures which operate in the known system and organization. They are acting only for the realization of the social state laws. I mean a more egalitarian, a more sharing society... But there is nothing to remove the system completely, or anything to resist the existing system.¹²¹

At this point, one more time we observe that Organization 5 is trapped within the templates of orthodox Marxism, which results in a continuous pessimism about the movement and about the possible outcomes of the movement. For Respondent S the solution must come from an organization like Internationals, oppositions which try to extend the boundaries of “breathing spaces” within the system are not posing a real threat to the system. What the respondent wants is a solution which will bring about revolution, but in the current conjecture the movement supplies only the ‘better than

¹²¹ Respondent S (45, Syndicate Administrative Member/Mining Engineer)

the worst'. Obviously, this respondent has not totally lost his belief in to socialism like Respondent R, and is waiting the movement to get a more anti-capitalist content. What we should add here is that he is not alone in this waiting room. Now let us listen to another group in this waiting room.

What we want to achieve? ... We call this *socialism from below*. With from below we want to indicate the *critical role of the working class*. From our point of view the only and single power that will be able to use the world resources for the benefits of the multitude is the working class, because it has to use the production materials collectively and is ready to leave its class position aside. Socialism can only be constructed with the hands of the working class. Another solution will result again with a domination of a minority. However, *the working class also needs a renewal*; I mean they are also ordinary people which have been transformed by the ideological devices of capitalism and globalization. They might have racist, sexist, etc... thoughts. It is not possible to change peoples' thoughts immediately. This is something that will happen during the revolution. I think our revolution has started, and the society will change during this revolution, and when the right time comes the abolishment of the existing system will come by it self. What we all have to do is to continue our struggle and revolution.¹²²

The answer to the “alternative future” is concrete; “socialism from below”. This approach is also prevalent in the discourse of Organization 4, since both of the organizations adopt a Trotskyist approach. But the content of “socialism from below” is not very clear. The subject of “socialism from below” is the working class. But it needs a renewal, since it is also affected by the “ideological devices of capitalism and globalization”, and this renewal should be made within the revolutionary process which has already started. And the “revolution will come by itself” when the right time comes. Another solution which will not form within the hands of the working class is not acceptable and will not satisfy Respondent B. Here the emphasis on the need for the “renewal” of the working class is important since it is opening up new horizons where the possibility of getting out of the templates of orthodox Marxism arises. Therefore, Organization 1 seems to have more potential compared to Organization 4 and 5 when coping up with the prevalent nature of the AGM regarding “newness” is considered.

If we want to establish a new society, we have to change all of the infrastructures and the structures radically. We cannot build a new society by changing some of the structural constructions. For example by taking the majority in the parliament and getting the government we cannot change the system and build a new society. *We need a total*

¹²² Respondent B (22, University Student)

*revolution for the alternative future we are fighting for. At this stage it is not possible to supply a recipe for how this will be achieved. I mean, I cannot say that if we do this and that we will achieve the society we want. What is evident is that there will be a revolution and the major forces of revolution will be the working class. I don't mean that the revolution will be made in an environment where the working class is only waiting for support. I am talking about a revolution that the working class actually will be the subject of it. But what we achieve will be socialism, internationalist socialism.*¹²³

Respondent A also from Organization 1 presents a stance favoring total revolution. The expected outcome of the movement is “internationalist socialism” as it has been mentioned previously, but strategies for the achievement of this goal is not open. Similar to most of the respondents Respondent A is also emphasizing the non-existence of a recipe or a model at the current stage. For her the only evident feature of this revolutionary process is that the working class will be the subject of it, but the question of how remains to be answered in the future. At this point we should mention that accepting the working class as the subject of this process is one of the mostly accepted frames within the sample, however there are also others who would not accept a working class directed change process either revolutionary or reformist. So how will the socialists convince the others?

...To achieve this, *dialogue is necessary*. I mean real dialog; not the dialogs where people hide their real wishes, and try to find opportunities to get rid of you. While struggling for common demands we do not need to have 100% commonalities, there is something called *consensus*. But here in Turkey we do not have internalized the consensus culture. People hide their actual demands, and try to throw you out of the window whenever it is possible. I mean, they are co-operating only up to the point where they do not need you anymore. This and looking for total commonalities is a sectarian behavior. If we can build a *consensus culture*, only after that we will be able to achieve what we want. Not alone, not one by one, together.¹²⁴

Here the answer of Respondent A, regarding our question above becomes dialogue and consensus, and the nature of this dialogue will become open to all when a “consensus culture” accepting the impossibility of hundredth percent commonality is adopted and internalized by individuals. When this “consensus culture” starts to prevail real and persistent coalitions which are necessary for the realization of the alternative future can be built and the dangers of conjunctural coalitions will be eliminated. It is surprising to observe that the belief in the “consensus culture” which

¹²³ Respondent A (46, Journalist)

¹²⁴ Respondent A (46, Journalist)

is prevalent in the Gay and Lesbian Liberation Movement here within a socialist SMO, but unfortunately we have no background information that will explain this coincidence.

Coming to Organization 3; a students' SMO with anarchistic tendencies and an anti-capitalist perspective, one more time we face an answer we get used to: "It will be more right to talk about tendencies not recipes [regarding the alternative future models]." ¹²⁵

For us also there is no recipe. We describe this *something that our life experiences will shape*. I mean *we try not to be the subject of the production and the reproduction processes of the globalization or the capital*. I mean we prefer not to act in the ways that reproduce the system. While preferring this, we also think about how we can produce the different one. I mean, if we don't want competition or efficiency, or don't want to work for long hours, or don't want our labor to be exploited, if we don't want to pay this much here or there... If we don't want to get into relations with people by means of money, how can we build a life style that discards these types of relations? These might be some minor things but when we build this action... I mean *the struggle itself is a process instead of a result*. ... Rejecting to be involved into such relations from where you are, I mean rejecting to get involved in the market. This is something like this. Therefore reaching the wholeness seems a little bit difficult. It looks like an individual thing but *you are at the center of the relationships that the capital wants to establish*. On your own, alone you are at the center of it. *You have the chance to reproduce it or to reject its reproduction*. The dynamics of this movement are not connected to the hierarchical decisions, organizations, etc... It is not something directed from the center. The dynamics of it is related to *the ability of everyone to oppose the capital, or to show the reflex of opposition to the capital*. I mean, it lies in *not waiting, feeling no need to recipes to be shown*. ¹²⁶

Here we observe an important cleavage, within this discourse compared to the others. As we have mentioned before, Organization 3 is differing from the other organizations regarding their movement frame, where they have developed a considerably holistic and system oriented approach. This also becomes evident within their arguments about the "alternative future" they are fighting for. They are not waiting for a recipe to be developed within the SFs that will describe the processes to be followed in order to reach to the goal. They are totally aware about the fact that "they themselves" are the subject of the process, not the working class alone; every single actor within the society is the actor of this process, which will

¹²⁵ Respondent H (28, Nurse/Graduate Student)

¹²⁶ Respondent G (25, Research Assistant/Graduate Student)

bring about the “alternative future”. This is what the researcher understands from “living within the revolution”, but obviously this is not the same thing as Respondent K implies. The area or “plateau” of this revolution is the “daily life”. Here it is important to recognize that this discourse is not differentiating the areas of the social actions and the daily lives; they are on the same level, same “plateau”, within the same “universe”, and these different areas are continuously interacting, where one has the potential to change the other. Therefore, for being compliant with the goal the movement poses the actors of the movement should act in accordance with the goals of the movement within their actual and factual “daily lives”. A daily life which does not comply with the goals of the movement will be damaging the process.

At this point it is possible to object that the “living within the revolution” concept which we have met in the discourse of Respondent K might be implying the same thing. But when we consider the whole interview, there is no explicit statement accepting the “daily life” as the actual base of the struggle. Additionally, symbolic observational data which becomes considerably important at this point also does not support this objection. The interviews with the members of Organization 4 have been performed in a café that belongs to the Organization. There the organization was not minding to sell “Coca-Cola”, “Nescafe”, etc. It is possible to object that these are minor things but as Respondent G stated before: “It looks like an individual thing but *you are at the center of the relationships that the capital wants to establish.*” Within this frame reaching the ultimate goal or the “alternative future” might seem to be very far away but “small projects” that realize this frame might diffuse within the societies and create “the whole”.

We have small projects like this... I don't know when we can realize it or how, but... Let us assume a canteen at the school. A canteen that gets promotions from the companies, that makes profit, whose owner rides the latest model jeeps, like this... And we have to drink tea from this canteen; we have to take our toast there. But how nice it would be, to have a canteen where we decided... I mean where there are no regulations. We wish to build our own canteen at one corner of the school, where we can put our stools, our cushions, our flowers, where we sit, make our tea ourselves, where we decide whether the tea is steeped well or not, and where the selling relation is removed. ... It is really something that can be established even today... I mean there is the capital in our canteen which realizes itself with the canteen owner. I mean while shouting on the streets as ‘I am against the capital’ we do not see such things. There we should see the state. The School administration will come and say ‘this is my land’. *This is the real ontological space where you can resist the state, and the system which denies your ontological existence.* There we will resist, this is what the

resistance is like. Consequently; breaking the shop window of McDonalds is not meaningful on its own, *such experiences will show how we will build another world.*¹²⁷

The buzzword “revolution wherever you are” gets real in these words. Other organizations seem to be waiting generally for a recipe or a program to be put into operation, however societal changes do not happen at an instant time. Street protests, global days of action, etc. are only an expression of the resistance to the system. The point which shows the key to “revolution” lies in the words above. When the people shouting on the streets go home, what they do? If they are continuing to reproduce the state and the system in their “daily lives”, if they do not give up acting like an actor in the scenario of the market in their “daily relations”, walking on the streets has got no use. The key lies in being able to adopt the theory to the “daily lives” of ordinary people, and this could not be done by making discussions in the WSFs, or preparing programs for the salvation of the society. The first and the most necessary aspect for mobilization has always been the “cognitive liberation”. Only after then people mobilize and act for change when other necessary conditions realize. In order to realize the necessary conditions for mobilization the “cognitive liberation” should precede, and this requires the establishment of another culture that denies the teachings of the current system. The other organizations in the sample did show only theoretical stances at this point, in other words they were people acting in the same manner when they go back their homes. The most important difference that this organization exerts is here. They do not go back to their daily lives and continue to act within the system which reproduces the system continuously; they try to break the borders of the system everyday and everywhere. Therefore, the “alternative future” does not have any recipe to be realized step by step, personal experiences, daily interactions, the reproduction of lives in ways resisting the reproduction of the system will develop the “alternative future”. But how will it be possible to convince the majority of the society to “live” in that way, which also implies the withdrawal from the “comforts” of life supplied by capitalism as well as globalization?

For example, we open that table you have seen today everyday to show our presence. This helps us to convey our review to people. It would be easier to put it to the newspaper stand

¹²⁷ Respondent G (25, Research Assistant/Graduate Student)

but we don't do this. This is *an opportunity to get into contact with other people*. Additionally, it is a place where we can realize our existence. Other members at other universities are also trying to do this. ... What is meaningful for us is that our thoughts diffuse. *The problem is not to establish hegemonies everywhere, or to take power, only let our thoughts diffuse, let our discourse diffuse*. Releasing a review has also such a meaning.¹²⁸

Getting into “face to face relations” with other people, and “personal contact” has been accepted as the best way to diffuse the ideas. Obviously this is the hardest way to diffuse ideas; however there is an implicit resistance to the prevailing “relationships” promoted by the global capitalist system even within the choice of this way to diffuse the ideas.

... We have made a slide show against war. ... There we called the Mother Miyesser¹²⁹ from the Mothers for Peace initiative. This had been a very meaningful action for us, because people call academicians to such panels as speakers. ... For example, last year there had been something about new production techniques, I mean the flexible production etc... There normally people call academicians. But there are people living these. There we called some workers who live these in factories. ... *Translation of experiences*, this is very important for us. ... The people who directly experience these things should come and share their experiences with us. We have to listen to these experiences without any mediator. Otherwise, we all are literate and learn about the theories reading the academicians. There is no need to listen to things from mediators third fourth time. They are writing here or there, go open and read them.¹³⁰

Within this strategy of diffusing ideas via personal relationships “praxis” becomes an important concept. Here Respondent H emphasizes their trust to experience, where they prefer to “touch” and “present” actual life experiences, where theory becomes real, something concrete that the bystander public or sympathizers can “touch”, and “contact” with. This seems to be a small scale realization of what Marx has called as “praxis”. According to the researcher Organization 3 seem to have realized the importance of “praxis”, and has put it into operation, although on a small scale. Previously when we were dealing with the “alternative future vision” of Organization 5 we have observed expressions about “localities”, and “local struggles” having the clues of the forms the “alternative future” will take.

¹²⁸ Respondent G (25, Research Assistant/Graduate Student)

¹²⁹ The mentioned figure is a mother whose two sons died in South East Anatolia, at different times. One of the sons had been serving for the army and the other one for PKK.

¹³⁰ Respondent H (28, Nurse/Graduate Student)

Mentioning about the Moranami Fishing Trust, the children working within the match production ateliers in India, the people working for the textile sweatshops within the household economy in Bolivian Mountains, the movement of unemployed people in South Korea, or the women's movement syndicate in India; Respondent S states that "these are things originating from real lives", "things that have their foot on the ground", "concrete struggle examples" which "should feed the global struggle", and "change its shape". Obviously these examples imply a similar "praxis" understanding, but it is not possible to conclude with the qualitative data at hand that this "praxis" conception has been or will be understood and incorporated by the other organizations within our sample. However, Respondent I is also aware of the fact that their "revolution" frame is not accepted by others, especially the "reformists" within the movement.

It would not be right or very early to call the AGM as a revolutionary or anti-capitalist struggle totally. ... There are elements that are trying to reform the globalization. They call themselves *alternative globalizers*. This is something very dangerous. They don't understand globalization as the power operation of capitalism; they call it bad capitalism, and call their actions against neoliberal globalization. This is a very handicapped approach. ... This approach will bring us to a state where we will only be an opposition which will reform the capitalist system and reproduce it. This is very dangerous.¹³¹

Identifying two fronts inside the AGM, namely the "reformist front", and the "revolutionary front", Respondent I emphasizes that "reformism" would not supply a way out of the system, and implies that the "reformist front" carries a potential of co-optation with the system, which would endanger the "revolution".

Coming to our last organization which has considerably different priorities compared to the other organizations within the sample we observe a deeper frame contestation regarding the "alternative future visions", and the "strategies of action" to be followed for reaching this goal. The respondents from Organization 6 have also realized that the AGM has not developed an explicit "alternative future" proposal yet, but this proposal will form on the road within the process, which they also will live within it.

¹³¹ Respondent I (37, Unemployed/Ceramics Artist)

About the alternative society model proposal, *I don't think that it [the AGM] is proposing anything*. At this stage since the movement is brand new there are only discussions and trials to know each other. I mean it is too early to describe an alternative future. But *maybe we won't need to describe it, but live it*. ... Because everything the variety will say will be important for the formation of the new thing.¹³²

Developing an alternative with anti-globalization stances is not something that everyone can do at an instance. This is something that has to be designed taking the sensitivities of all varieties into account. If it could be able to produce something like this then a revolutionary process would sound logical, but in a change and transformation process we should first try to change the things which directly disturb us and try to take the first steps, before trying to predict the 50th step. The future steps will be shaped with time.¹³³

The process which will be followed is continuing to keep its secrets here too, but Respondent T is also supporting the step by step nature of this process, and finds it logical that it would be a “revolutionary” one.

But how is the sketch or the shape of the “alternative future” Organization 6 is seeking for within the AGM, and how they are planning to reach it?

... For example, we know that *we cannot change the patriarchal system with a revolution*. I mean at least Marx states that he has developed an alternative to capitalism and for this his directions can be followed but there is no such formula for patriarchy. And this brings us to a state that it is not so easy to change some things with a revolution. I mean this, forces us... not by force but this brings to my mind reforms. You can call it reformism but I think that some things can really be understood and changed by walking on a way following *changes and transformations*. In order to make this we need some *devotion and self-sacrifice*. You can change things when you can devote yourself. The change of globalization cannot be something that will happen instantly and change everything. If this happens, it would involve serious violence and this is what we are not for. Therefore, we think that this will have more reformist sides.¹³⁴

Their first concern is the “patriarchal system” but they do not have a belief in that even a revolutionary process will be able to change this “patriarchal system”. As they explicitly state humanity has alternatives to capitalism within the existing human knowledge, but there has not been any solution posed to “patriarchy” until now. However, according to the researcher there is no need for pessimism because the movement also seems to have the potential to form an “alternative” which we do not know yet. Due to the distrust in the “revolution” for solving their problems

¹³² Respondent U (29, High-school Teacher)

¹³³ Respondent T (23, University Student)

¹³⁴ Respondent T (23, University Student)

reformism seems more reasonable to Respondent T, who previously found it logical that the movement would follow a “revolutionary process”. But a “revolution” might involve violence and due to the reasons which we will elaborate in the following sections under the violence heading they are not for it. But there are also other arguments for not favoring a “revolutionary process”:

I don't give names but within the Anti-War Platform or ISF there are groups who think and state that 'we are supporting the homosexuals but they are preventing our becoming a mass movement'. At one side you are opposing the same target, you are working for the same goal, walking side by side, and on the other hand what they develop about you is the same thing that the target we are opposing has developed. ... In this situation, there are many groups that are aiming a revolution, but the description of the revolution, like what the revolution should be... For us I do not accept the singled out description of revolution. It is not sufficient. Therefore, if I will leave the same oppression and the same denial it does not have any meaning for me. That's why we have to be there, we have to open up discussions, new areas of discussion, and overcome this somehow.¹³⁵

According to Respondent U the meaning “revolution” will take is important in the denial of a “revolutionary process”, because previous examples of “revolutionary processes” has not solved the problem of “patriarchy”. The above statement implies a necessity for the “renewal” of the working class which we have previously observed in the discourse of Organization 1, and 3. There is the need for opening up new platforms for the discussion of the problems of the implied “socialist revolution”, and obviously this becomes the first duty of Organization 6 according to Respondent U.

The patriarchal system is generally marginalizing the sexual minorities. Over this marginality, this difference it lets us feel guilty and handicapped since we do not belong to the major sex group. It tries to let us pay for this and the exploitation happens over this space. This is not a problem that can be solved with a revolution without being discussed and analyzed with every aspect. *Because the general tendency of the socialist groups is like that; 'the sexism will be solved after the revolution on its own'. This is something that closes the opportunities for discussion and consensus.*¹³⁶

Here we observe that the explicit denial of the orthodox Marxism to discuss the problems of sexism by insisting on that socialism will solve such problems is perceived to be the most important barrier for the “consensus” between the two

¹³⁵ Respondent U (29, High-school Teacher)

¹³⁶ Respondent T (23, University Student)

fronts. Respondent T indicates that the platforms opened up by their involvement within the AGM and the “No to War in Iraq Coordination” is closed by the socialist groups who leave no way for the discussion of problematic sides of socialism. Below Respondent U implies that this is a reflection of the socialists looking for “socialist stereotypes” within the movement, and being against the “stereotypes” will open up an opportunity for discussion.

We have to be against stereotypes. Because there is a system producing stereotypes, it stereotypes our hair, our clothing, everything. And who is making these stereotypes is evident. I mean we have to stand in opposition to this stereotype. If you are against this stereotype you start to understand, perceive this.¹³⁷

Generally, there is a pessimist mood about the future within Organization 6, but this is understandable since as they have stated economic, social, cultural, etc. problems seem to have a solution, but “sexism” and “patriarchy” as well as “homophobia”; these are not easy to overcome, especially in a considerably more “patriarchal” country like Turkey. Therefore they want to take the first steps, see what will happen, and then try to take the next step, although the road seems to be very long: “Reaching the society we want to live in is a very utopian thing for us. We have many obstacles on our road, very many obstacles to be overcome... We are just trying to reduce their number.”¹³⁸

However, they do not totally feel hopeless since they observe some positive changes, although they are minor things: “... It is encouraging that some discussions about homosexuality are going on in the Turkish oppositional movement. ... I mean somehow they also know homosexuals, and I think this is an important step.”¹³⁹

3.2.4. Class Issue

One of the most debated issues within the AGM concerns the “subject” of the change that the movement will bring about. Having reviewed the “alternative future visions”

¹³⁷ Respondent U (29, High-school Teacher)

¹³⁸ Respondent U (29, High-school Teacher)

¹³⁹ Respondent T (23, University Student)

of the organizations within the sample, we should look for the answer of the questions on the “subject” of this continuing process. In a sample consisting mostly of organizations with an anti-capitalist stance it is inevitable that the frame contestations regarding the subject of the “alternative future” focus on the “class” issue. Most of the respondents implicitly or explicitly state the working class to be the subject of the AGM, however there are contesting frames about the definition of the working class, which is also prevalent within the social science literature since decades, especially after the changes in the production processes with the effects of globalization and technological as well as industrial developments, which blurred the distinctions between the “known class formations”, and created “new classes” which even the social scientists cannot decide in which category to consider. Let us leave these discussions aside and focus on what the respondents think and how they frame the subject of the AGM.

*The working class is not very present when we think about the global movement. We think that any movement that leaves the working class aside and acts on libertarian arguments will not go farther than making some reforms. ... These political rifts hinder the formation of a political will that will transform the AGM into an international struggle against capitalism. The working class should be there and transform the movement.*¹⁴⁰

It is no wonder that our respondents from Organization 5 (a syndicate confederation) are emphasizing the importance of the working class’ being involved within this struggle, and insist that the revolutionary potential of the movement will only be possible with the involvement of the working class within the struggle as a transforming force. But if the working class is not very present within the movement, so who are the ones acting there?

Now here *people who may belong to the middle class*, who are disturbed by the current way things are going on, who feel uncomfortable due to the insoluble problems, who fear from this poverty come together anywhere. They are beyond the problems of their own countries. Of course these will affect us. But they are trying to organize something in relation with spaces like ANTI MAI group or the world social forum. How much does this class movement express itself, I mean *how much is this struggle overlapping with the labor movement and its dynamics?* I didn’t inspect it in detail, but I don’t think that the syndicates have a really affective, dragging position here. ... I don’t think that these highly global movements, I mean the ones tried to be built on an international level, are a huge power

¹⁴⁰ Respondent P (44, Syndicate Administrative Member/Economist)

against the globalization, but it might become the bed of the new organizational and struggle models. From inside of this the nucleus of these will emerge.¹⁴¹

Here “class consciousness” remains as the dominant feature of an opposition from the perspective of Respondent S; “middle class” fighting “for” the “working class” cannot substitute a real “class struggle”. However, there is no denial of the “highly global movements” which have the potential to develop new forms of struggle, and new types of organizations.

At this point Respondent S who is objecting about the less “affective and dragging” position of the syndicates within the movement should be asked for what they are waiting in order to get a more “affective and dragging” position within the movement. Previously Respondent K has stated that the issue of violence exerted by the “new anarchists” has been distancing the syndicates from the movement, because the syndicates did not want to get in oppositions with the state forces. But if the syndicates want to oppose the system within this movement, then within this opposition how will it be possible not to come into opposition with the state forces which represent the system? This is a considerably serious contingency that should be fixed in order to make the syndicates able to take an “affective and dragging” position within the movement. Additionally, we should add that as we have previously noted the “new anarchists” observe an “exclusionary” stance when their “violence” conception is considered which will be elaborated later under a special heading. And one of the actors of this “exclusion” is the syndicates when we consider the discourses of Respondent O and P which we have presented in the previous sections as well as will present in the following sections. Remember Respondent U stating that “endurance, tolerance, and patience” are necessary to understand each other and arrive at “consensus”. In order to take up a more “affective and dragging” position the syndicates have to reconsider their “exclusionary” behaviors and try to incorporate the “consensus culture” about which they have many things to learn from the Gay and Lesbian Liberation Movement. We

¹⁴¹ Respondent S (45, Syndicate Administrative Member/Mining Engineer)

also have to give his due since Respondent S is also aware about the fact that the “working class” as well as the labor movement needs a renewal.

Besides all of the problems, deficiencies, and faults the AGM is the expression of the statements that a more egalitarian, more equal, more humane society is demanded. I mean, the movement carries all of the actual dynamics of life, actual varieties of the life, and the real oppositions of humanity, therefore it is the most real base for the struggle for a better world. We should admit that *today the labor front is in a serious confusion in understanding and explaining the world, in determining its self position*. These formations show some contingencies, contingent coalitions. We have to describe what kind of economic or political or ideological developments these will bring. The explanations and new developments will emerge from these formations.¹⁴²

Here Respondent S turns the critiques to the “working class” and states that the current situation of the labor front is not opening a window for the struggle, and therefore they are using the opportunity window opened by the AGM for their renewal, restructuring, and for their own struggle. Maybe the magic of the AGM is embedded in these words; many opposing movements are trying to get out of the troubles they face, but they don’t know which direction to go. What the AGM offers is an opportunity for these movements to express their demands and to form coalitions that will open new “opportunity windows” for their own struggle. What is evident is that every part of this movement will mature, renew, restructure, or wake up together with the maturation of this new type of movement. But the complaints of Respondent S about the “middle class” acting “for” the “working class” did not end.

... This is not a thing we can do from here formulating solutions. It is related to being in the real life personally. It is related to understanding their spirit, their problems. They have the hatred, but it does not transform. They have disappointments, they have sadness, and they have things which have been lost. But neither the political nor the other arenas are speaking to them. They are alone, and thousands and millions... For them social forum is something where *middle class* people come. These people are not present in the social forum, in the anti-war coalition. They are in the most peripheral gecekondü [can be translated as squatter housing] regions of the city, and they are trying to survive on a little piece of bread if they are given.¹⁴³

... They all talk in order forms; ‘Folk, stand up, get behind the barricades, throw stones, lie down, crawl...’ They are not saying ‘come friend we can do this together’. They know everything, but nobody else knows better than him/her. S/He has a leader role. S/He has given this role her/himself. S/He talks with this role like this. But s/he has never been into a

¹⁴² Respondent S (45, Syndicate Administrative Member/Mining Engineer)

¹⁴³ Respondent S (45, Syndicate Administrative Member/Mining Engineer)

mine pit or gone to a factory, or even has made an action within such a poverty environment. If s/he goes there s/he will be in a daze, s/he wont know hat to do or which way to turn. Now we have to get this talent in order to make this connection. Otherwise you make social forums in the name of these people and they bring the AKP into power. This comes from there. There is the need for subsistence. I mean how can you live, how can you survive? If they make a political choice they are making like this. The activities you make have no meaning actually. Because you do not have anything, which will promise him/her hope.¹⁴⁴

Here Respondent S is implying the lack of “underclass” representation, which he equates the “working class” in his discourse. The reason of this intention is unclear to the researcher but the most basic explanation might be that the eroded labor wages have moved the class position of the “working class” so that the “working class” does not have any considerable distance to the “underclass”¹⁴⁵. For this “underclass” Immediate solutions are needed but these solutions cannot be developed in a top down manner which have been tried previously according to this respondent. The subject of the “lack of underclass representation” is a very hot topic which is also debated within the global platforms the movement supplies. The attempts to move the WSF to Mumbai in 2004 also considering the presence and representation of the “underclass”¹⁴⁶, there the underclass under-representation has been overcome a little bit, but still this is a persisting problem due to financial problems. In order to support the presence of the “underclass” within the movement financial support is very important, but there seems to be no hope for the “underclass” in Turkey to be represented in the social forum process, except the individual and mainly “middle class associations” dealing with issues of underclass.

¹⁴⁴ Respondent S (45, Syndicate Administrative Member/Mining Engineer)

¹⁴⁵ Here what the researcher wants to indicate with “underclass” is similar to what Marx has referred to as “lumpen proletariat” and which they have defined as “This scum of the deprived elements of all classes ... decayed roués, vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged jailbirds, escaped galley slaves, swindlers, mountebanks, lazzaroni, pickpockets, tricksters, gamblers, brothel keepers, tinkers, beggars, the dangerous class, the social scum, that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of the old society (Marx & Engels, 1992:267)” together with Engels. For Marx “lumpenproletariat” was unproductive and did not have the power of working class since they could not transform their regression due to un-productivity. Today it is not possible to consider the “underclass” as unproductive within the changed and continuously transforming economy-politics. Therefore we do not mean “exactly” the same thing as Marx and Engels.

¹⁴⁶ http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/main.php?id_menu=14_4&cd_language=2

At this point let us open a parenthesis and listen to Ece Temelkuran, one of the most prominent figures within the AGM, in other words one of the “elites” developed by the movement with the discourse on the “new anarchists”, in order to learn about how she explains the “middle class” struggling “for” the “working class”:

The developed countries have closed their borders to the ‘realities’ in the other parts of the world; they have prevented their citizens’ being affected via providing a hygiene filter. It was no chance that people from the developed countries who even can survive on unemployment insurance without doing anything came to Prague instead of Bangladeshis or Indians; on the contrary this is very consistent. Because those people who the mirrors attack, are trying to break through the ‘huge television stage’ within which they are living. In order to fill the cognitive vacuum the system creates, soon they will arrange alternative tourism tours and it is possible that they will create slogans like ‘Live like a Bangladeshi for one month! Touch the reality!

...

Those people, who witness that his/her own hand touching his/her own skin dissolves into the vacuum of an advertisement image, who are forced to a vegetable existence by the system, will cause the greatest problem to the system. Those people who have the ‘luxury’ and ‘comfort’ of living inside an untruth encompassing his/her whole life which is spent within the chatrooms on the internet under different names and identities, who have the ‘luxury’ of looking at the world from the ‘mirrors’ they have been provided and showing him/herself as a ‘mirror’, have been forced to expressed their discomfort by an instinct coming from the deepest inside of them. They have reacted to the system who offers immobility as a ‘luxury’ by acting. So they ‘got real’! They have shown that they are not made up of only a mirror by acting. They have acted.

Will the new-left grow out of here? Whatever happens, the new-left will take its energy from here (Temelkuran, 2000: 99).

“The spectacle society” of Guy Debord¹⁴⁷ wants to get rid of “spectacles” “forced by an instinct coming from the deepest inside of them”. There are also others who prefer to call the “subject” of this process towards the “alternative future” as the “new-left” like Temelkuran. But before going into the discussion of the “new-left”, which can be considered as the child of the social opposition wave, having shaken the world in 1968 Respondent R has something to add to our “class” discussion.

We are coming from the labor front. And I am old enough to understand that something new is going on. We have lived the struggles of the labor front, and know the importance of the proletariat. However, *the new generation*, I mean; they don’t grasp the importance of the labor. They have been born into a consumption society, and consumption has been the most important ideology in their lives. They do not know how bread is made. ... I mean, I don’t

¹⁴⁷ Debord, Guy, 1978, **Die Gesellschaft des Spektakels** (The Spectacle Society), trans. by Jean-Jacques Rospa, Hamburg: Edition Nautilus.

want to blame these young people but ... The *importance of production* should be thought to these new generations. They should take our experiences into consideration. It is good that they realize some facts about capitalism, but this is not enough. *The historical experiences of the proletariat should be taken into account and used* for the development of the 'another world' whatever it is.¹⁴⁸

Not denying that even the composition and class position of the "working class" has changed implicitly, and stating that the "subject" role of the struggle has been taken up by a "new generation" this respondent as the oldest in the sample indicates that the birth of a "new generation" is inevitable but this generation should be fed with the historical experiences of the "old working class struggles". This approach is more hope giving since it entails the possibility of a "consensus" to be developed between the two fronts.

What emerges is a new-left. It is not possible to discard the happenings in the last years in Seattle, in Prague, in Geneva. The left cannot close eyes to the emerging new wave. This is impossible. Maybe we are seen as a marginal minority for now, but what we are doing, I mean we are trying to be a part of has helped people to start thinking in another way about globalization. Fukuyama has said in 'End of History' that there is no applicable alternative to liberal capitalism. But the movement has shown that there is one. Of course the movement has confusions, contingencies, but there is hope for the future. I mean symbolically the movements have a great importance.¹⁴⁹

According to Respondent D from Organization 1 the emerging "subject" is the "new-left", which is perceived as "a marginal minority". However, this "marginal minority" has demolished the belief that there was no alternative to capitalism, and provided hope for the future, which broke the immobility of the left, and showed a light at the end of the tunnel.

The colorful and joyful crowd during the actions annoys most of the people from the old left. I mean the syndicates, the formal political parties, etc... They look at us like disgusting things. They call us 'apolitical, reckless guys', etc... They blame us for being unserious, behaving undisciplined. I mean these are very cliché words. But on the other side with the anger we have developed against those words we accuse them for being for stereotypes. You know this is like a football match we the new radicals against the old leftists. This is very annoying. Actually the real difference is in the comprehension of what is going on. From my point of view, what I see when I look at them is a left that has been left under the walls in 1989. I hate those party bureaucrats and the syndicate bureaucracy. What they see when they look at us is a group of people who are bypassing them and entering the scene. They are denigrating us; they don't take us as serious. What this causes is 'no way out'. As I told before, the required revolution is impossible without the organized powers of the syndicates

¹⁴⁸ Respondent R (51, Syndicate Administrative Member/Lawyer)

¹⁴⁹ Respondent D (22, University Student)

and the left. We know that our power will not be enough to demolish the system and form a new society. So what is then? We got stuck. We both get stuck.¹⁵⁰

Here the contestations between the orthodox Marxism, or the “old left” and the “new-left” is very explicitly elaborated within the words of Respondent C, which is also evident within the frame contestations going on in the movement. The left has been struggling in this new/old pit desperately for decades, but the future will show what kind of a consensus they will reach or whether a consensus will be possible.

Here it is time to open a parenthesis and try to elaborate what the so-called “new-left” implies. Actually, the origin of the term “new-left” is not very explicit, therefore let us first refer to Encyclopedia Wikipedia for a broader definition of what the term implies.

The new left is a term used in political discourse to refer to radical left-wing movements from the 1960s onwards. They differed from earlier leftist movements that had been more oriented towards labor activism, and instead adopted a broader definition of political activism commonly called social activism. The ‘New Left’ was an intellectually driven movement which attempted to correct the perceived errors of “old left” parties in the post-World War II period. The movement began to wind down in the 1970s when activists either committed themselves to party projects, developed social justice organizations, or became inactive in the movement.¹⁵¹

What the encyclopedia article directs our attention is the social change waves that shook the world in 1960s and 1970s, where we have witnessed the emergence of a new type of activism. Due to the repressive post World War II environment, and changes in the production system the “working class” has lost the mobilizing capacity considerably. Then we have witnessed the rise of the “new social movements”, which occupied the vacuum of the “old class-politics”. These “new social movements” did not have the working-class as their actor; rather they were acting grounds for the newly rising “middle classes”, who have been developed within the post-Fordist system. Although they were wageworkers they were not craft workers as the old proletariat. The industrial system and rapidly expanding new technologies gave rise to the development of a new group of professionals, which

¹⁵⁰ Respondent C (24, University Student)

¹⁵¹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Left

were using brainpower, rather than muscle power in order to do their work. They had partial control over the production process and were able to have partial access to the means of production. This new group, which Poulantzas¹⁵² called the “new petty bourgeoisie”, is suspected that it will move together with the working class because their interests are different and their political direction are not the same with the “working class”. They are seen as more individualist and achievement oriented, therefore at the first sight they do not belong to the working class. This view has been debated harshly within the left, but during the silence period of the “working class” after World War II the scene was left to the “new social movements” who indicated the “new-left” as the subject of action.

However, we are not sure about that the actor of the AGM is the same as the “new-left”, because there are other respondents who are objecting this frame. For Respondent I (from Organization 3, which we have called as the “new anarchists” throughout the text) the center of resistance is the North America and Europe – implicitly stated- because regions that constitute the “the Achilles’ heel of the Empire” do not have the potential and suitable conditions to show any revolutionary resistance to the system. Therefore the resistance originates from the parts of the system who are taking the greatest share of the surplus value that the system produces via the exploitation of the ones at the bottom. However, the respondent is not quite sure about the revolutionary potential of this resistance having its roots in the developed world.

... In the region there are many problems. Caucasians, Afghanistan, Turkey, Middle East, these regions are the Achilles’ heel of the Empire, the red points, but they cannot be the center of the resistance in the world, there is no voice. But when we look, *the opposition in the developed world is shouting*, they have a political voice. The reason behind this is that the focus points of the resistance do not have a revolutionary or a progressive dynamic; I mean it is related to the restructuring of the power relations in between the empire. It cannot have an anti-capitalist character; I mean it cannot open the road of the labor front. No political power that can open the human centered threshold arises, it cannot arise.¹⁵³

¹⁵² Poulantzas, Nicos, 1974, *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism*

¹⁵³ Respondent I (37, Unemployed/Ceramics Artist)

According to Respondent J from the same organization, the actual “subject” of the AGM is the “multitude” referring to Negri and Hardt’s influential work *Empire* which has had considerable effect on the theoretical as well as practical agenda of this organization according to our observations and the printed material that the organization supplied to the researcher. But the concept keeps to be something debated with suspicions and precautions for the respondent like it is for the social science scholars like the researcher and the social scientists.

We call this gathering ‘multitude’, as Negri indicates. ... We still don’t know whether this multitude approach will open a way, how much it will be effective in opening a way. However, it is a key for us that help to understand this transition period.¹⁵⁴

Thus far we have elaborated two actors framed as the “subject” of the AGM by the respondents within the sample. Obviously, there is a historical continuation in this area where first we observe the “working class”, then the “new-left” and then we come to the “multitude” which is the brand new one in the globalizing post-modern world of the 21st century. Let us elaborate this concept here to some extent and end the discussion about the “class issue” then.

For Negri and Hardt (2004:xii) who have put the concept of “multitude” on the agenda of the social scientists, politicians, as well as the AGM “multitude” is the “the living alternative that grows within *Empire*”. While describing the “multitude” the authors identify two faces of globalization:

...there are two faces of globalization. On one face, *Empire* spreads globally its network of hierarchies and divisions that maintain order through new mechanisms of control and constant conflict. Globalization, however, is also the creation of new circuits of cooperation and collaboration that stretch across nations and continents and allow an unlimited number of encounters. This second face of globalization is not a matter of everyone in the world becoming the same; rather it provides the possibility that, while remaining different, we discover the commonality that enables us to communicate and act together. The multitude thus might be conceived as a network: an open and expansive network in which all differences can be expressed freely and equally, a network that provides the means of encounters so that we can work and live in common (Negri & Hardt, 2004: xii-xiv).

According to the authors the “multitude” is not the same thing as “people” which is “a unitary conception” that “reduces that diversity in to a unity and makes of the

¹⁵⁴ Respondent J (22, University Student)

population a single identity”. Rather the “multitude” is consisting of “innumerable internal differences that can never be reduced to a unity or a single identity –different cultures, races, ethnicities, genders, and sexual orientations; different forms of labor; different ways of living; different views of the world; and different desires. The “multitude” is a multiplicity of all these singular differences (ibid.: xiv)”. The “multitude” also does not imply the same thing as “masses” since “the essence of the masses is indifference” where “all differences are submerged and drowned in the masses”. On the contrary the “multitude” is “many colored” and “thus the challenge posed by the concept of “multitude” is a social multiplicity to manage to communicate and act in common while remaining internally different (ibid.)”. The “multitude” is also a different concept compared to the “working class” which is “an exclusive concept” according to the authors. Rather “multitude” is “an open, inclusive concept”. But this does not mean that the “multitude” is not a class concept rather the authors insist that “multitude is a class concept” (ibid.: 117). According to the authors the old conception of class has become useless in that the old division between the economic and the political struggles has become a barrier hindering our understanding of current class relations. Class is a “biopolitical” concept which is both political and economic at the same time. This also implies that the labor conception is not confined only to waged labor; rather it includes the whole creative capacity of people.

It [The multitude] tries to capture the importance of the recent shifts of the global economy; on the one hand, the industrial working class no longer plays a hegemonic role in the global economy, although its numbers have not decreased worldwide; and on the other hand, production today has to be conceived not merely in economic terms but more generally as a social production –not only the production of material goods but also the production of communications, relationships, and forms of life. The multitude is thus composed potentially of all the diverse figures of social production. Once again, a distributed network such as the internet is a good initial image or model for the multitude because, first, the various nodes remain different but are all connected in the Web, and, second, the external boundaries of the network are open such that new nodes and new relationships can always be added (ibid.: xiv-xv).

From a socio-economic perspective Hardt and Negri (2004: 115) define the “multitude” as the common subject of labor, who makes the postmodern production. At the same time it is the object of the collective capital which is trying to let the “multitude” make the “body” of its own global development. The capital is trying to

transform the “multitude” into “an organic unity”, and the state tries to transform it into “folk”. This is the point where the real “productive biopolitical existence” comes out via the class struggles. When the “multitude” is imprisoned and transformed into the “body” of the global capital, it finds itself within the globalization processes and opposing to them. But the “bio-political production” the “multitude” deals with forms the common denominator of the “multitude” and mobilizes its common production against the global capital. With time this “multitude” developing its productive existence based on common denominator walks throughout the “empire” and escapes the boundaries of the “empire” where it can express itself autonomously and govern itself (ibid.: 216).

With this background the “multitude” has a political project, which “not only expresses the desire for a world of equality and freedom, not only demands an open and inclusive democratic global society, but also provides the means for achieving it (ibid.: xi).” According to the authors there are two characteristics of the multitude which make its contribution to the possibility of democracy today clear. The first might be called its “economic” aspect, in that the separation of economics from other social domains quickly breaks down. “Insofar as the multitude is neither an identity (like the people), nor uniform (like the masses), the internal differences of the multitude must discover *the common* that allows them to communicate and act together (ibid. 2004: xv).” The second characteristic of the “multitude” which is “especially important for democracy is its “political” organization.” We get a first hint of this democratic tendency when we look at the genealogy of modern resistances, revolts, and revolution, which demonstrates a tendency toward increasingly democratic organization, from centralized forms of revolutionary dictatorship and command to network organizations that displace authority in collaborative relationships (ibid.: vi).”

Although we find it impossible to make the conception of “multitude” let it suffice to add that taking the work of Negri and Hardt as a basis, respondents from Organization 3 identify the “subject” of the AGM as the “multitude”. Their emphasis on carrying the struggle to the daily life and personal relations is also compliant with

the authors' conception of the "multitude". According to the researcher this approach which makes every member of the society a potential 'subject' of the struggle which the AGM is carrying out is more satisfying than the other conceptions, keeping the cautions about the fragility and dangers such a "subject" might bring about.

3.2.5. State and Representative Democracy

Considering the "alternative future" frames of the organizations within the sample the frames about the "state" and "representative democracy" is another issue which needs to be elaborated due to the contesting frames about the subject within the movement. We can identify two fronts within the movement where the first front is favoring a state structure but have objections about the nature of the current form of the "state". On the other hand the second front is totally opposing the state and perceiving it as the apparatus of the system which hinders the ontological realization of individual autonomies. Below we will try to elaborate the responses about this issue.

Now, there are two important features. First it states that another world is possible. I mean while revolting against the system it has a belief in being able to create another world, it has a belief in winning, it is contending. First it started as a protest movement, now it is evolving into a movement opposing to all of the system. And it trusts its direct action. I mean it opposes any representation.¹⁵⁵

According to Respondent K from Organization 4 which is favoring a socialist internationalist "alternative future" frame as we have dealt with before, the AGM is denying any form of representation, and evolves into a form that totally opposes the system. But what kind of a state structure will this opposition will bring about according to this organization?

... I think that the national state structures should be present. ... But this does not mean that I am for the nation states. I mean to put a fact... It does not need to be a nation state. I actually mean a way where the structures of the capitalist state are being demolished. I mean an organization where all of the known formal armies, prisons, courts, all of the ideological

¹⁵⁵ Respondent K (46, Unemployed)

structures will be demolished. I don't know whether its name will be state or something organized on the SF. I actually think that the state device should be totally abolished.¹⁵⁶

Here the respondent does not name a “socialist state” explicitly but when we consider the previous examples we understand that the respondent is for the replacement of a capitalist state by a “socialist state”, although the discourse reveals that he cannot be sure about the nature of the state to be developed by the struggles of the movement.

... ‘the best reformists are the revolutionaries’. For example if there is an election, I think that we should use the opportunities that this election environment supplies. This is one side. Another side is; millions of people have not reached the cognitive level to overcome this election deception. We are against this representative system, but we also do not want to be seen as elitists who think like ‘stupid folk, poor people’... We choose to use this election system to show what kind of a toy the democracy is, what kind of a deception it is, of course within the limits of our possibilities.¹⁵⁷

Despite being against the “representative system” the respondent does not deny the use of the representative democracy as a tool within the struggle, which can supply opportunities for the development of the movement, using the instruments of the system. This is a rather strategic look but the researcher cannot be sure that this strategic approach has a potential to be accepted within the movement except the reformist tendencies in continental Europe. However, the respondent is also indicating the impossibility of this strategic approach since this project might fail due to the incapability of the cognitively un-liberated masses (i.e. bystander public) to grasp the “deception” of the representative democracy system.

Interestingly, all of the respondents from organization 4 prefer to call AKP as “AK parti¹⁵⁸”, whereas the others prefer to call it as AKP. This is very interesting in an environment where most of the opposing media is using this discourse to emphasize the dirtiness of this political party, where “ak” is used as an expression of purity by this political party itself and its supporters. Not to go into paranoid discussions about this preference of the respondents from organization 4, I will not try to pose any

¹⁵⁶ Respondent K (46, Unemployed)

¹⁵⁷ Respondent K (46, Unemployed)

¹⁵⁸ Primary data

explanations, but suffice to state that this preference in their discourse is very interesting in an environment where those people act against the war in Iraq, to which this government was trying to get involved. Keeping other drawbacks let it suffice to state that the ruling party, the government, therefore is not the main target, but the institution state itself.

... There is a real representational crisis. This is mostly due to the blurring of the borders between the left and the right. Social democracy has moved to more right and has become something like social liberalism. During the election periods they demand votes with speeches against war, and neoliberalism, but after elections the masses turn out into passive voting machines to be used for the next elections. They become deaf and blind. This in a way forces some people to find new ways of action like the AGM, but for the masses there is the risk of becoming apolitical. I mean, ordinary people do not go out for action, they just vote. What if they give up voting? Therefore, I think that building oppositions in the ballot box is also important. That lets the ordinary people feel their subjective power. This should be another aspect of the movement.¹⁵⁹

According to Respondent A from Organization 1, which has a similar frame about the “alternative future” compared to Organization 4 “representative democracy” is important. In the last decades the world is living a representational crisis where voting this party or that party has become meaningless since all of the political parties within the political spectrum have become more and more close to each other. Indicating this situation she has some precautions. The “ordinary people” in her words or the bystander public is not showing any resistance via mobilization, but they have a potential to vote, and although it has become meaningless to vote, this is better than not caring about who governs. If the opposition in the ballot box is rejected totally the bystander public may become more and more apolitical so that the realization of a global movement against the system will become impossible. For an activist who cares about the future of the AGM, this strategic approach is not something to be wondered, and remembering the above comment of Respondent K we observe that some organizations present similar comments about “representative democracy”. At this point, it is possible to conclude that AGM in Turkey will not totally reject the opportunities that “representative democracy” will supply within the near future. However, there are also others who totally reject the “representative democracy” and the opportunities it may supply.

¹⁵⁹ Respondent A (46, Journalist)

A subject definition based on representation, representative democracy is something that singles out the multitude. It removes the variety of the multitude. It tries to rationalize, to legitimize itself by singling out the multitude. But the movement is making the multitude the subject of action. We do not need representative democracy here. 'The center of the revolt is where you are'. 'Revolution comes from everywhere and with freedom'. We are trying to form our discourse over this.¹⁶⁰

For Respondent J a “subject definition” based on “representative democracy” or “representation” is not acceptable since “representation” is a process which singles out the variety of the “multitude”. The subject which is explicitly called as “multitude” is the center of their struggle, and the struggle does not need to use the ballot box as an object of its resistance. The researcher is not sure that this view is compliant with the “multitude” conception of Hardt and Negri (2004), since we have not observed any instance in that the authors reject the multitude’s opposition to the system in the democratic areas of the current system. Additionally, rejecting the “representative democracy” totally this respondent from Organization 3 is indicating another frame contestation within the movement, which comes to light with the below words of the same respondent.

... Everyone is the subject of his/her labor. That was what we have been insisting on in ISF. The aim of the SF is to let all dynamics of people speak as a subject. If we can build an environment where all dynamics can speak as a subject, only after then the SF will be a SF. We said that we could look at the process with a culture, a political line, which frees multitudes, diversities, not by putting a dynamic to the center.¹⁶¹

Within this perspective they totally deny the “state” and “state structures” which hinder the realization of the “subject”. What they are for is “direct democracy” and “self organizations”, instead of “state”.

State is blocking the realization of the subject. The domineering relationship between the state and the multitude is a barrier to the realization of the subject. Therefore, we have to put what we call direct democracy into operation, and this is definitely a revolution problem. There is no way for reconciliation.¹⁶²

... We are talking about ‘self organizations’. I mean, take this district, this district should decide its time dependent and space oriented establishment by itself. There have been many examples of this in the history. I don’t know maybe we can form district committees, district

¹⁶⁰ Respondent J (22, University Student)

¹⁶¹ Respondent J (22, University Student)

¹⁶² Respondent I (37, Unemployed/Ceramics Artist)

this, or district that... But this district will make this decision by itself. Nobody can make this decision in the name of this district. What it will look like? We mostly give the examples of the Europe of 48s, Paris Commune, the Soviets before 21, when we give reference to the history.¹⁶³

Actually, there are similar examples given by Respondent K. But the most important difference is the approach to the state. For respondent K the local organizations should be backed by a “state system”, by a “centered state system”, which means hierarchy, and this is not acceptable for our “new anarchists”. Let us remember the passage we have quoted before while we have been discussing the frames of the organizations regarding the AGM. They have mentioned about the tendencies within the ESF which suggested establishing a center for the ESF. For them this meant “organization”, “hierarchy” and becoming an NGO. They had got “goose bumps”. Their reaction to the centered system approaches presents an impossibility of “consensus” regarding this subject.

... In Europe there is such a tendency. In all of the organizations, I mean in the student organizations or labor organizations also there is a tendency... ‘Now there is neoliberalism, there is globalization, but how good it was before’. What they call for is the welfare state; I mean the social welfare state. There is a tendency like ‘neoliberalism and globalization has abolished the welfare state, let us go back to the welfare state’. ... Consequently, they are reformist from my point of view. They are defending the state while acting against the multinational corporations. ... At this point, we have to put importance on the *denial of the state* by anarchism. I mean let the capital go, and should we let the state come instead of it? No, the state also should go actually. It is important to see that the state and the capital are not very different things.¹⁶⁴

According to Respondent G reformist tendencies in Europe who want to bring the welfare state back prevail within the movement. However, these tendencies are not acceptable from their perspective since they do not bring about the “revolution” Organization 3 is struggling for. Within their conception there is no place for the “state” which they equate with “capital”; “state” is the reflection of the “capital” and in order to get rid of the state they also have to get rid of the “state” which reproduces the system.

¹⁶³ Respondent H (28, Nurse/Graduate Student)

¹⁶⁴ Respondent G (25, Research Assistant/Graduate Student)

At this point let us add that it is so natural that the reformist front within the AGM in Europe has the tendency to bring the welfare state back. On the other hand in Turkey the welfare state is often described as having been not fully developed..... If we have had such a chance, the researcher thinks that the reformist tendencies which seem to be apparent in the syndicates and political parties would have been more explicit, in other words; there would have been more reformist tendencies within the AGM in Turkey.

For us democracy is not something connected to the state. ... We are for a society where all dynamics in the social life will write their constitutions themselves, they will become the subjects of their own lives, and they will construct societal relations with their own experiences by themselves. I mean the political power apparatus; this is a very important concept for us. I mean if you ask whether the party or the state will be the political power apparatus, we answer none of them. For example, when we look at the universities, we think that the students, the instructors, and the administrative staff and workers are the self organizational elements of the university. They are the real owners of the university. They should be in power with a constitution that they themselves have written, and they should have the power of resistance even with arms when it is necessary if a power from outside interferes.¹⁶⁵

As we have stated before the alternative that the Organization 3 poses instead of “state” and “representative democracy” included key words like “self-organization” and “direct democracy”. In the above quotation we encounter a statement which makes the key words become more concrete. Although the example seems very utopian according to the researcher it uncovers the “alternative future” frame of the organization to some extent. However, we have to proceed by keeping the statement about “the right to armed resistance” in our minds which give considerable information about the approach of this organization to violence which will be discussed in the next section.

For Organization 6 (an initiative fighting for the the rights of homosexuals within the Gay and Lesbian Liberation Movement) there is no difference between a future with or without a “state system”, since their problem is not something to be solved with a known program. But they also do not deny some opportunities which the “representative democracy” may provide them in order to become “visible”.

¹⁶⁵ Respondent I (37, Unemployed/Ceramics Artist)

Our distance to the political parties and the state systems is the same. Developing a projection or choice for this is not under consideration. In all of the existing systems we are oppressed and exploited in the same manner. We are marginalized in the same manner. Therefore, we can change some things within democracy.¹⁶⁶

... From my point of view being represented in the parliamentary may be important, because being there means becoming visible. I mean, I think that someone who calls him/herself homosexual and swears at the parliament can change many things.¹⁶⁷

... I think that some things might be changed within representative democracy. I mean we can use representative democracy to change some things.¹⁶⁸

Regarding their pessimism about the “alternative future” which we have encountered previously they take “representative democracy” as the “second best”, but they preserve their belief in a new form of “alternative future” which is possibly an unknown thing and will emerge out of the actions of the AGM.

... Representative democracy is “the second best” in hyphens, the best will be found. But for the Gay Lesbian Liberation Movement the priority is not the critique of a state system, what we have first is the patriarchy. For homosexuals the alternative of a state system is not the agenda.¹⁶⁹

However, our knowledge is limited with the ones we have learned. Therefore, we should be able to think and create a different system. If we look at the current alternatives the representative democracy is also denying our existence, but at least being visible there is something that expresses our existence.¹⁷⁰

3.2.6. Violence

The last issue which should be discussed within the “prognostic frame” is “violence” which is accepted as a “strategy of action” for some of the groups within the movement. “Violence” is one of the most discussed issues within the AGM, therefore questions regarding “violence” were added to the semi-structured interview questionnaire in the direction of the preliminary interviews. Regarding the frames

¹⁶⁶ Respondent T (23, University Student)

¹⁶⁷ Respondent U (29, High-school Teacher)

¹⁶⁸ Respondent T (23, University Student)

¹⁶⁹ Respondent T (23, University Student)

¹⁷⁰ Respondent U (29, High-school Teacher)

about “violence” we actually observe various stances, which have their reasoning within their conceptions of violence.

The first stance that takes a totally rejecting position comes from the syndicate members:

And violence, ... I mean this is another very sensitive area which should be discussed and solved immediately. We are walking in the streets with people who are waiting to find an opportunity to exert their violence. For me this is intolerable. I mean, if you are waiting there to find an opportunity to show your violence then you lose the grounds for self-defense also. Those people even they themselves do not know the actual target of their violence. They call it self defense but what kind of a self defense damages public property? Your problem is not with the people in the streets, or with the shop-owners nearby. Your problem is with the system, with capitalism. I mean, you cannot get anything by breaking the windows of nearby shops. The movement should solve this problem immediately. I mean violence has no use for anyone. It only helps the capital’s provocations inadvertently.¹⁷¹

Here, “violence” is framed as something that is intolerable and damaging the grounds of self-defense for the AGM. For people belonging to formally structured organizations like syndicates, damaging the private or public property does not make any sense; there are no symbolic meanings about property damage. The target of their action is the system in the total meaning and they do not perceive individual actions of “violence” as “damage” to the system from one point. Although, it is no surprise that such a frame comes from syndicate members, who are emphasizing the importance of solidarity and organized struggles directed to the system on the one side; on the other side, this totalized vision of the target in this frame appears to be something that is disempowering the masses standing against the system. The target becomes something that is so huge that the individual actions cannot cause any damage to it; “the Tin Soldier, against the Master of the Universe”. Additionally, these respondents feel themselves uncomfortable within the street protests, which they perceive as environments where some activists are waiting for opportunities to show up their “violence”. As another respondent has explicitly expressed the high potential of “violence” keeps more formal groups like syndicates at a considerable distance to the movement: “Additionally, there are some events like 15th of

¹⁷¹ Respondent O (42, Syndicate Administrative Member/Economist)

February¹⁷². The politics performance styles which bring syndicates in opposition with the state distance them from the movement.”¹⁷³ The syndicates have to interact with the state and the government members continuously in order to express their demands and negotiate about the labor rights and social security issues. Therefore, their tendency of not being involved in hot clashes against the state police is very understandable. But within the wide ranging heterogeneity of the AGM it is inevitable that such people have to walk together with the people finding the right to exert “violence” on themselves within their conceptions. Even within the same organization, the conception and the attitude towards “violence” is varying.

The class struggle has to involve violence. This is due to the nature of capitalism. Violence is one of the most important bases of capitalism. Therefore the struggle against capitalism is a struggle against the violence device of capitalism. When I say violence I am not talking about the violence that we see during the protests. I mean I do not talk about the blind violence of masses damaging properties and people, or fighting with state powers, I mean the police etc... The violence of the working class is not a blind violence. It includes a decided behavior for showing the violence of capitalism. This violence denies exerting similar violence as the capitalist system does. These types of tendencies make the targets of the working class blurred. At this point I am not against violence, but the target, the aim, and the result of the violence should be explicit. I mean, if people watching their TV do not understand what you are fighting for, this violence will annoy them, and prevent you from gathering supporters from bystander public. This type of violence is not acceptable. What we should do is to transform these types of actions into much more valuable, useful ones. I mean, discarding the groups who show blind violence is not the solution; the solution is to teach them theories, practices, and get their violent tendencies under control for the good of the struggle. Like the advertisement says ‘the power you cannot control is not power’^{174, 175}.

Within this perspective coming from another member of the same syndicate the danger of the “violence” lies in its control. Admitting that the class struggle has to involve “violence” this respondent indicates the importance of “putting blind violence under control”. However, the “violence” this respondent is talking about is different from the “violence” the AGM experiences during the street protests. This “violence” includes “decided behavior for showing the violence of capitalism”, but

¹⁷² On the 15th of February 2003 “The Global Day of Action against War” the “No to War in Iraq Coordination” organized a mass protest in Istanbul, where some groups within the cortege had serious clashes with the police forces, and caused property damage.

¹⁷³ Respondent K (46, Unemployed)

¹⁷⁴ The respondent refers to a car tire advertisement slogan.

¹⁷⁵ Respondent P (44, Syndicate Administrative Member/Economist)

we cannot find any concrete examples which would make us able to figure out the type of “violence” the respondent indicate. For this respondent “violence” is acceptable when “the target, the aim, and the result” of the violence is decided, because capitalism itself is being identified as the cause of “violence”. This approach indicates about a strategic thinking about “violence” considering bystander public as potential adherents, where the respondent emphasizes the picture presented to the bystander public. This attitude implies the organization of the forces of the AGM in a manner that complies with the modernist conceptions of struggle, but the researcher is not sure whether this demand is compliant with the movement’s demands about no hierarchy and disorganization discussed before.

Another stance that does not accept “violence” comes from the Gay and Lesbian Liberation Movement members:

We are not for violence, for no type of violence. This is unacceptable from our side. We, ourselves face many instances of violence directed to us, and therefore it is impossible to accept violence for us. As members of society who experience the effects of violence at the most extreme points, nobody has the right to await acceptance of violence by us. We arrange discussions against violence, and handout brochures in order to prevent violence, and people we walk together there exert violence themselves, and want us to accept this. ... Although they are emphasizing their right to self defense, we are not sure about this. I mean, from my side I cannot be sure that the events on the 15th of February happened since those people were defending themselves.¹⁷⁶

The homosexuals are belonging to a rather “excluded” and “repressed” group of the society. In a country like Turkey, where patriarchal values are lived on an extremely dominant basis, and where masculinity is mostly cognitively interconnected to “power” these people might have experienced many instances of “violence” directed to themselves, their sexual preferences, and their bodily existence. According to a research performed at the Forensic Medical Institute of Istanbul University in 2003 there is a direct relationship with the homophobia and the “violence” exerted to the homosexuals (Çizmeçi, 2006 and Istanbul Tabipler Odası, 2003). This research indicates that the homosexuals experience “violence” more frequently than the heterosexuals. Additionally, the “violence” directed to the homosexuals comes mainly from the families, friends, and the close relatives. Under such circumstances,

¹⁷⁶ Respondent V (27, Administrative Member of Organization 6)

it is no wonder that even the verbal expressions of “violence” makes these people feel so uncomfortable that they make statements like: “The change of globalization cannot be something that will happen instantly and change everything. If this happens, it would involve serious violence and this is what we are not for.”¹⁷⁷ At this point, being against “violence” is acceptable, but making a back-step when “violence” is necessary for the realization of the demands the AGM is fighting for can cause a considerable contestation within the movement, because for some groups “violence” is something to be affirmed within the movement:

We have to give its due to the anarchists. They have been very effective in promoting the AGM to the world. It is not very important that it has been consciously or not. I mean, they have fought in Seattle in Geneva, they have shown their opposition with the system. But the SF has excluded them. ... Actually the empire needs an opposition to reform itself. I mean the SFs will not threaten the empire totally; it is a movement which will show its failures so that it can try to fix them. I mean the empire tries to structure an oppositional movement that will reform it. Naturally, it has to remove elements that might threaten it directly from the oppositional movements it structures. And terrorism, terror, or violence is the key for this exclusion. I mean the people who are saying this are realizing all the violence, how is this happening? I mean the greatest violence is the State itself. Can you think about it? A power which has legalized killing people... It is legal... I mean, it says I can kill people. ... So how will it be possible that such a power questions the violence of people? This is nonsense.¹⁷⁸

This respondent from Organization 3, a students’ SMO is explicitly affirming “violence” and the violent image of AGM. For this group if the state and the system are exerting violence for the realization of their aims, the AGM also has the right to exert “violence”. They explicitly indicate that being against “violence” is being against the revolution. Therefore, “violence” has become something like a device to show their total opposition to the system. The conception of “violence” from the perspective of this group is very different compared to the other groups. Let us try to understand this conception in their words.

Violence is not something related to the police. I mean; it is not only something physical. I mean, asking identity card to me when I enter from the door of this school, this is also violence. If violence is not to show it them, then I am for violence. Let’s meet violence with violence, but this can me cost my life also. I mean when I face police or soldiers one by one if I have one at hand I will use it. Consequently, there is no difference between the macro and

¹⁷⁷ Respondent T (23, University Student)

¹⁷⁸ Respondent I (37, Unemployed/Ceramics Artist)

micro level violence. *If I face violence at any point where I realize my existence then I will use violence from the point where I am.*¹⁷⁹

The last words are important in that the conditions where violence is seen to be right to self defense might occur even in small social interactions. This conception has major deficiencies in that any minor action that might disturb those people might be perceived as “violence” and the response may become “violent”. This proposes a considerably fragile equilibrium about freedoms. In a society where everyone is supposed to become “the subject of its own ontological realization” the borders will be incredibly close. So what will happen when the borders touch each other? This tendency might very easily bring about terrorism or a mass violence, which will bring about a society like “Mad Max”. Is this the alternative future they want?

For this group “violence” may take up many forms and has considerable symbolic meaning, which the Respondent O had been rejecting in the previous pages:

The student clubs like Engineering Society or Management Society organize ‘career days’. We perceive these as violence and get disturbed. ... There happens something like a slave bazaar and at his point we perform ideological violence to their violence. We put some posters over their posters, do some other activities. We make noise in front of their meeting saloons. The meeting they make there is a violence for us. They cannot do such things. So we show violence by making noise.¹⁸⁰

When I get the Lewis posters and billboards I really become very pleased. I mean, these are violence to me, they are material things but they are violence to me. I want to see different things there.¹⁸¹

In the above passages the respondents are mentioning examples which can be accepted by some members of the AGM when a considerably meaningful explanation follows it. However, the thin border between “violence” and terrorism does not make any difference for this group’s members, as the previously mentioned passage from Respondent H indicates explicitly.

¹⁷⁹ Respondent H (28, Nurse/Graduate Student)

¹⁸⁰ Respondent G (25, Research Assistant/Graduate Student)

¹⁸¹ Respondent G (25, Research Assistant/Graduate Student)

Another stance considering “violence” is a more formal stance that emphasizes the “right to self defense”:

We are for direct mass action which does not contain violence. I mean the violence is under the state monopoly. We only defend that people have the right for self defense against the violence of the system and the states. We believe in the power of masses, not in the power of violence. If we use violence we only use it whenever we need to behave in a violent way in order to defend ourselves against a violent action directed to us.¹⁸²

For this group if the individual faces instants of “violence” directed to itself from the system or the state it is given the right to defend him/herself against this “violence”. The content of this argument becomes explicit when we consider their interpretation of the events in Geneva during the G8 Meeting Protests in 2001, where the respondents from Organization 1 have been present:

In Geneva the violence was used as a device to terrorize the events by the state powers. It was explicitly directed towards provocation. I mean, the Italian Berlusconi government did everything it could to prevent the protesters reaching in Geneva. They banned trains entering Geneva, they stopped giving visas, and even they asked for visas to the protesters coming from Schengen countries. The Efforts to stop people was incredible. I mean, after such events, for me it was not a surprise to experience violence scenes during the protests. This was not an accident. I also remember that Luca Casarini the spokesperson of Ya Basta declaring that they have found some photographs that showed carabinieri putting some provocateurs inside the black block.¹⁸³

... Yes, violence does not exert a good picture for the people sitting at home before their TVs. But sometimes violence becomes inevitable, for example in Geneva after the death of Carlo¹⁸⁴. This is the nature of struggle.¹⁸⁵

The right to self defense is also acceptable for our independent respondent, although he takes a pacifist position for himself.

I actually, do not see myself in physical clashes in the movement. Because in the live I have chosen for myself there is nothing like this. I am against violence. But in Geneva there was something like self defense against the violence. I do not have any critiques about the people

¹⁸² Respondent B (22, University Student)

¹⁸³ Respondent A (46, Journalist)

¹⁸⁴ The Protester who had been killed by the Carabinieri during the G8 Meeting protests in Geneva in 2001.

¹⁸⁵ Respondent D (22, University Student)

who have taken part in these hot clashes, but this does not mean that I would be a part of this.¹⁸⁶

Thus far we have tried to present the framings about the concept of “violence”. To sum up, it is no wonder that “violence” is one of the most debated issues among the anti-globalizers, where the conceptions of violence as well as the behaviors towards violence are so variable. With the knowledge the humanity has produced thus far, we know that none of the systemic changes occur without “violence”; in other words we observe instants of “violence” on this level or that level within every instance of systemic changes. When we consider the anti-systemic nature, and the alternative future proposals of the AGM, it would be illogical to expect a systemic change with “a total rejection of violence”. Therefore, what the movement has to do immediately is to discuss the contesting frames about “violence” by putting all hats on the table, and a strategy regarding the level, the content, and the target of violence should be determined. Excluding the groups affirming “violence” (like the Anarchists) from the social forums, from the alternative future discussions, and from the platforms or gatherings is a behavior that would have detrimental and irreversible effects to the “unity of diversities”. If the movement starts to exclude the ones who do not think in the same manner with them, what will be the difference between the movement and the system which is being opposed due to its intolerance to varieties? At this point we are suggesting something that has been developed within the “existing” human knowledge up today, but the discourse of the movement is emphasizing the “newness” of its conceptions, so we are not sure that our suggestion about the strategic thinking on violence may be compatible with the movement or not.

Here our discussion regarding the issues contained within the “prognostic frame” of the movement has ended, but we need another heading which will make the picture of the AGM in Turkey clearer.

¹⁸⁶ Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

3.2.7. Turkey

Let us remember that the attendance of Turkey to the AGM has been very late due to the “irresistible comfort” the pessimism within the Turkish left has supplied, which has been discussed before within the elaboration of the genealogy of AGM in Turkey.

Political and mobilization opportunities are often created by cultural breaks and the surfacing of long dormant contradictions that reframe grievances and injustices and the possibilities of action. Sometimes these breaks are behavioral events that recast or challenge prevailing definitions of the situation, thus changing perceptions of costs and benefits of policies and programs and the perception of injustice of the status quo. The event which may suddenly impose a grievance, or the dramatic framing of an issue changes perceptions and calls attention to, crystallizes opinion on, moral and political matters that had been dormant or ambiguous (Zald, 1996: 268).

The political environment in Turkey -considering the societal oppositions- coincides with such an environment as Zald describes above. The events which have been experienced in Seattle in November 1999 have lead into the development of a “master frame” which diffused to most of the First World countries, and brought about a series of social actions. As the primary data revealed there have been attempts to develop similar societal protest organizations after the Seattle events, but these attempts remained insufficient for a considerable mobilization. It is possible to think that the events in Seattle may meet what Zald calls “the event which may suddenly impose a grievance” or the “dramatic framing of an issue” but for Turkey these events were not potentially strong enough to result in a burst of social movements opposing globalization, rather there have been only minor and small scale efforts. However, we should admit that the inspiration of S99 did not fade out for a long time, and this had been a considerable advantage for Turkey, where formations of political oppositions takes considerable time.

According to Zald (1996:268), cultural contradictions occur and lead into mobilization when two or more cultural themes that are potentially contradictory are brought into active contradiction by the force of events, or when the realities of behavior are seen to be substantially different than the ideological justifications for the movement. When we consider the case of Turkey; the IMF programs which are being implemented for decades, the structural adjustment programs and the import

oriented economic policies, the increasing acceleration of poverty, unemployment, economical defiles are present since years. On the other side there is the discourse of the governments on accelerating economic growth, development, and increasing employment rates. Although there appears to be an evident contradiction between the government discourse and the real life situations these contradictions have been the material of election propaganda, and internal discussions of the political oppositions. These contradictions have been translated into action by the mobilization of the small-scale retailers in 2001 and the voting trends which have brought the AKP to the government with a considerable vote ratio. The connection of these contradictory events with the so-called globalization was not possible at that stage. But the 9/11 events in the USA which brought about serious repression to the global AGM opened up an “opportunity window” where the movement has started to empower its forces against war. Being very close to the region where the predicted war is to happen this also prepared an “opportunity window” for the mobilization of the AGM in Turkey. Together with the initial SF initiative efforts which were not backed by an actual mobilization the Turkish AGM started to mobilize.

When we look at the world, there is a movement, let it be the AGM. This was what caused the formation of the SFs. I mean it came out of Seattle. What fed Seattle was the Zapatista Movement, the struggle against neoliberalism. I mean these formations come out by feedings from social movements. But when we look at Turkey there are no serious political and social struggles. Maybe we can count the Bergama movement as something similar to the Zapatistas. Here there are some resistances in some factories, but these are not things that shake the agenda of the country or even the agenda of the cities where they happen. I mean, there the Geneva events happen, and all of Italy stands up. I mean there is no such thing in Turkey. It remains limited since it is not based on a movement. I mean the most important thing we can say about the ISF is this. Since it is not backed by a movement it becomes only a coalition of the groups, parties and formations that have been present before the ISF. ... It is not something that can open the way of a movement.¹⁸⁷

According to Respondent G, in the world the actions of social movements brought about the formations called SFs. In Turkey there is a gathering tendency by looking at the movements all over the world, by being affected from the gatherings and actions in North America and Europe with the tendency to join and to do something. The process is not pushed or backed by a present or ongoing action potential and social movements. Therefore the building of solidarity, which is naturally very

¹⁸⁷ Respondent G (25, Research Assistant/Graduate Student)

fragile due to the POS of the country and due to the cleavages of the left wing especially, does not happen like the one in the global movement. Even during the anti-war protests the coalitions were very fragile and everyone wanted to ‘govern’ the formations. It is not possible to observe an internalized, strong feeling of solidarity. According to the researcher this is what is possible with an “imported master frame”, in that we mean that in Turkey there has been no effort or action for the development of the “master frame” of the movement. The “master frame” developed by the AGM in North America and Europe has been taken up. It is possible to object that this is a natural “diffusion” process a “master frame” experiences usually, but when we consider that the “master frame” built in the world could not be appropriated and reproduced by the local struggles, and is not backed by social actions our argument about the “imported master frame” can be justified.

At this point also some respondents within the sample have similar complaints about the current nature of the AGM in Turkey.

ISF is in a very *parochial* position currently. I mean *it could not be a part of the AGM*. Actually, it has been only a minor part of it... I mean, it does not have an organizational or structure or dimension. It has not been able to become a center of attraction for the people in Turkey, who are watching the AGM from their TVs at home, and let them, say ‘take of our slippers, wear our shoes, go there, participate and transform it’.¹⁸⁸

According to Respondent Z ISF has not been able to mobilize people. Although he emphasizes the difficulty of making people participate he explicitly blames ISF for the passivity in Turkey. Making comparisons with other countries he emphasizes a need for “repair”, i.e. becoming conscious citizens and individuals are stressed.

... Actually, there are some concrete examples in the world. In London two and a half million people walk, why do we not live such things? Actually, we will reach this Social Forum and the AGM process by repairing ourselves at first, and then we will mature. And this will be the most concrete benefit for us. I mean this [AGM] might give us a chance to heal our illnesses first.¹⁸⁹

... I mean the things we have seen in the world... We could not realize a small scale projection of what we have seen in the world here in ISF. Therefore we could not be a part of it [the ESF in Florence in 2003]. Or we could only be a small part of it, but we could not

¹⁸⁸ Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

¹⁸⁹ Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

transform it, affect it, or we could not represent ourselves there with lots of numbers. And this seems not to be possible for now, because there is such a structure; the Organization 4¹⁹⁰ has a very powerful position compared to the other organizations present in the ISF, and they are trying to be the core actually. This affects the presence of other organizations, and this is something against the logic of the social forum.¹⁹¹

Although stressing the importance of different groups coming together in anti-globalization attempts, activists in Turkey do not only lack in number, but there obviously exist also problems in terms of internal power relations among the different activist groups. According to Respondent Z the heterogeneous structure which forms the basics of the AGM is tried to be transformed in to a homogeneous structure in the ISF, and this is contingent to the spirit, the basic logic of the AGM. Following this, the same respondent mentions about serious problems like power claims which also reach to censorship sometimes:

... as I told before K is at the crossroads of the information, the information is gathered by K and he diffuses this information to us (because he is the moderator of the mailing list). We had a problem in this mail group. K did not diffuse some information to the mail group. This was a censorship problem in a group moderated by K. ... I have passed the information to the group moderator and he did not disseminate this information. ... You can bring explanations about such things, and apologize for it, but it is not possible to go back and change this. And this is something that lets you loose confidence to those people.¹⁹²

There are also other respondents emphasizing the hindering effect of the power claims within the movement, but as Respondent O indicates below this problem is a persistent one and a solution to this problem has not been posed yet, since every organization who may take up the duties of the SF will most probably act in the same way.

... All of the action coordination platforms become another base for the unfinished power struggles of the present organizations. Especially in Turkey... Take the SF process; it has become the arena of Organization 4. This causes divisions. I don't know how to overcome this problem, but this seems to be insoluble. Will it change if another organization takes up some of the duties? No, then they will try to keep the process in their hands.¹⁹³

¹⁹⁰ The respondent uses the actual name of the organization but I have used the pseudo-name of the organization for the sake of anonymity.

¹⁹¹ Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

¹⁹² Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

¹⁹³ Respondent O (42, Syndicate Administrative Member/Economist)

As Respondent Z indicates “Turkey is the heaven of the leftists who do not like each other.”¹⁹⁴ Under these circumstances divisions regarding power claims become a serious obstacle to collective and cooperative action which is necessary for becoming a mass movement and for being able to occupy an affective place within the global movement which is supposed to shape the “alternative future”.

Now we agree, I mean on the concept... We have put it intentionally as ‘Iraq’, ‘No to war in Iraq’. Actually, I am against all of the wars. But if we say this we narrow it. Here we agreed. But later, under ‘No to War in Iraq’ all groups want to put their agendas like isolation, democracy problems, sexism etc. When they do this, there appear congestions. These are very tiring processes. This I mean is the ‘left childhood disease’. Although we have discussed this a million times, and underlined it every time This also startles the syndicate bureaucracy. Additionally, there are some events like 15th of February¹⁹⁵. The politics performance styles which bring syndicates in opposition with the state distance them from the movement.¹⁹⁶

According to Respondent K who is blamed for trying to be the key person within ISF and the power claims within the movement occur due to the tendency of every organization to put their agenda at the first place. He emphasizes that the fragility and the high potential of provocations keep more formal groups at a considerable distance to the movement. It is no wonder that Respondent K identifies a different reason for the power claims compared to the other respondents, since he has the power to decide the agenda of the process at his hands according to the discourses of respondents from other organizations. His discourse is an implicit defense, and from here we can conclude that Organization 4 as well as Respondent K is aware of the fact that other groups have complaints about their being the “most visible” one within the social forum process.

... Before nobody was listening to us, but now we have taken place at the center of a very important development. Everybody should admit that. In practice, if you are looking after the general benefits of the movement, you will be the winner and consequently the movement will be the winner. We look at it like this. We do not differentiate between the benefits of the movement and our benefits, consequently with the growth of the movement

¹⁹⁴ Respondent Z (35, TV Reporter)

¹⁹⁵ 15th February 2003 had been announced as the “Global Day of Action Against War” by the main groups of AGM acting on the global scene, and the world has witnessed mass protests in most of the big cities like London, New York, Berlin, Sydney as well as Istanbul.

¹⁹⁶ Respondent K (46, Unemployed)

we also will grow, and with our growth the movement will grow. This is our understanding.¹⁹⁷

Why Organization 4 has started to deal with this process, to organize the social forum initiative? Maybe the answer of this question lies in these words. From the researcher's point of view this initiative has a considerably important strategic meaning when we think that this political party has only 600-700 members, and no one is aware of the existence of such a party, since they do not have the potential and organizational strength to show any presence in the political arena. This initiative has the potential to support the growth of the party in the political arena, and when we consider the "directing" position of the party in the social forum processes it appears that this decision is not made just because nobody wanted to do that (as Respondent O tells in one of the above quotations), on the contrary this decision appears to be "a deeply analyzed strategic decision", which will enable the growth of the party. Additionally, taking the point the SF has arrived today into consideration, we should admit that –although the political arena in Turkey is still not aware of the AGM in the country and the potential of TSF– TSF has gained a considerably important position in the European Social Fora, and got recognized by the WSF. It is possible that these developments might have served to the growth of the party-base, and the Party has strengthened its international ties through their attendance to the European Social Fora as well as World Social Fora. Although the respondent emphasizes that they "do not differentiate" between the benefits of the movement and their benefits, we obviously see that their benefits have been considerably more compared to the benefits the movement has gained yet.

When we look at the current situation which can be followed from the media and the official website of the SF, it reveals that the situation has not changed since 2003, on the contrary; the power of Organization 4 has been increasing within these years, where the Respondent K has been almost the "head" of the TSF and the general staff of the party (the respondents L, M, and N) have taken the secondary positions. At every instance about the SF we can find only the names of these respondents. This is

¹⁹⁷ Respondent K (46, Unemployed)

a very dangerous conjecture for the AGM in Turkey. With such an organizational approach we should not wonder that any presence during the international social forum gatherings and in the international as well as national media remain limited to declarations about Kurds and Kurdishness¹⁹⁸.

Despite these internal power claims and unwanted events there are some respondents who are able to make some positive statements about the AGM and the social forum processes in Turkey:

We don't know what this movement will bring about. I mean, at this stage we are like bystanders. We are watching what is going on and trying to learn. Actually, I feel myself like a tourist there. I mean, times will come when we will have words to say, but I don't know when this will be. We are just making a start. ... One of the advantages of this movement has been that it shook the left in Turkey a little bit. I mean, of course all of the left did not stand up and run to the streets, but we all have started to move although very slowly... As anybody in Turkey knows, to bring organizations from the left wing together is not an easy job. I mean, for now we are fighting everyday, but times will come when we will forget previous clashes and learn to listen to each other. The most remarkable benefit of the SFs for Turkey is that.¹⁹⁹

According to our oldest respondent, namely Respondent K, who has been one of the most optimistic respondents as we have seen before, there are also some advantages that the social forum processes have brought about. Although he states that the future of the movement keeps being unknown, it has been able to give a mobilization potential to the left in Turkey, and shows a potential that can make a contribution to the solutions of the problems in the left wing.

Another area of cleavage peculiar to Turkey is the contesting frames regarding the nature of the AGM. For the organizations that have already and internationalist background it is not right to think that Turkey has special conditions:

¹⁹⁸ “Mayor Demirbaş [mayor of Sur district of Diyarbakir] had declared a 6 page long report with the heading ‘Local Governance and Local Government in the Light of Multilanguage-ness’ in the ESF happening in the capital of Austria Vienna. Mayor Demirbaş has been questioned by 2 civil inspectors from the Ministry of Internal Affairs.”
<http://hurarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/goster/haber.aspx?id=4231887&tarih=2006-04-10>

¹⁹⁹ Respondent R (51, Syndicate Administrative Member/Lawyer)

In Turkey the leftist movements always thinks that *Turkey has special conditions...* I mean they see it like having a peculiarity compared to other parts of the world. *We do not see it like this.* We see Turkey inside this capitalist system; it is a part of this capitalist system.²⁰⁰

But Respondent H does not think in the same way:

... The Trotskyists have international connections, but I think *they are very unfamiliar to these lands.* For example during the formation process of the SF, there is something like the Labor Platform and many groups can express themselves inside this platform. I mean, the discussion of their politics is another subject but they have defined the Labor Platform as a ground for the gathering of the struggles, and it works in any way. But the *SF had no connection with the Labor Platform.* I mean there has not been any direct organic connection. No one has discussed whether we could establish a connection or not. We were just discussing, why the syndicates do not come to the forum. They won't because they have another platform where they can express themselves. I mean we should have developed an opportunity where we could discuss and let the thing what the Trotskyists call internationalism meet with the struggle tradition of this country. But the Trotskyists didn't want this. ... I mean if we cannot build this for me the globalization of the struggles in Turkey seem impossible. If we do not perform an analysis on the existing struggle traditions and if the left does not turn and look at itself... it is not easy.²⁰¹

According to her there are questions about direct global solidarity. The Trotskyists, who look at the struggle from an “internationalist” perspective, are unfamiliar to their own land. She indicates about the possibilities of coalitions with local coalitions formed before the social forum processes, which have never happened due to the unwillingness of the Trotskyist organizations who were “leading” the process as we have discussed above. According to this respondent the syndicates did not attend the process since they had another platform where they could express themselves²⁰². Here what she objects is that the connection between the global and the local struggles is necessary, but as we have encountered above the internationalist approach does not take the local as having peculiar conditions and tries to put the global struggle into operation instead of allowing their meeting and interaction. In order to solve these problems the “reflexive” restructuring of the left is immediately necessary, according to Respondent H.

²⁰⁰ Respondent N (37, Unemployed)

²⁰¹ Respondent H (28, Nurse/Graduate Student)

²⁰² Here we should clarify that the Organization 5 is the only Syndicate Confederation attending the SF process, but here in Turkey there are three syndicate confederations and the respondent is mentioning about the absence of the other syndicate confederations within the process.

However, Respondent S who also supports that the local and the international should be melted within an amalgamation pot in order to form a coherent and strong solidarity as we have seen previously is not supporting the attendance of the other syndicate confederations within the movement, whose absence was mentioned by Respondent H above: “In coalitions large like this [the respondent is talking about Labor Platform/Emek Platformu] half of these organizations have a bellyband with the state, and they are supporting the government policies totally, and they have structures which will hinder your actions inside your organization. You know in the social security issue it has been like this. And now in the labor law issue same things are happening.”²⁰³ Here Respondent S is indicating the previous cleavages which have been experienced within the Labor Platform and emphasizes that inside the heterogeneous structure of the AGM organizations which have direct connections with the system, and the states, will form a blockade for the progress of the process.

As we see there are many problems regarding the AGM in Turkey, but at every instance the “premature” nature of the movement should be kept in mind so that we will be able to conclude that “a premature baby needs more attention compared to a normal baby”.

*... We are waiting the growth of this child. When we wait we also will grow with it. Now it might look very theoretic but when it grows this child will not know any memorization, it will not define itself basing on any -izm, it will form its own identity, it will develop its own -izm where it will be the subject of its own action. And we think that it will show the power to demolish most of the memorizations. But we don't know when this wave will come. I mean the wave has come but we don't when this will be stated at the cognitive level. For example, in Turkey the left formed on a modernist discourse cannot understand this AGM. It is not sufficient to read and state this discourse.*²⁰⁴

This discourse is one of the most prevalent ones in the movement; the laboratory analogy in the discourse of the individual respondent, as well as the discourse of the syndicates is similar. Chesters and Welsh (2005), whom we have mentioned while we were discussing “reflexive framing”, are also supporting this discourse, where they propose an approach based on the “complexity theory” for the analysis of the

²⁰³ Respondent S (45, Syndicate Administrative Member/Mining Engineer)

²⁰⁴ Respondent I (37, Unemployed/Ceramics Artist)

movement. With this discourse in the background most of the attending social movements are applying a “wait and see” policy like Respondent I states above, and they all try to supply contribution as much as they can, but their contributions are dependent on the range they can be affective and the amount of international networking they can achieve.

As Respondent I indicates the left in Turkey has not understood the process in depth, but they are attending the movement with a reflex based on the thought that they should not be left outside. Most of the left social movements and NGOs attend the process, but they are not trying to contribute to it, their main tendency is to affect the movement’s construction process in a way that will support their goals and orientations. As we have observed throughout the text this tendency is prevalent in the SF processes also. All of the movements and NGOs make the laboratory analogy, but they are not waiting for something that “demolishes all the memorizations”, that will become something different freed from all of the –izms, and it is highly debatable whether this kind of a totally new thing will satisfy them. At this point the “one step backwards”, but “more interfering” position of the Turkish left can be understood more easily. They are walking cautious on the wet floor, but want to leave some footprints on the ground for not being excluded from the process.

CHAPTER 4

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In the preceding pages it has been tried to do an exploratory research on the frames within the AGM in Turkey. First background information on the emergence of the AGMs in the world have been supplied, and then the development of the “master frame against globalization”, which empowered masses for mobilization and diffused throughout the world, was elaborated. Then the theoretical and methodological choices which have guided the research throughout the case study were described. The next part of the text dealt with the case study which formed the basis of the research. There first background information on the AGM in Turkey has been supplied; its emergence, development and prospects, and finally the qualitative data about the frames regarding the “diagnostic” and “prognostic” frames within the movement have been analyzed. In the following part the main findings will be summarized and the effects of our findings will be discussed.

4.1. Conclusions about the Case Study

The awareness of Turkish civil society about the AGM has been considerably late compared to other parts of the world. But the possibility of a war within the nearby environment has opened up an “opportunity window” for the Turkish civil society, which accelerated the efforts for the social forum processes and attendance to the global movement. During these efforts a “master frame” developed in North America especially, has been “imported” and utilized within these efforts. As it has been previously mentioned the “master frame” developed in North America did not follow a usual diffusion process in that the theoretical and practical connections have not been firmly established, and the incorporation of the “master frame” has mostly been on a theoretical level, so that it was not possible to observe “praxis” within the movement on a prevalent basis. Actually, the activists have been impressed by the discourse of the “global” AGM, and they have incorporated this discourse into their own expressions as well as written material. However, this theoretical understanding which is explicit within their discourses is not directly translated into their daily

lives. In other words; the actions of the activists appear on one “universe” and their daily lives occur on another “universe”, where the former “universe” is a theoretical one and the latter is the practical one. These two universes cannot be combined within the same time and space, i.e., theory and practice do not meet on the same ground. Therefore, it has been preferred to use the term “imported master frame” for the discourse within the sample as well as the AGM participants in Turkey. This denotation is used keeping my reservations that the so-called “diffusion” of the master frame “should” follow this path due to the conditional requirements of the “age of globalization”, where information flows occur within nanoseconds via CMC technologies. In other words; with current conceptions and existing theoretical background it is not possible to denote this process as a “diffusion” process, but when the rate of information diffusion in today’s world is considered, it might be possible that the nature of diffusion has changed so that first the information or in this case the “master frame” arrives and gets incorporated into the movement discourse, and only after some time the incorporation of the “master frame” within “praxis” can be observed.

Remember that Snow and Benford (Snow & Benford, 2000: 625, Snow et al 1986: 473-476) defined “frame transformation” process as follows:

The programs, causes, and values that some SMOs promote may not resonate with, or may even be antithetical to conventional lifestyles, beliefs, and values. In that case, new values may be required to be developed; old meanings need to be changed, and irritating or invalid beliefs or “misframings” reframed in order to garner support and secure participants. What maybe required is a “transformation of frame.

Within their earlier work the authors (Snow & Benford, 1986: 474) identify two such transformation processes: transformation of “domain specific” and “global interpretive frames”. Here by “transformation of domain specific interpretive frames” they refer to:

... fairly self-contained but substantial changes in the way a particular domain of life is framed, such that a domain previously taken for granted is reframed as problematic and in need of repair, or a domain seen as normative or acceptable is reframed as an injustice that warrants change (Snow & Benford, 1986: 474).

In “transformations of global interpretive frames”;

... the scope of change is broadened considerably as new primary framework gains ascendance over others and comes to function as a *master frame* that interprets events and experiences in a new key. What is involved, in essence is a kind of through-going conversion that has been depicted as a change in one's sense of ultimate grounding that is rooted in the displacement of one universe of discourse by another and its attendant rules and grammar for putting things together. Domain specific experiences, both past and present, that were formerly bracketed and interpreted in one or more ways are now given new meaning and rearranged, frequently in ways that previously were inconceivable, in accordance with the new master frame (ibid.: 475).

Within the AGM in Turkey, we observe such a “transformation of global interpretive frame” in that the cause of blame becomes concrete in the perception of “globalization”, which is mostly equated to “neoliberal globalization” as well as “capitalism” within the respondents’ discourse. Previously, the anti-capitalist discourse (which is the most prevalent within the AGM as well as the research sample) has been mainly developing a discourse based on the political-economic conceptions of capitalist system drawing from the existing “socialist theory”. Additionally, other issues like environmentalism, feminism as well as gay and lesbian liberation have found their place within a “libertarian” discourse which mainly based on “social capital” and did not incorporate the political- economic arena totally. What the “imported master frame” of the AGM has brought has been the combination of these distinct areas of struggle within a more inclusive discourse that identifies globalization as the ultimate cause of all prevailing problems within today’s societies. This discourse has shown the intertwined and concretely interconnected structure of globalization, so that the activists started to draw connections between their actual discontents and the operation of the system. This of course has not only been the result of the master frame against globalization. There are also other communicative interaction processes going on within as well as outside the SMOs which have contributed to the process, but the thing that has crystallized the developments and identified the target has been the master frame against globalization. However, as it has been mentioned previously “movement framing” is a continuous process, and there is no final stage in a framing process unless the movement disappears (even when the movement disappears the researcher is not sure whether it will be possible to talk about a final stage within the movement framing process). Therefore; it will be the job of future social movement researchers to identify further transformations of frame within the AGM. Keeping reservations

about the future it should be indicated that there are doubts about that the current frame transformation processes within the AGM in Turkey has reached a satisfying point which should indicate a considerable mobilizing potential against globalization that would be able to form a mass movement with high numbers of attendance. Considerable amount of time and effort on theoretical as well as praxis level is necessary in order to reach such a point.

The variety within the movement brings together many contesting frames about the strategies of action as well as the ultimate goals, however there is one point that almost every actor within the movement has reached a general consensus on; the ultimate cause of their dissatisfaction with the society they live in is the “globalization”. Although there are many different conceptions about globalization the most prevalent conception describes globalization on a neoliberal basis. However, most of the respondents use globalization, neoliberal globalization, and capitalism interchangeably, where they indicate the intertwined structure of the capitalist system, and insist on the anti-systemic character of their opposition. This is mainly due to the high attendance of the SMs with a socialist background. There are also other organizations which have different priorities compared to the SMOs with a socialist background, but their frames about globalization are not very much differing, where they also indicate mostly the economic aspects of globalization but also do not forget to mention about some positive aspects of globalization like the changes in the Turkish regulations regarding sexism which have been performed by the forced coping up efforts of the EU. The most holistic frame regarding globalization comes from the “new anarchists” which are able to identify the effects of globalization at every instance of their lives within the social, political, economic as well as cultural realm.

The frames regarding the global AGM indicate a cautious stance, where most of the respondents indicate about the unknown orientation of the movement. There are doubts about the nature of the movement whether it is a reformist or a revolutionary one but there is a belief in that it will become a revolutionary movement, however the time and space of this “becoming” process as well as the steps it will follow will

become clearer on the road. There are also cautions about the heterogeneity within the movement, whereas most of the respondents indicate the enriching character of the heterogeneity within the movement and think that the movement should preserve this heterogeneity. There are also strong doubts about the strength and the future of the fragile coalitions within the movement. Keeping reservations about the character and direction of the evolutionary process which the AGM is following, the organizations have adapted a strategy which can be summarized as “be careful but not be excluded from the process”. According to the researcher this explains the reflex like action of the Turkish left which has not comprehended the process very well but do not want to be excluded from the process which may benefit the Turkish left also.

Coming to the prognostic frames we cannot observe a consensus on the actual remedies to be taken in order to get rid of globalization or capitalism. There is no common description of the “alternative future” that the movement is fighting for. Most of the respondents indicate that the number of sentences making the “alternative future” definition of the movement clearer will decrease the number of people attending to this “alternative future”. Therefore; there is no determined shape or no recipe or no directions to be followed but there is a strong belief and hope in that it will be better than today.

Actually every organization or individual within the movement has a rough sketch about the “alternative future” they are struggling for, and strategies to be followed in order to reach this goal. But we observe frame contestations about the role of the state and representative democracy within the frames about the “alternative future”. Organizations having a more formal organizational structure and hierarchy are for preserving the state centered structures with some systemic changes, and using the representative democracy apparatus as a tool for the realization of the alternative future. But organizations which favor non-hierarchy and disorganization want the state and representative democracy structures to be abolished totally, in that “self-organizations” and “direct democracy” will replace these structures.

About the “strategies of action” which will be followed there are strong frame contestations especially on violence, where more formally structured organizations try to avoid violence, which they claim to be used as a means of “self-defense” when necessary. For the “new anarchists” violence is inevitable at every instance of life for an anti-systemic movement, because the system is the actual cause of violence and the AGM should reply with violence to the violent acts of the system.

Also the “subject” of the expected change is not well defined. Formal organizations with a socialist background insist on the leading role of the “working class” keeping some reservations about its renewal. Less formally organized organizations define the actor as the “new-left” going one step further, but they also indicate the necessity of a renewal. For the “new anarchists” the “subject” of the necessary change should be “multitude” which is a more inclusive concept compared to the other ones, but they also do not forget to mention that the AGM should be cautious about the nature and direction “multitude” will follow in the future in order to prevent any disappointment.

“Frame contestations” are inevitable in an environment where many SMOs from various backgrounds come together. This natural process which has the potential to reach a “consensus” where every stakeholder can be satisfied is not hindering the action and mobilization potential of the movement, but “power claims” which appear to be prevalent within the Turkish AGM are a serious problem compared to the frame contestations. Actually, in Turkey there are two struggles within the movement. The first struggle is against the enemy, but the second struggle which is confusing and hindering the targeting of the enemy is going on inside the movement itself. Every organization within the movement is trying to take the first rank within the movement, where the actual “framing process” which is directed to garner bystander support and strengthen solidarity among the movement is falling out of sight. The data figures out an environment where every stakeholder is trying to put its own agenda at the first place, and trying to support its own maturation at the cost of the disempowerment of the AGM. Under such circumstances, it is so natural that we cannot observe any satisfying frame transformation which actually should

become a “self fulfilling prophecy”, in that a strong movement frame would guarantee strong solidarity and bystander support. Under such circumstances Organization 4 –which seems to be leading the AGM and social forum processes- has “imported” the master frame against globalization via it’s previously established international connections based on its Trotskyist tradition, and presented it as the “movement frame”. But the result, even today after three years of the research, it has not been able to create an effective action and mobilization potential. At this point the words of a senior agricultural engineer become more meaningful for the explanation of the current situation:

There are three phases which make a butterfly a butterfly; larvae, pupa, adult. One day a curious agricultural engineer, a self-opinionated screwball, got curious about what would happen if he would help the butterfly within the cocoon during the pupa phase to come out earlier, and he managed to pull out a caterpillar waiting for the right time in order to come out of its cocoon by force. But the thing coming out from the cocoon was something that did not have any resemblance to a butterfly. It was a creature which could not fly, since its wings did not ripe, could even not crawl, because the muscles did not mature.

From one point Organization 4 is trying to organize an AGM in Turkey which seems not to be ready for attending such a process. The result is a “slight” mobilization which cannot satisfy anybody within the movement. But from another point this process might be used for the renewal of the Turkish opposition which has been discussing the ways for restructuring since decades due to long time of inactivity. As some respondents have indicated during the interviews, time is going on in light speed and no one has time to wait for Turkish opposition which needs a reconstitution, therefore the movement should flow in its bed where the Turkish opposition should start to repair itself simultaneously within the movement as well as learning lessons from the AGM.

Considering the ineffectiveness of the AGM in Turkey in garnering bystander support there are also structural problems to be taken into account besides the unsuccessfulness of the organizations within the movement. In 1970s Turkey has experienced a civil turmoil which has resulted in strongly repressive reaction of the state and the military forces. This has brought about a resistant reluctance of the bystander public when oppositions to the existing system are under consideration. At this point it is possible to conclude that the “bad inheritance” of the political

mobilizations of 1970s is forming a “negative POS” which hinders the mobilizing potential of today’s AGMs.

The mobilizations which seem to be following the opening of “political opportunity windows” like the possibility of an “imperial” war do not show any coherence and continuity. Therefore the discussions which the activists call “action” are going on behind closed doors. Whenever there is a “real action” against an important economic or political meeting at one of the important centers of the world we observe an “action” in Turkey since everyone does not have the possibility of going to the center of the action and showing attendance. This is a reflex like action with the intention to “feel” itself as a part of the global struggle, and the “will” to occupy a column in a national newspaper or a couple of seconds at a national TV channel besides the global protests. Everyone is acting at the point where s/he is actually. At this point maybe it is not possible to talk about a “single movement”, rather we should talk about “a movement of movements” as Klein (2001), where everyone is realizing his/her own “individual revolution” at different points and different instances of life. Here we face important questions to be answered. If we are facing “individual revolutions” happening on “individual levels” how will these “individual revolutions” interact with each other, on what level will this interaction be possible? If these “individual revolutions” do not or will not interact with each other, how will a “societal revolution” be possible? This brings about a danger which the societies of today are currently facing; individualisms dissolving social solidarity ties. Under such circumstances the possibility of a global solidarity seems to be questionable. Being aware about the fact that the process is “evolving” in its way and the outcomes are unknown from today, we hope that these questions will be thought about and will be answered during the “becoming” process.

Another point that is worth to mention is that the total rejection of the system and its apparatuses seems not to be possible at the current stage. Therefore a “strategic thinking” which is existing but not prevalent within the movement should be adopted. Rejecting the use of representative democracy, and social forum processes as a tool which might bring about some policy changes like the “new anarchists”

does not seem to be logical under current circumstances when it is seen from a “SMO perspective”. These are opportunities for the movement which should be considered carefully and used as a means of the realization of movement’s demands although they might be minor gains compared to the ultimate goals of the movement. If the movement will close these small opportunity windows then the achievement of the movement goals appear to be not possible, and this obviously will hinder garnering of bystander support. Although I cannot be sure whether such a strategic thinking will comply with the “spirit” of the AGM, it is possible to conclude that such thinking should also be taken into account as a strategy.

According to Gamson and Meyer (1996: 285) “movement activists *systematically overestimate the degree of political opportunity* and if they did not, they would not be doing their job wisely”. To see in what ways they do this, they contrast “rhetoric of change” with what Hirshman²⁰⁵ (1991) calls “rhetoric of reaction” (qtd. in Gamson & Meyer, 1996: 285). According to the authors Hirshman finds three central themes in the rhetoric of reaction: “Jeopardy”, “futility”, and “perverse effects”. “Jeopardy” refers to the argument that by attempting some change we risk losing achievements already won. “Futility” refers to the argument that there is no opportunity for change, that any action is essentially a waste of time and resources that “attempts at political or economic reform are shown to come to naught by some ‘law’ whose existence has allegedly been ascertained by social science”. “Perverse effects” refers to the argument that this very actions designed to change things will only make matters worse. They state that movement activists employ an optimistic rhetoric of change to counter the pessimism of the rhetoric of reaction. For each of the three themes there is a corresponding counter theme making the opposite point about political opportunity; “urgency”, “agency”, and “possibility”. These arguments describe “rhetoric of change” that provides alternatives to the “rhetoric of reaction” (ibid.: 286). Activists counter the “jeopardy” argument by emphasizing the risks of inaction, and conveying a sense of “urgency”, the “futility” argument by asserting

²⁰⁵ Hirshman, Albert, 1991, **The Rhetoric of Reaction**, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

the openness of the moment, and finally, the “promise of new possibilities” counters the threats of “perverse effects”.

These arguments serve the needs of a mobilizing frame and lead to a *tendency to overestimate the existence of political opportunity – a systematic optimistic bias*. It is not merely a matter of seeing the glass half full rather than half empty but seeing is as half full when it is often 90 percent empty. If activists are sometimes more pessimistic in private than in public, they also frequently succeed in convincing themselves of the existence of opportunity.

This *lack of realism in assessing opportunity* is generally as *healthy for movement activity* as it is for the economic activity of entrepreneurs. ...

Those who challenge authorities or cultural codes have similar formidable odds working against their success, and must convince others that collective action is worthwhile. There are numerous examples of past movements that demonstrated the possibilities of change that few had thought possible in advance. If movement activists interpret political space in ways that *emphasize opportunity rather than constraints*, they may stimulate actions that change opportunity, making their opportunity frame a self fulfilling prophecy (Gamson & Meyer 1996: 286-287).

Keeping these theoretical explanations in mind let us remember the words of Roni Marguiles which we encountered while we were trying to supply information about the emergence of the AGM in Turkey. He has been talking about the persistent pessimism of the left in Turkey. When we consider the path the movement has followed until today the political opportunity windows which have opened up meanwhile have not been utilized satisfactorily. The master frame arising in Seattle in 1999 has been able to supply an “urgency” argument where it clearly indicated the consequences of globalization need urgent solutions and action in that the “jeopardy” arguments of the system have been overcome. The action cycles which have kept this “urgency” argument alive after Seattle, attempts like WSF which included efforts to develop an alternative have shown that the “futility” argument of the system had also been broken. It was possible to do new things and it was the right time to act now for the “new possibilities”. This showed that the movement was able to offer “new possibilities” against the “perverse effects” argument of the system. Within all this process the Turkish opposition could not move beyond the “wait and see” behavior. They only could utilize the instant opportunity window of war to a minor extent, but the coalitions formed there did not last long and they started to dissolve almost on the street during the protests. The power claims and intolerance to the opposition from right wing of the political spectrum attending the “No to War in Iraq

Coordination” created a “two headed” anti-war movement which is framed as a “time dependent front of the AGM”.

Here, with all this background it is possible to conclude that the lack of the characteristic features that Gamson and Meyer indicate to be necessary for the development of a “healthy mobilizing frame” are not present within the Turkish opposition which is supposed to mobilize the AGM in Turkey. The “systematic optimistic bias” which Gamson and Meyer indicate to be necessary in order to develop a mobilizing frame, and which is an indication of “healthiness” for a SMO is not present within the Turkish opposition. As Gamson and Meyer emphasize activists can convince themselves although they might be pessimist in their private life. But the self-convincing which is apparent within the written agit-prop material of the movement is not visible within the movement and within their discourses. Even at instances where the movement gets into real contact with the bystander public we can observe the persistent pessimism, which makes the convincing of the bystander public impossible. So it is possible to conclude that the “persistent pessimist mood” within the movement is a serious obstacle to the most important duty of the movement, namely; garnering bystander support. In the interviews it has been obviously seen that the movement is emphasizing “constraints” in spite of “opportunities”. Here it should be indicated that the thing what Gamson and Meyer call “making their opportunity a self fulfilling prophecy” does not seem something possible, and this reminds the researcher about the “Hodja Nasrettin” who has been cutting off the branch he is sitting on.

Another point to be mentioned here is the attendance to the AGMs for Turkey appears to be coming only from the left wing of the political spectrum, whereas we can observe attendance from the right wing in Europe and America although they do not appear to be large in number. During the anti-war protests we observed an active participation from the right wing also, but this trend did not last long. This attendance has mainly been the result of the prevailing circumstances where the main theme of the protests has been a threat of war in a “Muslim” country. During these protests we have observed conditional coalitions which appeared to be considerably

fragile and instant, and dissolved immediately after the start of the war where some organizations from the left wing could not tolerate the presence of the right wing within the anti-war coalition. Although the organizations within the sample exert a considerably socialist perspective we cannot conclude that the alternative future will not include people and organizations from the right wing. Tolerance, patience and endurance are easy to show when everyone resembles each other in this way or that way, but if the movement is trying to develop an alternative future embracing every single person on the earth without looking to his/her political orientation the Turkish left also has to learn ways of showing tolerance, endurance as well as patience to the people from the right wing of the political spectrum.

For social movements framing job is not confined to the movement and the bystander public, there are also authorities who should be convinced in order to shape the POS for the benefit of the movement. In Turkey when we consider the relations between the state authorities and the movement activists both sides are trying to exclude the other one, where especially the state authorities prefer to deny the existence of the movement by labeling them as a group of “crazy people” incapable to understand the political and economic circumstances of the age of globalization. It is rather ironical that we observe the same labeling within the movement also, where the members of more formal organizations with a socialist background and struggle history label the “new anarchists” as well as other grassroots groups and the gay and lesbian liberation movements using exactly the same words.

As a final word for this section it is possible to conclude that the Turkish opposition has not comprehended the AGM very well, in that it is meant that the number of people who have understood what really happens appear not to be so high –at least within the research sample. So why are the organizations and individuals attending the AGM, if they have not comprehended it very well? Four prevalent tendencies can be identified: First tendency, which has also been observed in Organization 4 who has been “leading” the social forum processes, is trying to expand its basis via the movement. The second tendency, which has been encountered in Organization 6 –a

member of the gay and lesbian liberation movement, sees the movement as an opportunity to show its existence. The third tendency, which has not been observed explicitly within the sample but can be found implicitly within organizations 1, 3, 4 as well as 5, is trying to affect the evolution of the movement in the direction that will serve to their goals. And finally, the ones who have complaints about the existing system, but do not find a satisfying place within any movement, like our independent respondent within the sample can be observed.

4.2. Framing Theory vs. Complexity Theory

The theoretical tool during this research has been the “framing theory”. Although the descriptors of the framing theory and the supplementary conceptions of the previous social movement literature have been applied, several deficits in applying this theory to the AGM which forms a peculiar example compared to the previous social movements which the social scientists encountered until today have been identified. As it has been mentioned several times a “new encounter” which has not been met previously is faced by humanity and existing theories and conceptions remain incapable in defining and explaining this movement. Sometimes frames and conceptions which cannot be explained since they seem to be impossible according to the prevailing social movement theories are encountered. Therefore many times I have thought that there should be another theoretical tool to explain the processes and the movement. At this point the problematic areas within the Framing Theory and a newer approach of Chesters and Welsh (2005) which seems to be more promising for the analysis of the AGMs will be summarized respectively.

First of all, the unit of analysis for the framing theory is defined as a “strip of activity” drawing from the earlier work of Goffman (1974: 10). Although this denotation is extended to a considerable amount by Snow and Benford (1988: 211) by indicating that framing is a time dependent process and applying the “cycles of protest” concept of Tarrow²⁰⁶ (1983) to framing theory, the researcher thinks that the

²⁰⁶ Tarrow, Sidney, 1983, **Resource Mobilization and Cycles of Protest: Theoretical Reflections and Comparative Illustrations**, Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Detroit, August 31 – September 4.

extended conception of the unit of analysis is not adequate to embrace the “time” and “space” of the AGM. Here what we want to indicate is that the framing process of the AGM is not happening only within the “strip of activity” or within the “cycles of protest”, the framing process is happening in every single moment of life independent of time and space, where space becomes virtual when we consider the interactions going on in the internet.

As Chesters and Welsh (2005: 197) point out the primary focus of frame analysis in the SM literature has been the process of “frame alignment”, by which individual interpretive schema are translated into collective ones through the work of SMOs (Snow et al., 1986: 464). This approach has generated some useful descriptors for processes by which SMOs establish and improve particular issues within the prevailing POS. However, when we consider the AGM besides formally organized SMOs which have long-lasting movement agendas and frames we encounter small non-hierarchized grass roots organizations with instant agendas and frames, and these two types of organizations are in close interaction with each other on real and virtual levels. Additionally on the virtual level the concept of POS becomes inapplicable, in that on the internet activists can generate creative spaces of flight like “copy left”, “digital commons” or “anti-capitalist hackers” which has not been encountered explicitly in the interviews’ content but have been observed during the organization of the “Global Days of Action” on the internet. Additionally, Chesters and Welsh (2005: 2001) indicate the presence of similar strategies of action in the Internet. So the descriptors of the framing theory developed within the limits of the POS become inapplicable at this point.

Another area of deficiency within the framing theory is that it is incapable of explaining the transition from individual frames to movement frames. For the frame analysis theory this area is left within the mental black-box of human brains, but we need ways of insight to the creative acts of individuals which might turn into interactions forming the movement frames.

There are also spatial deficits. Framing theory has been developed on a basis formed by the POS approach which arises in state boundaries. Although there are extensions

of the POS concepts to the international levels the AGM is something that does not respect borders, as well as geography. As we have mentioned before CMCs play an important role within the AGM, and this space is out of the control of states as well as global POSs. So, even the extended descriptors become incapable of dealing with such a space, which do not know any border.

In addition to all of the above deficits we think that the framing theory is an organizational approach, in that it deals with the framing processes of SMOs. But the AGM is not fitting within the existing organizational structures with its “complexity”. Actually, there are formal organizations adopting hierarchized structures of modernity, but we also encounter “disorganizations” which consciously reject the modernist organizational forms. Additionally; when we consider the social forum processes, and the global protests we are encountering a new type of organization which respects disorganization besides organization. Under these circumstances we have doubts about whether an organizational approach can be capable to explain this new type of organization, which also do not take national as well as spatial borders in general into consideration. Therefore we need a newer approach which also has the potential to deal with “disorganizations”.

Another general shortcoming in much of the movement literature as well as within the framing theory is the “reification” as Benford (1997: 418) points out. By “reification” Benford refers to “the process of talking about socially constructed ideas as though they are real, as though they exist independent of the collective interpretations and constructions of the actors involved. We speak of social movements, collective identities, ideologies, and frames as things.” This brings about several problems; the tendency to “anthromorphize” these reified notions; social movements do not frame issues; their activists or other participants do the framing. The neglect of human agency; social movements do not engage in protest, violence, frame contests, and the like; human beings do these things. The neglect of human agency within the analysis leads to a third problem: the neglect of emotions which forms a vital resource for SMs (Benford, 1997: 418). This tendency is devaluing the role of the actors within the movement, which becomes considerably important in

understanding the framing processes within the AGM, where individual frames have the potential to become movement frames with intense social interactions and via CMCs.

Taking the above arguments into consideration it is possible to conclude that the social scientists urgently need a new approach to understand the dynamics of the AGMs, which is forming a core for the current changes within the world's societies. At this point we think that a considerably recent work to which we have referred previously has a potential to overcome the above stated problems, and offer new areas of analysis for the social movement scholars. In this work Chesters and Welsh (2005: 187) suggest "that the familiar categories and concepts that have prevailed in social movement studies are no longer adequate to the global and networked character of these forces [AGM forces], derived as they are from rational choice theories and political exchange models. Instead, we suggest that the AGM is best understood as an expression of social and global complexity and we draw upon a neo-materialist/complexity reading of Deleuze and Guattari²⁰⁷ to make this case."

The key attractor which has directed Chesters and Welsh (2005) to look for a more comprehensive and more comprising theory for the analysis of the AGM has been its "complexity". Although the authors prefer a rather "complicated" notion to describe this analysis, let us try to formulate a "simpler" notion, which will make it easier for us. From our point of view there are two aspects within the AGM, which form this "complexity". The first aspect is concerned with the heterogeneity of the movement, in that various actors from very distant parts of the world and very different areas of interest have come together within the movement. This variety brings organizations and disorganizations together. The second aspect is concerned with the variety of actions within the movement. There we can find an incredible richness of activities which sometimes can be interpreted as a "cacophony". We observe dramaturgical expressions like street theaters, dance shows, marching bands, festive acts, etc. which we are not used to see within the usual political actions. The opposition is crossing

²⁰⁷ Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari, 1987. **A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia**, (Translated by Brian Massumi), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

the borders of the political and economic arena and occupying the daily life. By their consumption preferences as well as ways of living the activists are describing the daily life as an oppositional platform. This environment is also not discarding the usual political acts, where such actions also occupy a space within the movement. Besides this action variety on the real space we also observe a variety of oppositional actions within the virtual space of the internet, which also contribute to the movement framing, in that they have developed concepts like “copy-left”, “digital commons”, and “hacker class” which provide creative areas of resistance to the system by promoting “knowledge sharing” and new areas of opposition. So the whole life becomes a “battle ground”. Taking the whole content of these two aspects into consideration we already have a “complex” picture.

With this “complex” picture in mind the starting point of Chesters and Welsh (2005:188) is the “becoming” concept of Deleuze and Guattari (1987). According to the authors “becoming” is “re-grounding” life in a process, and this approach is destabilizing the idea of “being”. For Deleuze and Guattari (ibid.: 290) “becoming” indicates a process, a process of symbiosis within which heterogeneous elements are connected into new assemblages with emergent properties. Becoming is not “imitating”, since it does not involve approaching a certain endpoint or model; it is rather a kind or style of movement, where it always incorporates departures from the standard. (ibid.: 305). With these features becoming suggests “agency”, the agent has the power to decide to become or not. Here the “evolutionary process” which the respondents have indicated at every instance becomes meaningful. The AGM is following such a process via the actors present within the movement. Their acts of resistance, their deviations from the standard, i.e. their “becomings” will shape the movement, and its outcomes. That is why the movement does not have any describable outcome or shape; it is a kind of a “mass deviation” from the standard, where there is no intention to resemble something existent, or to reach a certain end point. Within this “becoming” process the AGM:

... creates deterritorializing forces through ‘lines of flight’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987: 55) – experiments in thought and action that allow traversing and over-coding (1987: 40, 335–6) of the ‘molar’ lines of segmentarity (economic, social and political norms) wherein power produces and imposes order. (Chesters & Welsh, 2005: 188).

What emerges within these actions:

... is a fractal movement space, akin to the patterning of self-similarity in complex systems, where modes of symbolic contestation, discursive democracy and antagonistic conflict overflow borders and are iterated through various scales from the local to the global (ibid.: 188).

This movement space is considerably different compared to the movement spaces of the 20th century, where it incorporates the whole life and every individual act into the struggle. Therefore:

... it remains inaccessible to social movement models of political exchange that operate within the conceptual confines of the nation-state and frame analyses focusing on collective identity as a mechanism of expressing political claims or grievances (ibid.: 189).

The authors (ibid.: 190) describe the AGM “as a system that is characterized by non-linear dynamics” and apply the concepts like “plateaux” and “reflexive framing” which they have developed in order to understand these dynamics. In their theoretical formulation particular attention is directed to three key domains; “space”, “meaning” and “time”. Here they

... describe and theorize the spaces of intensive networking” as “plateaux” where movement networks get visible and “reconfigured through the production of affective links, weak ties and emergent forms of discursive democracy (ibid.: 193-194).

Recognizing the importance of the “meaning construction processes” within the movement the authors look for a method of analysis “sense-making in these contexts” and try to develop a model for clarifying how meaning is constructed through “reflexive framing”, “a process of frame generation through reflexive iteration facilitated by CMCs” (ibid.: 189, 195-197).

Finally, we examine how the increasing complexity of societies and the differentiation of systems constituting them, allows movements to escape institutional mediation and express antagonistic action in directly cultural terms by effectively becoming media and over-coding the binary model of producer/consumer. Our intention throughout is to demonstrate how these insights are compatible with and further direct us towards complexity analyses of global social movement(s) (ibid.: 189).

What is promising in this work is that they suggest a conceptual framework that allows “descriptive and analytical purchase over two key processes in the emergence

of global social movements, *the process of encounter and interaction and the process of constructing shared understandings within and between movements* (ibid.: 192).” The concepts they advance are considerably utilizable compared to the conceptions of the SM literature as well as the framing theory, since these concepts are derived via the actual and virtual reflections of the AGM itself. What Chesters and Welsh (ibid.: 197) offer for the analysis of the AGM is a metaphorical concept originating from the “parallel universes theory” in physics, which states that interacting parallel universes exists at the same time and within the same space. When the nature of the AGM which cannot be confined within space and time is considered, the authors’ due should be given, since they have been able to grasp the co-existing variety of spaces and times within the movement.

Modernity has been a turning point in the human history, where it has deconstructed many conceptions and philosophical understandings under the light of the “enlightenment”, where Newtonian Physics has opened up new grounds for the humanity via enabling the transition from the scholastic thought to the analytical thought. Another turning point has been fostered by the Uncertainty Principle of Heisenberg, where we have witnessed a transition from modernist thought to post-modernity, where “all that is solid melted into air”²⁰⁸. Now at the beginning of the 21st century, physicists are discussing “parallel universes theory” which appears to be affecting the social scientists’ thought and theorizations. Simultaneously we experience a “global” social movement directed to shape a better future than today. Obviously we are experiencing a transition period and maybe “parallel universes theory” will mark another turning point within human history and thought.

4.3. General Conclusions about the AGM

Historical turning points let humanity face new political, economic, social and cultural claims. The AGMs also let us face such new claims, new forms of struggle, new subjects, and new types of relationships, which social scientists try to explain

²⁰⁸ Berman, Marshall. 1994. **Katı Olan Herşey Buharlaşıyor Modernite Deneyimi** (All That Is Solid Melts Into Air The Experience Of Modernity) (Translated by Ümit Altuğ and Bülent Paker) Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

via considerable amount of work. Actually the movement and its outcomes are explicitly “unknown” for social scientists as well as the activists within the movement, but there is a strong belief in the “global solidarity” and the possibility of an “alternative future” which is believed to be better than today. Although the movement was not able to demonstrate concrete goals and programs for the future one concrete and explicit outcome of the movement has been the identification of two areas of consensus within the world’s folks. First, it states that:

contrary to the ‘globalizing fables’ on the blessings of ‘free trade’ and the slow but sure ‘spill-over effect’ of the concentration of wealth, the financialization, mercantilization and deregulation processes which characterize the current capitalist globalization inevitably and systematically intensify inequalities of all kinds and the destruction of the environment (Seoane & Taddei, 2002: 116).

Second, it identifies:

“the international institutions (especially the IMF, the WB and the WTO) as parts of a worldwide structure of power that represents only the interests of the financial and transnational powers and fosters policies for their benefit (ibid.: 116).

With this almost totally shared consensus points the world has started to witness a new type of political contestation. Now it is time to indicate what is new within this new type of political contestation.

First of all, the most indicative and most debated characteristic feature of this new type of political contestation is the “actors” on the scene. After decades of inactivity a new actor having hardly debated characteristics has entered the scene. It was neither the “working class” nor the “new left”. Similar to Seoane and Taddei (ibid.: 118) it is thought that the boundaries of the AGM has transcended those of the labor movement to a considerable extent encompassing and even finding its most dynamic participants in a multitude of movements, some of which were born in recent decades under the heading of NSMs, and a diversity of associations and networks of struggle against corporate power and commercial and financial deregulation. Until the recent work of Hardt and Negri (2001) these actors did not have any name, where the social scientists used to extend the existing conceptions in order to let them be able to encompass the richness of the AGM. However after the exposition of the “multitude” concept of Hardt and Negri the movement explicitly started to prefer this labeling, in

that WSF organized discussion forums on the “multitude” (Sancar, 2004: 96). From the researchers point of view the movement activists should be given their due since the concept of “multitude” is more fitting to them compared to the extensions of the “working class” and “new-left” concepts.

Why it is thought that “multitude” becomes the right denotation for the “subject” of the AGM should be elaborated at this point. First of all, the conception of “multitude” is arising on the basis of the “immaterial labor” which indicates the changing character of production. Previously the basic of the labor organization was formed by the “material production” which developed the “industrial worker” conception. But today being confined within “material production” is not acceptable since most of the production producing surplus value and reproducing the capital hegemony does not occur only on “material production”. Think about the finance sector, computer programmers, service sector, artists, as well as consumers. Every act within the system is serving to the maximization of the surplus value and reproduction of the capital hegemony. Therefore a conception based on “material labor” is excluding quite large masses.

Secondly, the concept of “multitude” is much more inclusive compared to the concepts of “working class” and “new-left”. When the increasing polarization between the capital owners and the other classes is considered it can be realized that during the last decades the ones at the upper layers of the income pyramid have become richer, where the ones at the bottom got poorer, and this has resulted in a densification within the lower layers of the income pyramid, where the class divisions got blurred and a large mass with slight distinctions but common problems is formed. Within this dense mass the working class, the petty bourgeoisie, and the lumpen proletariat can be recognized. It appears to be obvious that the “working class” concept is excluding petty bourgeoisie and the lumpen proletariat, where “multitude” is embracing all constituents of this dense mass.

And finally, the concept of “multitude” is redefining the struggle arena. Previously the struggle arena has been confined within the political sphere, but today when it is considered that every single act of every single person is reproducing the system, a

struggle confined within the boundaries of political sphere would not be an effective power of resistance. What “multitude” conception offers instead of this, is a struggle arena which enables every single actor to establish its own autonomy and realize its ontological existence at every nodal point of life, wherever it is. Simultaneously these nodal points interact with each other and form a new type of political contestation network. This is what Hardt and Negri call “biopolitics” within their conception of “multitude”. Within this biopolitical sphere every creative act which has a symbolic resistant meaning becomes meaningful, where daily preferences, consumption patterns, as well as creative artistic productions can become an expression of praxis, and have the potential to threaten the system.

For the time being social scientists as well as prominent figures within the movement have not reached a consensus about who will be the subject of this “becoming”, but besides this they are also discussing whether this “multitude” can raise concrete political demands which have a potential to force a change.

As for the *political change-producing capacity* of this movement, my sense is that we should pay more careful attention to the *proliferating experiments* involving direct relationships with corporations, including labor standards monitoring in the apparel industry, forest certification regimes, and fair-trade campaigns in the coffee sector, among others. Whether or not particular initiatives prove sustainable, they represent early ventures into *citizen-driven transnational democratic institution building*. Whether or not these *direct action initiatives* become better integrated with ongoing NGO efforts to pressure states and transnational agencies for particular reforms is perhaps the largest unanswered question of all. The eventual resolution of these linkage issues may hinge on the work done at *social fora*, at both world and regional levels, along with other world governance and civil society conferences. *These gatherings tend to attract the different players required to forge the linkages on which effective political capacity depends*. Beyond their potential for changing how NGOs and direct activists mutually define and pursue goals, these gatherings of the social justice tribes also represent the first steps toward a global civil society populated not just by NGOs, but by citizens who seem to be making direct democratic claims beyond borders. (Bennet, 2004: 225)²⁰⁹

Here Bennet directs the attention to the “proliferating experiments” within the movement, which can be interpreted as the “iterative” acts of the movement. These acts arise due to conditional cases, where the “multitude” produces local solutions to local problems sometimes using international leverage mechanisms. However, these

²⁰⁹ My italics

local solutions are not discarding the “globality” of the problems, in that they can be diffused and adopted to similar cases if the structural conditions allow. These iterative acts of the multitude will develop the basis of the political claims of the movement, and shape the future struggles. As some of the respondents within the field research have indicated first, the movement can raise concrete solutions to local problems and following the footprints of these local but concrete solutions the ultimate goals of the movement might become clearer. And only after then the movement will “become” a “political body”.

The movement has also developed its own instruments to carry out some duties like raising political claims and developing new types of governance. Although there are various views about the functions of SFs most of the social scientists as well as activists interpret them as platforms where the demands of the AGM will be shaped. First of all, the SF processes have provided opportunities for the articulation and convergence of different SMs and associations, which at least brings about exchange of information and experience. Additionally, they allow a “citizen-driven transnational democratic institution building” as Bennet indicated above, and from these experiences within the SFs new types of democratic representation and governance systems may start to form. In other words, the realization of “direct democracy” might be possible when the experiences within the SFs are developed further. For the time being the functionality of the SF processes might be questionable but time will show whether they will function or not.

Another problem which forms one of the debated areas within the movement related to the “subject” concerns the North-South divide. As we all know the prominent actors of the movement have been mainly coming from the First World, who has been taking the lions share from the global income. But as we have indicated previously this is a natural consequence of the operation of the capitalist system. Activists from the First World obviously are the most “protected” ones within the system, which brings about a considerable alienation from the self and the real, in that they become potential agitators of resistance against the system. They want to

get rid of the protections the system has provided them, and “become” real life actors like Truman²¹⁰ by breaking the walls of systemic protection.

Rejecting the organizational forms of modernity this new type of political contestation has developed a new type of organizational form, which did not accept any hierarchy and representation. There is no center, no vertical hierarchy and no organization in the formal meaning. We observe nodal points over the world, which develop their own lines of flight and weak ties between these nodal points, which together form a “rhizomatic structure” with a horizontal organizational extension. This “rhizomatic network” has mainly been developed on the internet, where the fractured nodal points of the movement interacted with each other via listservs, emails, listservs, and virtual forums. This allowed the nodal points to exchange information, organize global actions, and develop new types of contestations within the virtual realm. Geographically the nodal points were distant, but virtually time and space were irrelevant for interaction.

Taking all of the new features of the AGM into account we face many questions to be answered. However, admitting that the “becoming” process of the movement is on the road we might hope that the movement will answer these questions in time. Keeping our reservations about the political capabilities of the movement the most important point that needs to be emphasized about this movement is that it has ended the pessimist aura of “no alternative to capitalism”, and showed that the “multitude” has the potential to develop an alternative to the existing system which is promoting a race to the bottom. For the time being no one in the world even the “multitude” is sure about the outcomes of the movement but there is a strong solidarity and a strong belief in a better future.

²¹⁰ The main actor of “Truman’s World” which has been explained in footnote 38

REFERENCES

Ashman, Sam, 2004, **Resistance to Neoliberal Globalisation: A Case of ‘Militant Particularism’?**, *Political Studies Association* 24(2): 143-153.

Ayres, Jeffrey M. 2002, *Transnational Political Processes and Contention against the Global Economy* in Smith and Johnston eds., **Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements**, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, pp: 191-205.

Ayres, Jeffrey M., 2004, **Framing Collective Action Against Neoliberalism: The Case of the “Anti-Globalization” Movement**, *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 10 (1): 11–34.

Ayres, Jeffrey & Sidney Tarrow, 2002, **The Shifting Grounds for Transnational Civic Activity**, *After September 11: Perspectives from the Social Sciences*. <http://www.ssrc.org/sept11>, Accessed 11.11.2003.

Baiocchi, Gianpaolo, 2004, **The Party and the Multitude: Brazil’s Workers’ Party (PT) and the Challenges of building a Just Social Order in a Globalizing Context**, *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 10(1):199–215.

Bhagwati, Jagdish, 2004, **Anti-globalization Why?**, *Journal of Policy Modelling* 26:439-463.

Benford, Robert D., 1997, **An insiders Critique of the Social Movement Framing Perspective**, *Sociological Inquiry*, 67 (4): 409-430.

Bennet, Lance W., 2004, *Social Movements beyond Borders: Organization, Communication, and Political Capacity in Two Eras of Transnational Activism* in della Porta, Donatella and Sidney Tarrow eds., **Transnational Protest and Global Activism**, New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishing, pp: 1-17.

Blee, Kathleen M. & Verta Taylor, 2002, *Semi-structured Interviewing in Social Movement Research* in Klandermans, Bert & Susan Staggenborg eds., **Methods of Social Movement Research**, Minneapolis: Minnesota Press, pp: 92-117.

Bourdieu, Pierre, 1998, **The Essence of Neoliberalism: Utopia of Endless Exploitation**, Translated by Jeremy J. Shapiro, *Le Mondé Diplomatique*, December, <http://homme-moderne.org/societe/socio/bourdieu/varia/essneoUK.html>, Accessed 01.11.2006.

Bourdieu, Pierre, 1998a, **Acts of Resistance: Against the New Myths of Our Time**, Translated by R. Nice, Polity Press: Cambridge.

Brecher, Jeremy, Tim Costello, and Benford Smith, 2000, **Globalization from Below: The Power of Solidarity**, Cambridge: South End Press.

Buechler, Steven M., 1999, **Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism**, New York: Oxford University Press.

Cassen, Bernard, 2003, **On the ATTAC**, *New Left Review*, 19: 41–61.

Chesters, Graeme and Ian Welsh, 2005, **Complexity and Social Movement(s)-Process and Emergence in Planetary Action Systems**, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 22(5): 187-211.

Cleaver, Harry, 1994, **The Chiapas Uprising and the Future of Class Struggle in the New World Order**, <http://www.eco.utexas.edu/faculty/Cleaver/chiapasuprising.html>, Accessed 01.12.2006.

Cleaver, Harry, 1998a, **The Zapatistas and the International Circulation of Struggle: Lessons Suggested and Problems Raised**, Paper prepared for conference on Globalization from Below at Duke University about problems that persist. <http://www.eco.utexas.edu/faculty/Cleaver/lessons.html>, Accessed 01.12.2006.

Cleaver, Harry, 1998b, **The Zapatista Effect: The Internet and the Rise of an Alternative Political Fabric**, <http://www.eco.utexas.edu/faculty/Cleaver/zapeffect.html>, Accessed 01.12.2006.

Çizmeçi, Şule, 2006, **Ne Bu Şiddet, bu Celal?** (What a Violence, What a Rage?), http://www.radikal.com.tr/ek_haber.php?ek=cts&haberno=5637, Accessed 14.11.2006.

Çoban, Aykut, 2002, **Küreselleşmeye Karşı Olmak: Olanaklar ve Sınırlılıklar** (Being against Globalization: Opportunities and Constraints), *Praksis*, 7: 117-164.

Davies, James C., 1962, **Toward a Theory of Revolution**, *American Sociological Review*, 17(1): 5-19.

Deleuze, Gilles & Felix Guattari, 1987, **A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia**, (Translated by Brian Massumi), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

della Porta, Donatella & Hanspeter Kriesi, 1999, *Social Movements in a Globalizing World: an Introduction* in della Porta, Donatella, Hanspeter Kriesi and Dieter Rucht eds., **Social Movements in a Globalizing World**, McMillan Press: London, pp: 3-22.

Ehrenberg, Johan, 2001, **Küresel Bir Sol Hareket Gerekli** (A Global Left Movement is Necessary), interviewed by Ali Özgentürk, *Cosmo Politik*, (1):140-143.

Ergül-Yılmaz, Müjgan and Deniz Gümüşel, 2001, **Environmental Policies And Applications In Transition Countries: A Closer Look Into Russia, China And Cuba**, Unpublished Paper Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of Sociology 325, Human Ecology, METU: Ankara.

Fotopoulos, Takis, 2001, **Globalisation, the Reformist Left and the Anti-Globalisation 'Movement'**, *Democracy & Nature the International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, 7(2):233-280. http://www.democracynature.org/dn/vol7/takis_globalisation.htm, Accessed 15.02.2003.

Gamson, William A. & David S. Meyer, 1996, *Framing Political Opportunity* in McAdam, Doug, John McCarthy and Mayer Zald, eds., **Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp: 275-290.

Gill, Stephan, 2000, **Toward a Postmodern Prince? The Battle in Seattle as a Moment in the New Politics of Globalisation**, *Millenium: Journal of International Studies*, 29(1):131-140.

Goffman, Erwing, 1974, **Frame Analysis**, Boston Massachusetts: Northeastern University Press.

Görenel, Zeki, 2002, *Karşıtlığın Küreselleşmesi, Neoliberal Dönemde “Yeni” Toplumsal Hareketler* in Soyak, Alkan ed., **Küreselleşme: İktisadi Yönelimler Ve Sosyopolitik Karşıtlıklar**, Istanbul: Om Yayınevi, pp: 305-351.

Habermas, Jürgen, 2001, “**Why Europe Needs a New Constitution.**”, *New Left Review*, 11: 5–26.

Hardt, Michael, 2002, **Today’s Bandung?**, *New Left Review*, 14:112-118.

Hardt, Michael & Antonio Negri, 2001, **Empire**, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hardt, Michael & Antonio Negri, 2004, **Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire**, New York: Penguin Press.

İstanbul Tabip Odası, 2003, **Eşcinsellere Yönelik Ayrımcılık ve Şiddet Tartışıldı** (The Violence and Exclusion Directed to the Homosexuals was Discussed), <http://www.istabip.org.tr/bg/bg22052003.html>, Accessed 14.11.2006.

Jenkins, J. Craig, 1995, *Social Movements, Political Representation, and the State: An Agenda and Comparative Framework* in Jenkins, J.C. and Bert Klandermans eds., **The Politics of Social Protest: Comparative Perspectives on States and Social Movements**, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp: 14-35.

Johnston, Hank, 2002, *Verification and Proof in Frame and Discourse Analysis* in Klandermans, and Staggenborg eds., **Methods of Social Movement Research**, Minneapolis: Minnesota Press.

Johnston, Joséé & Gordon Laxer, 2003, **Solidarity in the Age of Globalization: Lessons from the Anti-MAI and Zapatista Struggles**, *Theory and Society*, 32:39-91.

Kaldor, Mary, 2000, ‘**Civilising’ Globalization? The Implications of the ‘Battle in Seattle’**’, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 29(1):105-114.

Keck, Margareth. E., & Kathryn Sikkink, 1998, **Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics**, New York: Cornell University Press.

Klein, Naomi, 2001, **Reclaiming The Commons**, *New Left Review*, 9: 81-89.

Luxemburg, Rosa, 1993, **Sosyal Reform mu Devrim mi?** (Social Reform or Revolution), Istanbul: Belge Yayınları.

Maheu, Louise, 1995, *General Introduction* in Maheu, Louise ed., **Social Movements and Social Classes: The Future of Collective Action**, London: Sage Publications, pp: 1-17.

Marcos, 2001, **The Punch Card and the Hourglass**, Interviewed by Gabriel Garcia Marquez and Roberto Pombo, *New Left Review*, 9: 69-79.

Marx, Karl & Friedrich Engels, 1992, **Alman İdeolojisi** (German Ideology), Translated by Sevim Belli and Ahmet Kardam, Ankara: Sol Yayınları.

McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy & Mayer N. Zald, 1996, *Introduction: Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Framing Processes-Toward a Synthetic, Comparative Perspective on Social Movements* in McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald eds., **Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp: 1-20.

McCarthy, James D. & Mayer. N. Zald, 1977, **Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory**, *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6): 1212-1241.

O'Sullivan, Padriac, 2003, **The Social Forums: Abandon or Contaminate?**, <http://struggle.ws/wsm/ws/2003/ws78/socialforum.html>, Accessed 07.11.2006.

Sancar, Nuray, 2001, **Küreselleşme Karşıtı Hareketler** (Anti-Globalization Movements), *Evrensel Kültür* 114 <http://www.evrenselbasim.com/ek/yazi.asp?id=293>, Accessed 05.03.2003.

Sancar, Serpil, 2004, **Özgürleştirici Küreselleşme Olabilir mi?** (Can there be a Liberating Globalization), *Birikim* (177):92-98.

Seoane, José and Emilio Taddei, 2002, **From Seattle to Porto Alegre: The Anti-Neoliberal Globalization Movement**, *Current Sociology*, 50(1): 99-122.

Scholte, Jan Aart, 2000, **Globalization: A Critical Introduction**, NewYork.: Palgrave.

Scholte, Jan Aart, 2000a, **Cautionary Reflections on Seattle**, *Millenium: Journal of International Studies*, 29(1):115-121.

Smith, Jackie, 2002, *Globalizing Resistance: The Battle Of Seattle and the Future of Social Movements* in Smith and Johnston eds., **Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements**, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, pp: 207-227.

Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford, Jr., Steven K. Worden, & Robert D. Benford, 1986, **Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation**, *American Sociological Review*, 51(4):464-481.

Snow, David A. & Robert D. Benford, 1988, **Ideology, Frame Resonance and Participant Mobilization**, *International Social Movement Research* (1):197-217.

Snow, David A. & Robert D. Benford, 1992, *Masterframes and Cycles of Protest* in Morris, Aldon D., & Carol McClurg Mueller eds., **Frontiers in Social Movement Theory**, New Haven: Yale University Press, pp:133-155.

Snow, David A. & Robert D. Benford, 2000, **Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment**, *Annual Review of Sociology* (26):611-39.

Somel, Cem, 2002, **Türkiye’de Küreselleşmeye Tepkiler Üzerine** (About the Responses to Globalization in Turkey), *Praksis* (7): 35-56.

Şaylan, Gencay, [1995] 2003, **Değişim, Küreselleşme ve Devletin Yeni İşlevi** (Change, Globalization and the New Function of the State), Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Şensever, Levent, 2003, **Dünya Sosyal Forumu (World Social Forum)**. Istanbul: Metis.

Tarrow, Sidney, 1998, **Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tarrow, Sidney, 2002, *From Lumping to Splitting: Specifying Globalization and Resistance* in Smith and Johnston eds., **Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements**, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, pp: 229-249.

Teivainen, Teivo, 2002, **The World Social Forum and Global Democratisation: Learning From Porto Alegre**, *Third World Quarterly*, 23(4): 621–632.

Temelkuran, Ece, 2000, **Yeni-sol: Aynaların İntikamı** (The New-left: The Revenge of the Mirrors), *Birikim* (139): 98-99.

Ulagay, Osman, 1999, **Küreselleşme Nereye?**, *Foreign Policy* (Turkish Edition), Fall: 24-37.

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), 1994, *World Summit for Social Development, Briefing Paper No.4, Structural Adjustment in a Changing World*.

Uzun, Türkan, 2001, **Cenova Günlüğü** (Genoa Diary). Istanbul: Stüdyo İmge.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1999, **Seattle, or the Limits of the Globalization Drive**. *Fernand Braudel Center, Binghamton University Commentary No. 30*. <http://fbc.binghamton.edu/commentr.htm>, Accessed 01.12.2003.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, 2000, **Globalization or the Age of Transition?**, *International Sociology*, 15(2): 249-265.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, 2002, **New Revolts against the System**, *New Left Review*, 18: 29-39.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, 2004, **The Rising Strength of the World Social Forum**, *Fernand Braudel Center, Binghamton University Commentary No. 130* <http://fbc.binghamton.edu/commentr.htm>, Accessed 12.10.2005.

Wennerhag, Magnus, 2002, "AGM?" a paper presented at the ISA Congress in Brisbane Summer 2002, <http://www.soc.lu.se/soc/distans/global/wennerhag.pdf>, Accessed 15.03.2003.

Wilkin, Peter, 2000, **Solidarity in a Global Age-Seattle and Beyond**, *Journal of World Systems Research*, 5 (1): 20-65.

Wood, Lesley J., 2004, **Breaking the Bank & Taking to the Streets: How Protesters Target Neoliberalism**, *Journal of World Systems Research*, 10(1):69-89.

Yalınpala, Jale, 2002, *Küreselleşmenin Emek Piyasası ve İstihdam Üzerindeki Etkileri* (The Effects of Globalization on Labor Market and Employment) in Alkan Soyak ed., **Küreselleşme: İktisadi Yönelimler ve Sosyopolitik Karşıtlıklar** (Globalization: Economic Orientations and Sociopolitical Contingencies), İstanbul: Om Yayınevi, pp: 263-304.

Yedibela, Arzu, 2002, **Sistem Karşısı Hareketler ve Reformizm** (Anti-systemic Movements and Reformism), <http://antimai.org/mkl/ay02karsith.htm>, Accessed 15.03.2003.

Zald, Mayer, 1996, *Culture Ideology and Strategic Framing* in McAdam, Doug, John McCarthy & Mayer Zald, eds., **Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp: 261-274.

APPENDIX

A. DERİNLEMESİNE MÜLAKAT FORMU

I- Kişisel sorular:

1. Yaş/cinsiyet/meslek/eğitim düzeyi/katılımcı olduğu ya da temsil ettiği grup/örgüt.

II- Küreselleşme ve Küreselleşme Karşıtı Harekete yönelik genel sorular:

2. Küreselleşmeyi nasıl tanımlıyorsunuz?
3. Küreselleşmeye neden karşıısınız?
4. Küreselleşmeden nasıl etkilendiğinize dair somut birkaç örnek verebilir misiniz?
5. Küreselleşme karşıtı hareketi (KKH) tanımlayabilir misiniz?
6. KKH'nin düşmanı/hedefi kimdir?/Düşman olarak kapitalizmi görüyorsanız kapitalizmin tanımını yapabilir misiniz?
7. KKH'in eylem stratejileri konusunda ne düşünüyorsunuz?
8. Sizce KKH devrimci mi, reformist mi? Neden? Devrimci ve reformist tanımlamalarını yapabilir misiniz?
9. KKH'in heterojen yapısına nasıl bakıyorsunuz? (Güçlendirici/engelleyici)
10. KKH'in önerdiği bir alternatif toplum/sistem var mı? Varsa bu toplum/sistem konusunda biraz bilgi verebilir misiniz?
11. KKH'in geleceği konusunda ne gibi öngörülerde bulunabilirsiniz?

III- Eylemcinin Dahil Olduğu Grup ve KKH Konusunda Gruba Yönelik Sorular:

12. Neden KKH içerisinde yer alıyorsunuz?
13. KKH içerisinde yer alan bir eylemci olarak bu hareketle bertaraf etmek istediğiniz kendi düşmanınız/hedefinizi tanımlayabilir misiniz?
14. Sizce küreselleşmeye nasıl karşı koyulabilir/eylem stratejisi önerileri?
15. Neden temsili demokrasi benzeri yolları tercih etmiyorsunuz?

16. Bulduğunuz grup/örgüt hareketin hangi yönde gelişmesinden yana? (devrimci/reformist)
17. KKH'in eylemlerine katılım kararını nasıl ve ne zaman verdiniz?
18. KKH ile bağlantınızı nasıl ve kim aracılığıyla kurdunuz?
19. İletişiminizi nasıl sürdürüyorsunuz?
20. Küresel hareketle ne tür bilgi alışverişlerinde bulunuyorsunuz?
21. Hareketin genel koordinasyonu konusunda aktif olarak çalışan uluslar arası grup ya da organizasyonlardan size direk eylem ya da faaliyet çağrısı geliyor mu?
22. Bu uluslar arası örgütlenmeler bilgi birikimlerini sizinle paylaşıyorlar mı? Paylaşıyorlarsa daha çok hangi yolla?
23. Örgütlenme yapınızdan biraz bahsedebilir misiniz?
24. Düzenli toplanıyor musunuz?
25. Toplantılarınıza katılım zorunlu mu?
26. Grup üyeleri birbirleri ile genelde nasıl iletişim kuruyor? Yüzyüze görüşülüyor mu, yoksa yalnızca internet üzerinden mi iletişim kuruluyor?
27. Grup içerisinde hiyerarşik bir örgütlenme yapısı var mı?
28. Grubun belli bir üyelik sistemi var mı? Üye sayısı biliniyor mu?
29. Eylem kararlarını nasıl alıyorsunuz?
30. Eylem stratejileriniz konusunda biraz bilgi verebilir misiniz?
31. Bireysel eylem mi, kitlesel eylem mi? Neden?
32. Şiddet kullanılmasına taraftar mısınız? Neden?
33. Kendiniz tanıtmak, halkı bilgilendirmek ya da grubunuza yeni katılımcılar sağlamak için ne gibi çalışmalar yapıyorsunuz? (Konferans/Panel/Stand açmak/Eylemler)
34. Bir derginiz, ya da gazeteniz var mı? Düzenli olarak çıkarabiliyor musunuz?
35. Tanıtım için başka afiş ya da broşürler bastırıyor musunuz?
36. İnternet üzerinde bir web siteniz ya da e-posta listeniz var mı?

IV- Eylemcinin/Grubun Alternatif Toplum/Sitem Önerilerine Yönelik Sorular:

37. Yeni dünya düzeni nasıl olmalı? Alternatif bir toplum/sistem öneriniz var mı?
38. Gelişme/kalkınmayı nasıl tanımlıyorsunuz? (Çevre faktörü?)
39. Kalkınma da teknolojinin rolü ne olmalı?
40. Nasıl bir siyasi karar mekanizması uygulanmalı?
41. Eğer varsa, bu yeni düzende devletin rolü nedir?
42. Önerdiğiniz düzende değişik kültürler ve ezilen farklı kitlelerle nasıl başedebilmeyi umuyorsunuz?
43. Genel olarak KKH'in genel alternatif toplum/sistem önerileri ile sizin önerileriniz örtüşüyor mu? Varsa genelle aranızdaki farklılıklar nasıl aşılmalı?