

The North – South Divide and the role of the global justice movement

-

Reshaping interaction and intelligence for an age of global justice

**Paper for the ISA Conference on
North – South Divide – San Diego March 2006**

**Hans Abrahamsson
H.Abrahamsson@padrigu.gu.se
Department for Peace and Development Studies
Göteborg University, Sweden**

Abstract

Despite lack of causal links between poverty and political violence empirical evidences suggest that the North-South Divide influences global prospects for Development and Security. This makes the global justice movement an important partner in the global struggle against terrorism. However, at times, violent confrontations such as those in Göteborg, Washington or Genoa are used to portray some of its members as terrorists themselves. Distorted perceptions has made conflicts escalate and envisaged violence has become a self-fulfilling prophecy. To blame is not only rhetorical romanticization of violence among certain activists. The present division of labor between different security agencies has made it difficult to interpret collected intelligence according to local realities on the ground. The paper points in this regard to the danger of a conventional Westphalian thinking based upon the traditional dichotomy between friends and enemies not able fully to coop with post-Westphalian network activism based upon fluid identities and decentralized decision making processes. Instead strengthened interaction and dialogue between different actors are advocated for in order to deal with misperceptions and unnecessary confrontations. Dialogue should however, be understood as a learning process and not as a tool for reaching out in order better to communicate the objectives of the political policy pursued.

The problem and the purpose

During the UN summit fall 2006, Kofi Annan drew attention to the triangular relationship between security, development and human rights. Without prospects for prosperity there will be no security, without security no sustainable development and without Human Rights, neither development nor security. The statement is an articulation of the increased understanding of the need for strengthened coherence between countries national security policies and policies required for global development.

Hence, Peace and Development in the 21st century requires diminished North-South divides and stronger compatibility between global justice, sustainable development, national welfare and human security. Changed attitudes to growth

and consumption in the Global North is believed to facilitate sustainable development in the Global South.

During the last decades, the importance of civil society organizations in order not only to enhance the democratization of global governance but also to bring about such transformation of habits and values has become appreciated. Accordingly, the U.N. Secretary-General made a strong appeal to the social forces present at the World Social Forum in Mumbai to join the Millennium Declaration initiative. It was believed that their strive for Another World and a more holistic and sustainable approach to security and development had important common features. According to the appeal:

Time is running out ... It is for civil society to build creative, political and moral pressure to hold our Governments accountable to their Millennium pledges (IPS-Terraviva, Mumbai India 16-21 January 2004 No 2).

However, although a certain potentiality is at hand a number of both internal and external constraints reduce the role and impact of civil society organizations. One such constraint seldom analyzed and addressed is the distorted images of the enemy and prevailing misconceptions of intentions and objectives at hand not only within governments and security agencies but also within social movements. Such misconceptions contributes to create skepticism, hostility and even unnecessary violent confrontations between demonstrators and law enforcement agencies. Empirical evidences point to how such confrontations not only reduce legitimacy in society for most of the actors involved but also remove attention from the political issues that protesters want to have addressed.

This paper discusses the role of the global justice movement in diminishing the North-South divide.¹ The aim of the paper is to explore possible, albeit fluid and temporary, coinciding interests between critical social movements and economic and political decision makers and the subsequent need of and possibilities for strengthened interaction between them. Drawing from my own experience as a

¹ The author of the paper holds a position as an associate professor at the Department for Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, Sweden. I am also an active member of the Attac- and global justice movement in Sweden. The paper should be understood as some kind of position paper about how I as a scholar-activist look upon the impact of security and intelligence as regards the efforts of the global justice movement to contribute to Peace and Development in the 21st century. Preparing for the EU-summit in Göteborg, spring 2001, I was asked in my professional capacity to contribute to the creation of arenas and bridges for dialogue and interaction between involved actors, activists, political decision makers and law enforcement agencies. Following the violent confrontations during the meeting I was used as some kind of a messenger boy and mediator between the Police Commissioner and the activists. After the summit meeting I have been asked to contribute to the ongoing efforts on the international level to create dialogue and interaction between critical social movements and the various multilateral institutions. This has turned out extremely problematic due to the lack of trust and the dominating perceptions at both sides as regards the intention and objectives behind such interaction. It has in this regard become important to increase the understanding of why the effort to create dialogue so far has failed to the extent that it has. For this reason I have, besides studies of an important amount of documents and reports, conducted some 150 interviews with political activists as well as political decision makers at various levels, trying to map the difficulties with interaction and dialogue as well as the reasons for the violent confrontations.

scholar-activist in the global justice movement, the paper raises four interlinked arguments:

The first one is an empirical argument and addresses the ambivalence with which local governments and law enforcement agencies are approaching social movements. Some of the protesters are considered to be friendly and serious demonstrators, others to be provocative and violent. Whilst the former should be invited to dialogue the latter should be confronted, discredited and delegitimized. The argument holds that such a two-bin strategy of dialogue and repression at the present juncture instead increases frustrations and violent confrontations.

The second argument is a theoretical argument explaining why the efforts to divide protesters into serious demonstrators and violent activists are misdirected. The argument is that such thinking, rooted in Westphalian security thinking, (“the ones not with us are against us”) is outdated in present network society with fluid identities and loyalties creating new patterns of social conflicts with different dynamics.

The third, normative argument, holds that the global justice movement is not only an important actor in the war against poverty and consequently against terrorism, but even more so in defense of the open society and against xenophobic and parochial social forces. The argument points to the present structural opportunity for coming to grips with global inequalities, but questions at the same time the social rooting and political capacity of the movement to seize such an opportunity in the Global North. The violent confrontations have in this regard discredited the social movements and reduced their legitimacy within important strata of the population.

The forth and final, more methodologically oriented, argument points to the need to create conditions for a reinforced dialogue between decision makers and social activists in order to be able to deal with Internet based social conflicts in a non violent way. The invention of new approaches and methods, be it for collection and treatment of intelligence or strengthened interaction, is of outmost importance in this regard. A more confrontatively oriented dialogue is called for, capable of confronting and visualizing misconceptions and erroneous images of the enemy dominating the minds of important actors, hereby making a more realistic threat assessment possible.

Intelligence and social movements

Since the end of the cold war the civil society organizations have increasingly participated in the effort to democratize governance and to increase the legitimacy of the political system, be it on the local, national, regional or the global level (Scholte 2003). At the same time however, as these movements are considered important for the sustainability of the open society through strengthened dynamics of democracy, many decision makers in the western countries conceive of the movements as an amorphous mass – an Internet based swarm – not only impossible to control but also a threat to Western lifestyle and values, hereby undermining the soft power and capacity of attraction needed for continued Western based leadership.

The U.S. has a long and important tradition of civil rights movements in shaping the values of human rights and democracy. Although resistance to government since its inception has been based upon non violent civil disobedience (Thoreau 1849), the U.S. also has a strong tradition in discrediting and neutralizing the activities of such movements and their leaders.² Thus Martin Luther King Jr's Southern Christian Leadership Conference was one of many groups that early on became an object for the so-called "counter intelligence program" launched by the FBI in the middle of the 1950's. Ten year later the US Army and National Guard elaborated their plan to respond to major civil disturbances within the United States (Operation Garden Plot).³ The records of the Nixon administration in dealing with the Vietnam war protesters are documented. For the establishment, it was hard to believe that young Americans demonstrating against the war in Vietnam were not infiltrated by communist subversive forces from abroad (Jordan 1999). During the Reagan administration the surveillance of the solidarity movements increased as a consequence of the second cold war and subsequent roll back policy. The anti-war movement was considered to increase the leverage of the Soviet Union.

The tools used by US Authorities to neutralize the activities of the movements range from psychological operations by US military institutions in order to influence the behavior of the movements, or how they are perceived by the public at large (PSYOPS),⁴ to law enforcement agencies physically preventing protesters from demonstrating, or the Secret Service preventing them from embarrassing the president (Melanson 2005). While the FBI's COINTELPRO is known for spying on radical groups, the CIA with its "operation chaos" worked more actively to discredit various anti-war organizations. The agency also spread hundreds of agents through anti-war groups in other countries with

² The famous essay by Henry Thoreau "Civil Disobedience" was originally a lecture given at the Concord Lyceum on January 26, 1848. It was published as "Resistance to Civil Government," in May of 1849, in Elizabeth Peabody's *Aesthetic Papers*, a short-lived periodical that never managed a second issue.

³ The plan was last activated to provide military assistance to civil authorities following the September 11 2001 attacks on the United States (Senate Appropriations Committee Hearing on Homeland Defence, April 11, 2002 available at <http://appropriations.senate.gov/releases/record.cfm?id=182288>).

⁴ See joint publication 3-53, Doctrine for joint psychological operations, Department of the Army, 5 September 2003 available at http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/new_pubs/jp3_53.pdf

particular emphasis on Britain, France, Germany, Sweden and neighboring Canada (Farren 2003 p.77). Both the Rockefeller Commission and the Church Committee pointed to how CIA infiltrated academic circles, not only in the US but also abroad, something that obviously took up a lot of intellectual capacity that could possibly have been used for more accurate threat assessments.

The consolidation of US Hegemony

The perception of the solidarity movement as a threat to US hegemony prevailed after the end of the cold war. The Clinton administration complemented the National Security Council with a National Economic Council in order to consolidate US economic capacity to lead the process of globalization. The US dominance in technology and the size of its economy made it unchallenged as the only superpower. Consequently, the collapse of the Soviet empire was believed to put an end to history, provided that US values and national security interests could be consolidated. In the mid-1990s the troublesome clouds constituted of protectionist forces within the European Union who, supported by an emerging anti-global movement in the North, tried hard to regain political control of the market forces. The National Security Council phrased this fear thus in their Global Trends 2015 report:

“Many Europeans will see the role of foreign policy as protecting their social and cultural identities from the ‘excesses of globalization’ and from its ‘superpatron’, the United States. One of the ways in which leaders will respond will be to clamor for greater political control over international financial and trade institutions.”

The protesters at the WTO-meeting in Seattle took the US establishment by surprise. They claimed that the organization lacked transparency and decided to shut down the meeting. Not only did the French anti-globalist and strong opponent of the American life-style José Bové provocatively distribute Roquefort cheese free of charge outside Mc Donald’s. In the streets there were clusters of activists from the global justice movement, and people dressed up as sea turtles stood by the teamsters and unions that would normally never be in the same room as environmentalists – an alliance, albeit temporary, that indeed seemed to threaten US corporate interests. Through the Internet, within 24 hours some 1.448 different organizations and movements could agree to and sign a joint call for action. Working conditions of TNCs were under siege. The United Students Against Sweatshops paved the way for how angry consumers could tackle immoral profit making by US enterprises. The corporate sector started to covertly follow the activists in order to elaborate manuals on how to deal with the protesters (Nace 2005). In the ground-breaking work “Waltzing with the Raptors” the author launched cooptive approaches as conflict resolution mechanisms for dispute settlement (Peters 1999).

The failure of intelligence was thought to have contributed to the battle of Seattle. The preceding WTO-meeting in Geneva the year before had resulted in

massive street violence and one of the most important actors, “the Direct Action Network”, had openly declared its ambition to shut down the meeting when coming to Seattle. However, the FBI considered the level of street violence a European phenomenon which hardly would effect the U.S. The terrorist threat assessment that the FBI presented indeed pointed to significant protest activity but the threat of violence was considered “low to medium”.

The event in Seattle disclosed obsolete equipment for surveillance and collection of intelligence. Activists communicated world wide and planned their activities by internet or mobile phones. The traditional division of labor between the FBI taking care of internal threats and the CIA taking care of intelligence abroad with subsequent classical interagency rivalry turned out to be another constraint. In a globalized world, the division between internal and external threats become meaningless. Only Pentagon with its NSA program proved capable of collecting intelligence on a global scale. From now on the Defense Intelligence Agency became the main provider of intelligence in order to deal with the new border-transcending netwar.

Demanding Global Justice

In April 2000, thousands of activists met in Washington DC for protests against the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. On Saturday April 15, the day before the largest scheduled demonstrations, officials from the Fire and Emergency Medical Services (FEMS) together with officers from the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) entered the “convergence centre” of the activists, issued multiple fire codes violation notices, closed down the centre and ordered all of the individuals inside to vacate the premises. The MPD was later accused of orchestrating the event for the purpose of frustrating the constitutional rights of demonstrating. The following day the New York Times characterized the raid as a pre-emptive show of force (4/16/2000).

During the subsequent official hearing on the police action, it was disclosed that the chief of the Police got a memo from the Intelligence Unit on the 3rd of April giving full details of the layout of the centre and planned activities. The MPD tried in vain on the 13th to get a search warrant from the US Attorney’s office. Police reports claimed that they had found materials for making Molotov cocktails, a laboratory for mass production of pepper spray and bomb making material. The request was turned down, as MPD did not have sufficient cause to secure the search warrant. That was the reason why the police decided to act through the FEMS. Nearly 1200 people were arrested during the week. Chief Ramsey, in charge of the operation, was called to an official hearing by the District of Columbia, accused for excessive use of force.

Encouraged by a successful outcome in Seattle, activists prepared for a follow-up action against the Bretton Woods Twins in Prague the following year. While

some 35.000 demonstrators prevented the delegates to get into the WTO-meeting in Seattle, some 10.000 activists decided to prevent the delegates from getting out from the meeting in Prague. A new ingredient in the subsequent confrontations was the Ya Basta activists from Italy. Dressed in white overalls and protected by rubber tyres, their aim was to break through any cordon put in place by law enforcement agencies. Efforts to deny the activists entrance to the country were in vain and the police request to make a proactive move into the convergence center of the activists was denied by the public prosecutor due to lack of substantive motivation. Impressive preparations by the police and assistance of armored cars turned out insufficient to prevent violence.

After Prague the corporate sector's cooptive approaches towards the global justice movements were replaced by more hostile attitudes. The well-respected international business magazine Forbes wrote about corporate saboteurs and appointed the global justice movement the enemy of the free market. The main target of the protesters was considered to be multinational corporate power. However, protest objectives extend beyond the corporations to the regulatory framework and the multilateral institutions considered the servants of corporate interests. An even more important target was the politicians whose inactivity during the last decades gave the corporate sector a free ride. Gone seemed the time when citizens had the power to impose rules on the behavior of their own multinational corporations such as the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act taken by the US Congress 1977 prohibiting corporate bribery in overseas projects. The Financial Times articulated their understanding of the global justice movement in the following way

It is not, as Mr Blair has described the protesters, a "traveling circus of anarchists", although, to be sure, there are clowns, arsonists and Molotov-cocktail throwing thugs within the movement. Nor is it just society's green fringe of unwashed hippies and Luddite reactionaries, although there are plenty of vegan spiritualists, unreconstructed communists, regressive utopians and smoked-out dreamers. And, while there is plenty of fuzzy thinking and fast-and-loose abuse of economic statistics, there is also a critique backed by respected economists, businesspeople and politicians. Nor is it strictly speaking "anti-globalisation". The vast majority of activists are pro-globalisation, indeed products of it. The movement was welded together by the internet. Mass mobilisations, in Europe in particular, have been made possible by mobile phones. The unprecedented pitch of public feeling in the North for people in the South has coincided with cheap air fares between the two. Instead, this is counter-capitalism. The new wave of political activism has coalesced around the simple idea that capitalism has gone too far. It is as much a mood as a movement, something counter-cultural. It is driven by the suspicion that companies, forced by the stock markets to strive for ever greater profits, are pillaging the environment, destroying lives and failing to enrich the poor as they promised. And it is fuelled by the fear that democracy has become powerless to stop them, as politicians are thought to be in the pockets of companies and international political institutions are slaves to a corporate agenda. (Financial Times September 10, 2001)

A couple of months after Prague, several thousand activists gathered in Nice in order to raise their voices against the neoliberal orientation of the European Union and the apparent lack of political will to stop the process of marketization.

Lack of dialogue with the local government and of logistic support for lodging heated up the atmosphere. Despite refusal to let 1.500 activists from Ya Basta in Italy cross the boarder and enter the country, violent confrontations could not be avoided. The convergence centre was shut down and planned seminars and conferences by the activists were cancelled.

From Washington D.C. to Gleneagles

One month after the violent confrontations in Göteborg, June 2001, where some 25.000 people continued to protest against the neoliberal orientation of the EU project (an event to which we will return shortly) more than 200.000 thousand activists got together in Genoa to protest against the corporate led process of globalization and the democratic deficit within the G8.

As in Göteborg terrorist threats against the US president turned out to have a strong impact on the strategy used by those responsible for security. The harbor as well as the airport was closed for traffic and some 14000 policemen were supposed to keep the city under control. After two days of street violence the police raided the convergence centre of the Genoa Social Forum located in the Diaz School, alleging information at hand of the existence of Molotov cocktails. The school was closed down and several hundred activists arrested and beaten. The Molotov cocktails found turned out to have been planted by the police themselves.

During the preparation of the G8 meeting in Gleneagles last year, suspicions increased that external provocateurs tried to infiltrate demonstrations in order to escalate conflicts with law enforcement agencies and move the political debate and the strategies of resistance away from substantive political issues towards discussing acts of violence. Media whipped up fear about the prospects of trouble by quoting information from British Intelligence agents used for their briefing of the police chiefs on how to tackle terrorist threats. However, following the ongoing and worldwide process of privatization of security, allegations of planned violence came primarily from security consultants with background in the British Army and dubious connections with the far right. These consultants were working for the private security company Stuart Crawford Associates, requested to provide law enforcement agencies with intelligence. The problem was not only the fact that “the worse the warnings, the better the business”, but that the preparation for violent confrontations that followed became a self-fulfilling prophecy. Following the claim of the Police that they had seized a number of weapons, the eco-camp near Sterling, established in co-operation with the local authorities in order to lodge some two-thousand demonstrators, was contained by a security cordon and over 1000 activists were locked in and denied their right to demonstrate.

Taking all the events together, since the battle of Seattle a clear common pattern is emerging. Police have in a number of cases issued misinformation claiming unsubstantiated evidence of violent plans by protesters gathering for mass actions. The false information is then used as a pretext for unwarranted police actions. Draconian measures drawn from inadequate intelligence create anger and hostility with most of the protesters, regardless of their initial intention. The dynamic events in Göteborg, Sweden, in connection with the EU-summit to which we now turn illustrate this development.

The EU Summit in Göteborg, Sweden

Events in Prague and Nice made the Swedish activists as well as the government pre-cautious. They had coinciding interests in avoiding confrontations when Sweden took over the chairmanship in the European Union and hereby the task of hosting the next summit, scheduled for 15 – 17 June 2001. The global justice movement had just taken root in Sweden, and although the violent confrontations in Europe made the corporate sector talk about the danger of hooligans, the media had so far refrained from hostility. The Swedish Government was interested in breaking the vicious circle by demonstrating that an open European Union was possible.

Accordingly intense preparations for dialogue and interaction commenced. The municipality of Göteborg, the city designated to host the summit, arranged for accommodation and required infrastructure for the protesters. The University provided arenas for dialogue and special dialogue groups were created for interaction between the activists and government as well as between activists and local authorities in order to create conditions for political dialogue and massive and peaceful demonstrations. The police established a special contact group for interaction with the demonstrators, the so-called psycho-tactical group. At the time, few made the association to psychological operations, but most of the activist understood that the main task of the group was to collect intelligence. As activists had nothing to hide they participated in the interactions in exchange for required permits for demonstrations. The dialogue group got together regularly once a week during the two and a half months of preparation and met daily during the summit.

From dialogue to confrontation

The political activities started on Wednesday the 13th of June, two days before the Summit by a dialogue between activists and the Swedish government about the role of Sweden in the European Union and the role of Europe for Global Justice. The event was well covered by the international media.

The following day, Thursday the 14th, at 11 o'clock, the US president G.W. Bush arrived in town. When the dialogue group ended their meeting around 11.30 the very same morning, they were informed that the convergence centre had been surrounded by the police and that the activists were locked in. According to the Police Commissioner, nearly all of the activists in the convergence centre were planning violent actions. Later the Police Commissioner claimed access to intelligence disclosing that the Ya Basta movement and the anarchist that were lodged at the school had brought weapons inside intended for violent actions against not only the Summit but also against president Bush.

Neither the psycho-tactical group of the police nor the representatives of the local authorities or for that matter the activists participating in the dialogue group had been informed in advance. As the host of the dialogue group, I immediately contacted the Police Commissioner and asked for the permission to enter the convergence centre in order to find out what was going on and how to settle the dispute. It turned out a mission impossible. The main obstacle was prevailing images of the enemy and distorted conceptions of one another. My own interpretation of the situation I found is worthwhile to write in italic:

The police officers were sent to the school informed by the Commissioner that dangerous terrorists were to be found inside the school. The activists present believed that the containers constructing the cordon around the place had been brought there in order to put activists inside them and take them away.

Consequently, the deadlock turned out impossible to break – at first the police officers did not let any activists out, and when some of them finally did, most of the activists did not want to leave. Skeptical from the very beginning of the efforts to interact peacefully with the local police, the activists felt extremely provoked by the fact that the political space they had been offered suddenly and unilaterally was taken away. They were not very interested in giving up the place and hand it over to the police. Subsequently, the dialogue broke down and the days that followed were characterized by the most violent street confrontations in the political history of Sweden, where police officers found themselves forced to open fire against demonstrators. No weapons were ever found inside the school and the Police Commissioner was later taken to court, accused of having violated the law by his preventive action. He persisted that the action was required in order to guarantee the security for president Bush. The court did not find reason for a verdict of guilty and although that the director of the public prosecution authority appealed and demanded imprisonment, the case was closed.

The governmental investigation

If the dialogue failed during the Summit, it was paradoxically not only recaptured but also strengthened during the events that followed. The Government immediately took the initiative to arrange for an official report analyzing the causes behind the confrontations. The former Swedish Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson was appointed commissioner of the enquiry.

The governmental investigation came to play the role of a kind of therapy for officials from the police as well as for activists. A number of collective hearings and meetings took place, where testimonies from different actors were presented and commented upon. For many of the activists, the Carlsson commission provided the first occasion when any governmental body had been listening to their understanding of recent developments, be it the democratic deficit, global challenges or attitudes of the police. As one activist from the black block expressed after the first meeting with the commission:

It's strange that one has to throw stones, smash windows and partly set the city on fire in order to attract any attention from the authorities to our different political grievances
(personal communication)

Each actor had his own interpretation on why violence escalated to the level it did. The governmental official report pointed to structural problems within the law enforcement agencies. The National Police Board had decentralized too much of the decision making processes and responsibilities to the local police, but sufficient resources to take this on were not given. The investigation also pointed to a far too centralized decision making process within the local police, giving the Police Commissioner a too encompassing and at the same time not totally transparent role.

Looking back, most of the activists viewed the desire of the local police authorities to participate in interaction and dialogue before the summit as a search for an efficient way to collect information and to use that information in order to set up a trap. They pointed to the fact that it was the police themselves that strongly had argued for placing the school in question at the disposal of the activists in the first place. This was done despite strong reluctance by the Security Service to do so because of the central location of the school, considered to bring the convergence centre too close to the conference centre where the EU-summit was going to take place. The activists also brought to mind the fact that despite the search warrant being at hand for action on Wednesday evening, the police did not stop some fifty Ya Basta activist arriving by bus from Finland from entering the school during the night. On the contrary, the bus which was stopped and checked upon arrival in Sweden at the border south of Stockholm, was released and permitted to proceed to Göteborg. Then suddenly, out of nowhere, early on Thursday morning when most of the activists had arrived, over 100 containers were brought to the site in order to create an 800 meter long cordon around the school. People working in international shipping have confirmed that it normally takes some two to three months to

bring that number of empty 40' containers to Göteborg. More than 450 activists were locked in, but somewhat paradoxically released the following morning when the EU-summit was going to begin. However, at that moment the US president had left the country.

Furthermore, the activists were extremely skeptical of the motives presented for the closing of the convergence center. No one had heard of any planned violent activities towards president Bush during his visit in Göteborg. True, a big "Bush not welcome" demonstration was planned for, as was a peaceful mooning outside his hotel (with a canal between the hotel and the protesters), but no intentions of confrontations that could have given the police the motives to act this way.

Allegations had immediately surfaced that in addition to the closure of the convergence centre, police provocateurs were responsible for parts of the street violence that followed. In connection with the official investigations it was disclosed that several police officers had infiltrated the groups of masked demonstrators and actively contributed to digging up stones from the street, although no proof could be obtained that they also had participated in throwing them at different targets. This experience made many of the activists argue for the need to refrain from the use of different kind of masks in the future, although hereby an important symbolic value would be lost.

Strong suspicions also prevail that the police wanted to provoke the more violent-prone activists to act in order to arrest and to take legal proceedings against as many of them as possible. Empirical evidences in the form of a number of special installed cameras for surveillance and identification all over the city, as well as the preparation of special localities capable of keeping great numbers of activists in temporary custody, pointed in that direction.

The pre-emptive action to contain the convergence center at the school also took the Swedish security service by surprise. They had infiltrators in the school who did not observe anything that could motivate a search warrant, let alone the closure of the convergence centre. The same goes for the criminal investigation and intelligence unit of the local police. None of them had produced any threat assessment pointing to risks for attacks against president Bush.

The question of intelligence in a global network society

During the conversations I have had with the Police Commissioner after the events in order to sort out what actually happened and what went wrong, the need of contra-factual thinking was raised several times. What would have happened if he had not reacted? Indisputably the Police Commissioner was at the time concerned by the presence of the Ya Basta group. Weeks in advance he had checked the legal framework within which he had to act and realized the

complications in taking preventive action against people as long as they were only walking around in white overalls and dressed in tyres and rubber clothing. His concern might have been reinforced by the intention at the time of over 200 Ya Basta activists from Italy to join the demonstrations. Be as it may, two days before the summit their plans were suddenly changed and their participation cancelled.

The fact that the security services did not make an issue of the presence of Ya Basta did not surprise the Police Commissioner. During our talks he made it clear that he never paid any real attention to the intelligence provided by the Swedish security service. Himself a military intelligence man, he was fully aware of the fact that the Swedish security service did not have access to adequate information from any international sources whatsoever. Instead he relied on intelligence provided by the military and by the US counterparts. It struck me that this might be the reason why the events in Göteborg came so closely to follow the same pattern as the events in Washington D.C, and Philadelphia a year before.⁵

The conversation drew my attention to another possible structural problem within the Swedish security system that could explain the escalation of conflict in Göteborg, namely the way that various Swedish entities collect and treat intelligence. My concern increased some months after the delivery of the official report on the events in Göteborg, as another governmental investigation looking into the Swedish capacity of dealing with terrorism in the light of September 11 presented their findings. That report made me aware of the fact that in Sweden, as apparently in most countries, there is a strict division of labor between the police taking care of internal security and the military responding to external threat. Accordingly, the law enforcement agencies do not have full access to international threat assessment. Normally they are dependent on the military intelligence service.

The problem in this regard is not only the fact that a certain reluctance prevails within military circles to pass on secret information to the police due to its obligation to prevent and report on activities breaking the law, as the police hereby, it is assumed, can destroy the sources behind different kind of information. The main problem is due to the fact that the long-standing division of labor has created strong networks between different military intelligence services around the world that for decades have established a common culture in collecting and treating the information before it is passed on to other agencies for threat assessments. This culture is based upon secret methods for obtaining classified information from closed sources during the cold war related to

⁵ In Philadelphia, later the same year (august) the police raided a warehouse where activists were engaged in creating puppets to protest at the Republican National Convention. Seventy activists were arrested, materials were seized and the warehouse was shut down.

different national security interests. After the end of the cold war, and as will be further elaborated in the subsequent section, the traditional interstate conflicts have been complemented by other kinds of global challenges and social conflicts whose threat assignments requires stronger interaction with and social rooting in the society in order to properly interpret and evaluate the massive amount of information now available at open sources.

In Göteborg, the way the intelligence was collected also had a strong influence on the strategy employed in order to deal with the assessed threats. As it turned out, the preventive strike strategy used by the police was not only motivated by a secret threat assessment provided by the Swedish military intelligence, and ultimately based upon intelligence provided by the DIA, pointing to the Ya Basta movements as a potential danger for president Bush. First and foremost it was inspired by military thinking in terms of the necessity to differentiate between friends and enemies, i.e. bad and good protesters. Similar thinking is also dominating the police culture. The police was used to dealing with hierarchically structured organizations with a clear and distinct leadership and with mandates to act in the name of its members. In a network society such an approach became not only less efficient, it became harmful. The police became frustrated when having to deal with networking social movements with flat organizations and decentralized decision-making without any leadership in the traditional sense of the world. The not very outspoken responses by ad hoc appointed “representatives” of the networks to different questions by the police as regards planned activities was understood as a proof of hidden agendas and secrecy, instead of as signs that there was actually not much central planning going on in the areas in question. Subsequently these representatives were met with strong suspicion and some were erroneously placed in the enemies camp.

In my conversations with the Police Commissioner, he frequently emphasized the need for dialogue with demonstrators, but found it naive to believe that it would ever be possible to have dialogue with those activists that according to his experience were more prone to violent action. As a military intelligence man, he pointed to the need of having an advantage in information in order to be proactive, to keep the initiative and to separate good demonstrators from bad activists. However, the Police Commissioner admitted during our talks that he strongly had underestimated the anger by which also friendly and peaceful activists reacted towards the closure of the convergence centre.

Paradoxical as it may seem, to me the intelligence collected by the Swedish security service proved more reliable. The simple reason was that they, lacking access to international briefings, had to rely on what they could figure out on the local ground. For them, separating bad from good demonstrators was not an option. They realized that new kinds of social conflict in a network society with fluid identities and strong mobility between different methods of political articulation would make such a separation impossible. In fact a preventive strike

risked being taken as proof that the police had decided to unilaterally close the political space granted to the activists, a space they considered non-negotiable. Hence, as such an action could provoke the activist into defending their space by all means available, the Swedish security service would like to refrain from using such methods.

This sense of having a right to a political space, a the right to articulate political grievances which is not negotiable, is the result of the fact that the new generation in Sweden has been brought up as critical citizens in a society claimed to be democratic. When the reality they experience deviates from this long-standing reputation, the state loses its legitimacy in their eyes, and so does the police. This way of analyzing activists' behavior culturally frequently collides with the dominant culture within the police, emphasizing the need of being proactive, in order to preserve always the initiative. This underlines the need to develop an alternative and more interactive method for maintaining law and order by less violent means.

The autonomy of the local police

Such a need in turn raises the question of the local autonomy of the police. To what degree are local police authorities capable of pursuing their own developed approaches to different threats when dealing with global events and challenges?

In Sweden, the local chief in command is legally responsible, he or she has the ultimate juridical responsibility for actions taken. However, in the case of the EU-events in Göteborg, it is obvious that the Police Commissioner became dependent on foreign intelligence and hereby also influenced by the tactics used elsewhere.

It is not known exactly what the connections and channel of communication between the Police Commissioner and US intelligence services looked like. Of interest is what kind of arrangements made the US security trust the capacity of the local police to act according to agreements. They had little knowledge of the real intention of people in the demonstrations and behind the placards.

Presumably, the US security officers were satisfied as long as the local police authorities kept their promise to keep the demonstrators away from the president in order not to expose him to any embarrassments. The strategy to lock in several hundreds of the demonstrators at the convergence center, at a secure distance from President Bush's hotel (located in the very heart of the city within moats difficult to cross) obviously provided important guarantees for the

security arrangements made. According to the testimony of the Swedish security service before the governmental investigation

The Secret Service thought it was an excellent idea to first rent out the schools and then to lock the activists in.

According to the Police Commissioner, the fact that the action taken destroyed all conditions for planned dialogue and furthermore resulted in the most intensive street violence in the political history of Sweden was of a secondary importance.⁶

The events provoked strong reactions in different circles in Swedish society. The national union of the police force immediately raised concern over the working conditions of their members. As the police in general is not equipped for similar confrontations, under the chaos that followed several activists and policemen were wounded, buildings were damaged, and cars destroyed. Excessive violence by the police in some instances also endangered its legitimacy within society in large, a legitimacy of outmost importance in order for the police to be able to perform effectively.

Lost legitimacy for global justice

However, the chief political price for the events in Göteborg was to be paid by the activists. Not only did the police actions severely restrict the freedom to demonstrate of several hundreds demonstrators. The police intervention also prevented demonstrators from exercising their right of assembly since the anti-summit conference and other meetings were unable to be held as planned.

More importantly, however, after the summit the image remaining in the minds of ordinary citizens was a vandalized city set on fire by crazy, furious and

⁶ The experience from the EU summit in Göteborg is by no way unique. The APEC Summit in Vancouver, November 1997, when 18 heads of governments and of states got together in order to discuss the future of their trade agreements, provides another example on how the autonomy of the local police could be drastically reduced. The meeting, taking place at the premises of the University of British Columbia, had been preceded by intense dialogue between the government, law enforcement agencies and protesters in order to keep law and order and simultaneously respect the freedom of speech. In a way similar to the Swedish Government with regard to the EU summit in Göteborg, the Canadian Government was interested in providing the world with an example of an open summit and a city accommodating friendly protesters. In a similar way to Sweden, the government provided funds for alternative conferences, this time focusing on the question of human rights. Furthermore, the local police and the demonstrators had agreed to enter into faked confrontations with subsequent mass arrests in order to draw desired attention from the media. Shortly before the opening of the meeting the Canadian government came under pressure from several of the participating countries, which were not interested in exposing their heads of state to embarrassments. Indonesia threatened to withdraw from the conference if security measures were not taken avoiding all kinds of demonstrations. According to an investigation carried out by the University, the Canadian government found it necessary to make "a succession of extraordinary moves to immunize Suharto and other APEC leaders from any discomforting protest as the leaders drove onto the UBC campus toward the MOA site". These led to the breakdown of the original negotiated accord with protesters, and ultimately, to the protest escalating into a violent confrontation (Doyle A & Ericsson R, 1999).

violent activists. Many people dissociated themselves strongly, not only from the events as such but also from the political demands put forward by the movements. The demonstrators were dismissed as unserious hooligans and people took these developments as an excuse for non-involvement in the political dialogue on future global challenges. Certain organizations within the global justice movement that participated in the peaceful demonstrations saw their membership numbers declining by over 200 percent as a consequence of the reduced legitimacy. Many demonstrators got scared and lost interest in political activity. More radical groups went under ground, with the obvious risk that covert acts of sabotage will be picking up steam. The political capacity of the global justice movement to resist the more xenophobic forces and parochial fortress building actions was severely damaged.

Theorizing about social conflicts

The empirical evidences presented in the previous section point to the fact that the two-bin strategy used towards social movements by the law enforcement agencies in order to keep law and order frequently contributes to the escalation of violent confrontations between demonstrators and local police forces. One of the reasons is the very nature of social conflicts that has developed new dynamics and patterns after the end of the cold war.

In a globalised world, the questions of peace, security and development become increasingly dependent on people's social trust. As social trust becomes a key issue, the question of nation-state security has gradually been substituted by the question of human security, and the importance of understanding *social conflicts* increases. While political conflicts mainly concern the possession of government power or control over a certain territory, social conflicts are ultimately about a questioning of the legitimacy of the social order.

Every society is marked by social structures that determine which values and norms dominate, as well as how different resources are distributed and used. The social structures have been created by social actors and can be changed by actors. Hence, social conflicts should be understood as antagonisms around these structures – around basic values, around social status and political influence, or around scarce resources, between different groups of people. Because of perceived social inequalities or democratic deficits, the social order has lost part of its legitimacy. Strongly simplified, social conflicts are thus about antagonisms between the individuals and groups that want to preserve the social order, and those who want to change it. Hence, conflicts are intimately linked to the question of *power* – that is, to the capacity of individuals or groups to realize

their goals, satisfy their needs and promote their interests. Most social researchers see conflict as a normal state in the development of society and the constantly ongoing change of economic, political and social power structures (Weber 1947). The question is how such conflicts should be managed in order not to become violent.

Looking back

The English political philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) was one of the first to develop a theory on human nature and how the human inclination for conflict could be dealt with. In his classic work *Leviathan* (1651) he pointed to the possibility of evading a “war of all against all” through the establishment of a strong state. In exchange for the state being responsible for the security of the citizens, they would give up parts of their freedom. Such *social contracts* provided the sovereign state with legitimacy, and the monopoly on the use of violence needed for conflict management. The task of the state became balancing its own demands for order/security, and the market’s demand for freedom. The interpretation of the external threat was decisive for this balancing act. Hobbes gave priority to the preservation of order/security and spoke in favor of an authoritarian state. In connection with the English civil war and the Glorious Revolution (1688) John Locke could then develop the thinking around the social contract with the emergence of the *liberal state*. Since then *democracy* gradually developed into an important tool for managing social conflicts. Antiquity’s democracy concept (people’s power) was developed for the needs of a new time, where the ideas of delegation and representation became central. The social stratification of society allowed for the emergence of different political parties in order to look after the interests of the electorate. Hereby, those affected by decisions would indirectly be included in influencing their formulation.

The political dynamics of state, market and civil society

Referring to the industrialization of Europe, the Hungarian social anthropologist Karl Polanyi describes the fields of tension between the market’s need for freedom and people’s need for security and social safety in the form of a double movement. During the first movement the market expanded. Eventually local resistance emerged, in the form of a second movement that gave priority to the interests of society and citizens. Political decision-making was reintroduced and democracy was strengthened. At times the constellation of political forces permits an institutionalized state of equilibrium built on converging interests between different social forces. During the Westphalian era with its nation-state project the social contract constituted the base for such a historic compromise.

Polanyi thus describes the development of society as a constant dialectic between market and politics (Polanyi 1957).

The Italian political philosopher Antonio Gramsci analyzed the dynamics of the political process created by the interaction between the first and the second movement in the form of *wars of position* within or between different historic blocks. For Gramsci, the field of tension between the state's striving for order/security and the market's demands for freedom was complemented with civil society's striving for justice. The power relations that characterized the war of position and determined its outcome also came to mark the *hegemonic discourse*. For Gramsci, the issue was achieving control over the state. In this, emancipation was to be found. Only thereafter, freedom could be attained. Gramsci also viewed the exercise of power as a balancing act between consent and coercion. There was no state without elements of both (Gramsci 1971).

New patterns of conflict

Marxism in various varieties has been important in order to understand the causes and development of social conflicts during the later phases of European industrialization (Marx 1959). Through its focus on antagonisms between labor and capital, it has, according to my understanding, however less to offer for understanding contemporary conflict patterns. Network capitalism's delocalization of production has meant that conflicts tend to be less about social control or material poverty resulting from exploitation, and more about poverty resulting from being excluded and outside the system of production.

For many countries in the South, the nation state project is still in its infancy. It has turned out difficult to break the colonial vicious circle, in order to establish a social contract. A weak domestic resource base reduced not only the state's capacity to provide social security but also its capacity for resource mobilization. The legitimacy of the state remained weak, and its incapacity to achieve a monopoly of violence impaired the security of the citizens. A common feature for the new type of armed conflict that has become increasingly evident after the end of the cold war is that it is the civilian population that is hit the hardest. Although these conflicts find different local expressions, they often have common global ramifications through their loosely connected networks, which extend far across national borders (Kaldor 1999).

The causes of the social conflicts that develop in such situations vary. Contemporary conflict researchers speak about *protracted social conflicts*, the roots of which are to be found in a complex web of structural and psycho-cultural causes (Azar 1990). *Relative deprivation* is an important driving force, with its basis in a sense of poverty that often reaches beyond the strictly economic and material aspects and extends to people's need for recognition and

for being included in society's development with the same right to opportunities as others. Relative deprivation is not a matter of comparison between what people have and what they would like to have. Rather, it is a matter of what people, according to the social context where they are situated, feel entitled to have (Gurr 1970). Accordingly, people can develop a relatively high sense of injustice and exclusion, independently of their own social status and class affiliation. Relative deprivation can appear in people with a very low material living standard, as well as in those who are higher in the social hierarchy. At times people feel that they are being treated unfairly because of their affiliation to a certain group identity. Such *politicization of identity* from below can be exploited by frustrated elites trying to strengthen their social power by *instrumentalization of politics* from above (Nilsson 1999). Frustration gaps within different population groups more easily interlink and may lead to violence, the closer the country is to the *trap of low-level security equilibrium*. This concept denotes a situation where economic balance has been recreated at too low a level of development, while poverty and a sense of injustice with ordinary people may become the breeding ground for political mobilization of frustrated elites (Abrahamsson 2003).

The globalization of social conflicts

For countries in the North, the foundation of liberal democracy is changing. Cross-border *network capitalism* has begun to replace national systems of production by increased planetary connectivity. Technological innovation in communication has compressed time and space on a global scale. The present shape of the process of globalization is intimately linked to changed functions for the nation-state. In order to find its place in the process and to attract sufficient capital and technology for becoming a node in the network, the state has transformed itself from a filter absorbing externalities to a transmission belt for them. Such internationalization of the state (Cox 1987) increases people's fear for a race to the bottom or lost sovereignty. The striving of the state to increase its legitimacy towards the actors of the market has frequently implied reduced legitimacy vis-à-vis its citizens. The democratic deficits increase as a consequence of political decision making moving on to the global level or hiding behind computer screens.

Thus globalization should be understood as a social process and as an indicator of not only social but also political change. The party system is in a crisis, as people's social affiliation and identity become increasingly fluid. The faith in grand theory where development was about social engineering only is gone. With demands for renewal and diversity, the ideological conditions are changing. Many people do not want to be represented by someone speaking in their name. Instead they prefer increasingly to channel their political energy through civil society, a concept to be understood as a political space (arena) where action groups are getting together in order to change the rules and

regulations of social life outside political parties (Scholte 2003). Politics is individualized, and more focused on what is felt to penetrate everyday life. This becomes especially clear within the new social movements that are emerging. Thus, while the political dynamics are having difficulties rooting itself at national level in the South, the dynamics tend to lose their national ties in the North.

The intensified but unequal process of globalization has created new threats to peace and development. How people perceive increased international economic, political, social and cultural interconnections is normally dependent on where they are situated. Most people in the North have so far strongly benefited from the process. The same is true for many hundreds of millions of people in the South, especially in China and India, where many people's living conditions have improved substantially. But for a very large number of people, mainly in Africa, the Middle East, Latin America and Eastern Europe, poverty has rather increased. People here experience how growing disparities between poor and rich give different access to the Earth's resources and influence over political decisions. This makes the UNDP in its annual report 2002 conclude that the frustration in developing countries over unequal distribution of income and power has never been greater (UNDP 2002:101).

At the same time the effects of a rampant market led globalization is increasingly creating frustration also in the North. The Report of the National Intelligence Council's 2020 Project summarizes some of its findings in the following way:

“ We foresee a more pervasive sense of insecurity—which may be as much based on psychological perceptions as physical threats—by 2020. Even as most of the world gets richer, globalization will profoundly shake up the status quo—generating enormous economic, cultural, and consequently political convulsions. With the gradual integration of China, India, and other emerging countries into the global economy, hundreds of millions of working-age adults will become available for employment in what is evolving into a more integrated world labor market. This enormous work force—a growing portion of which will be well educated—will be an attractive, competitive source of low-cost labor at the same time that technological innovation is expanding the range of globally mobile occupations. The transition will not be painless and will hit the middle classes of the developed world in particular, bringing more rapid job turnover and requiring professional retooling. Outsourcing on a large scale would strengthen the anti-globalization movement”

This transformation of the global labour market with its shock increase in supply will reinforce the distinction also in the North between those of the population considering themselves to be included in the development and those feeling excluded. The problem is aggravated by the fact that the predominant neoliberal approach to globalisation in the North can offer nothing but decreased salaries or increased unemployment. In addition to the parochial and protectionist attitudes referred to social tensions and conflict will increase.

Recent studies point to how future conflicts are likely to take place in urban areas following increased urbanization, the spread of immigrant communities, and demographic pressures on renewable resources. Strong segregation and high unemployment may be fertile grounds for politicization of identity and instrumentalization of politics. The world is drifting apart and this makes it less meaningful to divide the globe in the North and the South. New borderlines have been socially constructed along the lines of inclusion-exclusion in all societies regardless of geography, making it more appropriate to talk about the Global North in the Global South and vice-versa.

This social conflict at the global level as regards distribution of resources and income has become especially palpable in recent years, and reminds us of the double movement that Polanyi used in order to describe European industrialization. Today, the first movement consists of a corporate driven globalization from above striving for market expansion on a global scale. Its shortcomings have given rise to a second movement, a countermovement from below with different political bases (Falk 2000). Integration and disintegration go hand in hand.

Even if globalization as a historical social process must be understood as politically irreversible, there is not anything nature-given about continuing a neoliberal approach to globalization. Hence, globalization should be understood as a political process, possible to influence and to shape. *However, as Polanyi* already pointed out, it is far from given that the second movement, responding to the shortcomings of the first, is built on the striving for progressive politics and safeguarding an open society.

The nature of the 2nd movement

At the one end of the spectrum of the different social forces that constitute the present second movement, we find a more explicitly anti-global orientation. It partly consists of attempts to recreate the prerequisites for the national project and save what can be saved of the welfare state. At times, these social forces try to achieve the goal through a regional approach. The advocacy of Samuel Huntington to strengthen the transregional Atlantic co-operation is a case in point (Huntington 1996).

On this side of the spectrum one also find the fortress-builders and more xenophobic forces that want to shut out globalization and protect themselves from the multicultural influence that threaten their local and national distinctive characters. In other parts of the world, many actors and social movements turn against the internationalism of the West as such. At times, as highlighted in connection with the widespread protests against the Cartoons of Mohammed, such popular uprising are strongly supported by various regimes frustrated by

enforced subordination to various western conditions and values. Samuel Huntington (1996) has in this regard pointed to the risk for a clash of civilizations. While contested in the North the thesis has some acceptance in the South. The contesters of this thesis hold that the multicultural society already is a fact, making it impossible to separate different identities from each other. However, others point to how failed integration in the North and increased inequalities in the South has reinforced the feelings of worlds apart and reads the recent riots in the French suburbs as a proof of the existing Global South.

On the other side of the spectrum we find what has become known as the *global justice movement*. Their struggle is more a question about what kind of globalization and not so much a struggle against globalization as such. It mainly consists of movements in the South, who react to the unequal conditions of globalization. Many of these movements want to fight the poverty they are in, through partly delinking from the neoliberal world order and instead of deregulating trade strengthen the internal base of accumulation and increase self-sufficiency primarily as regards provision of foodstuffs (Bello 2002). Increases in population reinforce the need of employment in the countryside so that young men are not forced into the cities where they will soon become targets for recruitment to illegal networks inclined to violence.

These movements in the South have also found allies within movements in the North striving for a different globalization, one that is more sustainable and democratic. Many people here react against the increasing levels of commercialization: not only against privatization of the public sector leading to the sale of services, but also against commercial interests increasingly being allowed to take over public space. The idea that “our world is not for sale” and the striving to break down the market economy’s consumption culture is becoming a more and more important common denominator for the new social movements that are emerging. So is awareness that increasingly large parts of the existing environmental space must be reserved for overcoming the increasing income gaps. With the help of the development of information technology, these diverse movements in North and South together try not only to globalize the questioning of the corporate driven globalization, but also to globalize hope that another world and another kind of modernity is possible.

As discussed in the previous section, the capacity of these movements to mobilize popular support took the world by surprise first in connection with the abolishment of the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (1997) and later in connection with the WTO meeting in Seattle two years later (1999). An important forerunner of the global justice movement is the *Zapatista* struggle for indigenous land rights in Chiapas in Mexico, where they, in the mid-1990s, with the help of modern communication technology and the Internet began what has come to be called a *netwar*, where “a war of the flea” quickly turned into a “war of the swarm” (Ronfeldt 1998).

Through the slogan “diversity is our unity” the movements point to their multi-generational, multi-class and multi-issue characteristics. Diversity in tactics and political articulation has revitalized the demonstrations. Gone are old-style gatherings confined to placard-waving and controlled marches from point A to point B. Instead the dramaturgy is one of a colorful and peaceful carnival. Unfortunately, at times more radical groups are imprudently prepared to seize any opportunity for “direct actions” by indulging in violent actions and inflicting damage on specific targets. In this context, excessively draconian procedures by security agencies could have a deleterious effect and give violence-prone activists the motives they need. Hereby they are contributing to increasing ordinary citizens’ dissociation from political activism and the question of global justice.

The two-bin strategy of repression and dialogue used by law enforcement agencies in order to keep law and order but at the same time grant freedom of expression and rights to demonstrate, has as earlier argued, proved to be less useful. In a network society with fluid identities and contextually based needs of political articulation the dynamics of mass protest make it impossible to divide demonstrators into good and bad. Frequently the intelligence used in order to take pre-emptive action has proved to deviate from realities on the ground. Internet has increased the availability of information sources, but created new difficulties in properly understanding the social power and legitimacy of the sender and how the information will be interpreted by the receivers.

The effects of and responses to globalization have created a paradigm shift in the way information must be collect and processed (Roberts 2005).

The Swedish governmental investigation of the events in connection with the EU summit in Göteborg pointed in this regard also to the political nature of the confrontations and drew attention to the fact that these never could be dealt with through law enforcement agencies only:

The protests in Göteborg cannot merely be viewed as a public order issue to be dealt with by the police. An analysis of the underlying causes reveals that the situation primarily concerned matters that can only be solved politically within our democratic structures. Changes in the forms for political involvement and the political arena also require new channels for dialogue and influence. The movements that are emerging today are characterized by a broad diversity of opinions, non-hierarchical networks, a lack of vision regarding broader social solutions, commitment to combating specific injustices in our world and a growing dependence on the media. Established channels, e.g., traditional popular movements and political parties, do not always manage to respond to the forms of expression found in these new movements. Thus, two separate cultures have developed that have difficulty in finding suitable forms of dialogue with each other. This situation is further aggravated by the asymmetrical conditions between, on the one hand, the holders of political and financial power and, on the other hand the movements that question them. We want to underline how important it is that our democratic processes are characterized by openness and transparency. In connection with the EU summit in Göteborg the Swedish Government – at the initiative of those involved in the organization of the demonstrations – tried to break the tradition of non-communication at this kind of meeting. This was an important step in the desired direction. Sweden should continue to promote increased

openness at future international meetings. An underlying problem is the sense of exclusion and powerlessness that many people – young people in particular – feel today. We want to stress the importance of political dialogue in the form of discussion and through other channels of influence and participation in democratic decision-making processes – at the international, national and local levels. It is crucial to find forms for such discussion between decision-makers and today's opinion movements. We would like to see further active efforts to find such forms, as well as channels to reduce the political exclusion that many people feel in Sweden today (Official Report SOU 2002:122)

Thus, the great challenge of our times is to create legitimate arenas and institutions that can manage the conflicts of a new time and return to people their social trust and disposition for political engagement. New forms for democracy and political influence must be developed at different levels, capable to create conditions for the emergence of new social contracts.

The question of power

This brings us back to the crucial relationship between democracy and power. The questions of power and democracy have always been intimately linked. The original purpose of democracy was to combat the abuse of power. Democracy became an important tool for people affected by different decisions taken within any given society to be able to also influence that decision. Its goal was the empowerment of people. Through increasing the possibilities for and capabilities of political participation, the exercise of power could become something liberating. During the era of nation state building, the economic and political power was relatively visible. In network society, it has often moved behind computer screens and become more invisible. Above all, the exercise of power is changing form. Today, the issue is increasingly one of power over thought – *discursive power*, that is, power over how people think and relate to different circumstances, something that is decisive for preserving the prevailing social order. Unlike earlier, it is no longer a matter of taking over political power. This is one important reason for social forces to instead channel their political energy outside the parliamentary multiparty system. For the new social movements, the issue increasingly seems to be empowering oneself vis-à-vis the market, strengthening people's consumer's power and delimiting the commercial influence on everyday life. Through an ongoing resistance against all forms of abuse of power, political and economic power should be transformed, and become an integrated part of the new social order that is sought (Hardt & Negri 2004).

As earlier accounted for, these new ways of political articulation and the need of political space brought about by the emerging network society, has entered into a strong cultural shock with traditional methods for policing political activism. Instead of relating to the global justice movements as a potential partner against xenophobic forces and/or anti-western hostilities in the South due to the uneven process of globalization, many of these new social movements after the end of

the cold war have paradoxically been conceived of as a threat to the prevailing power structures, and have become the objects of intense destabilization.

The transnationally based power elite seems not to have realized timely enough that the main threat impeding a more global globalization is most probably constituted by the old social movements in the North, wanting to defend at any cost the political gains they have achieved during the nation-state era regardless of the consequences for poorer segments of world population. So when needed in order to bring the second movement in a more progressive direction the new social movements with a more global focus have ironically lost the political strength required to make a difference.

When theorizing about how the global justice movement can recuperate lost legitimacy in order to influence the second movement not to take a xenophobic and nationalistic anti-global orientation, there appears a number of factors which point in the opposite direction.

Earlier in history, the expansion of the second movement and the subsequent capacity to regulate the market, making possible the historic compromise of the great transformation, was dependent on a strong state capable to use such a political pressure in an adequate way. As regards the present need for transformation, it is unclear which institutions could design and implement the social contract required for a similar historic compromise on a global level.

As a consequence of the uneven character of the global process it even seems difficult to reach a sufficiently strong consensus within the global justice movement as regards the content of such a global social contract. It should thus not be taken for granted that the movement can proceed in tandem. In the South, the collective identity is at times much stronger than in the North. Here trade unions are becoming stronger and more influential. Unlike their partners in the North many of the movements in the South still strive for the modern nation-state project and modernization as an important force behind human emancipation.

Possibly, strengthened regional cooperation can be fundamental for changing the asymmetric power relations in favor of the South. The question is furthermore to which extent the problems of identity characterizing the social movements in the North, as a result of increased individualization of politics and decreased collective identification, will influence their capacity to channel the political energy in such a way that they can make a difference.

Room of maneuver

Following the events in Göteborg, the national police board in Sweden has recently presented a new strategy for dealing with the political articulation of social movements. The point of departure for this strategy was the understanding that the police is an interacting actor and that the approach used indisputably will influence the relationship with the social movements and the degree to which violence can be avoided.

In the proposed strategy, the need for dialogue was underlined, and so was the need to separate the officers conducting the dialogue from the task of collecting intelligence. At present modification of laws is considered in order to try to exempt the officials involved with interaction with the activists from the obligation to report of planned activities, even if reporting may help prevent lawbreaking in a strict sense.

Such new attitudes from authorities as regards the political activities carried out by more critical social movements can be observed not only on the local level. At the global level the new leadership of the World Bank has, facilitated by the Swedish Government, tried to reach out to the more radical groups in order to find out prospects for renewed efforts to dialogue. The same initiative has recently been taken by different staff from the general secretariat of the United Nations. Before we analyze the position of various social movements towards such initiatives and possible methods to be used, it is important to explore the motives lying behind the increased interest in interaction and dialogue by different authorities and political decision makers.

The question of national security interests

At times there are clearings in the political landscape when the room of maneuver for political action increases. I have spent many years of research trying to find out under which circumstances such clearings occur. Of special interest in this regard is how new challenges and the subsequent need to redefine national security interests historically have provoked and facilitated a strengthened interaction between different groups in society (Abrahamsson 2003).

Accordingly, my understanding is that prevailing unmanageable contradictory circumstances and global challenges presently have increased the room of maneuver for a structural transformation of the global regulatory framework. The perceived uneven development and global injustices are believed to have reinforced conflicts and contributed to new patterns of (network based) political violence increasingly targeting civilian population. Subsequently the national

security interest has broadened to encompass also political, economic and social stability, focusing more on the question of human security.

Thus, as a consequence of the more intensified process of globalization with its compression of time and space it has become more clear how the question of peace and security links up with the question of development and global justice. Consequently, a number of economic and political decision-makers are increasingly becoming aware of how problems with poverty and relative deprivation, highlighted by civil society, create social unrest and political instability that threaten the very foundations for the market economy. Poverty is here understood in an extended sense, not only looking to material conditions but also to social integration and political influence. During the UN Conference on Financing for Development held in Monterrey 2002 the U.S. president G.W. Bush phrased it in the following way:

Many here today have devoted their lives to the fight against global poverty, and you know the stakes. We fight against poverty because hope is an answer to terror. We fight against poverty because opportunity is a fundamental right to human dignity.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/03/20020322-1.html>

Emerging coinciding interests

Speaking at a press conference at the World Economic Forum's headquarters in Geneva in 2004, the Forum's founder and executive chairman Professor Klaus Schwab drew attention to the fact that

We live in a world which is uncertain and fragile. At the Annual Meeting in Davos, global leaders from all walks of life will confront one basic fact: we will not have strong sustained economic growth across the world unless we have security, but we will not have security in unstable parts of the world without the prospect of prosperity. To have both security and prosperity we must have peace. This is the Davos equation: security plus prosperity equals peace. (www.weforum.org).

The present situation in the D.R. Congo gives a concrete and illuminating example of the linkages between security and development and the need for stronger interaction between the multilateral institutions and various non governmental and/or civil society organizations.

In D.R. Congo some 300.000 – 400.000 soldiers have to be demobilized and reintegrated into social life in the countryside. Simultaneously, demands for liberalization of external trade, stimulating the importation of cheap highly subsidized maize from United States and Europe, make required job creation impossible. As a consequence, young men, still armed, find themselves unemployed with few other possibilities to survive than engaging in various criminal activities. It is clear that possible economic gains from liberalized and

deregulated trade easily could be outweighed by increased costs for political stability and human security.

Similar situations may imply coinciding interests and strengthened cooperation between different stakeholders. A changed regulatory framework for international trade becomes of primary importance, in order to come to an end for agricultural subsidies in the competitive western agriculture, and instead to permit food sovereignty and hereby stimulate job creation in poor countries. Such demands have been advocated for quite some time by various NGO's acting as voice providers. Simultaneously the striving to reintegrate demobilized soldiers and normalize life in the countryside increases the multilateral institutions' need for local knowledge. Consequently, increased cooperation with local NGO's acting as service providers is called for.

International leadership

Now turning to prospects for global governance, similar kinds of coinciding interests and dynamics increasing the room of maneuver could be identified. In a globalized world and network society there is no longer such things as geographically determined strategic areas of interest that permit selective engagement only. Today the central matter is finding possibilities for sustained global commitment. This is why, in the long run, there is an increased need for the United States to use its soft power in order to obtain the required burden sharing for continued international leadership. Such "power of attraction" can only be mobilized through strengthened legitimacy internationally. This will make the United States more inclined to strengthen its cooperation with the multilateral system. Provided that legitimate policy making could be achieved, this could simultaneously increase the structural power of United States. The U.S. president G.W. Bush delivered the following speech in this regard to the general assembly during the UN Summit fall 2005:

Confronting our enemies is essential, and so civilized nations will continue to take the fight to the terrorists. Yet we know that this war will not be won by force of arms alone. We must defeat the terrorists on the battlefield, and we must also defeat them in the battle of ideas. We must change the conditions that allow terrorists to flourish and recruit, by spreading the hope of freedom to millions who've never known it. We must help raise up the failing states and stagnant societies that provide fertile ground for the terrorists. We must defend and extend a vision of human dignity, and opportunity, and prosperity -- a vision far stronger than the dark appeal of resentment and murder. To spread a vision of hope, the United States is determined to help nations that are struggling with poverty. We are committed to the Millennium Development goals.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/09/20050914.html>

It is such dynamics created by changed national security interests and new methods for the exercise of power that increases the political room of maneuver and permits structural transformation of the present world order. The empirical evidences are to be found on the agenda for the various international summits

taking place during the second half of 2005, where the question of global justice had strong priority, be it during the G8 meeting in Gleneagles, the UN+5 summit in New York, the World Bank/IMF annual meeting in Washington or the WTO ministerial in Hong Kong. The question of concern is how such opportunities for change could be seized, by which social forces and with what kind of political orientation.

Seizing the opportunity

One of the main difficulties in order to go from words to action is the lack of public support for the required structural transformation. It is indeed a troublesome, and conveniently forgotten, fact that an increasing number of ordinary citizens in the North seem to fear that demands for global justice and sustainable development might threaten their present standard of living.

According to recent surveys many people in this part of the world conceive of the process of globalization as a race to the bottom where only the fittest will survive. At best they are sticking their heads in the sand and ignore the problems – at worst they are turning inward, becoming more parochial. Hereby they will be open to influence from xenophobic forces, giving them the moral argument to do nothing about global injustice. The fear of such a reaction was said to be one of the reason why the authorities in France responded with such repressive methods towards the recent riots in the French suburbs. Not even the militant French left took to the street in order to defend the outcasts of society, nor did the global justice movement. For many ordinary citizens such confrontations provide the argument needed not to involve themselves with political activism.

The need for global politics

The lack of public opinion has also implied that no political arenas and institutions have been able to emerge capable of dealing with social conflicts in a global context. Thus, at the same time as feelings of injustice and democratic deficits contribute to increased social tensions and conflicts around the world, conditions are still lacking which, as earlier in history, could permit democracy to become the tool for stopping the conflicts from becoming increasingly violent and destructive. The growth of the global network economy has implied that the national arena is perceived to be too small for relevant decision making. At the same time, it is paradoxically also perceived as too big and too distant for grasping the political reality at the local level within which ordinary people live.

Global problems demand global solutions, and global solutions demand global institutions. The problem is that the UN-system has become increasingly paralyzed following the decreased legitimacy and popular support for the individual nation state upon which the system is built. In recent years, different

actors from both the corporate sector and civil society have consequently tried to broaden their contact areas in order to manage themselves common problems at the global level. Issues around sustainable development, debt cancellation, human rights and fair trade belong to the global issues that are high on the agenda during the *World Economic Forum* in Davos, as well as during the social movements' corresponding *World Social Forum* in Porto Alegre.

These new political arenas that attract substantial media attention are important in order to identify the problems and formulate proposals for solutions. But at the same time the mandates for the actors who appear on these arenas are unclear. The questions of whom they represent and wherein their political legitimacy lies are hard to respond to. Naturally, these arenas also lack legislative powers in order to translate words into deeds. Many critics hold that such fora become yearly fairs that raise a great deal of dust but leave the issues unresolved. In this sense they are still to be considered as artificial bubbles. They are indeed big enough in order for people moving around on these arenas to take themselves seriously and believe that something of importance is happening. However, as illustrated by the concrete outcome of recent summit meetings, they are at the same time still too small in order to make any real difference.

Nevertheless, tentative efforts have from time to time been made to create interaction and dialogue between these emerging arenas. Whether these initial efforts of interaction could imply that these arenas can grow in political importance and hereby contribute to the needed structural transformation depends, according to my view, on the ways the interaction is conducted and if the dialogue upon which it is based could result in sufficient political effectiveness as regards the impact on the problems it intends to address. The risk is obvious (intended or not) that the dialogue only gives the impression of change and a proof of that something really is happening when in fact everything remain as before.

The need for interaction and dialogue

Increased democratic deficits and distances between the political power elite and ordinary citizens could partly be explained by the transition from a Westphalian political system, with nation-states, social contracts and representative democracy as its main basic units of legitimacy, into an emerging global network society with fluid bases of identities, increased political individualization and strengthened discursive power-structures. Hence the process of globalization has seriously affected the conditions in which

democracy works. For international development cooperation, democratic deficits will reduce access to knowledge of local realities that is required for coherent policy identification. The prevailing deficits will also reduce the legitimacy of policy and constrain its implementation.

One way to deal with such constraining democratic deficits is creating new conditions for dialogue between different social actors not normally interacting with each other. Consequently, strong efforts have been made by the UN system and the Bretton Woods twins to increase popular participation when dealing with strategies for poverty reduction or the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

As previously accounted for, such striving for strengthened interaction and dialogue has also been noted in the way that some officials within multilateral institutions together with some of the political decision-makers on national level would like to approach and relate to new social movements in general and what is known as the global justice movement in particular.

The problem here is often that the relationship between the parties is characterized by very asymmetric power relations, which reduce the contact areas. The powerful are not used to communicating with networks where no one has the mandate to represent someone else. In addition, it is difficult to evaluate the legitimacy of the social movements. The powerless on the other hand, whose identity is often built on the sense of injustice and exclusion, see little reason for dialogue with the powerful, who are considered illegitimate. The parties thus continue talking at cross-purposes, and the conflicts are aggravated, because of different perceptions of the world and different understandings of what is politically attainable.

Another problem is the very understanding of the objectives of the dialogue, which frequently creates expectations that cannot be met by any of the participants. The powerful look upon the debate about different policy approaches as a problem of communication. They see dialogue as an opportunity better to put forward their views, in order to explain and persuade the others to change their minds. The powerless on the other hand take for granted that if the powerful are serious with their desire for dialogue, they will listen and also change and reorient the content of their policies. If not, the result is taken as proof that the other partner not really committed to the dialogue. Together with the difficulties translating words into deeds this has created a certain dialogue fatigue, not only within the multilateral institutions but also, and even more so, within the new social movements.

As accounted for throughout this paper, I find various reasons for the social movements to participate in dialogue with the powerful. Such an undertaking can not only strengthen a certain shared group identity between different parts of

the movement. In a network society with a strong impact of discursive power structures it is furthermore important to participate to the war of position going on at various levels in order to confront and hereby visualize such structures also for a broader public. In fact, interaction and dialogue around common concerns is the only way by which the global justice movement can regain lost legitimacy from the ordinary citizen and hereby contribute to defeating xenophobic and parochial fortress builders. Having said this, one minimal condition for participation in such a process is, however, that there are some prospects of achieving reasonable efficiency and normative strength.

The question of normative strength

The dialogue should be understood as a mutual learning process. It is not a question of reaching out, it is a question of pulling different perspectives together in order to produce new knowledge. The political effectiveness of such a process depends on three circumstances in interaction. The first concerns what I would like call for horizontal coherence. The second condition relates to whether the political attractiveness of the political arena could be made strong enough to involve the actors needed in order to properly identify the possibility structures and room of maneuver. The third depends on whether the method used for conducting the dialogue is capable of identifying points of divergence and convergence between different actors despite their asymmetric power relations. In what follows I will develop these circumstances further:

Horizontal coherence

By horizontal coherence I understand that actors within civil society (or within the group of multilateral institutions) with equal societal position and bargaining power (what is called symmetric power relations) share the same interest for change and the view of what could be done and how. Taking the actors in civil society as an example, it is not enough to use the empirical evidence from local reality provided by the project related NGO's (the ones known as service providers) in order to mobilize the required public opinion for change through the more action related social movements (the ones known as voice providers). The empirical evidences must also be transformed into a congruent policy capable of envisaging concrete solutions of the problems being addressed. As a concrete and recent example it will not lead to sustainable change if the global justice movement pushes for demands like "making poverty history", if such demands are not based upon a common understanding of the history of poverty capable to identify congruent measures in order to come to grips with the roots of the problem.

The argument is that this horizontal coherence is needed in order for the vertical interaction to become meaningful. It is a matter of the actors becoming

sufficiently confident in their understanding of the causes, dimensions and remedies of the problem in order for them to be able, during the vertical interaction, also to make compromises and adapt and relate their demands to the existing room for maneuver and prevailing possibilities' structures, without perceiving themselves as losers. For a successful mobilization of public opinion it is important to be able to point to victories. It is also by such confidence and grounded pre-understanding of the politically possible that the actors can become strong enough in order to be able to continue the struggle and in the long run also to extend the room of maneuver as such. Consequently, it is in this process of creating strengthened horizontal coherence that the decision is taken if actors, and if so which actors, are prepared to participate on the arena for vertical interaction. If such agreement can be reached, then the next step will be to identify the conditions under which such interaction is supposed to take place.

The attractiveness of the political arena

The aim of the vertical interaction is to find out what the different actors want and why. It is a question of visualizing prevailing power structures and with such an understanding identify the prevailing room of maneuver. One precondition for this is to identify a sufficient number of actors that find themselves in a situation where they both have the objective interest in change and the political capacity to influence the size and use of the room of maneuver. Another precondition is that a political arena is allowed to emerge with the capacity of permitting an unprejudiced discussion that makes it meaningful for the various actors, which their different opinions, experiences and motives to participate on the arena.

This is not an easy task. It is not always possible to identify points of entry capable of motivating different actors not only to participate but furthermore to find out how other actors conceptualize the problem and why. Frequently the most powerful actor accepts to participate in order to inform the weaker partner of what to do, and understand prevailing conceptual gaps as a question of pedagogical clarity. It is important in this regard to agree beforehand on the setting of the agenda (i.e. which questions/issues should be discussed and why it is important to discuss these), as regards which the weaker partner must have some kind of upper hand. Of equal importance is to clearly formulate the aim of the discussion and what the actors may expect as a concrete outcome. According to my experiences, the weaker partner is seldom interested in any kind of deliberative dialogue aiming to achieve some kind of consensus. Neither mandates nor power position permit required compromises for such undertakings. It could be more useful to identify differences in problem formulation and approaches to address the problem. Such an exercise will permit the weaker partner to understand the logic and rationale of the more powerful and thereby decrease the deficit of information and increase the knowledge of what is at stake. In the same way, and for the same reason, the more powerful

could be interested in investigating possibilities to identify coinciding interests and common approaches.

Methods for dialogue

As argued, the aim of the dialogue is to find out what the different actors want and why and hereby to increase the awareness of one's own thoughts as well as the knowledge as such of the issue in focus. Consequently, a dialogue should not be confused with neither a conventional debate, where one partner tries to persuade the other and hereby to gain political points from the attending audience, nor with a traditional negotiation aiming to reach an agreement on how to act.

When the actors have been identified and the objectives of the dialogue specified, the time has come to decide and agree to which method that is to be used for the dialogue. One basic point of departure is that the dialogue must be process oriented. It is by no means sufficient to meet once in order to conduct a serious dialogue. The actors carry their preconceptions of the "other" along and it takes time to get together. Dialogue is a question of trust and creation of trust takes time. The facilitator must accordingly invest a lot of energy in order to verify that each actor is fully aware of the agenda, its motives and expected outcome.

Personally I believe in different phases of interaction between different actors where it is appropriate to use different methods of dialogue. During a first phase it is often a question of finding out what the different actors want and why. By confronting them with each other, the difference in problem formulation and approaches as well as possible converging interests could be visualized and identified. This is the aim of what is called a confrontative dialogue. Based upon such confrontation it could be possible to gradually move into a second phase, in order to become more generative in the sense of creating policy. The aim of what is called a generative dialogue is to create common approaches to the problems not only based upon what each actor already did know but also through integrating the experience and thinking of the other actors hereby increasing normative strength and political effectiveness.

Both the confrontative and the generative dialogue place strong requirements upon the facilitator. He or she must be well informed about the substance of the issues to be addressed and prepared now and then to interrupt in order to summarize what has been said and to identify unclear points in need of further exploration. The kind of deep listening and loving speech which is required in order for the actors not to talk at cross-purposes, and upon which both the confrontative dialogue and the generative dialogue rest (what Buddhists most probably would call a mindful dialogue), make it furthermore important that the

actors are represented by the same people at the different occasions and meetings.

Conclusion

From a discursive point of view, the societies' conceptualization of well-being during the Westphalian political system has been based upon a trade-off between requirements of security provided by the state, the strive for freedom and development by the market and the claims for justice and human rights by civil society. The capacity of the nation state to provide security has, together with representative democracy, been the basic pillar upon which the social contract and the legitimacy of the political system has rested. Subsequently, when security interests have been threatened or development efforts questioned, the parliament has frequently found it necessary to sacrifice the question of human rights in order to reinstall law and order and to recapture the lost legitimacy.

The main argument of this paper is, with this affirmation in mind, that the post-Westphalian society, based upon its global network capitalism, totally has changed the conditions for the pillars upon which the political system has rested.

The security of the nation-state has become a question of human security. Development is no longer only about economic growth but first and foremost a question of sustainability, and the issue of human rights and justice has expanded into demands for a new global social contract. The role of the state in such a social contract is gradually taken over by actors of the market and of civil society, with troublesome democratic deficits and distances between political power elite and ordinary citizens.

In the network society with its fluid basis of identities, political individualization has increased and gradually complemented the representative democracy and parliamentary political system with demands for direct action and increased local participation. In order to create conditions for human security and hereby to strengthen legitimacy of the system, the network society requires that relative deprivation based upon poverty and alienation could be counteracted through increased inclusion, extended democracy and reinforced human rights.

Social conflicts without a passport

Strange as it may sound, as a peace and development researcher I do however not perceive neither violent conflicts, nor environmental degradation or acts of terror as the main and primary threat to democratic and sustainable development. According to my view they all constitute symptoms of a much

more complex threat, rooted in the North-South Divide and the global social conflict that different images of the universe have created.

Different surveys point to the fact that an increasing number of ordinary citizens in the North as well as in the South are persuaded that global justice is not compatible with requirements for sustainable development and even less so with what is required in order to maintain and consolidate the welfare state in the Global North. They are convinced that the process of globalization by necessity is a zero sum game, with an inherent race to the bottom where only the strongest survive. In the South people want by all means try to take advantage of whatever comparative advantage that exist in order not to be excluded from world affairs, while people in the North, although presenting an ignorant attitude, in fact become more and more parochial. Here, most ordinary citizens do not want global sharing at their own expense and try hard to stand up for what they have achieved during the political struggle on the national arena.

This attitude of ignorance and reluctance towards global needs has implied that few democratic arenas and legitimate institutions for global governance have been created. Consequently, interaction and dialogue between different actors in order to bring different empirical experiences together for coherent policy making is missing, and so are local institutions for policy implementation. As a result, in the North as well as in the South, vicious circles increase vulnerability and tensions between the parts of the population that are lucky enough to find themselves included, and the ones excluded and marginalized. This is a social conflict without passport, which will find parties and see alliances built at various levels.

It is such social conflicts that constitute the main threat against democratic and sustainable development. Such conflicts cannot be dealt with through collecting and treating intelligence in order to identify specific groups of people considered as carriers of such conflicts. As mentioned, the carriers varies from time to time depending on how their group loyalty will be influenced by global dynamics. In a network society it is for this reason not always possible to separate us from them, good from bad and friends from enemies. In order to deal with the problems the underlying causes of frustration and deprivation must be tackled.

Thus, in a network society the trade-off between security, development and justice is becoming a question of soft power, something that strengthens the need to involve civil society organizations more fully in political decision making. Human security in an extended sense is required if strengthened cultural identity is to become a base for interaction and dialogue between different societal groupings instead of a source of rivalry. In the same way – interaction and dialogue about the cultural specificities of security and development is a prerequisite for creating human security.

As argued, the global justice movement could play an important role in this regard. But instead of being perceived as a partner in the global struggle for peace and development, some movements are considered terrorists themselves. In the eyes of analysts, their understanding and sympathy with the underlying causes of terrorism are confused sympathy with the proper acts of terror. However, through such acts, the terrorist become the main enemy of the global justice movement. These acts of terror not only withdraw popular attention from political demands pushed for during years. The acts of terror also contribute to increased xenophobic and parochial reactions from ordinary citizens.

However, at times there are clearings in the political landscape when the room for maneuver for political action increases. From a peace and development perspective it has lately become clear how different interests for structural change have started to converge between different parts of the global justice movement and the multilateral institutions, be it on the question of debt relief, fair trade or increased aid. This has increased the need of interaction between the actors. On the one hand, the increased discursive power emanating from the emerging network capitalism has increased civil society's need of dialogue and interaction with the economic and political decision makers in order to visualize global power structures and their local implications. The need of the power elite to increase efficiency in the implementation of various measures at different levels, has simultaneously and on the other hand increased the importance of strengthened local and popular participation. Perceived as a security threat in the late 1990^s and early 2000^s, the global justice movement is gradually understood by different people as an important partner in the war on poverty. Whether governments, security agencies, or for that matter the global justice movement, are prepared to wash their long-standing images of the enemy, and to make fresh threat assessments that permit them to enter such interaction and dialogue, is of course another question.

References

- Abrahamsson, Hans (2003): *Understanding World Order and Structural Change – Poverty, Conflict and the global arena*. Basingstoke: Palgrave
- Azar, Edward (1990): 'Protracted International Conflicts: Ten Propositions,' in J. Burton and F. Dukes (eds.), *Conflict: Readings in Management and Resolution* :London: Macmillan Press
- Bello, Walden (2002): *Deglobalization – Ideas for a new world Economy*, London: Zed Books
- Burton, John (1990) *Conflict: Resolution and Prevention*, Basingstoke: Macmillan Press
- Coser, Lewis (1967): *Continuities in the Study of Social Conflict*, New York: Free Press
- Donatella della Porta (et.al) (Ed) 1999 "Social Movements in a globalized world", MacMillan Press Ltd, Basingstoke)
- Falk, Richard (2000) Resisting "Globalization-from-Above" through "Globalization-from-Below" in Gills, Barry (2000) *Globalization and the politics of resistance*, Basingstoke: Macmillan Press

- Farren, Mick (2003) *CIA: Secrets of the Company*, Collins 6 Brown: New York
- Galtung, Johan (1996) *Peace by peaceful means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilisation*, London: Sage
- Gramsci, Antonio (1971) *Selections from Prison Notebooks*, London: Lawrence & Wishart
- Gurr, Ted, R., (1970) *Why Men Rebel*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press
- Hardt, Michael & Antonio Negri (2004) *Multitude. War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, New York: The Penguin Press
- Huntington, Samuel (1996): *The Clash of Civilisation and the remaking of the World Order*, New York: Simon & Schuster
- Jordan, A et.al (1999) *American National Security*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press
- Kaldor, Mary (1999): *New & Old Wars – Organized Violence in a Global Era*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Marx, Karl & Frederick Engels (1959) *Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy*, New York: Anchor Books
- Melanson, Philip (2005): *The Secret Service – The hidden history of an enigmatic agency*, New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers
- Miller, David (2005) *How to Spin the G8*, Spinnwatch,
<http://www.spinwatch.org/modules.php?name=Content&pa=showpage&pid=360>
- Nace, Ted (2005) *Gangs of America – The rise of corporate power and the disabling of democracy*, San Franscisco: Berrett-Koehler
- Nilsson, Anders (1999): *Peace in our time – Towards a holistic Understanding of World society conflicts*, Göteborg: Padrigu Papers
- Official Report SOU 2002:122: Göteborg 2001. Summary in English available at
<http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c4/38/16/6d1e4dcc.pdf>
- Peters, Glenn (1999) *Waltzing with the Raptors – A practical Roadmap to protecting your company's reputation*, Brookfield: Rothstein Associates
- Polanyi, Karl (1957) *The Great Transformation*, Boston: Beacon Press
- Robberts, Kenneth E (2005): *Better analysis through networking: Expanding outreach in an era of global challenges*, paper presented to the ISA Conference, Honolulu, Hawaii
- Ronfeldt, David, et.al (1998) *The Zapatista "Social Netwar" in Mexico*, Arlington: Rand Corporation
- Scholte, Jan Aart (2003), *Democratizing the Global Economy: The Role of Civil Society*. Coventry: Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation
- Thoreau, Henry D (1849): *Civil Disobedience* a famous lecture by Thoreau given in 1848 and published as *Resistance to Civil Government*, in May of 1849, in Elizabeth Peabody's Aesthetic Papers. Please consult the Thoreau Reader
<http://www.eserver.org/thoreau/default.html>
- Weber, Max (1947): *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*; Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press