

Published in the journal *Globalizations*, Vol.1/2 (2004): 303-25. [Electronic publication with the permission of Taylor & Francis. The definitive version is available at <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a713948337~db=all~order=page>

“Another Europe is Possible”? Labour and social movements at the European Social Forum

Andreas Bieler and Adam David Morton

Notes about the Authors

Andreas Bieler is Professor of Political Economy and Fellow of the Centre for the Study of Social and Global Justice (CSSGJ) in the School of Politics and International Relations, University of Nottingham/UK. His research is predominantly focused on understanding the current struggle over the future economic-political model of the European Union (EU) and the possibilities to resist neo-liberal restructuring. He is author of *Globalisation and Enlargement of the European Union* (Routledge, 2000) as well as *The Struggle for a Social Europe: Trade unions and EMU in times of global restructuring* (Manchester University Press, 2006). E-mail: Andreas.Bieler@nottingham.ac.uk; Personal website: <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/~ldzab/>

Adam David Morton is Associate Professor and Fellow of the Centre for the Study of Social and Global Justice (CSSGJ) in the School of Politics and International Relations, University of Nottingham/UK and Visiting Lecturer in the Department of International Relations and History at the Universidad de las Américas (Puebla), México. His research focuses on issues of state formation, resistance, and economic restructuring in Mexico and Latin America. He is author of *Unravelling Gramsci: Hegemony, Imperialism, and Resistance in the Global Political Economy* (Pluto Press, 2007) and he has published in various journals, including *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, *Review of International Studies*, *Review of International Political Economy* and *Third World Quarterly*. E-mail: Adam.Morton@nottingham.ac.uk

“Another Europe is Possible”?

Labour and social movements at the European Social Forum*

Abstract

The first European Social Forum (ESF) held in Florence, Italy from 6 to 10 November 2002 brought together a diverse array of so-called ‘anti-capitalist’ movements including trade unions; new, radical unions; and social movements to contest the agenda of neo-liberalism as it is presented within and beyond processes of European integration. This article evaluates the ESF and the possibilities for co-operation between labour and social movements in forming joint strategies against neo-liberalism. It is often assumed—rather than demonstrated—that established trade unions are an obstacle to more radical contestatory practices of direct-action social movement resistance. With detailed empirical analysis, the article assesses whether there was a continuation of reformist practices within unionist activities at the ESF allied with a focus on the often-contrary sensibilities of social movement opposition. The activities and joint strategies of labour and social movements at the ESF are therefore examined, not least their resistance to both neo-liberalism and its ultimate extra-economic enforcement through military power as evidenced by the war on Iraq. Whilst conclusions about the efficacy of future co-operation are cautious it appears that the horizons of resistance are expanding not only within Europe but also at the global level.

Keywords:

European Social Forum, Globalization, Neo-liberalism, Resistance, Social Movements, Trade Unions.

From 6 to 10 November 2002, European ‘anti-globalization’²¹ movements including trade unions, non-governmental organizations and other social movements, gathered in Florence, Italy for the first European Social Forum (ESF). During 400 meetings ranging from small group workshops to large plenary discussions, around 32,000 to 40,000 delegates—organizers even speak of up to 60,000 people on the last day—from all over Europe, plus 80 further countries, debated issues related to the three main themes of the Forum: ‘Globalization and [neo-] liberalism’, ‘War and Peace’, as well as ‘Rights-Citizenship-Democracy’. The ESF culminated in one of the largest anti-war demonstrations ever on the afternoon of 9 November, when 500,000 protestors according to police estimates—almost 1 million according to the organizers—marched peacefully through the streets of Florence against the impending war on Iraq (Khalifa 2002; *La Repubblica* 10 November 2002: 2-3; Vidal 2002; Wahl 2002). This article evaluates the ESF in general and assesses specifically the possibilities of co-operation between established trade unions; new, radical

unions; and social movements in the formation of a strategy against neo-liberal restructuring, as it is presented in the process of European integration since the mid-1980s (on the latter see Bieler 2000, 2003a; Bieler and Morton 2001a).

It is frequently argued that established trade unions are an obstacle to the formation of a counter neo-liberal strategy in Europe. The European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC)—described at its inception as ‘firmly capitalist’ (van der Pijl 1984: 249)—has been consistently criticized for pursuing a narrowly circumscribed role within processes of European integration, distanced from broader social movements (Martin and Ross 1999: 354, 358). As Taylor and Mathers (2002a: 54) have put it, “the social partnership” approach that dominates the thinking of leading members of the European labour movement amounts to a strategy that not only further abandons the autonomy of the labour movement but confirms the logic of neo-liberalism through “supply side corporatism” or “progressive competitiveness.” In this process, the ETUC ‘has promoted monetary stability, market flexibility and employability at both European and enterprise level’ (Taylor and Mathers 2002a: 49). Theoretically, this can be interpreted as part of the legacy of the ‘labour aristocracy’, as some unions stand as the institutional products, or the *interlocuteurs valables*, of the defenders of privilege, formed and permeated by the contradictions and metaphysical suppositions of capitalism (Wallerstein 1991: 27-35).² After all, the combination of organization and mass support garnered by unions over the years has meant mobilized labour has often suppressed spontaneous struggle in the name of discipline (Hobsbawm 1987: 95). According to Antonio Gramsci (1978: 76), ‘the trade union is nothing other than a commercial company, of a purely capitalistic type, which aims to secure . . . the maximum price for the commodity labour, and to establish a monopoly over this commodity in the national and international fields.’ In other words, traditional trade unions take on a more determined rather than determining character, as ‘slaves’ to capital, whose *raison d’être* only makes sense within capitalist institutions (Gramsci 1977: 103-8, 190-6, 265, 332).

These theoretical propositions raise historical and structural questions about the function of trade unions within forms of capitalist social relations. In response to similar tendencies in the contemporary period, by contrast, what is envisaged are more grassroots-based movements

linked to new, radical unions such as the Italian *Comitati di Base* (COBAS) as well as other social movements such as the *Association pour la Taxation des Transactions Financiers pour l'Aide aux Citoyens* (ATTAC) and its focus on the implementation of the Tobin Tax on currency transactions. These new currents of resistance have grown within established labour organizations but now extend beyond their former home in their criticism of social partnership and neo-liberal restructuring. “These currents take the form of a transnational “social movement unionism” that links diverse groups and networks in opposition to neo-liberal globalization’ (Taylor and Mathers 2002b: 94).

The ESF is a good case to assess whether old style unions are restrained in their active participation in the formation of progressive strategies in contrast to new, radical unions and other social movements. With a focus on counter neo-liberal globalization strategies, the Forum brought together representatives from traditional unions such as the ETUC and new, radical unions such as the French *Solidaires, Unitaires et Démocratiques* (SUD) unions or the Italian union COBAS, as well as social movements such as ATTAC or the International Habitat Coalition. It therefore provides a good opportunity to examine whether there is a continuation of a liberal radicalism, otherwise known as the ‘aristocracy of labour’, within unionist activity whilst at the same time maintaining a focus on the often-contrary sensibilities of direct-action resistance. To do so, the article addresses two main questions: Firstly, were established trade unions widely present at the ESF and, if so, did they engage proactively with other social movements and radical unions, or were they defensive and exclusionary? Secondly, if there were links between trade unions and social movements, did they assist in establishing common positions and joint strategies against neo-liberal restructuring?

In order to address these questions and encompass a broad approach to both labour and social movements the article draws on the notion of class struggle as a heuristic guide. In the first section a wider definition of ‘class’ will be introduced and contrasted with an empiricist pluralism that maintains a focus on the emergence of a global civil society. The second section will analyse labour and social movements’ activities at the ESF. The third section then looks at labour-social movement interaction and the potential common ground for joint counter neo-liberal strategies.

The conclusion summarizes the main findings, provides an initial outlook on concrete results of the interaction between labour and social movements and evaluates the potential future for such co-operation.³

Neo-liberal restructuring and the extension of exploitation

The current wave of worldwide protests against capitalism is frequently associated with the emergence of a global or transnational civil society, re-establishing control over market forces, freed from national shackles. Optimistic assessments treat the emergence of global civil society as transcending nation-state structures and providing the basis, by default, of opposition to neo-liberal globalization. Held and McGrew, for example, regard transnational social movements as an important part of forces opposed to contemporary globalization and in favour of cosmopolitan social democracy (Held and McGrew 2002: 135; see also Keck and Sikkink 1998; Khagram *et al.* 2002; Smith *et al.* 1997). These approaches assume ‘first, that socio-political activists are increasingly organizing transnationally, thereby shifting the sites of socio-political power and legitimacy above and beyond the sovereign state; and, second, that these shifts in the locales of power are largely positive developments in the extension of liberal democracy and the enforcement of transparency and accountability at the global level’ (Colás 2002: 147). Yet, ‘global civil society is no less shaped by national governments and state-based political structures than national political parties and other representative institutions’ (Chandler 2003: 336). This, especially, since globalization has been authored by, and mediated through, different state forms (Panitch 1996: 84-6). Transnational actors, then, should not be counterpoised to the state system, as emphasis has to be placed upon the interaction between global civil society agents and those of the state, rather than on their mutual exclusiveness and opposition (Colás 2002: 170; Morton 2002: 50-3). In other words, while actors of transnational civil society may help to overcome national borders, they may also reinforce them (Colás 2002: 172). Moreover, some transnational civil society actors may resist globalization but others, such as international business associations, may actually further global neo-liberal restructuring (Scholte 2003: 4). As Sklair (1997) identifies,

global capitalism as a project is very much driven by elite social movement organisations of transnational capital.

A second problem in this literature on global civil society is that suggestions on how to counter neo-liberal globalization rarely go beyond reform measures within the confines of capitalism. Held and McGrew, for example, speak about a project of cosmopolitan social democracy, which emphasizes ‘the strengthening of multilateralism, building new institutions for providing global public goods, regulating global markets, deepening accountability, protecting the environment and ameliorating urgently social injustices’ (Held and McGrew 2002: 136; see also Held *et al.* 1999: 449-52). The regulation of globalization is regarded as the task in hand, in which democracy, i.e. political authority, is established beyond the national at the regional and global level (Held 2000). Similarly, Scholte proposes a ‘thick reformist’ social democratic project at the transnational level, which rejects the neo-liberal focus on the market and seeks ‘to generate greater security, equity and democracy by means of proactive public policies’ (Scholte 2000: 285). These suggestions, however, overlook the point that the source of inequality and exploitation is not to be found in the lack of political authority and control, but in the way capitalist social relations are organized. They fall ‘into the trap of fetishizing the political expressions of global capitalism by assuming that the political forms of rule it throws up can be transformed in isolation from the social relations that underpin this system’ (Colás 2002: 160).

This shortcoming is, thirdly, the result of taking state and market as ahistoric starting points of analysis within an empirically pluralist approach (Burnham 1995). Mainstream approaches to globalization generally concentrate on whether global structural change implies the loss of state authority to the market or whether some form of control can be maintained. Held and McGrew go beyond this dichotomy in that they argue that the state is neither unchanged nor loses authority but has become transformed and thus its powers, functions and authority re-constituted (Held and McGrew 2002: 126; see also Clark 1999: 62-5; Held *et al.* 1999: 9). The different stress, however, results in similar outcomes. The state is still perceived to be in an exterior relationship with the market, controlling it separately from the outside, even to the extent that the sphere of civil society is exalted as an intervening realm of autonomous action.

The 'anti-statism' of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) is often complicit in such counterposition whilst clearly playing a role embedded within the discretionary powers of state and global institutions, which vitiates the claim to autonomy (Petras and Veltmeyer 2001: 129-30). Scholte speaks about public management of private market forces, where 'state, substate and suprastate laws and institutions take firm hold of the steering wheel and harness the forces of globalization to explicit and democratically determined public policies' (Scholte 2000: 291). The re-regulation of the market at the international level is then subsequently linked to Karl Polanyi's idea of a double movement: after a period of laissez-faire, a phase of political regulation follows (Polanyi 1957: 130-77; Scholte 2000: 290-1; Scholte 2003: 5). Yet 'the autonomy and democratic qualities of associational life are partly belied by the historical association of civil society with the liberal state and capitalism' (Pasha and Blaney 1998: 420). Put more explicitly, state and market only appear as separate entities due to the way production is organized around private property relations in capitalism (Holloway and Picciotto 1977: 79). This implies that the extraction of surplus value is indirectly conducted through a contractual relation between those who maintain the power of appropriation over those who only have their labour to sell, as expropriated producers, rather than characterized by direct political enforcement (Wood 1995: 29, 31-6). By neglecting the central importance of the sphere of production, 'global governance' approaches overlook the historical specificities of capitalism and the vital internal links between state and market, with the former securing private property within civil society to ensure the functioning of the latter. Additionally, such approaches focus on 'modular' (diverse, fragmented, multiple) identities and associations within civil society. It is then assumed that such modular identities are adopted, traded, or shed with ease resulting in a banal politics of civility at the expense of a focus on a politics of social protest that transgresses civility (Pasha and Blaney 1998: 424). Individual civic responsibility can be identified as the motif of this focus on modular identities whilst also denying the possibility of any real change beyond the current neo-liberal system of global capitalism to advocate ameliorative rather than transformative possibilities (Langley and Mellor 2002; Amoore and Langley 2004). At best, a global capitalism with a human face is perceived whilst obscuring the continued relations of class exploitation inherent in capitalism.

In contrast, this article offers a historical materialist approach, which starts its analysis by identifying those social forces engendered by changes in the social relations of production (Cox 1981, 1983; Bieler and Morton 2003, 2004). To date, this approach has predominantly been applied to an analysis of hegemonic concepts of control (e.g. Cox 1987; Gill 1990; van der Pijl 1984) and is frequently criticized for over-emphasizing the strength of neo-liberalism and, thereby, overlooking the potential for resistance (e.g. Drainville 1994: 124; Strange 2002: 350-1). Whilst some research is now focusing on resistance (e.g. Gill 2002: 211-21, Gills 2002; Morton 2002, 2004), this article further contributes to filling the gap by also addressing the relative neglect of labour alongside wider social movements (O'Brien 2000a, 2000b: 89). This historical materialist approach makes clear that state and market, the economic and the political, are not separate entities, but two different expressions or forms of the same social relations of production. Hence production is understood in a broad way including 'the production and reproduction of knowledge and of the social relations, morals and institutions that are prerequisites to the production of physical goods' (Cox 1989: 39; see also Wood 1995: 22). Moreover, such an analysis is open-ended through an emphasis on class struggle 'as the heuristic model for the understanding of structural change' (Cox 1985/1996: 57-8). The essence of class struggle is exploitation and resistance to it. As Ste. Croix makes clear, 'bring back exploitation as the hallmark of class, and at once class struggle is in the forefront, as it should be' (Ste. Croix 1981: 57). This does not, however, mean understanding class as a form of social stratification that can then be wedded to an institutional account of societal actors (Rueschemeyer, Stephens and Stephens 1992; Collier 1999). Nor does it mean mechanically deriving 'objective' determinations that have an automatic place in production relations. Instead, there is a relational conception of class embedded in production that requires us to reject the category of the unified subject, namely because of the polarity of antagonisms and multiple subject positions rooted in capitalist accumulation, whilst nevertheless affirming the centrality of such human relations of exploitation to political life (Rosenthal 2002: 171-3). The analysis of scenarios of inequality is thus best related to struggles between classes that emerge in contexts of contestation rather than imputing 'class struggle' from a supposed class structure of society. People, 'identify points of antagonistic

interest, they commence to struggle around these issues and in the process of struggling they discover themselves as classes, they come to know this discovery as class-consciousness (Thompson 1978: 149).

By class is meant ‘a group of people who share a common relationship to the process of social production and reproduction, constituted relationally on the basis of social power struggles’ (Robinson and Harris 2000: 21). Also, given the increasing globalization of the social relations of production, the relationship between appropriators and expropriated, capital and labour, is equally regarded in transnational terms. Globalization, thereby, is not understood as some kind of external, structural pressure, but the result of clear transnational agency, operating within the structural conditions of transnational production and finance (Bieler 2000: 9-14; van Apeldoorn 2002: 26-34). Class struggle, furthermore, is not reduced to the opposition between capital and labour in a mechanistic way or in an exclusive emphasis on the work level. The focus on exploitation and resistance to it ensures that social forces are not simply reduced to material aspects, but also include other forms of identity involved in struggle such as ethnic, nationalist, religious, ecological, and gender forms (Cox 1987: 353). As Mark Rupert (2000: 14-15) puts it, ‘the horizons of progressive change cannot be contained within the historically specific categories of contemporary social forms, but must transgress conventional boundaries to encompass what we now understand as the spheres of “economics”, “politics”, “culture”, and the articulations of class with race and gender-based oppressions.’

In this vein, van der Pijl (1988: 46-8) argues that neo-liberal capitalist discipline has now extended to the entire process of social reproduction, involving the exploitation of the social and natural substratum. In response to the commodification of social services, the expanded destruction of the biosphere as well as the disruption of established ways of life, a whole range of new social movements have emerged to resist the latest intensification of exploitation within capitalism. As argued above, however, these social movements of civil society are not automatically all progressive and internationally-oriented in their resistance to neo-liberal restructuring. There can also, firstly, be progressive social movements, which have, however, an exclusive focus on the state. Some trade unions in co-operation with social democratic forces

may be tempted to adopt a strategy of ‘progressive competitiveness’, in which the focus is on increasing national competitiveness *vis-à-vis* other countries through flexibilising production via a continuous training of the workforce. ‘It presumes that mass unemployment is primarily a problem of skills adjustment to technological change rather than one aspect of a crisis of overproduction’ (Panitch 1996: 104).⁴ There are also nationalist, rightwing social movements, which attempt to protect a perceived cultural and ethnic superiority at the national level against all types of transnational pressures and subversions from within (Rupert 2000: 94-118). Finally, some transnational social movements may actually promote the process of neo-liberal restructuring at the global level. In sum, global civil society is as much a source of democratic activism as well as antidemocratic impulses reflecting in part the inequalities of capitalism (Pasha and Blaney 1998: 422-3). The struggles of these various social movements can be analyzed as class struggle as much as exploitation and resistance to it in the workplace. It is this extended notion of class struggle that affords an understanding of trade unions’ strategies and social movements’ activities as forms of resistance against neo-liberal globalization, investigated here within the realm of the ESF. In summary, then, globalization can be looked at ‘as a product of historically situated social agents, struggling over alternative possible worlds. Globalization . . . should be seen not as a condition, but as an open-ended process, the content and direction of which are being actively contested’ (Rupert 2000: 15). The ESF is one moment in this contestation springing forth from the second World Social Forum, held in Porto Alegre in 2002, which initiated the move to hold social forums at the regional level.

Social movements and trade unions at the European Social Forum

Social movements are frequently considered to constitute a so-called ‘extra-parliamentary’ opposition. They demand participatory democracy and social equality to open debate up to alternative political programmes, tactics and strategies (Petras 1999: 2). Unsurprisingly, in themselves, they are not cohesive actors but ‘a coherent non-unified family of forces’, that is constantly revising and reformulating its tactical priorities (Wallerstein 1995: 249-50). In distinguishing between social movements one can highlight the role of movements such as

ATTAC,⁵ who were co-initiators of the ESF and thus heavily represented at the meeting, as well as the *World Development Movement*,⁶ which aims to address the underlying causes of global poverty, by concentrating on influencing policy-making via research and lobbying (Session **I**). Others adopt the politics of more direct ‘extra-parliamentary’ action, embodied at the ESF in the presence of groups like the *disobediente*, which is the current wing of Italian autonomism that in previous incarnations has materialized as *Ya Basta!* and the *tute bianche*.⁷ The latter social movements—akin to autonomous movements like Reclaim the Streets campaigners, Earth Firsters, or People’s Global Action (PGA)—are pervaded by a different life-style ethos linked to their ‘decommodified’ social situation outside the labour market and are, therefore, beyond ‘the universe of social action that underlies liberal political theory’ (Offe 1985: 826). Instead, they are perhaps more easily described collectively as ‘movements within the movement’ that take as one of their themes the limits and dangers of the establishment and consolidation of bureaucratic structures linked to state power (Arrighi, Hopkins, Wallerstein 1989: 25-7). Additionally, a combination of more traditional and new currents of extra-parliamentary resistance can be observed in groups such as the British *Socialist Workers Party* and *Globalize Resistance*, both well represented at the ESF in Florence. Finally, a further specific characteristic of some social movements is their ‘single-issue veto alliance’ (Offe 1985: 830). For example, groups such as the Belgium *Le Comité pour l’Annulation de la Dette du Tiers Monde* (CADTM),⁸ closely linked to the international *Jubilee South Campaign*, founded in Johannesburg in 1999 for the cancellation of developing countries’ debt (CADTM 2002) (Session **I**); the *Habitat International Coalition* (HIC) and its commitment to secure housing for everybody (Session **IV**);⁹ or the *National Unions of Students in Europe* and its emphasis on protecting the right of everybody to free education (Session **IV**).¹⁰ Associations such as the international peasant organization *La Via Campesina*¹¹ with its focus on the protection of the interests of small and medium-sized agricultural producers were also present (Session **III**). Lastly, the pan-European social movement Euromarches, active as both organizer and participant, sustained a central role at the ESF (Session **VI**).¹² It came into existence at the EU summit in Amsterdam, in 1997, as a rallying point for a series of European marches against unemployment and has continued since then to demonstrate at EU summits as

well as hold counter-summits against unemployment, job insecurity and social exclusion (Mathers 1999).

The ESF was in many respects a starting-point for renewed co-operation between social movements and trade unions. For example, Austrian unions strongly supported social movements in the preparation of the ESF (Interview No.1). Similar support for the preparation of the ESF was also forthcoming from some of the French trade unions (Interview No.2). Nevertheless, many of the most important European unions were absent from the ESF.¹³ The biggest German unions—the metal workers’ union *IG Metall* and the service sector union *Ver.di*—refrained from sending representation to the ESF. Frank Bsirske, President of *Ver.di*, had been an announced participant, but did not eventually make an appearance due to national negotiations. From Britain, the *Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers* (RMT) had a high-level representative present, the Assistant General Secretary Pat Sikorski (Sessions **II**, **III**). However, other big unions, such as the public sector union *UNISON*, the engineering union *AMICUS* and the general unions *GMB* and the *Transport and General Workers’ Union*, were all absent. Perhaps this lack of commitment indicates a contemporary strand of the labour aristocracy linked to the historical and structural issues raised earlier. These absences, though, should not overshadow those who were present, especially from Southern European countries, but also the ETUC and several of its affiliated European Industry Federations (EIFs).¹⁴ Interestingly, although with significantly fewer members at the national level, radical, new unions were also strongly presented at the ESF, most notably COBAS, the main French education union *Fédération Syndicale Unitaire* (FSU) (Interview No.6), several of the SUD unions, as well as their confederation *L’Union Syndicale G10 Solidaires* (The Group of 10, or G-10) (ESF 2002a; Interview No.3; Interview No.5).

As assumed in the introduction, there were clear tensions within the labour movement between established trade unions and new, radical unions. These revolve around different histories, internal structures, as well as their different strategies *vis-à-vis* neo-liberal restructuring, all factors which played a role during the ESF. These differences, in turn, imply a different perspective on co-operation with social movements. In this section, then, the tensions within the

labour movement will be firstly analyzed, before unions' positions *vis-à-vis* other social movements are assessed. This will lay the ground for a focus on the commonalities of all these groups in the following section, allowing constructive consideration of future counter neo-liberal strategies.

Tensions within the labour movement

Historically, the new, radical European unions emerged as a reaction to, or even a split from, the established trade unions in the late 1980s and early 1990s due to discontent over the accommodationist position of mainstream unions *vis-à-vis* neo-liberal restructuring. COBAS was established in 1987 against the background of official union failure 'to confront the consequences for workers of the restructuring and rationalization of "Italian" capitalism within a global recession and the new diktats of the European Union' (Gall 1995: 10). Covering skilled and unskilled, public and private sector workers, they are a loosely linked organization of autonomous rank and file unions, which organize militant, unofficial strikes, in the wake of official union compromises with employers and state leaders on pay and working conditions. Similarly, the French union SUD-PTT organizes workers in the postal services and telecommunications industry and emerged in 1988 after a split from the *Confédération Française Démocratique du Travail* (CFDT) over the support for strikes in the postal services and hospitals. While the CFDT focuses on negotiations with employers, SUD-PTT conducts a much more confrontational strategy. Since 1989, SUD unions have been founded in the railway, health and education sectors as well as in various companies such as Michelin and Renault (Interview No.3). The associated formation of the confederation G-10 goes back to 1981, when ten autonomous unions formed an alliance for the first time. It was only after the entry of SUD-PTT in 1989 and especially since the formation of the rival, reformist confederation *L'Union Nationale des Syndicats Autonomes* (UNSA), as an alternative home for independent unions in 1993, that the G-10 became the focal point for radical, progressive unions (SUD 2002: 9-14). The confederation G-10 nowadays unites 32 independent unions including the SUD unions (Interview No.5).

As for the internal structure, the G-10 as well as the individual SUD unions define themselves as rank and file unions. Within G-10, 'the primary characteristic of a rank-and-file union is concretized by the idea that all decisions are the result of a consensus, where each rank-and-file union has one vote regardless of its size' (SUD 2002: 13). They put a strong emphasis on the actual opinion of their membership (Interview No.3), which is also why the G-10 has not appointed a General Secretary, but a General Delegate, indicating the participatory democratic internal structure of the unions (Interview No.5). Furthermore, the G-10 argues that neo-liberalism would require a new, more democratic trade unionism, which is able to drive forward social progress where traditional trade unions have failed 'the demands of the unified solidarity collective through a professional and inter-professional structure for the more efficient functioning of democratic trade unionism' (G-10 1998). SUD éducation also emphasizes sovereignty at the local level and 'places its action and practices within the orientations defined by its members: democratic debates and decisions in general assemblies, a temporarily limited electoral mandate, independence from political parties' (SUD éducation 2002a: 1). Finally, in accordance with their focus on organising militant unofficial strikes COBAS unions place emphasis on the rank and file at the company level at the expense of central organization. COBAS groups are independent, diverse and frequently have no regular link with their counterparts (Gall 1995: 13, 17-18). COBAS thus rejects a trade union structure with permanent, paid representatives. 'Instead, we are in favour of a rotation of those in positions of responsibility' (COBAS 2002b: 16).

Overall, the different history and structural development of union activities has implications for questions of strategy. Having mainly emerged as a reaction to established trade unions' accommodationist positions, these new unions reject tripartism with employers and the state, be it at the national or European level. SUD éducation, for example, accuses the ETUC of becoming a tool of capital that co-opts workers into the neo-liberal European order to ensure 'liberal peace'. Trade unionism along this line is regarded as an intrinsic part of the furtherance of neo-liberal restructuring in Europe (SUD éducation 2002b: 3). It criticizes precarious and flexible employment as the principle form of social organization and opposes the marketization of the

natural and human sphere of social reproduction. COBAS, too, criticizes the ‘politics of concertation, with which established unions have substituted social conflict’ (COBAS 2002b: 16). The fundamental conflict between capital and labour is considered irreconcilable (COBAS 2002a: 1). In short, new trade unions point to the intrinsic link between economic and political struggle. They go beyond collective bargaining and demand more radical change. While collective bargaining is not always rejected outright, it is generally linked to the danger of co-optation within the fold of neo-liberal restructuring.

Established trade unions at the ESF continued to concentrate on the defence of core labour rights with an emphasis on collective bargaining with employers supported by the state in tripartite institutions. These different positions on participation in tripartite institutions can be related to the current debate within comparative politics about different models of capitalism (e.g. Coates, 2000, 6-11; Schmidt, 2002, 112-18). On one hand, the Anglo-American model, based on neo-liberal economics, can be identified. Here, it is claimed that the state only concentrates on a policy of low inflation and price stability, but does not intervene in the market otherwise. Trade unions, considered to be an obstacle to the efficient functioning of the market, do not play a role in decision-making, neither at the workplace nor at the national, macroeconomic level. Clearly, this model of capitalism is rejected by both established and new, radical trade unions alike. On the other hand, however, there is the consensual or negotiated model of capitalism. In this model, trade unions do participate in decision-making, often via work councils within companies and tripartite institutions at the national level. This is the point, where established and new, radical trade unions part company. While the latter reject tripartism, criticised for co-opting trade unions into neo-liberal restructuring, the former regard it as a possible alternative to how capitalism can be organised at the European level. Thus, established trade unions welcome the assumed economic benefits resulting from market integration, but demand that trade union involvement and a stronger participation by the EU and member governments ensure that the negative consequences of neo-liberal restructuring can be countered. This goes back to established trade unions’ initial support for the Internal Market project in the late 1980s, based on the hope that the resulting economic union would also lead to

a social union and, thus, a Europe different from Anglo-American capitalism (van Apeldoorn 2002: 78-80).

As a result, tensions with new trade unions and their rejection of tripartism was a tangible feature in Florence. At times, ETUC and GSEE representatives reiterated the view that established trade unions were the best way to counter globalization despite the controversy this courts (Session **VI**). This was matched by the ETUC representative arguing that the market should be *supported* alongside promoting common EU regulations to establish a social market economy and counter the negative consequences of globalization (Session **III**). This was to be achieved via collective bargaining with employers and general social concertation. Unsurprisingly, such remarks were greeted negatively by the new trade union and social movement representatives and were widely derided by the majority of additional participants. Along similar lines, the Spanish confederation CCOO stressed the importance of union co-operation at the transnational European level through collective bargaining to secure the European social model of capitalism (Session **III**). The CGT representative likewise argued that international labour rights have to be secured through social partner negotiations supported at the same time by the right to strike at the European level (Session **IV**). Only through the strengthening of collective bargaining at the European level, the GSEE representative stressed, could the introduction of the Anglo-American model be prevented (Session **VI**). In short, all these interventions concentrated very much on the almost sole role of established trade unions, disregarding the position of new unions and social movements alike. At the same time, one COBAS representative criticized the big established unions for supporting compromises that had made Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) convergence and thus neo-liberal restructuring possible (Session **IV**). In common with this stance, another COBAS representative thought that the resulting flexibilization of the labour market was also the responsibility of centre-left governments and established trade unions (Session **III**). Other representatives similarly advocated the pivotal importance of organizing outside traditional union structures (Session **II**).

Equally, though, the differences between new and old trade unions should not be overstated. There were commonalities in approach between old and new trade unions in several

cases, whether in relation to the need to struggle for a EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (Sessions **III**, **IV**) or demanding the right to strike at the European level (Session **III**). Therefore, the commonalities between new and old trade unions need to be remembered as much as the differences, a point that will be addressed in more detail in the next main section.

Tensions between trade unions and social movements

The differences between established and new unions have an impact on their position *vis-à-vis* co-operation with social movements. Established trade unions, which still focus on the traditional channels of tripartism and social dialogue, are less inclined towards intensive co-operation with social movements. This is best exemplified by a FIOM representative demanding that social circumstances needed to be transformed from ‘the point of labour’ (Session **VI**). In turn, such social movements themselves continue to be sceptical about trade unions’ willingness to co-operate on joint counter neo-liberal resistance. Indicative of this was the representative of ATTAC-Italy arguing that traditional trade unions would not be open to new ways of representation and, moreover, that they still concentrated predominantly on domestic issues (Session **III**). At the same session, demands were even proposed for further extra-union mobilization to co-ordinate dissatisfaction with conventional political parties and institutions, especially given that German unions have eschewed defending the rights of immigrants.

By contrast, as a result of their rejection of traditional interaction with employers and the state, new trade unions define their struggle in a wider sense and are almost by definition more open to interaction with social movements. COBAS argues that in view of the current offensive by capital, it is no longer enough to concentrate on the defence of rights and conditions at the workplace. Instead, a new front needs to be formed that ‘stems from the fundamental terrain of trade unions and is necessarily extended into the more general political terrain and, thus, opposes the aggressive dynamics of capital, which invades all aspects of human activity’ (COBAS 2002b: 16). SUD unions and the G-10 also recognize that neo-liberal exploitation goes beyond issues of the workplace. ‘It is, therefore, necessary to operate in relation to all these consequences in partnership with social movements, which also struggle on this terrain’ (SUD 2002: 29-30; see

also G-10 1998). This stress practically supports the view, outlined earlier, that class content subsists in most social mobilization, linking the social and natural spheres in complex emerging forms (Foweraker 1995: 40). Hence these groups do not only raise demands related to the workplace, they also ask for the right to work, to accommodation and to health alongside raising ecological concerns. They demand decent unemployment benefits as well as rights for ‘illegal’ immigrants, the so-called *sans-papiers*. For example, SUD éducation argues that ‘it is our role as trade unionists to defend the basic rights of all—the right to work, to accommodation, to health care, to education, to culture . . . and, therefore, to co-operate with all those, who are excluded from them. This has been the reason for our engagement on the side of the *sans-papiers* since 1996’ (SUD éducation 2002c). Unsurprisingly, the G-10 and FSU were at the forefront of supporting French national protests by unemployed groups in December 1997 and January 1998 (Eironline 1998). Hence a G-10 representative at the ESF clearly demanded that the movement of the unemployed had to be included in the trade union struggle (Session **II**). Another G-10 representative pointed out that such links were absolutely essential for a fairer distribution of wealth (Session **III**). In the same session, COBAS argued that more support for workers in precarious employment conditions had to be forthcoming at the European level through the co-operation of unions and social movements.

Social movements are not homogenous actors either. They too differ according to the strategies they adopt. Earlier we distinguished social movements due to their focus on research and lobbying (ATTAC and the *World Development Movement*), a different life-style ethos that manifests in direct action extra-parliamentary opposition (*disobediente*), a mixture of traditional and new currents of extra-parliamentary resistance (*Socialist Workers Party, Euromarches*), and single-issue veto alliances (CADTM, *La Via Campesina*). In relation to these different types of social movements and our understanding of class struggle introduced earlier, the social movements present at Florence can be defined as progressive, due to their rejection of neo-liberal restructuring. This is combined with their inherently transnational dimension expressed in their participation in the ESF. Nonetheless, they differ according to the actions they are prepared to undertake, ranging from reformism to radical action groups and, thus, show differences parallel

to the divisions between established and new, radical trade unions. ATTAC and its emphasis on the Tobin Tax to control global finance as well as its demands for a moratorium on privatisations and a reform of international organisations is in many respects closer to established unions, focusing on the reform of global capitalism, not its transformation (Ancelovici 2002: 447-9). Euromarches' demands for a Europe of Social Rights including the right to a guaranteed individual income (Euromarches 2002b), is already more radical in that it suggests a decommodification of income. Wages are not directly linked to work, but are the result of a social right independent of the labour people undertake. The *disobediente* are then the most radical expression of social movements through their rejection of the lifestyle of neo-liberal Europe, demonstrating resistance not only in a range of areas and activities but in the way they conduct their daily life in general.

Nonetheless, despite all these tensions and differences there was a general willingness to co-operate present at Florence. Established trade unions also highlighted the importance of co-operation between unions and social movements and pointed to the different functions and qualities each could bring to a joint struggle. For instance, the representative of the Spanish CCOO argued that the union agenda had to be put forward at all levels in co-operation with social movements leading to the formation of a new international solidarity (Session **III**). It was acknowledged that in this process trade unions also have to defend the underemployed and the unemployed. Hence the main contribution of trade unions could be their experience in mobilizing people and organizing strikes, which would caution against underestimating the weapon of the general strike. In a like manner, the representative of the CGTP emphasized the importance of trade union-social movement co-operation in the struggle for another Europe. While the former could concentrate on the daily defence of basic rights, the latter could focus on the formulation of 'utopian', yet inspiring, goals (Session **IV**). Finally, the RMT representative pointed out that trade union-social movement interaction was not an oppositional but a dialectical process, with unions currently following the lead of social movements (Session **III**). It should also not be forgotten that the very attendance of the ETUC, several European industry federations, and national established unions at the ESF in Florence indicates that these unions

are open to moving beyond tripartism to engage with other social movements. In this vein, established trade unions have already initiated co-operation with social movements on specific issues.¹⁵

In turn, social movements have responded positively, with the representative of ATTAC-Italy identifying three areas for potential co-operation: (1) the issue of precarious work, where unions should go beyond defending those with secure employment; (2) immigrants and the fact that this is not only an issue of exclusion but also a matter of future illegal workers; and (3) the struggle against the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) and the related global push towards the privatization of the public sector (Session **III**). The representative of *La Via Campesina* also pointed to the successful co-operation between social movements and trade unions in relation to the World Trade Organization (WTO) meeting in Seattle in 1999. The ESF could thus serve as a sight to catalyze co-operation and overcome differences including the defence of individual rights, opposition to the war on Iraq, as well as joint campaigns against the privatization of public services and natural resources (Session **III**). These commonalities are now dealt with in more detail in order to ascertain the potential for joint strategies against neo-liberal restructuring.

Possibilities for joint counter-hegemonic strategies

When evaluating the programmes and resolutions as well as the interventions at the ESF by established trade unions, new trade unions as well as social movements, it is clear that the rejection of neo-liberal globalization and the very way European integration has been a part of this neo-liberal project is the fundamental common basis on which these groups meet and from where their co-operation starts (Khalifa 2003: 6). As stated in the call of the European Social Movements, ‘we have gathered in Florence to express our opposition to a European order based on corporate power and neo-liberalism’ (ESF 2002c). There is clearly common ground in the opposition to Anglo-American capitalism. Whereas the ETUC does not reject globalization as such—based on the belief that workers too may benefit from global trade—it nevertheless agrees that a different globalization is necessary. In this respect, although not expressed in these terms,

the ETUC's activities at the European and international level are clearly directed against neo-liberal restructuring (Interview No.7). As recently confirmed, 'for the ETUC, the European Social Forum in Florence represents an opportunity for dialogue with the social movements. We share with them the concerns relating to the harmful consequences of globalization' (ETUC 2002b). Of course, neo-liberalism itself is not directly rejected, but additional regulation is demanded in order to further the development of a social dimension within and beyond Europe in accordance with a consensual model of capitalism. 'The European social model must be defended and consolidated according to the needs of a different vision of economic and social relations on a global scale' (ETUC 2002b). Unrestrained globalization is therefore criticized for being unable to eradicate poverty, to combat social exclusion and to provide decent work for all. 'It is necessary to cure this failure in every respect. An urgent action is necessary to provide effective governance of the global economy and to guarantee fundamental rights and the creation of decent work' (ETUC 2003; see also ETUC 2002a). One way forward would be to globalize social justice or to democratize globalization.

New, radical trade unions are even more outspoken in their criticism of neo-liberal globalization and the way it is implemented within the EU. The very reason for the emergence of COBAS was the perception that neo-liberal restructuring had to be countered across different scales at the national as well as regional and global level (Gall 1995: 10). FSU regards EMU and the neo-liberal convergence criteria as a reproduction of the Washington consensus, which enforces neo-liberal restructuring at the global level through structural adjustment programmes (Laval and Weber 2002: 109). Whilst SUD unions accept the EU as a fact, they also appreciate that its construction is not neutral but inscribed and proscribed within the remit of neo-liberalism. The European struggle therefore needs to be linked to the struggle against globalization (SUD 2002: 96, 102). The G-10 representative made clear that the EU under construction is a Europe of social exclusion and profit maximization (Session III). The confederation criticizes the centrality of the market, the related primary focus on competition as well as the undemocratic institutional structure of the EU as some of the main problems within current integration processes (G-10: 2002). Social movements make similar observations.

Euromarches points out that ‘since the ratification of the Treaty of Maastricht, the Stability Pact has imposed social regressions on every country, even those where the rights had been most secure’ (Euromarches 2002a: 6). HIC argues that ‘regarding the challenges and damages provoked by [neo-] liberal globalization, Europe continues to choose the market rather than rights’ (HIC 2001, 2002).

Relating to the earlier and wider definition of class struggle, neo-liberalism was also understood as having extended exploitation into the sphere of social reproduction. The representative of ATTAC-Italy linked the issues of debt and employment to environmental degradation (Session **I**). Another ATTAC-Italy representative argued that one should focus on how both human and environmental resources are exploited by neo-liberal capitalism (Session **III**). The G-10 representative placed employment at the centre of debate on the commodification of human life (Session **II**). Finally, the FSU representative criticized the neo-liberal focus on education and training by organizations such as the OECD and the World Bank that concentrate solely on profitability and employability (Session **VI**). Importantly, these criticisms of neo-liberal restructuring at the global and European level were also cognizant of the point that neo-liberalism arose as a consequence of political choice (Sessions **I**, **III**). This is an absolute precondition for working towards future alternatives and indicates how institutions of work, production, distribution, housing, family associations and relations with nature are politicized both through social movements and trade unions.

Hence, despite all these differences between unions and social movements as well as within unions and within social movements, outlined above, ‘the neoliberal nature of contemporary globalisation has provided a common language to multiple militant particularisms and has thus produced a universalising dynamic which has both produced the movement of movements and is present within the movement of movements’ (Ashman 2004: 150). This does not imply a general rejection of capitalism as such, but it does indicate common commitments towards resistance in the most recent and exploitative stage of capitalism as expressed in neo-liberal globalization, thereby fulfilling to some extent an important precondition for potentially successful projects of transformative politics (Rupert 2003: 188).

Joint strategies against neo-liberal restructuring

On the basis of these general agreements, a convergence of opinions emerged around several areas for joint activities. Firstly, it was at the ESF that ‘anti-war organizations in 11 European countries agreed to demonstrate against Bush and Blair’s war on the same day: 15 February 2003’ (Stop the War Coalition 2003; see also CADTM 2003; ESF 2002b; Khalfa 2003: 5; LRCI 2003; Interview No.5). The result was impressive. Estimates speak of 1 million people marching in London, 1 million in Madrid and Barcelona respectively, and even 2.5 million in Rome. Secondly, neo-liberal restructuring of the public sector within the EU—pushed by the European Commission and the Lisbon European Council summit conclusions in 2000—and the GATS negotiations at the global level, were both perceived as the main threats to peoples’ livelihoods and the focal point for joint struggle (Session **IV**). The *World Development Movement* representative argued that fighting the GATS agreement was necessary to create space for alternatives (Session **I**). Also, the representative of *La Via Campesina*, indicating a generally shared viewpoint, argued that there was a need for a joint trade union-social movement campaign against the privatization of public services and natural resources (Session **III**). Both the CGT representative and the CCOO representative stated that essential services such as water and energy must not be privatized (Sessions **IV**, **V**). The representative of SUD-Rail argued that the construction of public services should be carried out at the European level and their defence be supported through European-wide mobilization (Session **V**). General public services were also recognized as part of Social Europe that could guarantee fundamental rights and contribute to social cohesion if secured within the European Convention (Session **V**). In any case, at the very least, the consensus was that public services must not become a new realm for capital accumulation (Session **III**). As a result of the interaction at the ESF, demonstrations in Brussels were organized by Belgian unions and ATTAC, on 9 February 2003, to keep public services out of GATS followed by a day of national action, on 13 March 2003, linked to the same theme (Interview No.4).

Education was an important sub-area of resistance to the privatization of the public sector. It was recognized that education has been increasingly commodified within market relations,

expressed in the introduction of university student tuition fees across Europe in the 1990s and the emergence of a consumer attitude as well as the increasingly dominant representation of corporate interests within research projects and the knowledge-based economy. Instead of a tradable commodity, the representative of the National Union of Students in Europe argued that education should be about democratic empowerment (Session **IV**). Consequently, this forces everybody ‘to place education at the heart of the construction of Europe for another globalization’ (ESIB 2003; see also FSU 2002) (Session **IV**).

In even more concrete terms, the demand by Euromarches for a European minimum income, important for the achievement of social cohesion (Euromarches, 2002b), received backing by the G-10 representative as well as the RMT and GSEE representatives, i.e. new and old unions alike (Sessions **II, III, IV**). Moreover, a seminar on tax evasion at the ESF was followed by a similar event at the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre in 2003 and led to the formation of the ‘Global Tax Justice Network’ in London, on 24 March 2003, with trade unions and social movements as its members. The network aims to ensure that owners of transnational capital can no longer avoid paying taxes by shifting their income to tax havens (Giegold 2003). The implementation of the Tobin Tax on currency speculation transactions—the initial reason for establishing ATTAC—was also widely endorsed to regulate international financial markets (Session **I**). In the same session, the G-10 representative argued that the EU would be a space where the Tobin Tax could be successfully implemented. Following the ESF, in March 2003, a joint declaration by ATTAC-Germany, the German Federation of Trade Unions (DGB), and the Association of German Development NGOs (VENRO) demanded that the new federal government and parliament work towards a tighter regulation of global markets. Considering that states have been involved in bringing globalization about, they are now also charged with the task of regulating it via measures such as the Tobin Tax (ATTAC-Germany *et al.* 2003).

Conclusion: the ESF and beyond

Henk Overbeek (1999: 248-9) distinguishes three main moments of recent neo-liberal global restructuring. The first moment of ‘deconstruction’ took place in the 1970s, when neo-liberal

economics emerged as the most successful theoretical criticism of Keynesianism in the post-WWII order. The second moment was a phase of ‘construction’, when neo-liberal restructuring was implemented from the early 1980s to the 1990s. The third moment of restructuring involves ‘consolidation’: the marginalization of alternatives to neo-liberalism has been secured at the same time as the project has been further extended in developing and former communist countries. It was during the 1990s, as part of globalization, that ‘neo-liberalism began to take on the mantle of a new hegemonic creed’ (Gamble 2001: 133). Nevertheless, hegemony is never static but always constantly constructed and contested in a dialectical combination of structural and agential processes (Bieler and Morton 2001b). In this sense, the purpose of this article is to draw attention to how the ‘anti-capitalist’ movement heralds a new moment in the process of global restructuring: the fourth moment of openly declared ‘contestation and resistance’ beyond the everyday realm of infrapolitics. The ESF in Florence is an important aspect in this new moment. So, what are the lessons to be learned from Florence in relation to the possibilities for a successful challenge to neo-liberal restructuring?

The ESF was in many respects only a starting point for future co-operation between unions and social movements. Frequently, unions and social movements spoke past each other or unions did not make any reference to social movements at all. Moreover, established trade unions, especially, tended to concentrate on the defence of workers’ rights at the workplace, which led to tensions with new, more radical unions and social movements alike. These cautionary remarks should not, however, overshadow the commonalities between trade unions and social movements nor the joint activities that have been re-enforced or initiated during the ESF. Firstly, as discussed, a rejection of neo-liberal globalization in general and the way it has informed restructuring in Europe in particular is common to all actors. Secondly, it is generally accepted that neo-liberal restructuring has been a political choice and that, therefore, alternatives are possible. Moving beyond a binary separation of trade union and social movement activities is therefore essential in trying to envisage the opening vistas of resistance (Munck 2002: 18-23).

On the basis of these commonalities, a range of joint actions have been agreed upon, including initiatives to defend the public sector and to push for the introduction of the Tobin

Tax. Most importantly, the crucial link between the struggle against neo-liberal globalization and the war on Iraq was forged. As Rupert outlines, ‘whereas for much of the preceding decade, the core rationale of neo-liberalism had been to use (primarily if not exclusively) multilateral and cooperative means in order to separate politics from economics to the greatest extent possible and thus to mystify the workings of power within the global capitalist economy, the new national security strategy directly and explicitly links neo-liberal capitalism with American global military dominance’ (Rupert 2003: 197). Participants at the ESF recognized this new connection between the hegemony of neo-liberal restructuring and its ultimate extra-economic enforcement through military power. Thus, anti-war protests were galvanized in a way that avoided the likelihood that the war would distract from resistance to neo-liberalism through the construction of a common external enemy (Wahl 2002: 21). Resistance to the war on Iraq is also resistance to neo-liberal restructuring itself. This is borne out by both the renewed anti-capitalist demonstrations in Geneva and Lausanne during the G8 summit in Evian (1-3 June 2003)¹⁶ and the emerging protest movement against National Missile Defence (NMD).

These two main topics of focus at the ESF were complemented by debates related to democratization, the third main theme. It was realized that successful alternatives can only develop if based on participatory democracy including the democratization of the work place, where people can partake in the decisions affecting their everyday lives. There is still a clear need for genuine democratic self-determination and self-empowerment, which, to return to the critique made earlier in this article, has to transcend the cosmopolitan social democratic vision where the market is regulated (Rupert 2000: 155). The ESF was an important step in this direction that at the same time was not inward looking within Europe. The notion of ‘another Europe’ is not part of an exclusive Euro-centric project; it is linked to an emphasis on a different world. Connections with different regional struggles in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America—such as the conflict of the Zapatistas in Chiapas—were frequently made.¹⁷ Since neo-liberal restructuring in Europe is understood as part and parcel of globalization, resistance to neo-liberalism cannot be restricted to Europe but must be expanded to the global level. In sum, the ESF in Florence was a success in that first steps towards co-operation between trade unions

and social movements were made and the anti-war protests successfully linked resistance to neo-liberal restructuring combined with demands for direct participatory forms of democracy.

Of course, while there is a general consensus on rejecting the neo-liberal Anglo-American model of capitalism, the split between those who argue that a consensual model of capitalism based on tripartism would offer an alternative way forward, on one hand, and those who regard this as a Trojan horse for the introduction of neo-liberalism through the backdoor, on the other, remains. Importantly, at Florence it was possible to devise joint activities despite these tensions. And indeed, some would argue that there is no reason why both strategies could not be seen as essential complementary aspects of a transformation project. Collective bargaining and social dialogue can have positive results in the short-term and are, thus, often of immediate benefit to workers affected by it. Without more radical demands and strategies, however, it is unlikely to result in more than some amelioration of the most drastic effects of neo-liberal restructuring. Yet, more radical demands and actions, while providing a vision of an improved society beyond neo-liberal restructuring, may not be able to obtain results in the short-term without tripartite engagements. In short, it could be argued that negotiations at the table as well as protests in the street are essential for a successful project of transformation.

In November 2003, a second ESF took place in Paris. The stakes were high. As one representative pointed out prior to it, the crucial question is whether the second ESF will simply be a repetition of Florence, or will lead towards its consolidation as a substantive political actor (Interview No.6). In Gramsci's idiom (1971: 376-7), this links to whether resistance can be rooted within 'organic' transformations of material life or, alternatively, whether it is to be limited to more extemporary polemics and ideologies that are 'arbitrary, rationalistic, or "willed"'. Paris was not promising in this respect.¹⁸ In contrast to the ESF in Florence, the ETUC organised its own forum prior to the ESF on 11 and 12 November 2003. No high-ranking ETUC official participated on panels of the ESF itself. Instead, three round tables were organised with the themes: (1) Social Europe and Enlargement; (2) Europe and the Euro-Mediterranean space; and (3) Europe and Latin America.¹⁹ In other words, rather than participating in an open-ended process of discussion facing potentially critical questions, a format of debate was chosen, which

could be controlled by the trade union hierarchy. Of course, some representatives of established trade unions still participated in panels of the ESF itself, but the separate trade union forum precluded the potential interaction with social movements from the very beginning. This is confirmed by the absence of panels, specifically dedicated to the interaction between trade unions and social movements. There were some sessions concentrating on the interaction between social movements and political parties, in which several trade unionists participated, but the general emphasis here rested on parties, not unions.²⁰ The concluding demonstration on 15 November 2003 further reflected the low profile of trade unions. The fact that the demonstration in Florence had been so large, was mainly due to the mobilisation by the Italian CGIL. In Paris, the various unions were present, but they had not mobilised a large amount of their members. Finally, the separate road between established trade unions and social movements is also visible in the actions resulting from Paris. While the social movement assembly agreed on calling for a day of action for another Europe on 9 May 2004, the then expected day of the ratification of the European Constitution, the ETUC called on its national affiliates and EIFs to concentrate on 2 and 3 April in their mobilisation of demonstrations for a Social Europe.²¹ Hence the achievement at Florence to bridge the tensions between a focus on tripartism and social dialogue and more radical demands and actions was not repeated.

This is not to say that Paris was a complete failure. The rejection of neo-liberal globalization continues to be the unifying theme of all groups present. The increasing number of participants indicates that the importance attached to the ESF is spreading. Nevertheless, the hopes raised by the Florence ESF were not fulfilled. It is really now the third ESF to be held in London in October 2004, where it will become apparent whether the ESF will have political significance, or whether it will develop into a cultural happening without any serious political implications.

Sessions attended as participant observers

- I** 'From the European Union shaped by neo-liberal globalization to the Europe of alternatives', (Thursday, 7 November, 9.30 a.m.).
- II** 'Recovery of European Trade Unions? 2002 Strikes and Conflicts', (Thursday, 7 November, 2:00 p.m.).
- III** 'Movements' and trade unions' struggle', (Thursday, 7 November, 5.30 p.m.).
- IV** 'Europe is not for sale: new rights for a new social system', (Friday, 8 November, 9.30 a.m.).
- V** 'Public Services and Privatizations', (Friday, 8 November, 2:00 p.m.).
- VI** 'Europe of workers between global production and social fragmentation', (Saturday, 9 November, 9.30 a.m.).

For details of the participants and topics discussed, see ESF (2002a).

Interviews

Interview No.1: President, Austrian Federation of Railway Workers; Vienna (20 March 2002).

Interview No.2: Member of the CFDT-banques council, CFDT-Fédération des banques and sociétés financières; Paris (11 September 2002).

Interview No.3: Federal Secretary, SUD-PTT; Paris (16 December 2002).

Interview No.4: Member of the ATTAC-France Administration Council and representative of the union SUD-PTT; Paris (16 December 2002).

Interview No.5: General Delegate (Secretary), Union syndicale G10 Solidaires; Paris (16 December 2002).

Interview No.6: President of Research Institute of FSU, FSU; member of the ATTAC-France Administration Council; Paris (18 December 2002).

Interview No.7: Political Officer, European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC); Brussels (21 January 2003).

Interview No.8: Deputy General Secretary, EPSU; Brussels (22 January 2003).

Interview No.9: General Secretary, European Transport Workers' Federation; Brussels (22 January 2003).

Interview No.10: Deputy General Secretary, European Metalworker's Federation; Brussels (23 January 2003).

References

- van Apeldoorn, B. (2002) *Transnational Capitalism and the Struggle over European Integration*, London: Routledge.
- Amoore, L. and P. Langley (2004), 'Ambiguities of Global Civil Society', *Review of International Studies* 30:1: 89-110.
- Ancelovici, M. (2002) 'Organizing against Globalization: The Case of Attac in France', *Politics & Society* 30(3): 427-63.
- Arrighi, G., Hopkins, T. K., and Wallerstein, I. (1989) *Antisystemic Movements*, London: Verso.
- Ashman, S. (2004) 'Resistance to neo-liberal globalization: A case of "militant particularism"?'', *Politics* 24(2): 143-53.
- ATTAC-Germany, DGB and VENRO (2003) 'Making Globalization Equitable', *Sand in the Wheels—ATTAC Newsletter No.165*: 6-11.
- Bieler, A. (2000) *Globalization and Enlargement of the European Union: Austrian and Swedish Social Forces in the Struggle over Membership*, London: Routledge.
- _____. (2003a) 'What Future Union? The Struggle for a Social Europe', *Queen's Papers on Europeanization*, <http://www.qub.ac.uk/ies/onlinepapers/poe.html>; No. 1, accessed on 1 May 2003.
- _____. (2003b) 'Swedish trade unions and Economic and Monetary Union: the European Union membership debate revisited?', *Cooperation and Conflict* 38(4): 385-407.
- Bieler, A. and Morton, A. D. (eds) (2001a) *Social Forces in the Making of the New Europe: The Restructuring of European Social Relations in the Global Political Economy*, London: Palgrave.
- _____ and _____. (2001b) 'The Gordian Knot of Agency-Structure in International Relations: A neo-Gramscian Perspective', *European Journal of International Relations* 7(1): 5-35.
- _____ and _____. (2003) 'Globalization, the State and Class Struggle: A "Critical Economy" Engagement with Open Marxism', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 5(4): 467-99.
- _____ and _____. (2004) 'A Critical Theory Route to Hegemony, World Order and Historical Change: neo-Gramscian Perspectives in International Relations', *Capital & Class* 82: 85-113.
- Bryman, A. (2001) *Social Research Methods*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burnham, P. (1995) 'State and Market in International Political Economy: Towards a Marxist Alternative', *Studies in Marxism* 2: 135-59.
- CADTM (2002) 'About the Campaign for the cancellation of the Third World debt' (13 March 2002), <http://users.skynet.be/cadtm/pages/english/ENGdebtcampaign.htm>; accessed on 26 May 2003.
- Callinicos, A. (2003) *An Anti-Capitalist Manifesto*, London: Polity.
- Chandler, D. (2003) 'New Rights for Old? Cosmopolitan Citizenship and the Critique of State Sovereignty', *Political Studies* 51(2): 332-49.
- Clark, I. (1999) *Globalization and International Relations Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coalition for Green and Social Procurement's Amendment (2002) 'Proposal for a directive on the co-ordination of procedures for the award of public supply contracts, public service contracts and public works contracts'; <http://www.epsu.org/projects/procure/CoalEN.pdf>; accessed on 30 January 2003.
- Coates, D. (2000) *Models of Capitalism: Growth and Stagnation in the Modern Era*. Cambridge: Polity.
- COBAS (2002a) 'Per un movimento anticapitalista e contro la guerra', *COBAS—Giornale della Confederazione COBAS* No.12 (supplement): 1.
- COBAS (2002b) 'Confederazione Cobas: chi siamo e per cosa lottiamo', *COBAS—Giornale della Confederazione COBAS* No.12 (supplement): 16.
- Colás, A. (2002) *International Civil Society: Social Movements in World Politics*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Collier, R. B. (1999) *Paths Toward Democracy: The Working Class and Elites in Western Europe and South America*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cox, R. W. (1981) 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10(2): 126-155.
- _____. (1983) 'Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An Essay on Method', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 12(2): 162-75.

- _____. (1985/1996) 'Realism, Positivism, Historicism', in R. W. Cox with T. J. Sinclair, *Approaches to World Order*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 37-50.
- _____. (1987) *Production, Power and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- _____. (1989) 'Production, the State and Change in World Order', in E-O. Czempiel and J. N. Rosenau (eds) *Global Changes and Theoretical Challenges: Approaches to World Politics for the 1990s*, Toronto: Lexington Books.
- Eironline (1998) 'Widespread protests by unemployed people: towards a new form of social movement?' 28 January 1998, <http://www.eiro.eurofound.ie/1998/01/Feature/FR9801189F.html>; accessed 5 September 2002.
- ESF (2002a) *Un'altra Europa è possibile—Another Europe is Possible* (official programme of the European Social Forum). Florence: ESF.
- _____. (2002b) 'Anti war call' (12 November 2002), <http://www.fse-esf.org>; accessed 14 November 2002.
- _____. (2002c) 'Call of the European Social Movements' (12 November 2002), <http://www.euromarches.org/english/02/esf03.htm>; accessed 27 May 2003.
- ESF (2003) *Construire une autre europe, un autre monde* (official programme of the European Social Forum). Paris: ESF.
- ESIB (2003) ESIB Committee on Commodification of Education—Newsletter February 2003; <http://www.esib.org/commodification/newsletters/04newsletter.htm>; accessed 26 May 2003.
- ETUC (2002a) 'Johannesburg: Creation of jobs and active social policies, conditions for a sustained economic progress' (3 September 2002); <http://www.etuc.org/en/>; accessed 29 January 2003.
- _____. (2002b) 'European Social Forum: The European Social Model at the service of economic and political relations on a global scale' (6 September 2002); <http://www.etuc.org/en/>; accessed 29 January 2003.
- _____. (2003) 'A world with peace, jobs, rights and social justice' (23 January 2003), <http://www.etuc.org/en/>; accessed 29 January 2003.
- Euromarches (2002a) 'Droits sociaux, convention, constitution européenne', *Marches Européennes/News* No.23: 6-7.
- _____. (2002b) 'Proposal to the European Social Movements—Call of Florence: For a Europe of Social Rights', <http://www.euromarches.org/english/02/esf02.htm>; accessed 27 May 2003.
- Fielding, N. (2001) 'Ethnography', in N. Gilbert (ed.) *Researching Social Life*, 2d. Edition. London: Sage.
- Foweraker, J. (1995) *Theorizing Social Movements*, London: Pluto Press.
- FSU (2002) European Social Forum: Florence—November 2002, Paris: FSU.
- G-10 (1998) 'Congrès Constitutif: Résolution Générale', <http://www.g10.ras.eu.org/>; accessed 20 May 2003.
- _____. (2002) 'Forum social européen de Florence: le mouvement social s'affirme en Europe!', <http://perso.wanadoo.fr/sudptt44/G10FSE.pdf>; accessed 20 November 2002.
- Gall, G. (1995) 'The Emergence of a Rank and File Movement: the Comitati di Base in the Italian Worker's Movement', *Capital & Class* No.55: 9-20.
- Gamble, A. (2001) 'Neo-Liberalism', *Capital & Class* No.75: 127-34.
- Giegold, S. (2003) 'International tax justice network up and running?', *Sand in the Wheels—ATTAC Newsletter* No.177: 10-11.
- Gill, S. (1990) *American Hegemony and the Trilateral Commission*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (2002) *Power and Resistance in the New World Order*, London: Palgrave.
- Gills, B. (ed.) (2000) *Globalization and the Politics of Resistance*, Houndmills: Macmillan.
- Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed. and trans. Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith, London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- _____. (1977) *Selections from Political Writings, 1910-1920*, ed. Q. Hoare, trans. J. Matthews, London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- _____. (1978) *Selections from Political Writings, 1921-1926*, ed. and trans. Q. Hoare, London: Lawrence and Wishart.

- Held, D. (2000) 'Regulating Globalization?', in D. Held and A. McGrew (eds) *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Held, D. and McGrew, A. (2002) *Globalization/Anti-Globalization*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. and Perraton, J. (1999) *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*, Cambridge: Polity.
- HIC (2001) 'In Nice the debut of a new, yet very ancient, movement' (20 February 2001), <http://www.habitants.org/index.php3?file=newsfull.php3&id=67>; accessed on 26 May 2003.
- _____. (2002) 'HIC, from Porto Alegre to Porto Alegre passing through Florence' (8 July 2002), <http://www.habitants.org/index.php3?file=newsfull.php3&id=91>; accessed 26 July 2003.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1964) *Labouring Men: Studies in the History of Labour*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- _____. (1973) *Revolutionaries*, London: Abacus, 1999 edition.
- _____. (1984) *Worlds of Labour: Further Studies in the History of Labour*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- _____. (1987) *The Age of Empire, 1875-1914*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- _____. (1994) *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914-1991*, London: Penguin.
- Holloway, J. and Picciotto, S. (1977) 'Capital, Crisis and the State', *Capital & Class* No. 2: 76-101.
- Keck, M. E. and Sikkink, K. (1998) *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Khagram, S. J., Riker, V. and Sikkink, K. (eds) (2002) *Restructuring World Politics: Transnational Social Movements, Networks and Norms*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Khalifa, P. (2002) 'The ESF in Florence: a preliminary report', *Sand in the Wheels—ATTAC Newsletter* No.154: 3-5.
- _____. (2003) 'War on Iraq, what's next?', *Sand in the Wheels—ATTAC Newsletter* No.176: 3-7.
- Langley, P. and Mellor, M. (2002) "'Economy", Sustainability and Sites of Transformative Space', *New Political Economy* 7(1): 49-65.
- Laval, C. and Weber, L. (2002) *Le nouvel ordre éducatif mondial: OMC, Banque mondiale, OCDE, Commission européenne*, Paris: Institut de Recherches de la FSU.
- Lenin, V. I. (1964) *Collected Works*, vol. 21 (August 1914-December 1915), London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Martin, A. and Ross, G. (1999) 'In the Line of Fire: The Europeanization of Labour Representation', in A. Martin and G. Ross et al. (eds) *The Brave New World of European Labour: European Trade Unions at the Millennium*, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Mason, J. (2002) *Qualitative Researching*, 2d. Edition. London: Sage.
- Mathers, A. (1999) 'Euromarch—The Struggle for a Social Europe', *Capital & Class* No.68: 15-20.
- Morton, A. D. (2002) "'La Resurrección del Maiz": Globalization, Resistance and the Zapatistas', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 31(1): 27-54.
- _____. (2004) 'The Antiglobalization Movement: Juggernaut or Jalopy?', in H. Veltmeyer (ed.) *Globalization and Antiglobalization: Dynamics of Change in the New World Order*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Munck, R. (2002) *Globalization and Labour: The New "Great Transformation"*, London: Zed Books.
- O'Brien, R. (2000a) 'Workers and World Order: The Tentative Transformation of the International Union Movement', *Review of International Studies* 26(4): 533-55.
- _____. (2000b) 'Labour and IPE', in Ronen Palan (ed.) *Global Political Economy: Contemporary Theories*, London: Routledge.
- Offe, C. (1985) 'New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics', *Social Research* 52(4): 817-68.
- Overbeek, H. (1999) 'Globalization and Britain's Decline', in R. English and M. Kenny (eds) *Rethinking British Decline*, London: Palgrave.
- Panitch, L. (1996) 'Rethinking the Role of the State', in J. Mittelman (ed.) *Globalization: Critical Reflections*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Pasha, M. K. and D. Blaney (1998) 'Elusive Paradise: The Promise and Peril of Global Civil Society', *Alternatives* 23(4): 417-50.
- Petras, J. (1999) *The Left Strikes Back: Class Conflict in Latin America in the Age of Neoliberalism*, Boulder: Westview Press.
- Petras, J. and H. Veltmeyer (2001) *Globalization Unmasked: Imperialism in the 21st Century*, London: Zed Books.

- Polanyi, K. (1957) *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Robinson, W. I. and J. Harris (2000) 'Towards a Global Ruling Class? Globalization and the Transnational Capitalist Class', *Science & Society*, 64(1): 11-54.
- Rosenthal, J. (2002) 'Who Practices Hegemony? Class Division and the Subject of Politics', in James Martin (ed.) *Antonio Gramsci: Critical Assessments of Leading Political Philosophers*, Vol.4 London: Routledge.
- Rueschemeyer, D., Huber Stephens, E., Stephens, J. D. (1992) *Capitalist Development and Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Rupert, M. (2000) *Ideologies of Globalization: Contending Visions of a New World Order*, London: Routledge.
- _____. (2003) 'Globalising Common Sense: A Marxian-Gramscian (Re-)Vision of the Politics of Governance/Resistance', *Review of International Politics* 29: 181-98.
- Ste. Croix, G. E. M. de (1981) *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World from the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquests*, London: Duckworth.
- Schmidt, V. A. (2002) *The Futures of European Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scholte, J. A. (2000) *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, London: Palgrave.
- _____. (2003) 'The global fight let us face', *Sand in the Wheels—ATTAC Newsletter* No.164: 3-5.
- Sklair, L. (1997) 'Social Movements for Global Capitalism: The Transnational Capitalist Class in Action', *Review of International Political Economy* 4(3): 514-38.
- Smith, J., Chatfield, C., and Pagnucco, R. (eds) *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State*, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Stop the War Coalition (2003) 'The day the world demonstrated against war on Iraq' (15 February 2003), <http://www.stopwar.org.uk/iraqfeb15demo.asp>; accessed 29 February 2003.
- Strange, G. (2002) 'Globalization, Regionalism and Labour Interests in the new IPE', *New Political Economy* 7(4): 343-65.
- SUD (2002) *Qu'est-ce que SUD Solidaires*, Paris: L'Archipel.
- SUD éducation (2002a) 'Pour un syndicalisme alternatif', *Le journal* No.148: 1.
- _____. (2002b) 'Les enjeux des élections de décembre', *Le journal* No.148: 2-3.
- _____. (2002c) 'Sans-Papiers', *Le journal* No.148: 4.
- Taylor, G. and Mathers, A. (2002a) 'The Politics of European Integration: A European Labour Movement in the Making?', *Capital & Class* No.78: 39-60.
- _____ and _____. (2002b) 'Social Partner or Social Movement? European Integration and Trade Union Renewal in Europe', *Labour Studies Journal* 27(1): 93-108.
- Thompson, E. P. (1978) 'Eighteenth-Century English Society: Class Struggle Without Class?', *Social History* 3(2): 133-65.
- van Apeldoorn, B. (2002) *Transnational Capitalism and the Struggle over European Integration*, London: Routledge.
- van der Pijl, K. (1984) *The Making of an Atlantic Ruling Class*, London: Verso.
- _____. (1998) *Transnational Classes and International Relations*, London: Routledge.
- Vidal, J. (2002) 'Florence builds a bridge to a brave new social paradise', *The Guardian* (London), 11 November: 18.
- Wahl, P. (2002) 'Seattle, Genua ... und jetzt Florenz: Eine Bilanz des ersten Europäischen Sozialforums in Florenz', *Oekumenischer Informationsdienst* No.70: 21.
- Wallerstein, I. (1984) *The Politics of the World-Economy: The States, the Movements and the Civilizations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1991) *Unthinking Social Science: The Limits of Nineteenth-Century Paradigms*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- _____. (1995) *After Liberalism*, New York: The New Press.
- Wood, E. M. (1995) *Democracy Against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, S. (2002) *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism*, London: Pluto Press.

Notes

- * Andreas Bieler gratefully acknowledges the financial support of the British Academy (Ref.: SG-33623). An earlier version of this article was presented at the 4th PSA Labour Movement Group Conference *Labour Movements: Old and New*, University of Salford (4 July 2003). We would like to thank those involved for their comments and support as well as David Coates, Jean Faniel, Robert O'Brien and Mark Rupert for additional suggestions for revision. The constructive comments of the two anonymous referees for this journal, in addition to the recommendations of Barry Gills for improvement, were also gratefully received.
- ¹ There is a problem of nomenclature concerning the 'anti-globalization' movement as many of the groups constituting it are not anti-globalists in the strict sense. Hereafter, the broad rubric of 'anti-capitalist' movement is therefore adopted 'not because a majority of activists think it possible or perhaps even desirable to replace capitalism altogether' but because there is nevertheless an emerging anti-capitalist consciousness present (Callinicos 2003: 14-15).
- ² The notion of an 'aristocracy of labour' can be related to Lenin's analysis of labour movement activism meaning support for reformism through parliamentarism and 'class truce' rather than 'class struggle' (see Lenin 1964: 161). Labour aristocrats came to be identified with unionists and social democratic movements to account for the failure of the 'revolutionary' potential of the working classes (an historical overview and critique is provided by Hobsbawm 1964: 272-315; Hobsbawm 1973: 144-54; Hobsbawm 1984: 214-26 and 227-51).
- ³ For the research on the degree of co-operation between trade unions and wider social movements at the ESF, we have adopted an 'observer-as-participant' methodology, relying on direct observations and interviews without intensive participation in the events observed (Bryman 2001: 299). In order to maximize time and efficiency and guarantee manageable data, we first identified the focus of our research, namely the interaction of trade unions and social movements, and then used this as a guide to data collection (Mason 2002: 89-90). Hence, we attended those sessions at the ESF that either dealt directly with trade union-social movement interaction or had predominant representatives on panels from each sphere. Note taking was carried out in three stages. During the sessions observed, we made 'jotted notes' concentrating on key phrases and quotations. At the end of each day, we compared our notes, complementing them and giving them coherent order. Directly after the ESF we developed full field notes. This included the systematic relation of data to principle themes resulting from the observations and our discussions as well as initial ideas of interpretation (Bryman 2001: 304-6; Fielding 2001: 152-3, 159). Validation of the data gained at the ESF was then achieved through cross-checking with written primary material by trade unions and social movements, either collected directly at the ESF or obtained from these groups' internet sites, as well as follow-up interviews with representatives of established trade unions, new trade unions and social movements. The authors have translated all cited documents and interviews. Both the sessions observed and the interviews conducted are listed at the end of the article. The former are referred to in Roman numerals, the latter in Arabic numerals.
- ⁴ Swedish trade unions, for example, have re-focused their attention on the national level along these lines in recent years, see Bieler (2003b: 402-3).
- ⁵ ATTAC was first founded in France in June 1998, see <http://attac.org/indexen/index.html>. For an analysis of its establishment, goals and inner dynamics, see Ancelovici (2002).
- ⁶ Information on the World Development Movement is accessed most easily at <http://www.wdm.org.uk/>.
- ⁷ For an historical overview of Italian Autonomism, see Wright (2002).
- ⁸ For more information see <http://users.skynet.be/cadtm/pages/english>.
- ⁹ For more information see <http://home.mweb.co.za/hi/hic/about.html>.
- ¹⁰ For more information see <http://www.esib.org/>.
- ¹¹ For more information see <http://ns.rds.org.hk/via/>.
- ¹² For more information see <http://www.euromarches.org>.
- ¹³ We considered a union to be present, if a leading representative participated in one of the scheduled plenary sessions or workshops. This was assessed through an analysis of the official programme (ESF 2002a).

-
- ¹⁴ The unions present at the ESF included high level representatives from the French union *Confédération Générale du Travail* (CGT); the Italian, former communist union *Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro* (CGIL) and its metal workers' federation *Federazione Impiegati Operai Metallurgici* (FIOM); the second most important Spanish confederation *Confederación Sindical de Comisiones Obreras* (CCOO); the main Portuguese confederation *Confederação Geral dos Trabalhadores Portugueses* (CGTP); and the Greek confederation *Geniki Synomospondia Ergaton Ellados* (GSEE). The EIFs present included the General Secretary of the *European Transport Workers' Federation* (ETF) (Interview No.9), participating actively in plenary discussions (Session **VI**); the General Secretary of the *European Metalworkers' Federation*, although not in a speaking capacity (Interview No.10); as well as the *European Federation of Public Service Unions* (EPSU) (Interview No.8).
- ¹⁵ See, for example, the co-operation of the EPSU and several other European industry federations with a range of environmental and other social movements such as Greenpeace Europe and the Social Platform—itself a network of European NGOs promoting the Social Dimension of the EU—in lobbying the EU Council of Ministers to amend the Draft Directive on Public Procurement to include social, ecological and fair trade criteria in the award of public procurement contracts (Coalition for Green and Social Procurement's Amendment 2002; Interview No.8).
- ¹⁶ The Guardian (London), 'Carnival turns to confrontation', (2 June 2003): 5.
- ¹⁷ See the following report on events in Chiapas in light of the ESF, *Il Manifesto*, 'E adesso gli indios non marciano più soli', (10 November 2002): 7.
- ¹⁸ Information for the following discussion was gained from another set of participant observations plus the analysis of official documents collected during the ESF in Paris.
- ¹⁹ See <http://www.fsc-esf.org/francais/article781.html>; accessed on 12 December 2003.
- ²⁰ See, for example, 'Social and citizens' movements/political parties (1)' (Paris; Thursday, 13 November, 6 p.m.) and 'Social and citizens' movements/political parties (2)' (Paris; Friday, 14 November, 6 p.m.); authors present at both sessions.
- ²¹ See, respectively, <http://www.fsc-esf.org/francais/article918.html>; accessed 7 January 2004 and <http://www.etuc.org/EN/Press/releases/igc/ActionDay.cfm>; accessed 7 January 2004.