

**Report**

C|A|S|I|N

# The European Social Forum at 3: Facing Old Challenges to Go Forward

**November 2004**

Julian Lee  
Geneva, Switzerland

**Programme on NGOs & Civil Society**

Centre for Applied Studies in International Negotiations  
Centre d'études appliquées de la négociation internationale

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>C A S I N</b></p>	
<p><b>Centre for Applied Studies in International Negotiations</b>  Av. de la Paix 7 bis  C.P. 1340  1211 Geneva 1  Switzerland</p> <p>T +41 22 730 8660  F +41 22 730 8690  E <a href="mailto:casinfo@casin.ch">casinfo@casin.ch</a>  W <a href="http://casin.ch">casin.ch</a></p>	<p><b>Julian Lee</b>, Research &amp; Training Associate, prepared this report for the CASIN's Programme on NGOs and Civil Society.</p> <p><b>The Programme on NGOs and Civil Society</b>  Worldwide, the role of civil society has been increasing at rapid speed. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have become significant and influential players and generate much interest. Created in 1986, the Programme on Non-Governmental Organizations and Civil Society aims at contributing towards a better understanding of NGOs and the solutions of complex and conflictive societal problems involving NGOs.</p> <p>The opinions expressed in this paper reflect only those of the author and not those of the institutions to which he/she is or was affiliated.</p> <p>Copyright CASIN, © November 2004</p>

## Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2
<b>The Social Forum Movement</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Motto</b>	<b>3</b>
EUROPEAN SOCIAL FORUM, PART III: LONDON 2004	3
<b>Financing</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Participants</b>	<b>3</b>
Marginalized Groups	4
AGENDA	4
<b>Cross-Issue Character</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Condemning Warfare: The Concluding Demonstration</b>	<b>5</b>
THE POLITICS OF A HETEROGENEOUS MOVEMENT	5
<b>The Lead-Up to ESF 2004</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Horizontals vs. Verticals</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Reform, Revolution, or Autonomy?</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Unions and the Social Forum Movement: A Marriage of Convenience?</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Autonomous Spaces</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Protest Methods</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Does a Social Forum Need Outputs?</b>	<b>11</b>
MEDIA COVERAGE: SUFFERING FROM A LOSS OF NOVELTY?	12
THE FUTURE OF THE MOVEMENT	13
<b>Mobilizations</b>	<b>13</b>
G8 Summit, Perthshire, Scotland, July 2005	13
European Council, Brussels, Belgium, March 2005	13
<b>Major Challenges: Policy Success, Rhetoric and a “Pedagogy of Struggle”</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Opportunities: Political Representation and Engagement</b>	<b>14</b>
CONCLUSIONS	15
ANNEX 1: ESF CHARTER OF PRINCIPLES	16
ANNEX 2: THE CALL OF THE ASSEMBLY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS	18
ANNEX 3: REGISTERED ORGANIZATIONS	21
ANNEX 4: AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS	23

ANNEX 5: LIST OF ACRONYMS

26

ANNEX 4: GLOSSARY

27

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Social fora have become one of the most significant civil society events in history. The third European Social Forum (ESF) is one in a series of many small and large such processes. Although this year's ESF was significantly smaller than previous editions due to comparatively low levels of government funding, it still mobilized some 20,000 participants from across Europe. Most of the participants and speakers seemed to come from the United Kingdom, France, Italy and Spain, while Eastern Europeans, Scandinavians and Germans were relatively underrepresented.

Somewhat dominated by the Iraq agenda, the Forum still managed to cover a wide range of topics. Although this makes it somewhat of a mystery to some outside observers, the variety of issues represents one of the strengths of the movement, as it allows activists to unite across causes. This cannot mask the divides within the movement, however. "Horizontals" charge that the ESF has become too hierarchical, whereas "Verticals" don't see enough results coming out of the Fora and strive for more effective, vertical structures. Horizontals created several "Autonomous Spaces" in parallel with the Social Forum this year to hold meetings independently in response to the heavy criticism of the organizational process leading up to the ESF. Although these spaces had existed at previous Social Fora, this was the first time were set up without consultation with the formal ESF.

The movement faces several challenges going forward if it wants to continue its popularity and existence. These include the need to move away from ritual condemnations, to overcome the divide between Horizontals and Verticals in the organization of Social Fora, the ability to pronounce clear, unambiguous messages for the outside world, and to find ways of making the struggle a daily habit for more people. Most of all, it will need to see the real policy successes that have so far eluded it.

At the same time, opportunities exist for the movement. This year's ESF saw significant trade union involvement. Elements of the two movements perceive mutual advantages to be had from closer cooperation, although this view is by no means universal. No less controversial is the political representation of the movement, which is finding expression in far-left political parties across Europe.

## INTRODUCTION

In what has by now almost become a ritualistic gathering, the broad European Left gathered in London from October 15 to 17 for the third European Social Forum (ESF)<sup>1</sup>. This year's edition was significantly smaller than the previous fora in Florence (2002) and Paris (2003). Nevertheless, it brought together some 20,000 people in the north of London under the motto "Another World is Possible". Issues under debate ranged from asbestos control to migrants' rights, but the dominant theme this year was the Iraq occupation. As any political event of this magnitude, the Forum was full of internal contradictions, and not without conflict. In part as a result of this, it was the breeding ground for some important developments in the social movement scene, which this paper will explore.

### The Social Forum Movement

Born out of the Seattle WTO protests in 1999, the social forum movement first appeared on the world stage in Porto Alegre, Brazil. It was the product of an alliance between Bernard Cassen, of the French ATTAC (the Association for Taxation of Financial Transactions for the Aid of Citizens), Oded Grajew, President of ABRINQ (the Brazilian Association of Toy Manufacturers), and Francisco "Chico" Whitaker head of a Brazilian NGO association. In 2001, with the support of the ruling Brazilian Worker's Party (*Partido dos Trabalhadores*), they created the first World Social Forum (WSF), originally as a counterpoint to the World Economic Forum (WEF) in Davos.

Conceived as a "world civil society event", they intended the WSF to provide an

"open meeting place for reflective thinking, democratic debate of ideas, formulation of proposals, free exchange of experiences and interlinking for effective action, by groups and movements of civil society that are opposed to neoliberalism and to domination of the world by capital and any form of imperialism, and are committed to building a planetary society directed towards fruitful relationships among Mankind and between it and the Earth."<sup>2</sup>

The first WSF attracted some 20,000 participants, mainly from Brazil. The second Forum in 2002, welcomed 50,000 delegates, and this number grew to 100,000 in 2003, as well as at the fourth Forum, held in Mumbai.

The numerical and ideological successes of the WSFs spawned local and regional offshoots. One of the most significant ones is the ESF, which first took place in Florence in 2002, followed by Paris 2003. Both events saw some 50,000 participants each. The large number these events attract have helped make the social fora one of the most significant civil society phenomena in recent history.

---

<sup>1</sup> A list of acronyms and a glossary of terms are available in Annexes 3 & 4.

<sup>2</sup> See the WSF/ESF Charter of Principles, Annex 1.

## Motto

The movement's motto –“Another World Is Possible”– countered the fatalistic neo-liberal tenet that ‘There is no alternative’. It emerged from the somewhat misnamed ‘counter-globalization’ movement, later called ‘anti-capitalist’ or ‘social justice’. The more recent phrase, ‘a networked movement of movements’, emphasizes new social actors creating new links and practices.

## EUROPEAN SOCIAL FORUM, PART III: LONDON 2004

Although the London edition of the ESF was significantly smaller than the previous events, some 20,000 people flocked to the venue at Alexandra Palace in northern London over the course of two and a half days. In part, the smaller size can be attributed to significantly reduced government funding compared to the Paris and Florence ESFs. Despite the reduced size, many people, including London's mayor Ken Livingstone, billed the event as the biggest conference in the United Kingdom ever. According to the organizers, participants came from nearly 70 countries, and took part in over 500 meetings, listening to more than 250 speakers. Some 600 journalists followed the event. 1000 NGOs were represented at the meeting, and proceedings were facilitated by 700 volunteers, including 200 translators.

## Financing

Financial contributions from government sources were considerably less than in previous ESFs in Florence and Paris. This in part explained the smaller size of this year's ESF. The Greater London Authority (GLA) contributed £480,000, roughly one third of the overall budget of £1.4 million. In addition to the GLA, large trade unions contributed major donations towards the organizing costs, totaling some 20% of the budget. For example, the London Region chapter of UNISON (Britain's biggest trade union) contributed £50,000, and the Transport & General Workers Union donated £25,000. In part, higher registration fees than previously (ranging from £10 to 30) made up for the shortfall in government spending, and constituted the largest financial contribution to the ESF budget. These relatively high prices (registration fees in Paris ranged from € 3 to 50, depending on income) were hotly debated, as there was fear that those without the means would be unable to attend. As at past ESFs, organizers raised further funds through registration fees for each seminar (€200 in the past), and through affiliation fees (ranging from £50 - 1,500) for organizations wishing to support the organizing committee financially and morally through the Charter of Principles.

## Participants

The ca. 20,000 participants were a mix of young and old, although young people did seem to form the majority. Representatives from Great Britain, France, and Italy, Britain dominated the Forum numerically, both in the audience and on the podium, and Greeks were also heavily represented. Germans, Scandinavians, Dutch, Austrians, and particularly Eastern Europeans, on the other hand, seemed to be underrepresented relative to their population sizes. The audience was also overwhelmingly white, not representing the number of immigrants in most Western European countries.

## Marginalized Groups

Several constituencies felt that they were underrepresented at this ESF:

### YOUTH

Prior to the ESF, the Youth Forum of the Austrian Social Forum called for a self-administered and self-organized youth forum at the ESF in an effort to increase the representation of youth and increase the appeal of Social Fora to young people. There was some opposition to such a proposal, as several people felt that having separate youth spaces would simply facilitate political parties' recruitment.

### Women

Global Women's Strike and other women's organisations from more than ten countries had called for a women's day at the ESF since December 2003. The organizers controversially did not grant this wish, contrary to the Paris ESF, where several thousand people participated in the women's day. This led several women's organizations to demand an institutionalised women's day at ESFs.

### The Poor, Voiceless, Paperless

The location of this year's ESF in London, one of the most expensive cities in the world, the lack of public financing and the resulting high registration fees at the Forum, and strict British immigration rules led to the *de facto* exclusion of the poor, the identification-less and the voiceless (in French, *les sans*, literally "the without"). Therefore, many of the people whose rights the Forum purportedly fought for were not personally represented in London.

## AGENDA

As always, the range of topics at this year's ESF was extremely broad. Sessions titles ran the gamut from "Is Europe an Alternative to US Empire?", to "Women and Authority", to "The Left in the Union Movement Across Europe", to "GMO-free Zones." The Forum sees the diversity of topics and opinions as a source of strength and enrichment, as this prevents creating "moments of convergence on particular struggles" and instead "enables a process of testing different ideas in continuous debate."

Six previously agreed-on "axes" defined the program content.

- War and peace
- Democracy and fundamental rights
- Social justice and solidarity: against privatization (deregulation), for workers, social and women's rights
- Corporate globalization and global justice
- Against racism, discrimination and the far right: for equality and diversity
- Environmental crisis and sustainable society

There were some concerns that the Iraq war dominated the agenda, and that British issues drew too much attention. There were 23 sessions on the Iraq war, but only one on the European Constitution. This was certainly a function of the Forum having been held in Great



Britain, a country whose government is active in Iraq, and whose citizens are skeptical about Europe. Indeed, the French media particularly highlighted this discrepancy, reflecting the differing interests between continental Europe and the UK. However, Italian delegates to the European Assembly (the preparatory commission for each ESF), whose government is also heavily implicated in Iraq, also voiced the same discontent. They accused the organizers of being “distant from Europe” and “too preoccupied with matters in their ‘province’”.

### **Cross-Issue Character**

Les Levidow, Research Fellow at the Open University, notes that activist networks have been in search of new ways of linking their causes across issues and space. Indeed, beyond the grassroots, influential thinkers of the movement such as Susan George have explicitly called for such linkages to be made in order to increase the number of participants and therefore the effectiveness of campaigns. Mottos like “Our resistance is as global as capital”, and “Everything is connected to everything else” express the interconnectedness of the struggle. Similarly, “No Issue is Single” expresses an analysis that what is perceived as capitalist exploitation joins all facets of our lives. Successful resistance relies upon embracing issues which, on the surface, are very divergent. The anti-capitalist movement includes a whole array of visions of a different society, Levidow notes. The essence here is that, jumbled though the agenda may look to the outsider, its variety makes sense when viewed through this lens.

### **Condemning Warfare: The Concluding Demonstration**

A peaceful international demonstration from Russell Square to Trafalgar Square concluded the London ESF. Although the march’s motto was “Stop the War, No to Privatization, No to Racism: For a Europe of Peace and Social Justice,” the overwhelmingly dominant theme was centered around the war and occupation in Iraq. Coordinators claimed 70,000 participants, while police estimated between 15,000 and 20,000. Organizers had expected around 50,000 demonstrators. A large portion of the marchers seemed to be participants of the ESF. Participants carried placards denouncing George W. Bush and Tony Blair as war criminals and terrorists, calling for their resignations; Italian protestors shouted “Berlusconi terrorista”. Demands for troops to be pulled out of Iraq were also frequent.

## **THE POLITICS OF A HETEROGENEOUS MOVEMENT**

### **The Lead-Up to ESF 2004**

It appears as though it is considered a major coup for a city or organization to be able to host the ESF. The London mayor’s office campaigned for London as a venue, and the Socialist Workers Party fought hard to preserve its status as the principal organizer. This generated considerable controversy during and after the organizational run-up to the Forum. Those striving for a horizontal, non-authoritarian atmosphere criticized the organizing committee for being “un-transparent, non-participatory, and exclusionary.” Particular criticism was leveled at the “hierarchical and authoritarian” Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and Socialist Action (SA).

The disapproval came from several sides within the movement, each with its own motivations. For example, 10 major British NGOs<sup>3</sup> issued a letter to the organizers complaining that their voices were left unheard in the selection of panelists. Specifically, they were disappointed that not one representative of development NGOs featured among the speakers. The International Socialist Resistance criticized that the process of selecting speakers had “quickly become yet another race for positions, with the biggest/most vocal/richest players jockeying for speakers.” The problem was further perpetuated, according to the Swiss Social Forum, by the nature of social movements and organizations in Britain, which have a tendency to be divided and not to cooperate. This was reflected in the continued slamming of the organizing committee by the Communist Party of Great Britain. It has to be stressed, however, that many other individuals and organizations also criticized the organizers. Although the ESF’s Charter (see Appendix 1) optimistically proclaims that the ESF does “not constitute a locus of power to be disputed by the participants in its meetings”, it appears as though political jockeying did take place in the lead-up to this year’s event.

The central involvement of Mayor Ken Livingstone’s Greater London Authority (GLA) also caused apprehension. The GLA provided free public transit tickets for the first 20,000 participants to register, and the overall support of the GLA was valued at £480,000. There was substantial concern that the GLA’s involvement in financing represented a vehicle for control of the ESF. Indeed Les Levidow reported that the main organizers would often demand acceptance of certain proposals on the grounds that the GLA would otherwise withhold its funding, amounting to “political blackmail”. Several people suspected Livingstone of using the ESF as a showcase, “another platform for [his] endless appetite for publicity and re-election”. A further criticism raised at the organizers was their failure to distribute information about the planning sessions in a systematic, timely manner. As a result of critiques about organizational exclusivity and financial contributions, some activists issued calls to create “autonomous spaces” such as “Beyond the ESF”<sup>4</sup> and “The European Creative Forum”<sup>5</sup> (see below). Some 200 seminars and workshops were planned in such fora on the fringe of the ESF. Although both the organizers of the ESF and of the autonomous spaces welcomed each others’ existence and contributions in official documents, a divisive debate raged behind the scenes among some supporters of each.

None of these issues are new to the movement. The WSF 2002 already saw political contests for power in the organization which resulted in the creation of parallel events. The Mumbai WSF in 2004 also had its own alternative event, Mumbai resistance. Nonetheless, they reflect a division within the movement.

### Horizontals vs. Verticals

There are distinct differences between two groups within the Social Forum movement: Eric Decarro, former national president of the Public Service Union in Switzerland and active in the *Forum Social Lémanique* and the Swiss Social Forum, observed that, on the one hand, the “Verticals” strive for efficiency, structure, a certain degree of control, and results. Les Levidow describes this strain as being typical of leftist parties, who view mass mobilization as a precondition to persuading people to support pre-determined political demands. At the

---

<sup>3</sup> Action Aid International UK, ACTSA, Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, Jubilee Debt Campaign, Oxfam GB, Trade Justice Movement, Traidcraft, War on Want, World Development Movement

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.wombles.org.uk/auto/>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.europeancreativeforum.org/>

same time, the mobilizations provide ideal platforms for the parties to recruit members and sell party newspapers. Levidow paraphrases the description of the thinking behind the Verticals' organization by Vincenzo Ruggiero, a sociologist at Middlesex University, as follows:

“Vertical organizations have characteristics of economic enterprises and bureaucracies. Their concept of mobilization is linked with the professional efficiency that their leaders promote. The growth of the organization coincides with a greater strength of its leadership and the overall anonymous strength of its membership. As partners of an economic-type consortium, the membership provide an indirect resource, whose role is less to influence decisions than to strengthen the leadership's capacity to implement them. The verticals require a delegated participation which gives the leadership a symbolic support (and often a financial one) and strengthens their bargaining power, both public and private. Transparency and democracy will come in the future but only if they are renounced in the present. Another world may be possible, but only as a future reward for current deprivation.”

On the other hand, the “Horizontals” promote a notion of grassroots democracy that eschews hierarchies, as well as actions based on civil disobedience. This branch, according to Levidow, views the anticapitalist struggle as an opportunity to create horizontal networks, to inspire creativity, voice new aspirations and thus mobilize practical alternatives. Decarro describes the Horizontals as being divided into two further camps: One sees the ESF as a debatable space that can be reshaped. The other views the ESF as having been captured by traditional leftist political forces. Both groups would concur that the ESF process should serve to maximize opportunities for political exchange in an effort to create participatory collective action.

Again quoting Les Levidow's summary of Ruggiero's description, this time of the Horizontals:

“The horizontals draw their strength from the participatory intensity of their members and from the breadth of networks which their activities inform. In such movements, their very existence depends on the decisions, values and lifestyles adopted by those who participate. Non-delegated actions shape and consolidate their choices, values and lifestyles. Such movements take shape while trying out practices; their participants' identity is not pre-set but rather is shaped through actions. Liberation is simultaneous with action: to change the world and to change life are co-existing aims.”

Decarro states that both sides have their points, as the ESF naturally embodies fundamental contradictions. He further noted that there was a much heavier trade union involvement than in previous years. This is significant because the union movement has supported the European Constitution, which accepts the predominance of the market and of private capital. Many other participants would heavily protest this notion.

### **Reform, Revolution, or Autonomy?**

Alex Callinicos, a leading figure in the Socialist Workers Party and a professor of political science at the University of York, has identified three strains within the European movement, each of which is internally heterogeneous: There is a reformist branch, associated in particular with ATTAC, which views the movement as a means of exerting pressure on states to impose greater regulation on financial markets. A radical left, including the PRC in Italy, the Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire in France, and the SWP in Britain, seeks to “connect resistance to neo-liberalism with a broader project of social

transformation.” Third, autonomists “tend to regard the anti-capitalist movement with its distinctive ways of organizing as an end in itself through which the existing structures of power can be ‘evaded’ and new forms of life constructed.” Contemporary capitalism, in his analysis, is also imperialism, and is hence tightly connected to the wars waged in Afghanistan and Iraq. Two lessons from his analysis were directly reflected in this year’s ESF: First, the popularity of the thesis that capitalism and war are natural allies. This interpretation is echoed in the consensus-derived Call of the Assembly of Social Movements, the final document of the ESF, which implies that it enjoys support among a broad cross-section of the Forum. Second, the diversity of approaches within the movement to deal with the challenges of the current economic and political system. Contrary to how the media often portrays the social forum movement, it is anything but a homogenous group of people. Even though it comprises, broadly speaking, the political left, the range of actors and ideas within the movement is enormous. It is from this fact that some supporters talk of “a movement of movements” and that the final declaration of the Forum, the Call of the Assembly of Social Movements<sup>6</sup> states that “our strength is our diversity.”

It is therefore important to stress that different groupings view the movement with very different eyes. Some advocate only legal action, others advocate civil disobedience. Some promote lobbying within the current system, others call for revolution. It is within this context of diversity that one also needs to view fears of domination by the SWP. The SWP leads the British left, but not the continental left. One seminar entitled “Oil addiction – energy politics, corporate power and global climate change” saw four out of five speakers identify themselves as being from the SWP. The fifth speaker, from Attac Germany, told the audience “Environmentalists need to acknowledge that people need to change their lifestyles.” An SWP speaker retorted: “It’s a bosses’ problem. There is no point guilt-tripping the consumer. Working class families’ lives are hard enough, they need a holiday,” he stated with reference to short-haul aviation. These two different analyses of the same problem illustrate the diversity of the different strains of creed found within the movement.

### **Unions and the Social Forum Movement: A Marriage of Convenience?**

As mentioned above, trade unions were among the main financial backers of the London ESF, reflecting their interest in the Forum and its perceived utility. Indeed, the ESFs have had considerable union support since their foundation. Pierre Beaudet, Director of the Alternatives Network, has noted that, having been faced with the ineffectiveness of strikes, European trade unions started allying themselves with the social forum movement starting in Florence in search for new avenues for achieving their goals. At first, the more militant unions started a dialogue, with the more traditional ones joining later. He further noted that the anti-war movement was instrumental in bringing the two groups together. However, the unions’ stance on neo-liberalism is in general somewhat less radical than that of the majority of the movement, and they would fall into the “reformist” strain of the movement.

British trade unions in particular seemed keen to get involved in the Social Forum. Having lost millions of members under Margaret Thatcher and Tony Blair, some of them did not hide that they saw the ESF as a useful event for their cause. Frances O’Grady, deputy secretary general of the UK Trade Union Congress (TUC), expressed quite clearly in an editorial in *The Guardian* that the TUC viewed the ESF as an opportunity to recruit young people. At the same time, she also stressed how globalization is playing into the hands of both social movement activists and unions by causing phenomena such as moving labor

---

<sup>6</sup> See Annex 2.

abroad or workers' exploitation. From O'Grady's point of view, it thus was crucial to build alliances between social movements and unions, in an effort to "get better at winning" battles against privatization, discrimination and deregulation.

Some members of the movement, in particular those who are ideologically close to a class analysis of social ills, are also calling for critiques of globalization to be brought into the trade union movement. The relationship between unions and the movement is hence not unidirectional.

At the same time, union involvement in the movement is not uncontroversial. Grassroots activists of the anticapitalist and antiwar movement charge that NGO or trade union delegates can in no way represent them. Some observers claim that the main organizers, including the unions, "have appropriated the experience and language of the anti-capitalist movement in ways which marginalize its novel, creative dynamics as a movement," as Lev Levidow noted. A planned demonstration at Canary Wharf in favor of janitors' rights revealed this rift. The march was timed to coincide with the ESF. Organized by Globalise Resistance and originally backed by the T&G union, it suffered an injunction from the London police. Faced with legal action, the T&G withdrew its support, a move that more radical elements, such as Globalise Resistance, viewed with contempt. Patrick Piro, writing in *Politis*, charged that unions only got involved financially in the Forum after having been reassured by the GLA's funding. This reflects a commonly held point of view which accuses unions—and in particular their leadership—of being timid, and of selling out to neo-liberalism's agents.

### Autonomous Spaces

The WSF in Mumbai had seen the creation of "Mumbai Resistance", a grouping of grassroots activists who felt that the WSF had been watered down and wasn't radical enough. Similarly, several "alternative" or "autonomous spaces" were created on the fringes of the London ESF. This year's ESF, however, marked the first time that certain groups which previously were thought to be part and parcel of the movement openly challenged the organizers.

In many ways, the creation of Autonomous Spaces reflected the issues Horizontals had with the formal ESF process. In their declaration, the Autonomous Spaces stated clearly that they "recognize, value and support the energy, diversity, and experiences of those attending the ESF. Indeed many groups and individuals will participate in events both inside and outside of the main ESF." Their main objection to the formal ESF was that the process leading up to the event was very flawed, and cite these shortcomings as the main motivation for creating Autonomous Spaces. Wishing to represent a world of "Autonomy, Self-Organisation, Solidarity and Sustainability", they created their own fora.

Several different Autonomous Spaces were organized: Solidarity Village, held in Bloomsbury, comprised of around 70 workshops. Holistic practitioners, vegans, small-holders, green and pagan activists, anthropologists, home-schoolers, fair-traders, artists and performers cooperated to show that "Another Economy is Possible."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> [www.solidarityvillage.org](http://www.solidarityvillage.org)

The main event in the Solidarity Village, Life Despite Capitalism (LDC)<sup>8</sup>, was a joint project between Letslink London and the London Social Forum, with input and assistance from many other organizations. LDC described itself as “a project/forum to approach the question of alternatives to capitalism in the here and now.” This objective stands in opposition to “Life After Capitalism”, a slogan often used in the formal ESF process. LDC sees itself as a forum that gives people the means to reclaim the exercise of the many powers to do and to produce things, effects and relations. LDC also stated that only “people themselves [...] create [alternatives to capitalism] and not some transcendent power with a ‘correct’ line such as parties, states, or gods.”

“Beyond ESF”<sup>9</sup> was organized by the anarchist grouping the Wombles at the Tottenham Campus of Middlesex University. In the organizers’ judgment, the ESF was “incapable of achieving revolutionary change because it accept[ed] the current hierarchical system and seeks minimalist-reformist change inside current governmental structures.” In their view, the WSF-ESF process “does not advocate anti-systemic change. It merely asks for ‘capitalism with a human face.’” In contrast to this, Beyond ESF wanted to promote not only horizontal ways of organizing, but more importantly a “radical, anti-authoritarian critique of the contemporary institutions of domination,” of which they consider the ESF to be a part. Beyond ESF proclaimed itself “radically different from the official ESF”, as it included neither government sponsorship, nor political parties, nor leading activists or big-name speakers, nor an entrance fee. The four main topics were “Autonomy & Struggle”, “No Borders & Migration”, “Casualization”, and “Social Control & Repression”.

No reliable figures are available as to the number of participants at these events, however they probably lie in the low thousands cumulatively. The noteworthiness in these events lies in several factors. First, the Alternative Spaces created in the past had been requested from the organizers. This year, they were set up independently. Second, they clearly represent the autonomous branch of civil society, as Callinicos described it, and to a lesser degree the revolutionary one. Third, for the first time, participants of the Autonomous Spaces targeted the formal ESF with protests. They interrupted a session and forced it to shut down, causing much debate among participants of the ESF on the appropriateness of this action. While a sizable portion of the audience clearly sympathized with the grievances the protestors expressed, others rejected the disruptive way in which the protest was carried out.

The creation of Autonomous Spaces as an entirely independent unit apart from the ESF (only timed to coincide with it) poses a clear challenge to the organizing process for any upcoming ESFs. The organizing committee for the 2006 ESF, to be held in Greece, will need to address the divisions that the organization of the London ESF generated.

## Protest Methods

The protest of members of the Autonomous Spaces also helped illustrate the divide within the movement on protest techniques, in particular on direct action. Previous protest “events” of the movement—in particular surrounding the G8 and WTO summits, and IMF and World Bank gatherings—have received more media coverage for the violence they often generated than for the message they wanted to convey. It is clear that there is no

<sup>8</sup> <http://esf2004.net/en/tiki-index.php?page=LifeDespiteCapitalism>

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.wombles.org.uk/auto/>

consensus within the movement on appropriate techniques of voicing discontent. Quite a few people justify violence by saying that “it’s not us who are ordering the dropping of bombs on innocent women and children in Falluja” (Chris Nineham) and claiming that a “few broken windows are insignificant” in the grand scheme of things (a Scottish representative of the Dissent Network). Others reject violence. In general, however, acceptance of different sorts of protests prevailed. Less violent, but creative forms of protest, such as those promoted by the Laboratory of Insurrectionary Imagination<sup>10</sup> enjoy great popularity. Experts say that direct action tactics might be more effective than a massive demonstration, because their sheer silliness and extraordinary symbolism draw the attention of the media and eager sympathizers.

### **Does a Social Forum Need Outputs?**

A recurrent debate within the Social Movement surrounds the objectives of Social Fora. One of the reasons the outside world frequently does not take the Fora very seriously is that no clear outcomes are visible from these gatherings. However, people inside the Movement would view this differently. Certain protagonists credit the Movement—and to a degree themselves—with the electoral defeat of former Spanish Prime Minister José María Aznar, with preventing U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell from visiting the Olympic Games in Athens, some, notably Vittorio Agnoletto, the spokesperson of the Italian Social Forum movement, even with the current insurgency in Iraq, and with the massive world-wide anti-war protests of February 15, 2003. While the validity of some of these claims is open to individual interpretation, it is important to note that for the people making them, these constitute real successes of the movement. This does not necessarily mean that they don’t see the problem that, on the whole, the movement has yet to register many policy successes. But it does exemplify that those seeking goals from the movement believe they have attained some. In this spirit, this year’s Call of the Assembly of Social Movements has mobilized extensively for protests and solidarity campaigns for the coming year.

Other participants, however, do not see the immediate need for policy outcomes from Social Fora. They argue that the objective of the ESF is to network, gain inspiration and receive new energy for groups to fight the remainder of the year. As Vera Zavala of openDemocracy stated, “the revolutions are made in the ties created between ideas, people and movements.” A strong institutional backer of this year’s ESF, the World Development Movement, wrote that “the ESF is a chance for people from around the world to come together to engage in debate, organize action and build networks to strengthen our movement.” An ESF spokesperson seconded this notion, stating that a Social Forum is “people learning from each other and building strategic relationships. Those things do make a difference.” In this sense, Social Fora are not that different from the WEF, in whose opposition they were originally created. The crucial distinction, of course, is that the people gathering and networking at the WEF already have a system in which to operate, whereas social movements are fighting for a “another possible world.” Their challenge is hence incomparably bigger.

---

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.labofii.net/home/>

## MEDIA COVERAGE: SUFFERING FROM A LOSS OF NOVELTY?

Media coverage of this year's Social Forum was relatively sparse, which may be due to the relative "normality" of Social Fora, which now occur on a yearly basis and have been around for some time. Television coverage was particularly sparse, and often limited to the concluding demonstration. Even though mainstream outlets such as *Le Monde*, *Reuters*, the *BBC*, the *Telegraph*, or, further afield *Globe and Mail* (Toronto) or the *Manila Times* did carry stories on the Forum, the actual issues were somewhat underrepresented. In part, this can be attributed to the nature of the movement, which comprises of so many different streams and causes that it cannot provide unified sound bites to reporters who shift from issue to issue. Thus, *Reuters* for example described the ESF as "an umbrella organization of groups with a bewildering array of aims and interests."

Conservative papers simply do not take the ESF seriously. The *Financial Times* dismissingly described it as a "leftwing jamboree". The *Telegraph*, in a story mockingly titled "Down with capitalism they chant – then charge £10 for a Che [Guevara] sweatband", portrayed "a world full of alarming contradictions." It went on to denounce that the Forum was "more than willing to accept funding from the Mayor of London's office to the tune of £400,000", ignoring the reality of the heated debates in the run-up to the ESF about this contribution. The *Telegraph* concluded that the atmosphere at the ESF was one of a "doomed village fete rather than an invigorating global revolution."

In a separate development shortly before the ESF, the FBI, responding to a demand issued by law enforcement agents in Switzerland and Italy, ordered *Indymedia's* web hosting provider Rackspace to turn in its London-based servers that host some 20 websites of the independent news outlet. *Indymedia* is an independent web-based media collective. Since the FBI issued the order to Rackspace, the reasons for the impoundment were unknown to *Indymedia*. It took several days before the *Nouvel Observateur* was able to report that two policemen who were active during the anti-G8 protests in Geneva in 2003 had brought the charges against *Indymedia*. Their photos, accompanied by their names and contact information, as well as incitements to violence were published on the *Indymedia* website. *Indymedia* pulled the relevant page on September 22, according to the *Tribune de Genève*, after having learned that the FBI was questioning Rackspace. Meanwhile, a federal prosecutor in Bologna, Italy, stated that she was investigating *Indymedia* Italy because it "may support terrorism." The International Federation of Journalists demanded an independent inquiry into the action, stating that the method used resembled intimidation. The FBI returned the servers to Rackspace on October 15, however a lot of data had been erased.

This was the second time a U.S. authority mounted such an investigation just before a major event of the Left, following a Secret Service investigation into *Indymedia* just before the Republican National Convention in August/September. Both instances aroused considerable attention in the international news media.



## THE FUTURE OF THE MOVEMENT

### Mobilizations

The Call of the Assembly of Social Movements, the final document of each ESF, serves as a “calendar” of mobilizations for the movement until the next ESF. Mobilization for future causes was not limited to the Call, however, but took place throughout the Forum. The principal call-ups pertained to the 2005 G8 Summit in Scotland, and the European Council Summit in Brussels in March 2005.<sup>11</sup>

#### G8 Summit, Perthshire, Scotland, July 2005

The protests for this summit proved particularly popular among attendees from the UK. Organizers saw 2005 as a particularly auspicious year for trying to influence British policy, as the UK will hold both the G8 and EU presidencies, and will likely face a general election. Several umbrella groups are forming a coalition to organize protests: “G8 Alternatives”<sup>12</sup> describes itself as “a coalition that includes organisations and individuals from a broad range of social movements that are coming together to plan for and organize massive peaceful protests and a counter-summit. The coalition includes those who are against the G8 and also those who wish to lobby the G8.” The “Make Poverty History Coalition”<sup>13</sup> campaigns for economic justice, including dropping third-world debt, improving aid, and achieving trade justice. It seeks to align the Jubilee movement with the trade justice movement. The “G8 Climate Action Group”<sup>14</sup> is seeking to change industrialized countries’ climate change politics. Finally, the “Dissent Network” is a horizontal network that rejects capitalism. It has a rather confrontational attitude and promotes radical action and civil disobedience.

#### European Council, Brussels, Belgium, March 2005

The Call of the Assembly of Social Movements ends with a call to action to gather in Brussels in March. March 20, 2005 will mark the second anniversary of the start of the war against Iraq. The European Council meets on March 22 and 23 to take stock of the Lisbon Process. The demonstration is to be held on March 19 “against war, racism, and against a neo-liberal Europe, against privatisation, against the Bolkestein project and against the attacks on working time; for a Europe of rights and solidarity between the peoples.”

### Major Challenges: Policy Success, Rhetoric and a “Pedagogy of Struggle”

It is clear from the above discussion that the Social Forum Movement faces a number of challenges. Perhaps the biggest one is that the movement has been unable to effectively change the policies it is attacking. Protests against the war in Iraq went unheeded. The G8 is continuing its decision-making, albeit in remote locations. Some of the harshest strategic critiques come from within the movement. The WTO continues to operate. Controversial Islamic Studies Professor Tariq Ramadan, feted at this year’s ESF, warned not to simply repeat slogans at Social Fora. Susan George, economist and director of the Transnational Institute, echoed his caution. Whether one believes that Social Fora should be goal-oriented or not, the movement needs to address the reality that the impact of Social Fora on policy has been very limited. The next test for the efficacy of the movement will be the adoption of

<sup>11</sup> For other mobilizations, please refer to the Call of the Assembly of Social Movements in Annex 2.

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.g8alternatives.org.uk/>

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.makepovertyhistory.org>

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.dissent.org.uk>

the European Constitution, which most members of the movement view with enormous suspicion because it enshrines neo-liberal policies and makes competition the basis of European Union law, and gives the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) a role in European defence. In their view, it does not adequately address environmental sustainability, and human and citizenship rights. Most members of the movement call for the Constitution's outright rejection, however influence over its adoption will be the movement's European test over the next few years.

Since the movement is a very loose grouping of diverse ideals and goals, finding an effective rhetoric to influence policy is a daunting task. However, some simple steps can be taken within the movement that make it more credible to the outside. If the movement wants to be taken seriously by potential new recruits and by its adversaries, it cannot be self-congratulatory, and it needs to learn to bring across a coherent message to the media. The movement will also need to address the question of internal debate and democracy. The current divided state of the movement provides only a shaky basis from which to move forward. Issues such as the format of the Fora, their financing, the representation of divergent and fringe groups, internal decision-making processes need to be dealt with if the movement wants to remain attractive to its current and potential constituents. There already is recognition within the movement of these challenges, as reflected in the decision to hold the next ESF in the spring of 2006. This one and a half-year gap in between Fora – instead of the usual one year– provides an opportunity to question some of the basic tenets of the movement, as well as some of their practical implications.

Beatriz Quiros of the Spanish trade union confederation STEs noted how difficult it was to mobilize Spaniards now that the country's troops had been removed from Iraq. Tariq Ramadan developed this point further, asking how a “pedagogy of struggle” could be developed that ensured that the aims of the movement could be fought for on a regular basis.

### **Opportunities: Political Representation and Engagement**

The London ESF saw numerous calls for political representation of the Forum's values and ideas. Such pleas came from Alessandra Mecozzi of the Italian Metallurgical Employees and Workers Federation (*Federazione Impiegati Operai Metallurgici*), Christine Buchholz, editor of *Linksruck* (a German socialist paper), and somewhat less surprisingly from Raúl Romera Rueda, MEP for *Iniciativa Per Catalunya – Verds* and Alex Callinicos from the SWP, among others. References to recently founded political parties, such as *Wahlalternative Arbeit & Soziale Gerechtigkeit* (Electoral Alternative for Work and Social Justice, Germany<sup>15</sup>), *Partito della Rifondazione Comunista* (Party of Reformed Communism, Italy<sup>16</sup>) or the Respect Coalition<sup>17</sup> in the UK, were common, and speakers hailed their perceived successes. Voices of caution on the topic came from Pierre Khalifa (Attac France) and Raphaella Bolinin, one of the organizers of the Florence ESF. They argued that the movement should not seek political representation until it has “mobilized the masses and seen political victory.”

Tariq Ramadan also called for a strategy of engagement during one of the sessions. Arguing that the movement “always speak[s] about ‘the other’ as if [the divide] represented

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.wahlalternative-asg.de/>

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.rifondazione.it/hp/index.html>

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.respectcoalition.org/>

a clash of civilizations”, he called for more dialogue between the movement and those it seeks to influence. This view, however is met with considerable criticism within the movement, where many argue that the “elite” has its venues for networking and hammering out ideas (various summits, the WEF etc.), so that the alternatives should also have their exclusive spaces. In this view, engagement can occur elsewhere.

## CONCLUSIONS

The third ESF saw significant challenges from within the movement. The organizational lead-up to the Forum was heavily criticized, and as a result, autonomous spaces were set up without consultation of the formal ESF to provide a venue for those who didn't agree with the Forum's values. This year's ESF drew substantially fewer participants than previous editions, which can in part be attributed to the cost of travelling to London and of attending the Forum. The ESF movement risks losing the large numbers of participants that were one of its main legitimising elements in the first two years. Although the debate between horizontals and verticals will most probably not be resolved before the next ESF in 2006, fundamental issues require soul-searching among the organizers. Some people saw the ESF 2004 as a step backwards. As a movement, the Forum needs to keep progressing to stay successful.

At the same time, new opportunities are emerging. Relationships with trade unions are strengthening, and political parties that give voters an opportunity to turn opinions into political power are emerging. These developments may help strengthen the movement and offer new avenues for its struggle.

Those outside the movement will need to learn to accept that, much like political parties, it harbours many different ideals, goals, strategies, individuals, groups and philosophies. A clearer understanding will only come about once traditional norms are cast aside, and one accepts the nature of the Fora as what each participant wants it to be: For some, it is a networking event, for some an inspiration, for others yet a results-based process. Its heterogeneity is the movement's key characteristic.

## ANNEX 1: ESF CHARTER OF PRINCIPLES

The ESF's Charter of Principles is verbatim the same as the WSF's:

The committee of Brazilian organizations that conceived of, and organized, the first World Social Forum, held in Porto Alegre from January 25th to 30th, 2001, after evaluating the results of that Forum and the expectations it raised, consider it necessary and legitimate to draw up a Charter of Principles to guide the continued pursuit of that initiative. While the principles contained in this Charter - to be respected by all those who wish to take part in the process and to organize new editions of the World Social Forum - are a consolidation of the decisions that presided over the holding of the Porto Alegre Forum and ensured its success, they extend the reach of those decisions and define orientations that flow from their logic.

1. The World Social Forum is an open meeting place for reflective thinking, democratic debate of ideas, formulation of proposals, free exchange of experiences and interlinking for effective action, by groups and movements of civil society that are opposed to neoliberalism and to domination of the world by capital and any form of imperialism, and are committed to building a planetary society directed towards fruitful relationships among Mankind and between it and the Earth.
2. The World Social Forum at Porto Alegre was an event localized in time and place. From now on, in the certainty proclaimed at Porto Alegre that "another world is possible", it becomes a permanent process of seeking and building alternatives, which cannot be reduced to the events supporting it.
3. The World Social Forum is a world process. All the meetings that are held as part of this process have an international dimension.
4. The alternatives proposed at the World Social Forum stand in opposition to a process of globalization commanded by the large multinational corporations and by the governments and international institutions at the service of those corporations' interests, with the complicity of national governments. They are designed to ensure that globalization in solidarity will prevail as a new stage in world history. This will respect universal human rights, and those of all citizens - men and women - of all nations and the environment and will rest on democratic international systems and institutions at the service of social justice, equality and the sovereignty of peoples.
5. The World Social Forum brings together and interlinks only organizations and movements of civil society from all the countries in the world, but intends neither to be a body representing world civil society.
6. The meetings of the World Social Forum do not deliberate on behalf of the World Social Forum as a body. No-one, therefore, will be authorized, on behalf of any of the editions of the Forum, to express positions claiming to be those of all its participants. The participants in the Forum shall not be called on to take decisions as a body, whether by vote or acclamation, on declarations or proposals for action that would commit all, or the majority, of them and that propose to be taken as establishing positions of the Forum as a body. It thus does not constitute a locus of power to be disputed by the participants in its meetings, nor does it intend to constitute the only option for interrelation and action by the organizations and movements that participate in it.
7. Nonetheless, organizations or groups of organizations that participate in the Forum's meetings must be assured the right, during such meetings, to deliberate

on declarations or actions they may decide on, whether singly or in coordination with other participants. The World Social Forum undertakes to circulate such decisions widely by the means at its disposal, without directing, hierarchizing, censoring or restricting them, but as deliberations of the organizations or groups of organizations that made the decisions.

8. The World Social Forum is a plural, diversified, non-confessional, non-governmental and non-party context that, in a decentralized fashion, interrelates organizations and movements engaged in concrete action at levels from the local to the international to build another world.
9. The World Social Forum will always be a forum open to pluralism and to the diversity of activities and ways of engaging of the organizations and movements that decide to participate in it, as well as the diversity of genders, ethnicities, cultures, generations and physical capacities, providing they abide by this Charter of Principles. Neither party representations nor military organizations shall participate in the Forum. Government leaders and members of legislatures who accept the commitments of this Charter may be invited to participate in a personal capacity.
10. The World Social Forum is opposed to all totalitarian and reductionist views of economy, development and history and to the use of violence as a means of social control by the State. It upholds respect for Human Rights, the practices of real democracy, participatory democracy, peaceful relations, in equality and solidarity, among people, ethnicities, genders and peoples, and condemns all forms of domination and all subjection of one person by another.
11. As a forum for debate, the World Social Forum is a movement of ideas that prompts reflection, and the transparent circulation of the results of that reflection, on the mechanisms and instruments of domination by capital, on means and actions to resist and overcome that domination, and on the alternatives proposed to solve the problems of exclusion and social inequality that the process of capitalist globalization with its racist, sexist and environmentally destructive dimensions is creating internationally and within countries.
12. As a framework for the exchange of experiences, the World Social Forum encourages understanding and mutual recognition among its participant organizations and movements, and places special value on the exchange among them, particularly on all that society is building to centre economic activity and political action on meeting the needs of people and respecting nature, in the present and for future generations.
13. As a context for interrelations, the World Social Forum seeks to strengthen and create new national and international links among organizations and movements of society, that - in both public and private life - will increase the capacity for non-violent social resistance to the process of dehumanization the world is undergoing and to the violence used by the State, and reinforce the humanizing measures being taken by the action of these movements and organizations.
14. The World Social Forum is a process that encourages its participant organizations and movements to situate their actions, from the local level to the national level and seeking active participation in international contexts, as issues of planetary citizenship, and to introduce onto the global agenda the change-inducing practices that they are experimenting in building a new world in solidarity.

Approved and adopted in São Paulo on April 9 2001 by the organizations that make up the World Social Forum Organization Committee, approved with modifications by the World Social Forum International Council on June 10 2001.

## ANNEX 2: THE CALL OF THE ASSEMBLY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

We come from all the campaigns and social movements, “no vox” organisations, trade unions, human rights organisations, international solidarity organisations, anti-war and peace and feminist movements. We come from every region in Europe to gather in London for the third European Social Forum. We are many, and our strength is our diversity

Today war represents the harshest and most real face of neo-liberalism. The war and the occupation of Iraq, the occupation of Palestine, the massacre in Chechnya, and the hidden wars in Africa are crushing the future of humanity. The war in Iraq was justified by lies. Today Iraq is humiliated and destroyed. Iraqis are prisoners of war and terror. The occupation brought neither freedom, nor better conditions of life. On the contrary, today the supporters of the thesis of “clash of civilisation” are stronger.

We are fighting for the withdrawal of the occupying troops in Iraq, for an immediate halt to the bombing and for the immediate restitution of sovereignty to the Iraqi people. We support the right of the Iraqi people to resist the occupation.

We support the Palestinian and Israeli movements fighting for a just and lasting peace. Following the judgement of the UN International Court of Justice and the unanimous vote of the European countries in the UN General Assembly we call for an end to the Israeli occupation and the dismantling of the apartheid wall. We call for political and economic sanctions on the Israeli government as long as they continue to violate international law and the human rights of the Palestinian people. For these reasons we will mobilise for the international week of action against the apartheid wall from 9 to 16 November, and for European days of action on December 10 and 11, the anniversary of the UN Declaration on Human Rights.

The destabilisation of global climate poses an unprecedented threat to our children's future and to humanity: We support the call from environmental organisations for international action on climate change in 2005. We support the campaigns against GMOs and for safe agriculture, food and environment.

In February 2005 we will join the actions of protest against the NATO summit in Nice. We oppose the G8's self-assumed task of global government and neo-liberal policies, and therefore we pledge to mobilise massively on the occasion of the G8 summit in Scotland in July 2005.

We want another Europe, which rejects sexism and violence against women and recognises the right to choose an abortion. We support the international day of mobilisation against violence against women on 25 November and the European initiative. We support mobilisation to celebrate International Women's Day on 8 March. We support the European initiative on 27/28 May in Marseilles proposed by the World March for Women.

The ESF is opposed to all forms of segregated provision for disabled people. In all work about disabled people the ESF supports the principal of ‘Nothing about us without us’. All ESF organisations should actively include disabled people. The ESF opposes all eugenics and fights for the rights to life and full civil rights for disabled people. All ESF events must

be fully accessible for disabled people. We recognise that sign language is a basic necessity for the inclusion of Deaf people.

We stand against racism and Fortress Europe and for the rights of migrants and asylum seekers; for freedom of movement; for citizenship of residence and the closing of detention centres. We oppose deportation of migrants. We propose a day of action on 2 April 2005, against racism, for freedom of movement and for the right to stay as an alternative to a Europe based on exclusion and exploitation.

The Assembly of the Social Movements supports the Indymedia global solidarity statement and condemns the seizure of the indymedia servers as an attack on free speech, press freedom, privacy and the right to communicate, and calls for a full investigation in the seizure of the Indymedia Servers.

We express our solidarity to the Greek sailor Giorgos Monastiriotis, who was condemned 3 years and 4 months when he refused to take part in a military mission in the Gulf and thus participate in the war against Iraq. We demand the immediate drop of any charges against him. We express our solidarity to all soldiers of all nationalities who refuse to take part in the occupation and the repression of Iraqi resistance.

At a time when the draft for the European Constitutional treaty is about to be ratified, we must state that the peoples of Europe need to be consulted directly. The draft does not meet our aspirations. This constitution treaty consecrates neo-liberalism as the official doctrine of the EU; it makes competition the basis for European community law, and indeed for all human activity; it completely ignores the objectives of ecologically sustainable society. This constitutional treaty does not grant equal rights, the free movement of people and citizenship for everyone in the country they live in, whatever their nationality; it gives NATO a role in European foreign policy and defence, and pushes for the militarisation of the EU. Finally it puts the market first by marginalising the social sphere, and hence accelerating the destruction of public services.

We are fighting for another Europe. Our mobilisations bring hope of a Europe where job insecurity and unemployment are not part of the agenda. We are fighting for a viable agriculture controlled by the farmers themselves, an agriculture that preserves jobs, and defends the quality of environment and food products as public assets. We want to open Europe to the world, with the right to asylum, free movement of people and citizenship for everyone in the country they live in. We demand real social equality between men and women, and equal pay. Our Europe will respect and promote cultural and linguistic diversity and respect the right of peoples to self-determination and allow all the different peoples of Europe to decide upon their futures democratically. We are struggling for another Europe, which is respectful of workers' rights and guarantees a decent salary and a high level of social protection. We are struggling against any laws that establish insecurity through new ways of subcontracting work.

We are fighting for a Europe that refuses war, a continent of international solidarity and ecologically sustainable society. We fight for disarmament, against nuclear weapons, and against US and NATO military bases. We support all those who refuse to serve in the military.

We reject the privatisation of public services and common goods like water. We are fighting for human, social, economic, political and environmental rights to defeat and overcome the

rule of the market, the logic of profit and the domination of the third world by debt. We refuse the use of “war on terrorism” to attack civil and democratic rights, and to criminalise dissent and social conflict.

The European Social Movement supports the national mobilisation of the Italian movement on 30 October to mark the signing of the European Constitutional Treaty – against war, liberalisation and racism, to get the troops out of Iraq and for another Europe. The European Social Movement supports the national mobilisation in Barcelona against the summit of Zapatero, Chirac and Schroeder on the European constitution in January 2005. We support the mobilisation on November 11, 2004 against the Bolkestein directive.

At a time when the new European Commission shamelessly boasts a high profile of laissez-faire politics, we must start a process of mobilisation in all European countries in order to impose the recognition of both collective and individual social, political, economic, cultural and ecological rights for men and women alike. To enable all the peoples of Europe to join this process, we must build a movement that overrides our differences and groups all the forces of the peoples of Europe ready to be involved in the struggle against European neo-liberalism.

20th March 2005 marks the second anniversary of the start of the war against Iraq. On 22 and 23 March the European Council meets in Brussels. We call for national mobilisations in all European countries. We call for a central demonstration in Brussels on 19 March against war, racism, and against a neo-liberal Europe, against privatisation, against the Bolkestein project and against the attacks on working time; for a Europe of rights and solidarity between the peoples. We call all the social movements and the European trade union movements to take to the streets on this day.



## ANNEX 3: REGISTERED ORGANIZATIONS

List as of September 23, 2004.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. 11.11.11   | 37. Danish Palestinian Friendship Association                          |
| 2. Achse des Friedens   | 38. DAPSE(Democracy and Public Services in Europe)                     |
| 3. AFRS, Alliance for Responsible Science   | 39. Derby Rail & Engineering   |
| 4. Airport Watch  | 40. Devon County Association of NUT                                    |
| 5. Akina Mama wa Afrika   | 41. DWP Dorset PCS   |
| 6. Appel pour une ecole democratique  | 42. Ealing NUT   |
| 7. ARCI   | 43. ELA (Basque Workers Solidarity)                                    |
| 8. Armenian Youth Federation  | 44. Endavant   |
| 9. askapena   | 45. ENDYL – European Network of the Democratic Young Left              |
| 10. Associazione Culturale  | 46. ESF Tyneside   |
| 11. Associazione Marxista Progetto Comunista  | 47. ESK  |
| 12. Attac 06 (France)   | 48. Federaci3n de sociaciones de Vecinos de Barrios de Zaragoza (FABZ) |
| 13. Attac France  | 49. Federation SUD PTT   |
| 14. Attac Germany   | 50. FEDISSAH   |
| 15. Avocats Sans Fronti3res   | 51. FGTB-ABVV  |
| 16. Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation   | 52. FIAN International   |
| 17. British Refugee Council   | 53. FIOM   |
| 18. Bundesausschuss Friedensratschlag   | 54. Firenze Social Forum   |
| 19. BUPL  | 55. Forum Ambientalista  |
| 20. C.I.S.L.t   | 56. France Am3rique Latine   |
| 21. Camden NUT  | 57. Friends of the Earth   |
| 22. Campaign for the Welfare State  | 58. FSU  |
| 23. Campaign Genoa 2001- Greece   | 59. Fundaci3n Rey del Corral de Investigaciones Marxistas              |
| 24. Carmelite Justice and Peace International Commission                                      | 60. Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft, Hauptvorstand             |
| 25. CENI – Kurdish Women’s Peace Office   | 61. GIC-AJEPD  |
| 26. Centro de Estudios Rurales- y de Agricultura Internacional                                | 62. Giovani Comunisti  |
| 27. CGIL  | 63. Globalverkstan   |
| 28. cgil scuola   | 64. Grand Alliance of Nigeria  |
| 29. CIG – Confederacion Intersindical Galega  | 65. Greek Social Forum   |
| 30. Citizens’ Global Platform   | 66. Groundswell UK   |
| 31. CNAPD   | 67. Hammersmith and Fulham Teacher’s Association                       |
| 32. Comisi3n Espa3ola de Ayuda al Refugiado (CEAR), Spanish Commission for Refugee Assistance | 68. Havering Teachers’ Association                                     |
| 33. Communist Party of Turkey   | 69. Howard League for Penal Reform                                     |
| 34. Coordinadora de ONGD – Euskadi  | 70. IG Metall  |
| 35. Corporate Europe Observatory  | 71. INAISE   |
| 36. CRID  | 72. Indian Workers Association Great Britain                           |

73. International Free Women's Foundation
74. IPAM
75. Irish Anti-War Movement
76. Irish Social Forum
77. Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies
78. Joves d'esquerra
79. Kunstlerinnen und Kunstler gegen Krieg (artists against war)
80. Lambeth Teachers' Association (NUT)
81. Langile Abertzalen Batzordeak (LAB)
82. Le Mouvement de la Paix
83. LEGAMBIENTE (League for Environment)
84. Ligue des driots de l'Homme (LDH)
85. LITTORA
86. Mag. 2 Finance Coop.
87. Manchester Jews for Justice for Palestinians
88. Marxism Alive
89. National Catholic Refugee Forum
90. National Federation of Women's Institutes
91. Nature Human Centric People Movement
92. Network of Engaged Buddhists
93. Netzwerk Cuba- Informationsbüro
94. Nigeria Youth Association
95. Norwegian-Cuban Friendship Association
96. Ole Hansen & Partners
97. open Democracy.net
98. OSPAAAL
99. Oxfam-Solidarity
100. Paz con Dignidad
101. PLS
102. PRIAE
103. Project HOPE
104. Public Services International
105. Punto Rosso-World Forum of Alternatives
106. Red Global
107. Revolution Europe
108. ROBA dell'Altro mondo
109. Rosa Luxemburg Foundation
110. Sammondano
111. Schools OUT!
112. SinCobas
113. Sindicato de Estudiantes
114. SNES
115. Southwark Unison
116. STEE-EILAS
117. STEERglobal
118. Stichting UNITED
119. SUD AERIEN
120. Syndicat National Unifié des Impôts (SNUI)
121. Norwegian Communist Party, The
122. Open Organizations Project, The
123. Transnational Institute
124. UIKI-ONLUS
125. Union syndicale G10 Solidaires
126. University of Leeds
127. ver.Di Berlin-Brandenburg
128. ville de villejuif
129. VOICE International
130. Weitblick-Arbeitsstelle für Frieden und Gerechtigkeit
131. Women Towards a Different Europe WTDE
132. Women Without Border
133. World March of Women

## ANNEX 4: AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

List as of September 22, 2004.

1. 1990 Trust, The
2. AADC
3. Abortion Rights
4. Abolition 2000 UK
5. Africa Centre, The
6. African and African Descendents Calicus
7. Agreed Ireland Forum
8. Amicus London Computer Staffs
9. Amicus London Regional Council
10. Amnesty International
11. Arms Reduction Coalition
12. Asian People with Disabilities Alliance
13. ASLEF
14. Association of University Teachers
15. BABELS
16. Back to Basics Training
17. Birmingham TUC
18. Black Londoners' Forum, The
19. Bookmarks
20. Brent Stop The War
21. Bristol Defend Asylum Seekers Campaign
22. British Deaf Association
23. Buddhapadipa Temple, The
24. Camden Unison
25. Campaign against Climate Change
26. Campaign to close down Campsfield
27. Campaign to defend Asylum Seekers in Southwark
28. CAMPEACE
29. Central Line West Branch, RMT
30. CGIL Scuola Estero GB
31. Christian CND
32. CND
33. Colchester TUC
34. Committee to defend Asylum Seekers
35. Communication Workers Union
36. Communication Workers Union
37. South West No.1 Branch
38. Conference of Social Economists
39. Cuba Solidarity Campaign
40. Dalit Solidarity Network
41. Day-Mer (Turkish and Kurdish Community Centre)
42. Diaspora
43. Diligence Advice
44. Dr Paizah Neave
45. Elcena Jeffers Foundation
46. Federal Union
47. Fire Brigades Union- East Anglia Branch
48. Fire Brigades Union- London Regional Office
49. FM Arts
50. Gay Authors Workshop
51. Genuine Empowerment of Mothers in Society
52. Globalise Resistance
53. Globalise Resistance- Oxford
54. GMB
55. GMB Holborn Branch
56. Goldsmith's College Students' Union
57. Greenwich Teachers' Association (NUT)
58. alkevi (Kurdish and Turkish Community Centre)
59. Hammersmith and Fulham TUC
60. Hands off Venezuela
61. Haringey TUC
62. Hornsey District Woodcraft Folk
63. IDOM
64. Inquest
65. Institute of Employment Rights
66. International Socialist Resistance
67. Islington NUT
68. Islington UNISON
69. Jubilee Debt Campaign
70. Justice for Colombia
71. Kurdish Federation- FED-BIR
72. Labour CND
73. Lewisham Community Network
74. Lewisham Social Forum
75. LFEPA UNISON
76. London Churches Group for Social Action
77. London Muslim Coalition
78. London Older People's Strategy Group

79. London Transport Regional Council
80. London Voluntary Sector Training Consortium
81. London Wildlife Trust
82. LSESU People and Planet
83. LSE UNISON
84. Merseyside Stop the War
85. Coalition
86. Millennium Disability Agency
87. Movement for the Abolition of War
88. MSF Croydon and Crystal Palace Branch
89. MSF Housing Branch
90. Muslim Association of Britain
91. Muslim Council of Britain
92. NAAR
93. NATFHE
94. National Assembly of Women
95. National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers
96. National Union of Students
97. National Union of Teachers
98. Newham Monitoring Project
99. Newham Refugee and Homeless Forum
100. New Left Review
101. Network of Oxford Women for Justice and Peace
102. NO2ID
103. No Sweat
104. Nuclear Tree Coalition
105. Older Feminists' Network
106. OXFAM
107. Oxford and District TUC
108. Oxford World Development Movement Group
109. Palestine Solidarity Campaign
110. Paradise Press
111. Plymouth & Cornwall Pensioners' Forum
112. Plymouth & District Trades Union Council
113. Plymouth Stop the War Coalition
114. Post Worker
115. Project K
116. Punjabi Women Social and Cultural Society UK
117. Redbridge Teachers' Association
118. Red Pepper
119. RMT
120. RMT- Bristol Rail Branch
121. RMT- Piccadilly & District West Branch
122. RMT Waterloo Branch
123. Sandwell Division NUT
124. Sierra Leone Womens' Forum UK
125. Share the World's Resources
126. Simon Jones Memorial Campaign
127. Socialist, The
128. Socialist Appeal London Supporters' Club
129. Socialist Resistance
130. Socialist Teachers Alliance
131. Southampton TUC
132. South West Regional Council TUC
133. Spirit Matters
134. Stop the War
135. Student Assembly Against Racism
136. Student CND
137. Sumac Centre, The
138. TGWU
139. TGWU (5/908 Branch)
140. TGWU Acts Branch 1/618
141. TGWU Auto Group Heathrow Branch
142. TGWU- Region 2
143. TGWU (South East and East Anglia)
144. Thames North Synod of the United Reformed Church
145. Third Age Foundation
146. Tobin Tax Network
147. Transport and General Workers' Union
148. Travellers' Law Reform Coalition, The
149. TUC
150. UNISON
151. UNISON, City of Plymouth
152. UNISON (City of Newcastle upon Tyne Branch)
153. UNISON Housing Associations Branch
154. UNISON Southend Borough Branch
155. UNISON South West
156. UNISON United Left
157. UNISON Westminster
158. Unite Against Fascism
159. Waterloo Branch RMT
160. Weekly Worker
161. Westminster Teachers' Association
162. Wolfe Tone Society
163. Womens' International League for Peace and Freedom

- 164. Workers' Power
- 165. Yeovil District TUC
- 166. Zimbabwe Womens' Network UK

## ANNEX 5: LIST OF ACRONYMS

ABRINQ	Brazilian Association of Toy Manufacturers ( <i>Associação Brasileira a dos Fabricantes de Brinquedos</i> )
ATTAC	Association for Taxation of Financial Transactions for the Aid of Citizens ( <i>Association pour la Taxation des Transactions financières pour l'Aide aux Citoyens</i> )
ESF	European Social Forum
GLA	Greater London Authority
LDC	Life Despite Capitalism
MEP	Member of European Parliament
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Non-governmental organization
SA	Socialist Action
SWP	Socialist Workers Party
TUC	Trade Union Congress
WEF	World Economic Forum
WSF	World Social Forum
WTO	World Trade Organization

## ANNEX 4: GLOSSARY

Alternative Spaces	See “Autonomous Spaces”
Autonomous Spaces	Fringe events at the ESF which treated many of the same issues as the ESF itself, but which adhered to different organizational principles and different ideals. Usually more → <i>horizontal</i> in nature.
Direct action	Direct action is a method and a theory of stopping objectionable practices or creating more favourable conditions using immediately available means, such as strikes, boycotts, workplace occupations, sit-ins, or sabotage, and less oppositional methods such as establishing radical social centres, although these are often squatted. Direct actions are often (but not always) civil disobedience. Those employing direct action aim to either obstruct another agent or organization from performing some objectionable practice act with whatever resources and methods are within their power, either on their own or as part of a group, in order to solve problems. This method and theory is <i>direct</i> in that it seeks immediate remedy for perceived ills, as opposed to <i>indirect</i> tactics such as electing representatives who promise to provide remedy at some later date.
European Assembly	The preparatory commission for each ESF
Horizontals	Promote a notion of grassroots democracy in the ESF process that eschews hierarchies, as well as actions based on civil disobedience.
Indymedia	A network of media organizations and journalists. Indymedia produces print, audio, and video journalism, but is best known for its open publishing newswires: internet web log sites where anyone with internet access can publish information. The content of Indymedia is determined by its participants; this contrasts with the majority of past and present "alternative" and "mainstream" media organisations, which are generally led by relatively small, closed groups that determine content from the top of an editorial hierarchy.
Socialist Action (SA)	Trotskyist party in the United Kingdom, officially named the <i>Socialist League</i> . Founded in 1981.
Socialist Workers Party (SWP)	Revolutionary socialist party in the United Kingdom. Advocates ‘Socialism from below.’
Verticals	Strive for efficiency, structure, a certain degree of control, and results in the ESF process.
Wombles, the	The WOMBLES (White Overalls Movement Building Libertarian Effective Struggles) are a loose anti-capitalist group in the United Kingdom that dresses in white overalls.