

World Social Forum: The New Social Movement and Core-Periphery Division

M. Falikul Isbah¹

Abstrak

Paper ini mendiskusikan World Social Forum atau WSF sebagai konsolidasi gerakan social baru yang berpengaruh luas di hampir seluruh belahan dunia, mulai negara-negara maju, berkembang hingga terbelakang. Kendati demikian, tulisan ini menunjukkan bahwa solidaritas dan konsolidasi yang menghendaki tata dunia baru yang lebih adil tersebut kesulitan untuk membangun pemahaman bersama atas karakter ketertindasan, struktur ketidakadilan, dan budaya politik bersama karena perbedaan posisi elemen-elemen gerakan tersebut secara geopolitik, geoeconomis dan peradaban cultural.

A. Introduction

This essay discusses the recent emerging global resistances toward globalization in the form of new social movement, and how it deals with the issue of core-periphery disparity and difference in the context of capitalist globalization. It is intended as an extended discussion of Wallerstein's New Revolts against the System to deal with core-periphery division, which was popularized by Wallerstein himself (Wallerstein 2008).

Wallerstein categorized 'antisystemic movement' in 1970s into two types of popular movements; 'social' and 'national'. Social movements were identically related to class struggle against bourgeoisie class in the form of socialist parties and trade unions. National movement were associated with a national liberation from foreign colonization,

¹ Lecturer in Social Sciences and Community Development topics at STAI Mathali'ul Falah, Pati, and he had just completed MA in Sociology from the Department of Sociology, Flinders University of South Australia (2011). Within the period of July and December 2011, he will be a research fellow at BES La Salle, Universitat Ramon Llull, Barcelona, Spain, Leiden University and Utrecht University, the Netherlands in which he join a summer school on Project Management: Worldwide and conducting a library research on Islam and Socio-Economic Activities.

or a struggle for a new national ideology to replace the existing imperial regime².

Both types of movement shared a 'state-oriented' strategy for the last three decades of nineteenth century and ignored social transformation on individual domain. In the late nineteenth century, both of them completed their goal with a two-step strategy: achieve power on the state leadership, and then transform the world³. Most national movements showed their successful missions to liberate their national territory and build an independence nation-state. While a significant numbers of social movements succeed to gain state leaderships. However, both movements never succeed to fulfil their promises to transform people and the world. As a result, wealth gap between the officials and the mass became extreme, and the dream to transform the world seemed not as easy as they thought due to various interstate interests. Many of them were too busy to keep the power on their hand from domestic competitors. This is a general feature of world in the 1960s⁴.

Those movements received principal critiques in the end of 1960s. The critics categorized those social movements as the Old Left and accused them as 'not the solution but part of the problem'. Another thing they resisted was the hegemony of the United States in the world system structure⁵. Up to now, national movements have been becoming established political parties with their hierarchical structure under the shadow of patrimonial and oligarchy, while social movements have been showing dynamic changes in terms of ideological discourse and modes of movements.

The next sift of social movement was the emergence of social-democratic parties in Europe in 1980s with more rhetoric about ecology, sexism, racism, or all three. However, such variant of social

² Wallerstein, I 2002, *New revolts againts the system*, *New Left Review*, vol. 18, page. 29.

³ *Ibid.* 30.

⁴ Wallerstein, *New revolts againts the system...*, page. 32.

⁵ *Ibid.* 33.

democracy, which some of them now in power, was excluded from the World Social Forum due to their 'counter-revolution' policies, such as supporting war in Iraq and Afghan. Another type of antisystemic claimant was many organizations working on human right issue. They were institutionalized in the form of international non-government organizations, which were mostly based in core zones and worked mainly in periphery zones.

New social movements in the form of many transnational organizations concerning about human right, environment, gender, and racism have been spread worldwide. However, their feature shows a same pattern as capitalist-world system: their centres are located in the core with working orientation in the periphery. This feature often becomes their weakness in terms of legitimacy and credibility because the government, and likely the population, of a country where they work accuse them as the representative of their base-countries⁶. For instance, during Indonesia's New Order regime, the Indonesian government always resisted any negative opinion on its human right reports, and considered it as a foreign intervention toward its domestic affairs and sovereignty.

In recent years, the new variants of social-inspired movements review several weaknesses and fails of the Old Left. Its two-step strategy, its internal hierarchies and priorities are thrown. In spite of those, the new social movements consider that to gain social transformation they do not have to wait 'after the revolution' or gaining the state power. They choose to campaign their issue, eq environment, racism, or gender equality, within any political conjunction.

The newest variant of social movements today is what commonly called anti-globalization movements. Their main focus is against free trade in goods and capital under neoliberalism platform, which is implemented and strengthened through World Economic Forum, Washington Consensus, the policies of IMF and WTO. The departure

⁶ Wallerstein, *New revolts againts the system...*, page. 36.

of emergence was a massive protest at Seattle WTO meetings in 1999. The protestors comprised a range of social movement variants, from the Old Left, trade unions, new movements and anarchist groups mostly coming from North America⁷. Seattle inspired the continuing significant demonstrations at every intergovernmental meeting in the line of neoliberal agenda. After having a series of demonstrations, the movement held World Social Forum I in Porto Alegre and the annual subsequent Forum as a counter brand to World Economic Forum.

World Social Forum (WSF) has showed a new epoch of 'antisystemic movement'. After its long dynamic change along with the changes of global political landscape, anti-systemic movement is emerging under the banner of anti neoliberal-led globalization. As seen in its several excessive demonstrations, it comprises a big group of social activists from core countries and a wide range of protesters from periphery. Nonetheless, does that portrait by-pass the relevance of the idea of core-periphery division? How does anti-systemic movement deal with that issue of division?

What I mean by periphery here is a relational concept offered by Wallerstein⁸ to distinguish the degree of profitability from the core countries in a capitalist world-system. There might other similar relational concepts with similar meaning, such as developed-developing countries, the first-the third world, and colonial-postcolonial countries. The reason to choose core-periphery as a conceptual term here is its contextual position within modernity and globalization mode of production. In terms of geographical location, the core is identically named the North, while the periphery is identically named the South. In this essay I use both terms interchangeably.

⁷ Wallerstein, *New revolts against the system...*, page. 36.

⁸ *Ibid.* 59.

B. World Social Forum

The WSF has taken place in Porto Alegre, Brazil in 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2005, while in 2004 it was held in Mumbai, India. The surprising thing of those events is that there were thousand people from worldwide with a range of backgrounds, from representatives of non-government organizations, public intellectuals, academics, political parties, media workers, labour unions, peasant unions, to student groups⁹. Those events comprise various programs, from seminars, workshops, cultural performances, to art exhibitions. All things were full of anti neoliberal-led globalization banners and slogans.

Those events has become a myth that defines today's political encompass. For Hardt¹⁰, those represent a new democratic cosmopolitanism, a new anti-capitalist transnationalism, a new intellectual nomadism, and a great movement of multitude. The first WSF at Porto Alegre emerged as a great network to bring the members of the Brazilian Workers' Party (PT) together with the anti 'globalization' protest movement from around the world. Porto Alegre was also intended as the opposite of Davos, a city in Switzerland where the financial, industrial, political oligarchies of the world attended the World Economic Forum annually to arrange and rearrange the direction of capitalist globalization. Contrary to Davos meetings, which were restricted to small elite and protected by armed guards, Porto Alegre meetings were overflowing events with innumerable participants.

The first WSF, at least, provides two points to the world of social movement. First, it appears as a transitive space for networks and connections among the movements from around the world to create

⁹ Economy, RUF 2007, Foundations and Mass Movements: The Case of the World Social Forum 1, *Critical Sociology*, vol. 33, no. 3, page. 506.

¹⁰ Ponniah, WFFT (ed.) 2003, *Another world is possible*, Zed Books Ltd., London. Page. xvi.

a kind of 'new internationalism'. Hardt¹¹ considered that it is no use to give precise political labels, because the meetings involved a range of ideological conjunctures, from democratic cosmopolitanism, proletarian communism, to anarchist internationalism. They redefined and extended the concept of human rights, and opened new formulations and experiments. The act of linking and connecting becomes a fundamental mode of the movements because they are struggling against a structure of power that is unified at a global level. Unfortunately, the movements from Asia and Africa are much less represented compared to their colleagues from North America, South America and Europe.

The second important point striking there was a common process to deal with differences and disparities. Recognizing and constructing what they have in common is what unifies the network, that they seek to find and expand commonality in their differences by putting every difference and disparity as a discussion topic as well as an organizational project.

C. Points of Departure

Porto Alegre meeting is a point of arrival of various global directions of social movements and protests against globalization. To mention here, the First Intercontinental Encounter for Humanity and against Neoliberalism, initiated by the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN), in Chiapas, Mexico, in 1996, massive and militant protestors in Seattle WTO meeting in 1999, the first European March Against Unemployment, Precarious Employment and Exclusions, mobilized by the movements of the unemployed and supported by the labour unions, organizations of undocumented

¹¹ Ibid. xvii.

immigrants and European human rights organizations, between 14 April and 14 June 1997, and many other important departures¹².

Several observers have insisted on citing the First Intercontinental Encounter for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism, held in Chiapas, Mexico, from 27 July to 3 August 1996 by the initiative of the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN), as the first step in building the international movement against neoliberal globalization. More than 3000 people from over 40 countries came together in the mountains of southwestern Mexico and issued the 'Second Declaration of Reality'. This international approach of the Zapatista movement had already been expressed in the date chosen for its public appearance, 'the day the third millennium began in Mexico' with the entry into force of the NAFTA free trade treaty (Taddei 2002). Mertes (2004,p.viii-ix) considered that Zapatista movement in early 1994 when NAFTA revealed as the monumental moment of social movement since the fall of the Berlin Wall to represent not only Mexican society but all the world's oppressed peoples. The initiative was extended through two more meetings (in Barcelona, Spain, in 1997, and in Belém, Brazil, in 1999), and then inspire the subsequent creation of Global People's Action (GPA) in February 1998.

Taddei¹³ notices that the release of the first drafts of the Multilateral Investment Agreement (MIA), especially at the initiative of the Global Trade Watch organization in the USA, in early 1997 is a trigger for subsequent explosion of radicalism among anti globalization movements. This agreement had been negotiated secretly at the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) since 1995. The MIA is an international treaty designed to protect foreign investment, to the disadvantage of the regulatory powers of states and peoples, and was immediately cited by its opponents as 'the new bible of global capitalism' and characterized

¹² Taddei, JSaE 2002, From Seattle to Porto Alegre: The Anti-Neoliberal Globalization Movement, *Current Sociology*, vol. 50, no. 1, page. 101.

¹³ Ibid, 102.

as an 'International Investor Rights Treaty' and the 'Constitution of the New Order' of the total hegemony of transnational capital. In response to the release, many US social groups, then their colleagues in Europe and worldwide, start to a first transatlantic and international campaign. The long campaign against MIA was the first point of articulation (mainly in Europe and North America, but to a significant extend it spread worldwide as a serious issue). The involvement of many NGOs, intellectuals, activists and representatives of social movement was considered as the birth of a movement against neoliberal globalization.

The feature of Europe was triggered by social unrest of the unemployed as a result of the more intensive application of neoliberal policies under the Maastricht Treaty in early 1997. The first European March against Unemployment, Precarious Employment and Exclusions, mobilized by the movements of the unemployed and supported by the labour unions, organizations of undocumented immigrants and European human rights organizations, took place between 14 April and 14 June 1997, concluding in Amsterdam with the participation of 50,000 demonstrators. The other two subsequent marches showing the convergence of European social movements campaign for the construction of a 'Europe of solidarity and of the peoples'. The emerging French social movement was triggered by social security reforms and privatization of the national railroad company in November-December 1995. All those, to mention a few, are the important points of departure of Europe protest against neoliberal globalization¹⁴.

The North-based emerging coalition against IMF, World Bank and WTO consisted of the anti-poverty NGOs, Oxfam and its more radical sisters, get a sharp agitation from their task in Africa and Latin America due to the debt burdens and structural adjustment program imposed by the world financial institutions. At the same time,

¹⁴ Taddei, From Seattle to Porto Alegre: The Anti-Neoliberal Globalization Movement..., page. 102-103.

American trade unions were also under some pressure from their members to protest against industrial relocation from the core to the periphery. Reversely, 'Students against Sweatshops' were mobilized by US garment-workers' unions to protest against the inhuman exploitation of GAP and Nike workers in Southeast Asian export production zones, EPZs¹⁵.

Another track flowing from the periphery to the core is through a broad protest against the use of genetically modified seeds and dumping plans of US and European agribusiness in 1990s. Just to mention a few, half a million farmers in Bangalore marched in protest against the free trade subscriptions of the Uruguay Round. Small farmers' unions in Europe linked up with those in Latin America, India, Malaysia, the Philippines and South Africa to form Via Campesina, whose programme for regulating world agriculture get a massive step forward when GATT morphed into the WTO in 1994. The struggle against water and electricity privatization, a key element of neoliberal agenda, contributed significant as well; the Sweto Electricity Crisis Committee and Anti-Privatization Forum in South Africa, La Coordinara in Bolivia, and the Narmada Dam protest in India¹⁶.

In 1998, the first great victory of the anti-neoliberal movement was gained; the postponement and suspension (publicly announced) of the secret negotiations on the MIA in the OECD. In February, an international coalition of over 600 NGOs and social organizations launched a coordinated campaign of denunciation and pressure against the agreement. In April, activists from more than 30 countries held protest demonstrations against the OECD meeting in Paris, presumably called to approve the agreement; the OECD ultimately decided to postpone approval. This fact, experienced as a first partial victory, provided encouragement for a new international campaign,

¹⁵ Mertes, T (ed.) 2004, *A movement of movements: is another world really possible?*, Verso, London and New York, page. ix.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* ix.

which again triumphed in October when the OECD decided to suspend (at least publicly) the negotiations (Taddei 2002,p.104). Subsequently, just before the demonstrations in Seattle, three events occurred in Asia, Latin America and Africa which shed light on the participation of Third World social movements. The Second World Conference of AGP was held in Bangalore, India, 23–6 August; the first ‘Latin American Shout of the Excluded’ to demand work, justice and life in different countries of the region occurred on 12 October; and the South–South Summit Meeting on Debt was held in Johannesburg, South Africa, under the support of the Southern Jubilee¹⁷.

The ‘Battle of Seattle’ was a monumental protest in USA. It was transformed into a remarkable landmark for social protest across the world. It was the most important demonstration that that country had seen since the years of protests against the Vietnam War. But in addition, Seattle crystallized the convergence – though with differences of approach and substance – between the US labour movement and the ecological, farmer, consumer defence, student, women’s and Third World debt movements. The convergence of the US labour movement with foreign labour unions and a range of social movements materialized in the streets. Many US labour leaders marched arm in arm with delegates of the French CGT and SUD, the Brazilian United Workers’ Federation (CUT), the Korean KCTU and the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU), as well as representatives of peasants, women, students and ecologists. This was an unprecedented event in postwar US labour history, which had been characterized by the AFL-CIO’s aggressive ‘anti-communism’ and deep hostility towards any kind of radical movement¹⁸.

The movement is a rejection of what is being bundled along with trade and so-called globalization- against the set of transformative

¹⁷ Taddei, *From Seattle to Porto Alegre: The Anti-Neoliberal Globalization Movement...*, page. 105.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* 107.

political policies that every country in the world has been told they must accept in order to make themselves hospitable to investment. Naomi Klein calls this reality 'McGovernment', comprising cutting taxes, privatizing services, liberalizing regulations, busting unions, and applying flexible production. This is not about trade, but about using trade to enforce the McGovernment recipe¹⁹.

Referring to this long dynamic of social movement, which flows to Porto Alegre as the first arrival point, it can be concluded that the social movement in USA, Europe and South America were much more actively engaged in all the process, compared to their colleagues in Asia and Africa. The main reason for the groups in USA and Europe is that they have more established institutional structure or organization with better managerial and technological skill, which help them to be more 'critical' toward what is going on in the global level. In South America, especially Brazil, Venezuela, and Bolivia, the Left group get a very significant popular support and put them on power. This condition make them possible to build broader political influence and networking with other groups across the world²⁰.

D. Debate Themes

As reported by Taddei²¹, the main theme raising in the debates was wealth and democracy. These two themes comprise the issues around the need to ensure the public character of humankind's goods, shielding them from the logic of the market; the construction of sustainable cities and habitats; the urgency of a fair redistribution of wealth and how to achieve it; the dimensions of the political, economic and military hegemony exercised by the USA and the structure of world power; the continuing validity of the concept of

¹⁹ Mertes, A movement of movements: is another world really possible?..., page. 226.

²⁰ Vanden, HE 2007, Social Movements, Hegemony, and New Forms of Resistance, Latin American Perspectives, vol. 34, no. 2, p. 17-18.

²¹ Taddei, From Seattle to Porto Alegre: The Anti-Neoliberal Globalization Movement..., page. 100-101.

imperialism and the idea of socialism (debates that had been shut down by the hegemony of liberal thought); gender equality; democratization of power; the guaranteed right to information and democratization of the media; the need to regulate international capital movements; the future of the nation-state. In the afternoons, an enormous number of workshops and working groups organized by the participating social movements and organizations were used as opportunities for encounter and exchange, to spread information on the different national experiences of resistance to neoliberal policies, and for coordination of efforts and activities with an eye on the future. The real meaning of the Plan Colombia, the social conflicts in Latin America, the future of biodiversity, the experiences of social property, the alternative artistic movements, the problems of public education, the struggle of the international women's movement, the experience of the Peasant Way, labour union action policies, etc., are just some of the immense variety of issues that were addressed. The exhausting days of discussion were closed by 'testimony' by well-known militants, social and political leaders, writers and journalists from around the world.

In terms of strategic theme, the participating groups, beyond their different perspectives, experiences, social-political context and programs, discussed four main points. Firstly, they discussed the tactics of protest. On this point, the participants are divided between advocates of non-violent direct action and those who prefer the more traditional forms of mobilization. The second issue has to do with the strategies to be pursued vis-a-vis the 'institutions of world power' from now on. The debate is between a policy of reform of the world organizations and a policy of 'disempowerment'. The third disagreement focuses on the relationship between the social and political dimensions. This requires each party to clarify its understanding of those two concepts. This point appeared as a tension between the social movements and associations, on the one hand, and the political parties and the state on the other. Finally, the

fourth point at issue refers to the proposals to modify the current processes of concentration of wealth and power worldwide²².

These debates were present, explicitly or implicitly, throughout the Porto Alegre. They were discussed and projected as questions to be addressed in the future. Some pose core questions for the movement, whose resolution will depend on its historical praxis and its constant capacity for critical reflection, correction of errors and formulation of new goals. The movement's persistence also reflects the curve of ideological-political perspectives that fit within the anti-neoliberal globalization movement, in all its width and with all the degrees of maturity of the different participating movements.

Commercialization has absorbed and penetrated the field of social relations, daily practice and consciousness, becoming the lodestone of ideological life²³. Promoted as a positive value of social life, it was also put forward as an epistemological constrain for the interpretation of the social processes and collective action. In response to these tendencies, the spirit of Porto Alegre evidenced the strength of human fraternity and solidarity. This spirit, embodied in the thousands of individual wills that were present, was also capable of seriously questioning the legitimacy of the neoliberal premise that 'There Is No Alternative'²⁴, and replacing it with the idea of building a collective utopia. As said by an anonymous voice of the people at the end of the Forum, today we can again see that another world (our world) is possible²⁵.

²² Taddei, *From Seattle to Porto Alegre: The Anti-Neoliberal Globalization Movement...*, page. 119.

²³ Sader in Mertes, *A movement of movements: is another world really possible?...*, page. 257.

²⁴ Chomsky in Taddei, *From Seattle to Porto Alegre: The Anti-Neoliberal Globalization Movement...*, page. 120.

²⁵ *Ibid.* 119-120.

E. The Nature of Core – Periphery Division

Along with the more excessive nature of globalization, inequalities between nations increase dramatically. By the mid 1990s, the gap was at its highest recorded level over the past two centuries, including the period around World War II (Roberto Patricio Korzeniewicz 2003,p.4). Therefore, the idea to raise core-periphery division in this discussion is relevant for some reasons. Firstly, although neoliberal globalization dehumanizes human being regardless of their nationality with the value of commoditisation, insecure employment, and so forth, the effect is different for people in different political area due to the existing economic, social and political conditions. This reason is commonly reproduced by national liberation movements to characterize foreign hegemony to their territory. Secondly, whatever the impact of globalization in the core, the suffering of people in the periphery is much more pathetic because their wage and living standard are considerably lower.

Hu-Dehart²⁶ points out several critical points in relation to the idea of core-periphery division within globalization context. First, through the “export-processing zones” (EPZs) or “free trade zones” (FTZs) all over the global periphery, finance capital from the global core flows unfettered across interstate borders to locate sources of cheap labour. Such kind of pattern happens mainly in producing consumer goods, such as electronics, clothing, shoes, and toys, which are produced in the periphery for export back to the core. There are mediators who facilitate such practice under the banner of global economic integration. They are local elites in the periphery and out-sourcers or sub-contractors from countries with early export-based industrialization, like Japan, Singapore, and Taiwan. The subcontractors subsequently expand their production sites to poorer countries such as Indonesia, Thailand, Mexico, Central America and

²⁶ Hu-Dehart, E 2003, Globalization and its discontents: exposing the underside, *Frontiers*, vol. 24, no. 2-3, page. 249.

the Caribbeans to meet the demand of larger international capital, which are based in the core.

Nike, Inc is a remarkable example of large global capital that takes unlimited benefit from this new system. Its thirty-year history in Asia is equivalent to the history of globalization. The Washington Post indicts that “no other company symbolizes the mobilization of American companies overseas more than Nike, Inc. During 1970s and 1980s, the owner of Nike, Inc., Phil Knight noticed that new computer and fax technology enabled him to export and control the production of his branded shoes in Asian countries, where cheap, largely female, labour are available in unlimited number. At that moment, he closed down his last U.S. sneaker plants in New Hampshire and Maine, and discovered the possibility of out-sourcing production system. Then he subcontracted with Asian entrepreneurs from the more wealthy Asian countries, such as Taiwan, South Korea, and Hongkong to set up new factories in poorer, and with cheaper labour, Asian countries such as China, Indonesia and Vietnam. The subcontractors handled all the work of recruiting, training, and disciplining workers, monitoring production, setting wages, and paying workers. In other words, they took over all aspects of labour relation, and dealt with the host governments as well as local officials, which had been on the responsibility of Nike, Inc. before. Under the new global rule, Phil Knight became the sixth richest man in the United States, but his profit and success were founded on the crowded-faceless labour, nameless Asian poor girls²⁷.

It can be concluded that the subcontract system is very problematic in terms of international division of labour, rationalization of wages, gender equality, and permanent hierarchy of race, class, and nationality differences²⁸. Further, the idea of core-periphery in perceiving the nature of globalization remains relevant

²⁷ Ibid. 246-247.

²⁸ Hu-Dehart, Globalization and its discontents: exposing the underside, *Frontiers...*, page. 247-248.

due to several reasons. First, the nature of oppression, or globalization impacts, between the core and periphery is different. Second, the political opportunity structure to deal with the threats of globalization is structurally differentiated through global governance structure.

F. The issue of Core-Periphery in WSF

The distinction of South and North, indeed core and periphery, has more to do with power and elite life-style than geographical location. The repressive nature of capitalist state power is posed much more starkly in South. In Argentina, at least 30 protestors have been killed since March 2001. At least 14 Sem Terra activists have been murdered and hundreds jailed. In June 2001 four Papuans were killed by the state during protest against austerity measures and privatizations²⁹.

Via Campesina, a North-South alliance of working farmers, always ritually burnt Monsanto and Coca Cola logos by the end of its meetings. Environmentalists from the core need to listen attentively to these farmers and indigenous groups whose concern on international capital is highly critical. Joao Pedro Stedile, a leader of Brazilian Farmers' Sem Terra, was asked by Northern sympathizers, what should they do to help the landless in Brazil. He replied, overthrow your neoliberal government!³⁰

The encounter between the new social movements from the Core and Periphery should reveal and address not only the common project and desires, but also the differences of those involved – differences of material condition and political orientation. Those from North America and Europe, for example, cannot but have been struck by the contrast between their experience and that of agricultural labourers and the rural poor in the rest of the world. The

²⁹ Mertes, *A movement of movements: is another world really possible?...*, page. 245.

³⁰ *Ibid.* 246.

movement from the core and the periphery need a transformation, not to become the same or even to unite, but to link together in an expanding common network. However, as Hardt criticizes, the forum provided an opportunity to recognize such differences and questions for those willing to see them, but it did not provide the conditions for addressing them³¹.

The most important political difference cutting across the entire Forum concerned the role of national sovereignty. There are two primary positions to response today's dominant forces of globalization. The first is to reinforce the sovereignty of nation states as a defensive barrier against the control of foreign and global capital, and the second strive towards a non-national alternative to the present form of globalization that is equally global. The first poses neoliberalism as the primary analytical category, viewing the enemy as unrestricted global capitalist activity with weak state controls, while the second is more clearly posed against capital itself, whether state-regulated or not. The first one is anti-globalization movement based on national sovereignty, as followed by many Left-ruling parties in South America. This position, in a respect, is similar to national liberation movements in colonial era. The second, in contrast, opposes any national solutions and seeks instead a democratic globalization³².

The leadership of Brazilian PT (Workers' Party) and French ATTAC are the proponents of national sovereignty. In effect as the host of the Forum, the PT occupied the most visible and dominant spaces of the Forum. The non-national sovereignty was echoed by various groups that have conducted the protest from Seattle to Genoa³³.

³¹ Hardt in Mertes, *A movement of movements: is another world really possible?...*, page. 232.

³² *Ibid.* 232-233.

³³ Hardt in Mertes, *A movement of movements: is another world really possible?...*, page. 233.

Another important issue in this regards is related to market access. Walde Bello, an intellectual cum activist from the Philippines, notices that there is a tendency in the core –tough not all environmentalist fall into this- to use environment standard as a way of banning goods from developing countries, both on the grounds of the product itself or because of the production methods. The consequence is a kind of discrimination. Bello³⁴ proposed to find a more positive solution by pushing the core environmentalists to be actively involved in upgrading production methods in the periphery toward a Green technology. The focus should be on supporting indigenous Green organization in the periphery, rather than on sanctions.

Developing networks and connections among social movements from the core and periphery requires to listening each other the experiences and views regarding their social, political and economical context in a deep passion. This is truly inevitable because the difference and disparities between the core and periphery still exist. Apart from those things to address further, WSF is a space where people, regardless of their nationality and local political background, discuss alternatives and affirm their sense of solidarity. It needs to be an all-inclusive forum, where people who might not be able to agree on medium-level strategic factors can nevertheless still come and clarify the debates.

³⁴ Bello in Mertes, *A movement of movements: is another world really possible?...*, page. 63-64.

Bibliography

- Economy, RUfP 2007. 'Foundations and Mass Movements: The Case of the World Social Forum 1', *Critical Sociology*, vol. 33, no. 3.
- Hu-Dehart, E 2003, 'Globalization and its discontents: exposing the underside', *Frontiers*, vol. 24, no. 2-3.
- Mertes, T (ed.) 2004. *A movement of movements: is another world really possible?*, Verso. London and New York.
- Ponniah, WFFT (ed.) 2003, *Another world is possible*. Zed Books Ltd.. London.
- Roberto Patricio Korzeniewicz, TPM, Angela Stach 2003. 'Globalization and society: processes of differentiation examined', in RBAJG Reitz (ed.), *Trends in Inequality. Towards A World-Systems Analysis*. Greenwood Publishing Group, Abingdon
- Taddei, JSaE 2002. 'From Seattle to Porto Alegre: The Anti-Neoliberal Globalization Movement'. *Current Sociology*, vol. 50, no. 1.
- Vanden, HE 2007. 'Social Movements, Hegemony, and New Forms of Resistance'. *Latin American Perspectives*, vol. 34, no. 2.
- Wallerstein, I 2002. 'New revolts againts the system', *New Left Review*, vol. 18.
- _____. 2008, 'The modern world-system as a capitalist world-economy', in FJLJ Boli (ed.), *The globalization reader*, Blackwell Publishing. Oxford.

