

“BUILDING TRUST”

A Report on NGO Reactions to the World Economic Forum Davos, Switzerland January 23-28, 2003

**Report Prepared for:
Centre for Applied Studies in International Negotiation
CASIN
Geneva, Switzerland
January 2003**

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of the Centre for Applied Studies in International Negotiation (CASIN)

SUMMARY

From January 23-28th, 2003, the small alpine skiing village of Davos, Switzerland plays host to both extremes of the political spectrum. As the business-suited men arrive in black Mercedes, escorted by their bodyguards to attend the Annual Meeting of the World Economic Forum, anti-capitalist and anti-globalisation demonstrators gather their placards to protest the event.

Widely recognised as the global summit that defines the political, economic, and business agenda for the year, the World Economic Forum draws high-ranking elected officials, heads of influential institutions, and leading business people from all corners of the world—as well as demonstrators and critics of the WEF’s neoliberal agenda.

This year’s theme, “Building Trust”, has particularly irked WEF critics, who gathered to protest, discuss, and educate the public on the problems related to big business. The Public Eye on Davos, an alternative forum hosted by a coalition of NGOs, attempted to bring business leaders and civil society leaders together to critically discuss the effects of corporate-driven globalisation. In a series of sessions on various issues—from Corporate PR strategies to the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Pipeline Project, NGO experts presented their evidence of the impacts of WEF decisions and outlined their demands for change.

On another front, the WEF co-hosted the Open Forum, an event designed to bring NGOs and civil society into dialogue with WEF participants. Though the topics for discussion had potential to provoke interesting dialogue, the pre-selected panellists (chosen by the WEF), the lack of time, and the absence of WEF participants prevented this from occurring. What resulted instead was more an advertisement of ‘how corporations are doing good in the world’, while serious concerns and questions were left untouched.

For the first time in years, authorities granted permission for an anti-WEF demonstration to take place on Saturday, January 25th. Though more than a thousand protestors from a wide range of social circles gathered in Davos, several thousand others were denied access and held up at Landquart. A peaceful march took place in Davos, though clashes with police took place in other cities, most notably Landquart and Berne.

WHAT IS THE WEF?

Considered by most businesspeople to be the “global summit” that defines the political, economic, and business agenda of the year, the World Economic Forum Annual Meeting took place this year from January 23-28th in the small, alpine skiing village of Davos, Switzerland. For six days, more than two thousand people, including 24 heads of state, 13 labour leaders, 82 cabinet ministers, 67 heads of international organisations, 177 academics, 1300 business leaders, and 282 media representatives held more than 270 discussions on a wide variety of topics. This year’s theme is “Building Trust” in recognition of the dirtied image of business following the corporate scandals of the US and the loss of faith in big business.

The World Economic Forum, or WEF, is a foundation funded by the contributions of its members, including one thousand of the largest and most powerful multinational corporations in the world, and has an annual turnover of more than \$100 billion US. For the past thirty-three years, the WEF’s Annual Meeting has taken place in Davos (aside from 2001, when the event was held in New York, for combined reasons of security and ‘solidarity’ with American business) and has attracted numerous high-ranking officials and heads of international organisations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Organisation.

The objective of the WEF is different from most official meetings where decisions and outcomes are a priority; the WEF is more an opportunity for informal networking between top business leaders and politicians, the goal of which is to establish “partnerships between and among business, political, intellectual and other leaders of society to define, discuss, and advance key issues on the global agenda”. Despite that no formal decisions are made, the WEF has, in the past, paved the way for several significant endeavours: the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) Uruguay Round from which subsequently emerged the World Trade Organisation (WTO) as well as negotiations on the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Another significant WEF-related initiative took place in 2000 when Kofi Annan, Secretary General of the United Nations, announced the United Nations Global Compact, an

initiative aimed at “strengthening cooperation and partnership with the business world” through the voluntary implementation of nine shared values based on environmental, labour and human rights agreements.

“BUILDING TRUST”

Despite the WEF’s self-proclaimed mission of “improving the state of the world”, public criticism of the forum has grown in recent years. Frequently considered an ‘elitist’ gathering of privileged men (the participation of women has yet to reach ten percent of the total number of participants and participation in the forum can cost up to \$30 000 US per participant), many are beginning to question the secrecy of WEF, especially when the impacts of its activities have a global reach. With forum access restricted to participants belonging to the WEF and selected media representatives, there is not much space for public or civil society input. Though the forum boasts its good relationship with non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and a ‘multi-stakeholder approach’, the reality is that less than 50 are represented inside the forum.

In fact, over the past five years, increasing resistance to the Forum—both locally and internationally--has become a regular event. The WEF’s response, up until this year, had been a complete ban on all demonstrations and the effective ‘sealing off’ of the community. Rising tension over international security, especially given the pending war with Iraq, nuclear threats from North Korea, and the continued fear of terrorist attacks, have contributed to what some call “bunker syndrome” at the WEF.

The costs of such security measures are astronomical: for this year’s forum, security costs exceeded 14 million Swiss Francs, the largest security expenditure ever during peacetime. With 2000 police guarding the community (some patrolling the slopes on skis), roving military guards in neighbouring towns and along all transportation routes, and random inspections, the ambiance of the WEF is less than welcoming. As helicopters buzzed overhead, surveying the scene, WEF security indeed seemed prepared to shoot down any unauthorized aircraft within 50 miles of the forum.

Community members are becoming increasingly annoyed with the WEF's 'security regime'. In fact, some parents have started sending their children away for the duration of the forum in an attempt to avoid the hassle of security interruptions as well as any threat of an anti-WEF attack. Susanne Gysi, President of the local Socialist Party in Davos expressed her frustration: "In February, I'm launching a community initiative. Public criticism of the forum has to have a place in next year's preparations and I'm sure that the majority of citizens don't want this hassle again." Margot Hofstetter, a local hotel owner, explains why she has changed her view of the forum: "The WEF started very small, but now these scenes of the military, the police--maybe fights, maybe violence, and maybe killings--make all of us uptight. I don't want my children to see the village turned into a military base. This is not the kind of publicity Davos needs. The forum could give us a really bad name."

This type of public criticism, combined with a growing distrust of business and corporations in general sets a difficult backdrop for the forum. A recent Gallup poll, conducted in collaboration with the WEF, discloses "very low levels of trust in institutions around the world". Regarding the role of 'leaders', the report reveals that with few exceptions, leaders of all kinds in most countries are given lower trust ratings than the institutions they lead; leaders of NGOs are the only ones with a clear majority of citizens' trust; and, that there is a "declining trust that the world is going in the right direction".

Acknowledging the difficulties faced by the WEF, Klaus Schwab (President of the WEF), optimistically stated, "Restoring confidence is one of the most important leadership challenges today. As such we will devote this Annual Meeting to discussing the necessary steps to build trust in leaders and institutions in a multi-stakeholder approach." WEF participant Jeffrey Garten, Dean of the Yale School of Management, however, warned that, even with such nice objectives as 'building trust', the WEF agenda has "never been more loaded with intractable problems". In his opinion, "Global leaders are at the most important crossroads since the end of the Cold War."

OPPOSITION TO THE WEF:

THE OPEN FORUM

In recognition of the growing dislike for their “behind closed doors” approach, and ostensibly, in an effort to “build trust” with the public, organisers of the WEF have decided to co-host an “Open Forum” alongside official WEF events. This series of meetings is designed to “facilitate interaction and discussion on current issues between global leaders, citizens, and civil society organisations—including church, NGO, and non-profit organisations”. Hosted at the Swiss Alpine Middle School, each session was open to 300 members of the public at no charge. Topics of discussion ranged from Fair Trade, to Globalisation, to Business in Conflict Areas, to Migration, and others. For a complete programme, please see attached Appendix A.

The Open Forum was, according to its organisers, a notable success. Marking the “openness” of the WEF to engage in “critical dialogue with the public” and allowing for “controversial discussions”, many thought the Open Forum was a considerable step forward in the relations between critics and WEF participants. However, upon closer examination, the Open Forum was flawed in a number of ways that prevented it from achieving its stated objectives of “encouraging debate on globalisation in the world”.

Though some may argue that the Open Forum was well-attended, it is essential to analyse the composition of those who attended. For the most part, the panellists consisted of older, white men with the crowd comprised mainly of local adults (also mostly white) interspersed with small groups of local students. Few NGOs were present in the crowd, as most had deliberately boycotted the event, considering any attempt at “dialogue” with the WEF both impossible and biased in favour of business. Indeed, even the NGOs present as panellists tended to be rather moderate in their perspectives—none of the NGOs involved in Saturday’s protest were invited to the sessions. As for dialogue between WEF participants and the public, it did not occur as extremely few were ever present at the sessions and only one WEF participant ever spoke from the crowd.

The Open Forum was further frustrated by the fact that, despite interesting topics of discussion, inadequate time was allotted for full “dialogue” to take place. All seven sessions lasted no longer than one hour and a quarter, with each session granting the floor to no less than six panellists. Questions from the public were typically left until the last five minutes of each presentation, and restricted to three to five questions per session. Without the presence of NGOs or individuals involved directly in researching the areas of discussion, there was also a notable absence of critical questions and discussion.

In general, many complained that the sessions also avoided any in-depth discussion of controversial issues. For instance, during the session on Child Labour and Children’s Rights, the vast majority of the discussion focussed on how the exploitation of children was “inherently wrong”. However, only Irene Khan, Secretary General of Amnesty International, pushed for a more complex analysis of the situation, arguing that the introduction of laws illegalising child labour often exacerbate the situation by forcing the practice underground where worse activities, such as child prostitution and child soldiers, occur. She also attempted to broaden the discussion to include women’s rights and contraception issues. While Neil Kearney (International Textile, Garment, and Leather Worker’s Federation, Belgium) demanded that corporations “declare war, smash the gates that deny freedom, release children, and allow them to reclaim their childhood”, Khan called for the end of rhetoric and a re-focussing on reality, suggesting binding legislation as a concrete method for preventing corporations from exploiting child labour. Though Khan provoked more complex discussions, the focus of the session remained fairly superficial, centring on a simple ‘eliminate child labour’ stance.

The session entitled “Labour Wanted, Locals Preferred” focussed primarily on migration issues. Before the official session opened, the floor was given to a local human rights organisation leader who explained that, despite the so-called “Open Forum”, WEF security had prevented a bus of demonstrators from reaching the session, many of which were immigrants and/or “illegal workers”. When required to show identification, the demonstrators refused, not wanting to jeopardise their precarious status in a country where many of them did not have full citizenship rights. Philip Jennings, from Union Network International, supported them, criticising the WEF for its purported objective of

“Building Trust” while denying access to those most affected by migration policies and for silencing the most relevant voices in the discussion. As the session unfolded, panellists explained their perspective on growing global migration issue. Didier Cherpitel of the Red Cross emphasised the importance of providing basic needs to those in distress, Bruce McKinley from the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) argued the importance of “controlling” and “managing” human flows in accordance with the interests of the recipient countries, and Susan Martin explained how xenophobia was “understandable” given “cultural and language differences” and “neighbours not knowing who lives next door”. Wolfgang Auwarter-Kuhn (Kuhn-Rikon Switzerland), the only employer on the panel, did not offer many answers as to whether or not business was “complicit in the exploitation of cheap, immigrant workers”. The session exemplified the typified perspectives of each organisation, while simultaneously failing to progress beyond their entrenched views on the issue.

The session on the UN Global Compact provided one of the more interesting discussions, thanks primarily to the moderator who posed rather pointed, critical questions. However, as the panellists were members of the Compact, effective criticism was nearly absent- Aside from the attempt by Kenneth Roth to criticise the Compact from within for being “toothless” and for attempting to “bluewash” irresponsible business, most of the panellists were eager to sign nothing but praise for the initiative while enthusiastically claiming to be embracing the principles of Corporate Social Responsibility. Whereas most critics were looking for some admission of bad practices in the past, hoping that this would increase public trust, none of the panellists were willing to discuss such issues. Rather, Peter Brabeck (CEO of Nestle) would only discuss his efforts at developing trade unions in Colombia (avoiding questions of trade union problems in China) and Bjorn Stigson (President of the World Business Council on Sustainable Development) commented, “Business has done the most to implement the Rio goals”. Following the session, the more critical listeners called the session “advertising” and a “platform for bluewashing”. When the moderator asked why, if building trust and embracing Corporate Social Responsibility was the true objective of such companies, they would not reject any effort to establish binding legislation, Stigson replied that “increasing regulation would likely lead to decreased compliance”. According to Stigson, “Business

is the best organisation to establish standards... We certainly don't want governments or bureaucrats involved", exemplifying the impasse between NGO demands for greater accountability through legislation and the corporate perspective.

Other critics saw the Open Forum as an opportunity for corporations with tarnished images to "advertise" their new concern for human rights, environmental protection, and labour standards. During the session on Business in Areas of Conflict, for instance, Jonathan Oppenheimer, a Public Relations representative from De Beers, argued against claims that De Beers had been involved in the "conflict diamonds" or "blood diamonds" trade. Rather, as he stated, De Beers had always supported democratisation and had taken a "long-term vision" toward management that 'naturally' led to sustainability, and had, in fact, enthusiastically led the Kimberly Process for diamond certification.

For Kenny Bruno, one of the speakers of the Public Eye on Davos, it is was this type of appropriation of terms such as "sustainable", "corporate socially responsible", "democratic", etc. that have undermined the Open Forum's attempts to both build trust with the NGO community as well as engage them in any meaningful dialogue. As Matthias Herfeldt of the Berne Declaration, explained, "The panels were not contradictory and the podiums were monopolized by white men of the North... a real dialogue with economic leaders is practically impossible".

If the Open Forum's objective had been to fill the room with an attentive audience, then it could be deemed successful on this front. However, as a "space for dialogue" between WEF participants and members of the public, NGOs, and civil society, the general consensus among those critical of the Open Forum was that it was a "failure"--or at least not very satisfying—interaction was simply not possible. With too little time for questions, a panel of people in near or complete agreement on most issues, pre-selected by the WEF, and the lack of a critical audience due to NGO and civil society boycotts of the event, it was criticised, in the words of one demonstrator, for being an attempt to "control dissent over the WEF, ensuring that it never touches the larger issues such as capitalism, globalisation, etc."

Even those who thought the event was “very positive”, such as Christoph Stuckelberger (Bread for All) admitted that the panellist selection process would need to change in order to reduce the WEFs influence over the panellists.

THE PUBLIC EYE ON DAVOS:

The Fourth Annual “Public Eye on Davos”, an independent international conference and public forum, took place opposite the WEF in Davos from January 23-28, 2003. The Public Eye, sponsored by a coalition of Swiss and International environmental and development NGOs¹ and coordinated by the Berne Declaration, was initiated as “an opportunity for a critical discussion of the activities of the WEF and its corporate members”. Matthias Herfeldt, head organiser from the Berne Declaration, explained that the objectives of the Public Eye were to “confront corporate leaders at the WEF with the demands of civil society, to provide a platform for NGO experts, academics, and political representatives from the global North and South to critically analyse corporate-driven globalisation and present alternatives towards more equitable and sustainable world economic policies”.

The conference, held at the Dutch Asthma Clinic, marked the most successful year in the Public Eye’s history with strong participation from both international and local levels. According to the organisers, this is representative of the success of the “ever-growing world movement that is a progression from Rio, Seattle, the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), and the World Social Forum (WSF). Participants attended a series of discussions, topics ranging from Corporate Accountability, Corporate PR Strategies, to the relationship between Globalisation and Labour Rights. This year’s conference focuses on multinational corporations and their role in globalisation. For a complete programme, please see Appendix B.

¹ The Public Eye is a coalition of the following organisations: Berne Declaration—Eklärung von Bern (BD-EvB)Pro Natura (Friends of the Earth Switzerland), Friends of the Earth International (FoEI), Asociación Latinoamericana de Organizaciones de Promoción (ALOP), Corporate Europe Observatory (CEO), Focus on the Global South, International South Group Network (ISGN), Tebtebba Foundation, Women in Development Europe (WIDE), and World Development Movement (WDM).

Standing in direct opposition to the WEF, organisers of the Public Eye boycotted the Open Forum and criticised the WEF on numerous fronts. Andreas Missbach (Berne Declaration) argued that “international economic policies and other global public affairs should no longer be discussed at private meetings like the WEF” and denounced the WEF’s farcical attempts at “creating dialogue” and “opening the WEF to the public”, ignoring the fact that the Public Eye exists for these same purposes and represents a truly independent, beyond the influence of the WEF. “If the WEF were truly interested in dialogue, they would be willing to speak here [at the Public Eye]”, he said. Given the WEF’s focus on “building trust” this year, the Public Eye mocked the WEF and the Open Forum for its ironic lack of transparency, open dialogue, and commitment.

Matthias Herfeldt echoed these sentiments, contending that the Open Forum has a “narrow definition of how global issues will be addressed.” In his view, the Open Forum does not provide voice for serious criticisms. “The WEF is like a laundry service, this is its most important role. The Forum is a ‘greenwash’ platform and gives the big corporations the opportunity to talk softly and show their sunny side. Whatever commitments to improving the world or to be a good corporate citizen during the forum are completely without any consequences. Therefore, we have some questionable “good corporate citizens” down in the congress centre, such as the mining giant Rio Tinto. This multinational has a very long record of human rights violations and of the destruction of the environment”.

Clearly, the WEF’s objective of “building trust” was under attack at the Public Eye. Many panellists claimed that, given the manipulated content of the Open Forum and the refusal of WEF participants to “dialogue” at the Public Eye, it was impossible for the WEF to make assert that it was “building trust”. Both Phil Knight (CEO of Nike) and Lord Browne (CEO of BP) were invited to discuss issues of globalisation pertaining to their specific corporate practices but both refused. Miriam Behrens (Pro Natura) argued, “This is not building trust. It proves that corporations are not here to learn from dialogue with other stakeholders, but to continue to do business as usual”, to which Matthias Herfeldt added: “At the WEF it is always Sunday, filled with noble sounding sermons, but corporations should be judged by what they do, not what they say.”

The Public Eye panellists also condemned the WEF and its corporate membership for undermining efforts to enact binding legislation ensuring environmental and social concerns are factored into their decision-making and daily operations by proposing vague commitments to rhetorical principles in place of real legislation. Tony Juniper (Friends of the Earth International) complained that there was little commitment from the WEF as to how to implement the sustainable development goals so eagerly and enthusiastically presented at the WSSD. Fighting for binding regulation, he said, “Rules are needed to control the worst excesses of big business—not only to protect those who are better off, but to afford rights to those who pay the highest prices of all—in suffering the effects of pollution, degraded land, stolen resources and poverty.” Other NGOs dismissed the voluntary guidelines proposed at the WEF, arguing that “blind trust is not enough—we need binding global rules to secure corporate accountability.”

The Public Eye also targeted its criticisms toward the WEF’s other focus—a pending war in Iraq. In addition to its typical focus on the economy, much of the discussion at this year’s Forum revolved around US Secretary of State Colin Powell’s presence and the likelihood of a nuclear war. Frustrated with the dominance of war-talk, Public Eye organisers criticised the WEF for ignoring the opportunity to discuss issues of peace, development, and “building trust”, not war. “The real agenda of Davos is war and how war will secure future revenue for oil companies and security for the continual growing energy demands in the North. The WEF is sadly always about the financial bottom line”, said Andreas Missbach (Berne Declaration).

While the majority of the Berne Declaration focussed their efforts on the Public Eye on Davos, two representatives were present at the opening of the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre as a demonstration of solidarity between the organisations in their search for “alternatives to a globalisation dominated by business interests”. Additionally, the Public Eye maintained close contact with the WSF and Marcelo Lucca, the WSF ambassador in Davos.

Despite that organisers of the Public Eye attempted to provide a meeting space for anti-WEF groups, in some senses, it fell prey to the same criticisms as the Open Forum. Most of the panellists represented large, established NGOs such as Amnesty International, Oxfam International, and Friends of the Earth International and many of the topics presented were already well-known to those in attendance: Nike's role in sweatshop labour, Union Carbide and the Bhopal disaster, corporate attempts to undermine environmental and social legislation, etc. Perhaps it was for this reason that the Public Eye failed to attract many of the demonstrators present at the Saturday protest. Though the presentations were, in general, very well researched and organised, the topics were already familiar to the younger, anti-globalisation movement, and the presentations were perhaps a big 'square' to meet their demands. Despite some excellent panellists such as those speaking on the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Pipeline Project and Corporate Public Relations strategies, the ambience of the Public Eye seemed unenthusiastic and isolated from the WEF events, and lacked the enthusiasm of other counter-forum events such as the protest and the World Social Forum.

THE PROTEST:

In contrast to previous years when WEF protests were banned from Davos, this year, a public demonstration against the WEF was authorised. Despite the official approval, though, many of the demonstrators were disappointed at the conditions placed upon the protest: bags to be searched on trains, systematic photographing, and identification checks at all waypoints into Davos. Worried that such intense security measures would allow police to complete their 'black list' of protestors, protest organisers seriously considered cancelling the protest in Davos, threatening acts of civil disobedience and protests in other cities instead.

Security was indeed tight. In the days leading up to the protest, one hundred foreign protesters, considered "known dangers" and black-listed by Swiss police, were informed that their access into Switzerland, for the duration of the WEF, was denied. In addition, the Schengen accord, the law governing the free flow of people across national borders between certain European countries, was suspended.

The “Social Express”, a special chartered train bringing demonstrators from Geneva, Lausanne, and Zurich, was also prevented from reaching Davos by police, reneging the agreements made earlier by police agreeing to allow the train through to Davos. The Anti-WEF Coalition expressed their frustration at this, calling it a “dangerous precedent” and David Bohner, from the Olten Alliance, questioned the legality of such an act, claiming, “Everybody has the right to attend an authorised protest”. Others still laughed at the notion that the WEF was focussed on “Building Trust” and establishing dialogue while forcefully preventing demonstrators from attending an authorised event.

Throughout the afternoon, demonstrators gathered in Parsennplatz, reflecting a wide array of perspectives, but united in their opposition to the WEF. As the crowd grew, it gathered around the main tent on “Carlo Giuliani Platz” (dedicated to the Italian demonstrator who died in a clash with police during the G8 summit in Genoa) where IndyMedia had set up their technological base camp and where flyers and other information were distributed. Protest slogans such as, “Rights for People, Rules for Big Business”, “No Justice, No Peace”, “We want trees, not Bush”, “Zapata Vive, la Lucha Sigue” and “No Blood for Oil” could be heard. Banners were strung around the perimeter of the Platz while groups danced, chanted, drank, and waited for the “Social Express”.

The most visible group at the protest was the Swiss Syndicat Industrie & Batiment (SIB) with several hundred of their union members waving red flags and the union leaders calling out to the crowd to demonstrate against liberalisation and privatisation, claiming that the “private meetings inside the WEF have no democratic legitimacy”, so this protest is directed against the “undemocratic nature of the WEF and its economic policies that lead to poverty, hunger, and an increasing destruction of natural resources” as well as to the “warmongers who participate in the WEF and who are preparing for war against Iraq”. “We, the SIB, are in solidarity with the growing movement of those pursuing the globalisation of social justice”.

Amidst the red flags of the SIB were other groups ranging from a small delegation of the FZLN of Mexico, to the MLKP of Turks and Kurds, a small bunch of oil spill birds carrying white egg placards asking for the end of the oil economy, and another group, dressed as monkeys with President Bush masks, and carrying clubs which they used to 'beat on the world.' Other groups, including VPOD/SMUV, Greenpeace, the Basler Appell gegen Biotechnologie, Comedia, SolidariteS, the Theologische Bewegung fur Solidaritat und Befreiung, and Resos carried more conventional banners. Others carried signs saying, "Remember Ghandi" and another group carried a life-size golden replica of a Hindu cow through the masses. Within the crowd of nearly 1500, most of the protestors were between the ages of 18-35 with the majority of them coming from the German-speaking part of Switzerland.

When it became clear that the Social Express had been blockaded in Landquart, the group decided to split into two with half (most notably the SIB) catching the train to join the others in Landquart and the other half deciding to march to the Kongressentrum, home of the WEF. While some of those reaching Landquart were involved with clashes with the police (tear gas and rubber bullets were used on the demonstrators), others went on to Berne where more serious confrontations took place at the Reitschule, an important centre for leftist activities.

While the protestors were gathering, riot police on the streets prepared water cannons to be used in case the demonstration got "out of hand", or, as one police officer put it, it they "make too much noise". Other police, fearing an attack of violent protestors, wished for sub-zero temperatures to keep the protest away. The belief that "protesters come here to fight with the police on purpose," indicates what could be seen as police prejudice toward the demonstration and the success of what activists call "attempts to demonise the anti-corporate globalisation movement, portray it as violent, and disregard our critique of the status quo."

Meanwhile, the protestors remaining in Davos wound through the streets, chanting and waving placards, and eventually gathering in front of the Rathaus on the main Promenade. At this point, a small group of five or six protestors attempted to break into

the building, smashing the glass of the front doors—the only violence or damage that took place. The overwhelming majority of the protestors immediately ‘boo-ed’ the action, expressing their disgust with the use of violence. From here, the protest split—some going home, others leaving for Landquart. For photos of the days events, please see Appendix C.

NGO PERSPECTIVES:

Between the protest and the Public Eye on Davos conference, a number of NGOs and other organisations were present to voice their concerns about the WEF. Though the groups varied widely from radical, anti-capitalist, ‘smash the WEF’ types to those pushing for more moderate reforms, the groups were nearly universally united in their opposition to a war in Iraq and the dominance of the United States in the global political arena. Other areas of convergence included the end of environmental degradation, the improvement of global working conditions, and a globalisation of social justice and opportunity in place of exploitation and poverty. Other topics of concern included the following:

- Anti-Capitalism
- Anti-War
- Capitalism
- Child Labour
- Corporate Accountability
- Corporate Social Responsibility
- Culture
- Economic and Social Rights
- Environmental Issues
- Fair Trade
- Foreign Investment
- Genetic Technology
- Globalisation
- Green Labelling
- Indigenous Rights
- Intellectual Property
- Labour Issues
- Multinational Corporations
- Multinational Trade Agreements
- Peace-building
- Pesticides
- Population and Migration
- Public Services
- Socialism
- Sustainable Production & Consumption
- Sweatshops
- Transparency
- Water Rights & Privatisation
- Women in Development
- WTO/MAI/NAFTA

Though many NGOs and organisations held similar view on many issues, there were still distinct differences among them. For a brief overview of some of the organisations' views and demands, please see the attached Appendix D.

OUTCOMES:

REPORTS AND DECLARATIONS:

During the Public Eye on Davos conference, a number of press conferences and public declarations were made. A coalition of the Reform the World Bank Campaign, Friends of the Earth International, and the Berne Declaration held a press conference highlighting the importance of corporate social responsibility and corporate accountability being 'standardised' through the establishment of binding legislation that outlines specific commitments to environmental and social principles. In the Press Conference, the speakers explained that it was not Enron and Arthur Anderson that led to the erosion of public faith and a growing distrust of big business, but rather, the loss occurred much earlier. In order to regain the public's faith, big business will have to not only implement binding legislation, but also admit their responsibilities for their failures in the past.

Also during the press conference, the same trio of NGOs announced the launch of the "Collevecchio Declaration on Financial Institutions and Sustainability". Michelle Chan of Friends of the Earth USA explained how, "Flying below the public's radar screen, private banks and investors have been helping underwrite some of the world's most environmentally destructive projects such as the Three Gorges Dam in China". She argued that, "as more people know about this, the public will increasingly hold financiers responsible through tried and true tools such as exercising consumer choice, engaging in stakeholder activism, and pressuring politicians to reform government regulations."

The Collevecchio Declaration outlines the "unique role and responsibility the financial sector has in advancing sustainability". The declaration points to both the role of banks as financiers of unsustainable projects as well as the need for companies to "put profits before people" and "actively promote international economic policies that do the same".

The Declaration outlines six principles that financial institutions should embrace: a commitment to sustainability, to “do no harm”, to responsibility, to accountability, to transparency, and to sustainable markets and governance. An accompanying Implementation Document outlines the immediate steps financial institutions can take for credit, investing, and underwriting transactions. Drafted in Collevocchio, Italy, the Declaration represents the demands of a group of international activists campaigning on banks such as ABN-Amro, Morgan Stanley Dean Witter, Union Bank of Switzerland, Credit Suisse, West LB, Barclays, and Citigroup.

Also released in the days before the WEF/Public Eye forums was a report issued by AFL-CIO, Amnesty International USA, EarthRights International, Friends of the Earth US, Global Exchange, Oxfam America, Sierra Club, and the Working Group on the Community Right to Know. In this report, the coalition declares that “building trust requires disclosure” and highlights US multinationals’ shameful human rights, environmental and labour records. The report, entitled “International Right to Know: Empowering Communities Through Corporate Transparency” documents the “irresponsible environmental, labour, and human rights practices committed by ExxonMobil, Nike, McDonalds, Unocal, Doe Ron, Freeport McMoran, and Newmont Mining and calls on American businesses to demonstrate their leadership and commitment to building trust by disclosing the same kind of information for their operations abroad that is required here in the US.

“Globalisation has brought on a ‘race to the bottom’ as US businesses scramble to relocate to countries with the weakest environmental and labour standards. We need to ensure that when companies choose to take the low road, they can’t hide it”, states Jason Mark (Global Exchange). Stephen Mills, director of Sierra Club’s International Programme adds, “Our corporations are America’s most visible ambassadors abroad, and too often they’ve secretly represented the worst, not the best, of America”. According to Paul Orum Working Group on Community Right to Know), another contributor to the report, “Information is the first step in ensuring the health and safety of communities and families and these disclosure standards are the right way to go. Communities overseas

should have access to the same information when US companies set up facilities in their backyards”.

WEF ‘HIGHLIGHTS’

Over the course of the World Economic Forum, several events of global significance took place. Behind the closed doors of the Official Forum, the following informal agreements were forged and the following announcements were made.

Klaus Schwab, Founder and President of the WEF, while acknowledging that “Davos is the place where business and other stakeholders of global society work together to make the world a better place” also admitted that, “Never before in the 33-year history of the WEF has the situation in the world been as fragile, as complex, and as dangerous as this year.”

Peruvian President Alejandro Toledo advised participants inside the WEF to “listen to the voices of the protestors” and to “begin building a bridge to those who are attending the WSF”. The President of Tanzania echoed this, pushing for “the end of asymmetrical power relations between north and south”, and stating, “It is already too clear that poor economies, and the poor within all economies, will pay the highest price—that is not right, and that does not have to be the case.”

Businesses operating in Africa pledged to practice “good corporate governance” and agreed to the signing of four voluntary civic commitments: Business Covenant on Corporate Governance, the Business Declaration on Corporate Responsibility, the Business Covenant on the Elimination of Corruption and Bribery, the Business Declaration on Accounting and Audit Practices. These agreements attempted to consolidate the commitments made last September at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg.

US Secretary of State Colin Powell seemingly criticised the WEF, alluding to the growing dissatisfaction with the American plan for unilateral action against Iraq, when he said, “What we can do as one nation is nothing compared to what we can do if we can all unite”.

H.M. Queen Rania of Jordan spoke of closing the “hope gaps” for the most vulnerable, referring to citizens of the West Bank, Afghanistan, and other places, urging participants to form a “peaceline” to connect communities, bringing benefits to regions in conflict and underdevelopment. “Unlike finite resources like water and oil,” she explained, “the resources of peace, opportunity, and tolerance are never empty”.

The Global Fund to Fight Aids announces the scope of the global AIDS problem, stating, “Nothing in recorded human history comes close to AIDS” and adding that “the world just hasn’t realized how affected it is by the pandemic which is already worse than the Black Death and will not peak for decades”. In response to the crisis, the Fund asked for \$6 billion US more to continue their work on AIDS/HIV. Despite overwhelming tension concerning the Iraq situation, the Fund appealed to WEF participants to not direct all of their attention to international tension. Spokesperson Bill Clinton also addressed the participants, asking for increased support for the AIDS/HIV campaign.

Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamed called for a “compromise solution” to the crisis over Iraq, arguing that war would only lead to more revenge and retaliation. He warned Americans of the consequences of fighting terrorism like a terrorist. His concern was echoed by Pascal Couchepin, President of the Swiss Confederation: “The use of force can only be the last resort after all other means of persuasion are exhausted.”

Kenneth Roth, the Executive Director of Human Rights Watch, was applauded for his critical remarks on the US rejection of international legal norms of human rights, referring, in particular, to its treatment of participants in the Afghan conflict. He cautioned this approach, arguing that it is likely to undermine support for its campaign against terrorism.

The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation announced a \$200 million grant for continuing research on AIDS, malaria, and other diseases affecting developing countries. The funds, to be used in partnership with the National Institute of Health, are earmarked for “overcoming scientific roadblocks” and “critical scientific challenges in global health”.

Brazilian President Luis Inacio Lula da Silva, in attempt to build a bridge between Porto Alegre and Davos, pushed for better communication between the WSF and the WEF. “The most fantastic thing,” he said to the WEF participants, “is that I’m going back to the WSF and my comrades will notice that you haven’t taken a bite out of me.” Nor have I taken a bite out of you. I think there is some room for us to get together to talk.” Lula also used the WEF as an international platform to announce his proposed World Agreement for Peace and Against Hunger—an international anti-hunger fund for developing countries.

Pharmacia Corp. announced its agreement with a non-profit Dutch group to allow generic drug producers to sell cheaper versions of its AIDS drug, “Delavirdine”, in the developing world.

CONCLUSION: THE FUTURE OF DAVOS

Though both the Public Eye and the protest were considered successes, organisers are hesitating over their strategy for next year. “Clearly,” says Matthias Herfeldt, “the future is with the World Social Forum [in Porto Alegre], not in Davos—but there is still an important role to play for NGOs protesting at the WEF.” Calling attention to what he calls the “unmatched voices” present at the WEF, protesting and alternative forums can still play a crucial part in pressuring the WEF for change.

This year’s World Social Forum drew over 150 000 people from all corners of the world to collectively struggle against “economic, social, and cultural imperialism”, and to come together to discuss proposals for a more just world. The all-encompassing forum gives voice to women, men, youth, adults, farmers, fishers, indigenous people, people of all beliefs, colours, and sexual orientations who hold the belief that “another world is possible”, the theme of the WSF. With well-known guests such as Luis Inacio da Silva (also present at the WEF), Hugo Chavez, Aleida Guevara (Che’s daughter), Noam Chomsky, Evo Morales, and others, the WSF, if it manages to survive its own success, could rapidly become the dominant forum. As Ed Mayo, Director of the New Economics Foundation explains, “The WSF has so much creativity and consensus. It is wholly chaotic, but much clearer in its aims. In the long run, it is going to be more relevant than the WEF.”

APPENDIX A: PROGRAMME OF OPEN FORUM:

I. What Innovations Lead to Social and Economic Changes?

Panelists:

- Rick Aubry (Rubicon, USA)
- Javier Hurtado Mercado (Irupana Andean Organic Food—IRUPANA, Bolivia)
- Reema Nanavaty (SEWA, India)
- Adolf Ogi (Sports for Development and Peace, Switzerland)
- Gisele Yitamben (Association pour le Soutien et l'Appui a la Femme, Cameroon)
- Medard Meier (Bilanz, Switzerland), moderator

Co-organised with the Self-Employed Women's Association (SEWA)

II. How Can Business Contribute to the Global Compact?

Panelists:

- Peter Brabeck-Letmathe (Nestle, Switzerland)
- Joseph Deiss (Federal Councillor of the Economy of the Swiss Confederation)
- Samuel A. DiPiazza Jr. (PricewaterhouseCoopers, USA)
- Kenneth Roth (Human Rights Watch, USA)
- Bjorn Stigson (WBCSD)
- Lukas Schmutz (Basler Zeitung, Switzerland), moderator

Co-organised with the Swiss United Nations Association

III. Fair Trade—an Alternative?

Panelists:

- Pascal Couchepin (President of the Swiss Confederation)
- Paola Ghillani (Max Havelaar Foundation, Switzerland)
- Claude Hauser (Migros, Switzerland)
- Carlos A. Vargas (Coocafe, Costa Rica)
- Hansjorg Walter (Swiss Farmers Confederation, Switzerland)
- Ursula Hurzeler (Swiss Television, SF DRS, Switzerland), moderator

Co-organised with Max Havelaar Foundation

IV. Can Globalisation be Ethical?

Panelists:

- John Elkington (SustainAbility, United Kingdom)
- Musimi Kanyoro (YWCA, Switzerland)
- Peter Lorange (IMD International, Switzerland)
- Christoph Stuckelberger (Bread for All)
- Daniel Vasella (Novartis, Switzerland)
- Thomas Wipf (Federation of Swiss Protestant Churches)
- Stephan Klapproth (Swiss Television, SF DRS Switzerland), moderator

Co-organised with the Federation of Swiss Protestant Churches/Bread for All

V. What is the Role of Business in Areas of Turmoil?

Panelists:

- Laurent Goetschel (Swiss Peace Foundation)
- Andreas Gross (National Councillor, Switzerland)
- Rolf M. Jeker (Societe Generale de Surveillance Holding, Switzerland)
- Jakob Kellenberger (International Committee of the Red Cross, Switzerland)
- Jonathan Oppenheimer (De Beers Group of Companies, South Africa)
- Simon Taylor (Global Witness, UK)
- Esther Girsberger (Sonntagszeitung, Switzerland), moderator

Co-organised with the Swiss Peace Foundation

VI. Are Children's Rights Merely for Show?

Panelists:

- Kader Asmal (Minister of Education, South Africa)
- Bernard Boeton (Terre des Hommes Foundation, Switzerland)
- Neil Kearney (International Textile, Garment, and Leather Workers' Federation, Belgium)
- Irene Khan (Amnesty International, UK)
- Rajshree Pathy (Rajshree Group of Companies, India)
- Mary Robinson (Ethical Globalisation Initiative, USA)
- Rosanna Fuentes (Foreign Affairs, Mexico), moderator

Co-organised with the International Federation Terre Des Hommes

VII. Labour Wanted: Locals Preferred

Panelists:

- Wolfgang Auwarter-Kuhn (Kuhn Rikon, Switzerland)
- Didier J. Cherpitel (International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies—IFRC, Switzerland)
- Susan F. Martin (Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University, USA)
- Brunson McKinley (International Organisation for Migration—IOM, Switzerland)
- Govindasamy Rajasekaran (Malaysian Trade Union Congress, Malaysia)
- Rene Rhinow (Swiss Red Cross)
- Hannes Britschgi (Facts, Switzerland), moderator

Co-organised with the Swiss Red Cross

APPENDIX B: PROGRAMME OF PUBLIC EYE ON DAVOS:

Opening Ceremony

Keynote Speech: Oskar Lafontaine, former Minister of Finance, Germany

Corporate Accountability: Binding Rules for Big Business

Panelists:

- Meena Raman (SAM/Friends of the Earth Malaysia)
- Mark Malloch Brown (UNDP, Switzerland)
- Hans Engelberts (Public Services International, France)
- Patricia Hewett (Secretary of State for Trade and Industry, UK)

Corporate PR Strategies

Panelists:

- Peter Eigen (Transparency International, Germany)
- Ganesh Nochur (Greenpeace India)
- Isabela Figueroa (Rainforest Foundation, USA)
- Irene Khan (Amnesty International)

The Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Oil Pipeline

Panelists:

- Ketji Gujaraidze (Green Alternative for the Georgian Republic)
- Antonio Tricarico (Reform the World Bank Campaign, Italy)
- Richard Howitt (Labour Member of European Parliament, UK)
- Lord Brown (BP, UK)

Impacts of Globalisation on Switzerland: cutbacks in public services?

Panelists:

- Christiane Brunner (Social Democratic Party, Switzerland)
- Daniel Lampart (Green Party, Switzerland)
- Alessandro Pelizzari (Attac, Switzerland)
- Doris Schuepp (Swiss Union for Public Services)

Globalisation and Labour Rights

Panelists:

- Phil Knight (Nike, USA)
- Tim Connor (NikeWatch, Oxfam Community Aid Abroad, Australia)
- Rustam Aksam (FSPTSK union, PT Doson, Indonesia) not present
- Ida Mustari (former employee of PT Doson, Indonesia)
- Yeheskiel Prabowo (FSPTSK union, PT Doson, Indonesia)

APPENDIX D: OVERVIEW OF SOME NGO PERSPECTIVES:

OLTEN ALLIANCE: This alliance of leftists, Christians, independents, pacifists anarchists, greens, anti-imperialists, feminists, communists, grassroots groups, parties, unions, NGOs, and all people in solidarity with global movements protesting the WEF, consider the forum “completely illegitimate and with the only purpose of increasing the profits of the large corporations”. Additionally, they reject a war with Iraq and consider that neo-liberalism, the basis of the WEF, threatens public services, undermines local agriculturalists, and increases the number of ‘working poor’ and is responsible for the ever-increasing waste of resources, poverty, and hunger on the planet. They declare that the “self-proclaimed global leaders consider war as a legitimate political tool”, whereas, “we advocate protest and acts of civil disobedience to shatter the silence imposed by the WEF and we ask the Swiss Confederation to leave the soldiers in the barracks—the army has no place among the demonstrators”. The Olten Alliance protested in favour of the extension of social and economic rights for all, in place of their dismantling and privatisation; the guaranteed access to food and basic health care; the end of all military interventions and the abolition of the “right to intervene” of the industrialized countries in the name of “civilizing values” or “national interests”; the right for all populations in all countries to democratic self-determination and control over their resource base; the cancellation of developing countries’ debt; freedom of movement

BASLER APPELL GEGEN GENTECHNOLOGIE: This group protested for the preservation of diversity of species and quality of life in an intact environment, free of gene technology; for a fairer world, free of patented goods; for a more humane world with ethically justifiable medicine and research; against the genetic manipulation of foods, against “patenting life”.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL: At the WEF, Amnesty declared its concern for the security of protestors, asking federal and cantonal authorities to “ensure that the right to peaceful demonstration is observed and that international human rights standards are fully observed during the policing operations”. Irene Khan stated, “Swiss authorities have a responsibility to ensure the safety and security of WEF participants, as well as of demonstrators, local inhabitants, and property” as well as to “ensure that people are able to exercise peacefully their rights to freedom of assembly and expression” without being subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention. During one WEF session, when Irene Khan asked US Secretary of State Colin Powell if he was ready to justify provoking a “massive humanitarian and human rights catastrophe” by declaring war against Iraq, she received hearty applause from the audience.

BERNE DECLARATION: The BD expressed concern about Nestle’s participation in the UN Global Compact, especially considering its past behaviour in Ethiopia, Colombia, and Brazil. It is also dissatisfied that the nine principles outlined in the agreement are only voluntary. They claim that Nestle fails to support even the principles of the UNGC, questioning its use of the UN symbol as a strategy for “bluewashing”. They claim that if Nestle were “really concerned about the well-being of the planet, it should go beyond self-regulation and move towards an international effort to establish regulations and democratic control of MNCs”.

FRIENDS OF THE EARTH INTERNATIONAL: FOE aimed to put forward an alternative view about the impacts of economic globalisation, the role of corporations in sustainable development, and to pose questions about justice, democracy, and transparency. “We have come to ask who are the winners and who are the losers in the global casino and to ask in whose interests the WEF is acting and how. High on our list this year will be to ask both companies and government representatives meeting in Davos what they intend to do in taking forward decisions reached at the Jo’burg Earth Summit last September. In particular, we will be asking what action will be taken to give effect to the UN commitment to ‘actively promote corporate responsibility and accountability’”,

said one FOE spokesperson. He contended that, “if WEF participants are serious about building trust, then they must be serious about the actions that need to be taken as a matter of urgency to make companies accountable to their stakeholders and the people they impact, now and for the future”. “Multinational companies involved in the WEF are abusing their economic power and political influence when they meet with politicians and government officials behind closed doors during the annual meeting in Davos” , said FOE Chair Ricardo Navarro. FOE is advocating a UN convention that outlining the specific legal responsibilities on social and environmental issues for corporations, recognized by the UN and the ILO. The FOE explained their attendance at WSF as essential for ‘movement building’ and vital to formulate alternatives to neo-liberal economic globalisation policies.

ANTI-WTO COORDINATION: The Anti-WTO Coordination criticised the WEF for representing “the anachronic protopatriarchal capitalist institution” responsible for promoting neoliberalism for the last 20 years and for being the most important institution that cleared the way for the creation of the WTO. They believe that “the system cannot be reformed or simply humanized” and it is “not possible to discuss with the WEF, the WTO, or the G8—it must be destroyed”. “We must fight also against the repressive authoritarian system that protects this barbaric social order.” The basic beliefs of the Anti-WTO struggle for an alternative future are as follows: self determination, autonomy, and the re-appropriation of rights, public space, wealth, wants, and time. They fear that international corporations present at the WEF are “taking control over every aspect of life—what we eat (GMOs), what we breath (pollution from the destruction of resources), what we learn (the privitisation of the education system), our health (privitised medicine, worker conditions), breakdown of society (North South inequalities, the prostitution of women and children, the loss of women’s rights, violence against lesbians and homosexuals, the pillage of resources in the South for the benefit of corporations in the North, the end of civil liberties (video surveillance, etc.)”. Concerning their frequent association with radical measures, one member of the anti-WTO group explains, “The real violence is American, with their missiles and their

planes. Breaking a window is only symbolic violence”. Their call to action: “Don’t hesitate to jump on the train of resistance!”

CAMPAGNA PER LA RIFORMA DELLA BANCA MONDIALE: The Reform the World Bank Campaign announced their criticism of the WEF, where politicians and bankers have “not had the courage to table a concrete and credible proposal to initiate an open debate leading to negotiations among all stakeholders, including a broad range of civil society groups, on a framework of sustainability rules for financial institutions.” They also criticized the WEF for “hijacking noble terms such as ‘ethics’ and ‘trust’”, and for refusing to focus on the underlying causes of such deep mistrust. As a result, they reject the “adocracy” that has characterized the debate on regulations and call for the creation of a level playing field based on highly internationally recognized standards for sustainability. They present a challenge to big banks and investors who are key players in backing companies and their operations and share a responsibility in corporate and accounting scandals that have eroded trust in the capital markets with the Collevocchio Declaration and believe that this “forms the basis for the beginning of a credible and open debate with all stakeholders, including civil society, on financing environmental sustainability and social justice.”

WIPE OUT WEF/ANTI WEF COORDINATION: The WOW/Anti-WEF organisation considers the WEF the “meeting of the richest MNCs and government bureaucrats to discuss ways of making oppression and exploitation more efficient and more profitable.” They argue that, though the WEF claims its mission is to help “eradicate poverty, promote security, and enhance cultural understanding”, it is more a representation of the interests of multinationals such as Microsoft, Coca Cola, Nestle, Shell, and hundreds more. They view the WEF as “another attempt to minimize the social and political rights in favour of the benefit of capital owners” and argue that “previous summits have shown that a critical public is not welcome—state authorities protect the economy bosses and politicians with every method available (legal and illegal) and try to suppress every critic”. Claiming that the WEF is impossible to reform and that dialogue with it is not

possible, they claim, “our attitude toward it is confrontational” and “we aim is to smash the WEF and to prevent their meetings.” They view the WEF as only one specific institution of the “capitalistic system of exploitation which we disapprove of completely”. “Our protest does not end with a smashed WEF, our fight is against capitalism which cannot be civilized—its own logic and rules, together with other forms of oppression like sexism, racism, homophobia, anti-Semitism, characterize the injustice of our world”. When asked about the vagueness of their position on violence, one member asked the media whether or not they posed the same question to WEF members, “Ask Colin Powell if he’s a pacifist... We’ve been authorized to protest!”

APPENDIX E: PARTIAL LIST OF ORGANISATIONS PRESENT

- Aktion Finanzplatz Schweiz (AFP)/Action Place Financiere Suisse
- Asociación Latinoamericana de Organizaciones de Promoción
- Basler Appell gegen Gentechnologie
- Colonialismo
- Corporate Europe Observatory
- Erklärung von Berne (Berne Declaration)
- Focus on the Global South
- Friends of the Earth International (FoEI)
- Greenpeace International
- Helvetas
- International South Group Network
- Internationale Vereinigung für Natürliche Wirtschaftsordnung (INWO)
- Oltner Buendis (Olten Alliance)
 - Swiss Members:
 - Anti-WTO Koordination Bern
 - 1-Mai-Komitee Zürich
 - Alternative Liste AL, Zürich
 - Attac Schweiz (Attac Switzerland)
 - CaBi Antirassismus-Treff St. Gallen
 - Comedia - Region Bern/Oberwallis
 - Comedia - Region Zürich/Ostschweiz
 - Comité pour l'Annulation de la Dette du Tiers-Monde
 - DADAvos
 - Direkte Solidarität mit Chiapas
 - Grüne - Les Verts, Schweiz
 - Grünes Bündnis Bern
 - Grüne Davos
 - Infoladen Reitschule Bern/Autonome Volxbibliothek
 - Interessengemeinschaft Kulturraum Reitschule (IKuR) Bern
 - INWO Schweiz
 - Junge Alternative JA!, Bern
 - Juso Schweiz
 - Juso Bern Stadt
 - Komkar, ArbeiterInnenverein aus Kurdistan, Zürich
 - Kommunistische Partei Kurdistans (KKP)
 - Kurdisch-türkisch-schweizerischer Kulturverein (Kutüsch), Bern
 - kraftfeld
 - Neue PdA Basel
 - NEUE WEGE - Zeitschrift des Religiösen Sozialismus
 - Ökumenische Kommission Gerechtigkeit, Frieden und Bewahrung der Schöpfung (GFS)
 - der Arbeitsgemeinschaft Christlicher Kirchen Appenzell / St. Gallen (ACK)
 - Partei der Arbeit der Schweiz (PdAS)

- Partito della Rifondazione Comunista Svizzera
- phase 1
- PSK, Sozialistische Partei Kurdistan, Zürich
- Religiös-Sozialistische Vereinigung der Deutschschweiz
Service Civil International, Schweiz
- SMUV Region Bern
- Solidarités - Genève
- SOLIFONDS
- Sozialistische Alternative/Solidarität, Basel
- Theologische Bewegung für Solidarität und Befreiung
- WWF svizzera italiana
- Zentralamerika-Sekretariat Zürich

International Members :

- AK Internationalismus München
 - attac freiburg (Deutschland)
 - IFIR - International Federation of Irani Refugees
 - MLKP
 - The Sudanese Communist Party
 - Sudanese Youth Union
-
- Oxfam Community Aid Abroad
 - PR Watch
 - Pro Natura (Friends of the Earth Switzerland)
 - SIB (Syndicat Industrie & Bâtiment)
 - Skat Foundation
 - Tebtebba Foundation
 - Wipe Out WEF!
 - Women in Development Europe (WIDE)
 - World Development Movement

APPENDIX F: PARTIAL LIST OF INDIVIDUALS

- Adolf Ogi (Sports for Development and Peace, Switzerland)
- Alessandro Pelizzari (Attac, Switzerland)
- Andreas Gross (National Councillor, Switzerland)
- Andreas Missbach (Berne Declaration)
- Antonio Tricarico (Campagna per la riforma della Banca Mondiale)
- Bernard Boeton (Terre des Hommes Foundation, Switzerland)
- Bjorn Stigson (WBCSD)
- Bobby Peak (Groundwork, Friends of the Earth South Africa)
- Bruce McKinley (International Organisation for Migration--IOM)
- Brunson McKinley (International Organisation for Migration—IOM, Switzerland)
- Carlos A. Vargas (Coocafe, Costa Rica)
- Christiane Brunner (Social Democratic Party, Switzerland)
- Christoph Stuckelberger (Bread for All)
- Claude Hauser (Migros, Switzerland)
- Claudio Buess (Berne Declaration)
- Daniel Lampart (Green Party, Switzerland)
- Daniel Vasella (Novartis, Switzerland)
- Didier J. Cherpitel (International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies—IFRC, Switzerland)
- Doris Schuepp (Swiss Union for Public Services)
- Esther Girsberger (Sonntagszeitung, Switzerland)
- Ganesh Nochur (Greenpeace India)
- Gisele Yitamben (Association pour le Soutien et l'Appui a la Femme, Cameroon)
- Govindasamy Rajasekaran (Malaysian Trade Union Congress, Malaysia)
- Hannes Britschgi (Facts, Switzerland)
- Hans Engelberts (Public Services International, France)
- Hansjorg Walter (Swiss Farmers Confederation, Switzerland)
- Ida Mustari (former employee of PT Doston, Indonesia)
- Irene Khan (Amnesty International, UK)
- Isabela Figueroa (Rainforest Foundation, USA)
- Jakob Kellenberger (International Committee of the Red Cross, Switzerland)
- Javier Hurtado Mercado (Irupana Andean Organic Food—IRUPANA, Bolivia)
- Jérôme Faessler (Attac-Genève)
- John Elkington (SustainAbility, United Kingdom)
- Jonathan Oppenheimer (De Beers Group of Companies, South Africa)
- Joseph Deiss (Federal Councillor of the Economy of the Swiss Confederation)
- Jules Peck (WWF UK)
- Kader Asmal (Minister of Education, South Africa)
- Kenneth Roth (Human Rights Watch, USA)
- Ketji Gujaraidye (Green Alternative for the Georgian Republic)
- Laura Miller (PR Watch)
- Laurent Goetschel (Swiss Peace Foundation)
- Lord Browne (BP, UK) invited, but not present

- Lukas Schmutz (Basler Zeitung, Switzerland)
- Magda Barros Biavaschi (WSF Ambassador)
- Marcelo Lucca (Ibero-American Institute for Economic and Social Vigilance/WSF Ambassador)
- Marianne Hochuli (Berne Declaration)
- Mark Malloch Brown (UNDP, Switzerland)
- Mary Robinson (Ethical Globalisation Initiative, USA)
- Matt Phillips (Friends of the Earth EWNI, UK)
- Matthias Herfeldt (Berne Declaration)
- Medard Meier (Bilanz, Switzerland)
- Meena Raman (SAM/Friends of the Earth Malaysia)
- Michelle Chan-Fishel (Friends of the Earth USA)
- Miriam Behrens (Pro Natura—Friends of the Earth Switzerland)
- Musimi Kanyoro (YWCA, Switzerland)
- Neil Kearney (International Textile, Garment, and Leather Workers' Federation, Belgium)
- Paola Ghillani (Max Havelaar Foundation, Switzerland)
- Pascal Couchepin (President of the Swiss Confederation)
- Patricia Hewett (Secretary of State for Trade and Industry, UK)
- Paul de Clerck (Milieudefensie/Friends of the Earth Holland)
- Peter Brabeck-Letmathe (Nestle, Switzerland)
- Peter Eigen (Transparency International, Germany)
- Peter Lorange (IMD International, Switzerland)
- Phil Knight (Nike, USA)
- Philip Jennings (Union Network International)
- Rajshree Pathy (Rajshree Group of Companies, India)
- Reema Nanavaty (SEWA, India)
- Regula Renschler (Radio DRS, Switzerland)
- Rene Rhinow (Swiss Red Cross)
- Richard Howitt (Labour Member of European Parliament, UK)
- Rick Aubry (Rubicon, USA)
- Rolf M. Jeker (Societe Generale de Surveillance Holding, Switzerland)
- Rossana Fuentes (Foreign Affairs, Mexico)
- Rustam Aksam (FSPTSK union, PT Doson, Indonesia) invited, but not present
- Samuel A. DiPiazza Jr. (PricewaterhouseCoopers, USA)
- Simon Taylor (Global Witness, UK)
- Stephan Klapproth (Swiss Television, SF DRS, Switzerland)
- Susan F. Martin (Institute for the Study of International Migration, USA)
- Thomas Wipf (Federation of Swiss Protestant Churches)
- Tim Connor (NikeWatch, Oxfam Community Aid Abroad, Australia)
- Tony Juniper (Friends of the Earth International)
- Tshambalala Msimang (Minister of Health, South Africa)
- Ursula Hurzeler (Swiss Television, SF DRS, Switzerland)
- Wolfgang Auwarter-Kuhn (Kuhn Rikon, Switzerland)
- Yeheskiel Prabowo (FSPTSK union, PT Doson, Indonesia)