Preamble to:

State Agents and Party People in Transnational Social Movement Spaces,

Lesley Wood, York University

Politics and Protest Workshop, CUNY Graduate Center

Each year, for the past five years, I've wrestled with this paper. There is something about the case of the World Festival of Youth and Students that fascinates me. Initially, what amazed me was the fact that it was a transnational activist event, supported by the Soviet Union that survived the collapse of the Soviet Union, and had partly transformed itself for a new era. But only partly – as it continued to operate using models that are have fallen from political fashion. Then I tried to figure out what it *was* exactly, how it fit into the models of transnational social movements I had access to.

About a year and a half ago, I submitted an earlier version of this paper and received a revise and resubmit. This was unsurprising to me as I knew I was lacking an argument in the piece. I've changed it dramatically since that time – really in this past week - following one of the reviewers' advice that I shift the paper from a historical account to an analysis of the interactions between states, political parties and the event itself. This is where I'm at now.

What I'm interested in knowing is:

- Is the question clear?
- Is the framework appropriate?
- Do I need to apply the model or is it fine as it stands as a proposal for a framework?
- Who else has worked on this particular question especially those who look at the political science, international relations literature.

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss the piece. I am confident that the paper will benefit from your input!

Sincerely, Lesley Wood, York University ljwood@yorku.ca

State Agents and Party People in Transnational Social Movement Spaces Lesley Wood, York University

A few years ago, a Canadian anti-poverty activist told me a story about attending the World Festival of Youth and Students in Caracas, Venezuela in 2005. The opening event for that festival was an Olympic style procession of national delegations marching behind their flags into a stadium. The activists from the Canadian delegation were divided about this event – some of them didn't want to march behind the flag, which they saw as a symbol of colonialism and imperialism, much to the dismay of their Venezuelan hosts. After a great deal of passionate debate, the delegation agreed to march behind the flag, flown upside down in a sign of distress, and joined by the flags of Quebec, and the Mohawk Nation.

Clearly, the idea of activist delegations representing their nation-state at a transnational social movement event was being called into question by the Canadian participants. I found the story both amusing and intriguing. What was the role of nation states and their symbols in transnational social movements? This festival was not only a space for activists and movement organizations to come together against imperialism and war, it was a festival that clearly involved states and political parties, albeit socialist, communist and social democratic ones. This created a contradiction for contemporary anti-capitalist activists who not saw their own states, but states, elections and political parties as part of the problem, as part of an old, bureaucratic and hierarchical politics. This festival was not the only place where such a tension emerged. Although the World Social Forum formally excludes political parties and nation-states from participating in its events,

both types of political actors provide resources for and engaging in and around the forum process. It was clear despite the rhetorical celebration of spaces for transnational social movements as beyond the state; states and political parties continue to play key roles. This raised a question for me. How do we understand the operation of states and political parties within transnational social movement spaces?

By looking at the case of the World Festival of Youth and Students, which emerged in 1947 and continues to occur, and the paradigmatic 21st century World Social Forum, one can see at least some of the variation in the way that states and political parties operate within and influence transnational movement spaces. These observations will allow me to propose some categories through which one might evaluate the involvement of these political actors in a useful fashion.

Method and Data

I'm examining the cases of the World Festival of Youth and Students and the World Social Forum because they represent two distinct versions of an attempt to organize a transnational social movement forum or festival. There are similarities - both involve ongoing coordination amongst contentious actors and large, regular, global events where thousands of activists gather. Both rotate the location of these events. Both aim to strengthen the capacity of movements opposed to capitalism, colonialism and imperialism. However there are important differences. The two events emerged in different moments – the post-war context of 1947 in Europe for the WFYS and the globalizing moment of 2001 in Brazil for the WSF. Each is organized by different configurations of actors, and coordinate and communicate differently. The funding of, participation in (obviously the

first event is intended for youth and students), program and culture of the two events are also different.

There are obviously many ways one could compare the two events but this paper highlights the differences in the role of states and political parties in the events with the goal of proposing a way of better understanding variation in the involvement and activity of states and political parties. I trace these differences through archival data of programs, statements, government documents and newspaper coverage about the festivals and their organizing bodies. I have read accounts from participants in earlier festivals and have also interviewed 8 participants who had attended the festivals in 1997 (Havana), or in 2005 (Caracas).

Social movements, the state and political parties - definitions

Both the World Festival of Youth and Students and the World Social Forum are sites of social movement activity. As McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly (2001) explain:

Social movements are a distinctive form of contentious politics—contentious in the sense that social movements involve collective making of claims that, if realized, would conflict with someone else's interests, politics in the sense that governments of one sort or another figure somehow in the claim making, whether as claimants, objects of claims, allies of the objects, or monitors of the contention.

This form of contentious politics developed in Western Europe after 1750, as a synthesis of three elements:

- 1. a sustained, organized public effort making collective claims on target authorities (let us call it a *campaign*);
- 2. employment of combinations from among the following forms of political action: creation of special-purpose associations and coalitions, public meetings, solemn processions, vigils, rallies, demonstrations, petition drives, statements to and in public

- media, and pamphleteering (call the variable ensemble of performances the *social movement repertoire*); and
- 3. participants' concerted public representations of WUNC: worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitment on the part of themselves and/or their constituencies (call them *WUNC displays*) (Tilly and Wood 2012).

Both transnational events bring together individuals and groups involved in social movements, with the intention of facilitating their activity. They make distinct but sustained claims about imperialism, democracy and peace and war, justice and human rights. They involve massive marches and rallies as part of their programs, and make claims about the world they want to see. The motto of the most recent World Festival of Youth and Students (2010) was "Let's Defeat Imperialism, for a World of Peace, Solidarity and Social Transformation." Similarly, the World Social Forum is a space where social movement participants gather and strategize. The charter of the World Social Forum explains:

The World Social Forum is an open meeting place for reflective thinking, democratic debate of ideas, formulation of proposals, free exchange of experiences and interlinking for effective action, by groups and movements of civil society that are opposed to neoliberalism and to domination of the world by capital and any form of imperialism, and are committed to building a planetary society directed towards fruitful relationships among Humankind and between it and the Earth (WSF Charter 2001).

However, although both events frame the end of imperialism and neoliberalism as their goal, and the strengthening of cross-cultural and international ties part of its strategy, it would be misleading to describe them both as social movements in and of themselves.

Indeed, the debate about whether the World Social Forum is an 'open space' for interaction or a 'movement' that takes positions on issues has generated intense debate. Interestingly, whether the World Festival of Youth and Students is part of a social movement or is a international relations project of socialist states has long been debated.

What is clear is that they are both spaces where social movement actors gather internationally, with the goals of anti-imperialism and peace. These spaces can be considered mobilizing structures within transnational social movements (Oleson 2011, Smith 2008). The literature on transnational social movements developed over the past twenty years have shown us that transnational civil society networks, advocacy networks, communication ties, NGO networks and movement ties have become denser. They target transnational financial institutions, nation states, and international institutions and corporations. However, as Rosenblum and Lesch argue, since the Cold War, conceptions of transnational civil society see it as existing apart from, or antagonistic to, government. In addition, academic work has focused on understanding newer, non-state transnational actors, and there has been little systematic analysis of the role of states and political parties in these networks and spaces. Indeed, the 'political' in terms of struggles for institutionalized power, sometimes seems absent in the discussions of these transnational 'social' movements. There are exceptions. Grounded in his careful work on political opportunities and waves of protest, Sidney Tarrow recognizes the role of states in his analysis of transnational social movements (TSMs). Tarrow (2001) describes TSMs as:

"mobilized groups engaged in sustained contentious interaction with power-holders in which at least one state is either a target or a participant. To be transnational, a social movement ought to have social and political bases outside its target state or society; but to be a social movement, it ought to be clearly seen to be rooted within domestic social networks and engage in contentious politics in which at least one state is a party to the interaction."

Within this definition, states are either targets or participants in Transnational Social Movements. An example of the former would be the transnational movement that linked local and national campaigns in different countries against South Africa's policy and

practice of apartheid. This is fairly obvious, and falls within our understanding of transnational social movements. However, transnational social movements also involve states as participants, with Canadian government participating in a transnational movement by boycotting South African goods, and supporting the organization of rallies by exiled anti-apartheid activists. There are many other such examples of course, but such activities have attracted little attention from social movement scholars, who, following the lead of social movement activists themselves may see the participation of states in their movements as threatening their movement identity as 'authentic' or 'grassroots' (Polletta 2007).

States and Social Movements

States it is clear, are participants within transnational social movements, albeit participants with particular tendencies, structures and capacities. By states, I'm referring to nation-states – that particular consolidation of power and control that emerged in the 18th century in Western Europe through the desire of powerholders to extract resources, wage war, protect their allies, or jail your opponents (Johnston 2011, 5, Tilly 1985). As Weber noted, states are bureaucratic organizations holding a monopoly on coercive power within a delimited territory (Weber [1921] 1964, 154). However, these bureaucracies take different forms, determined in part by the histories of resource extraction, war, alliance building and internal opposition. They are the institutions of the most powerful, whose practices are partly directed at maintaining their own position. Although bureaucracies, whether challenging or maintaining power do tend to have a tendency towards oligarchy (Michels 1962), the organizational goal of state actors involves both maintaining their own

distinguishes them from actors in social movement organizations. Whereas social movement actors' primary definitional task is challenging authorities or practices, states' primary definitional task is governance, with engagement in social movements against international authorities or other states taking a much less significant role. Their aim for participating in such movements may be ideological, or strategic international relations. As a result, one would presume that the behavior of states and social movements will differ in their motivation, form and praxis. Of course, there is variation - the practices political elites operating within states will vary through time and space – as will their explanations of these practices – state strategy may emphasize economic or ideological rationale, independence or interdependence. Their form and practices will of course influence the form and repertoire of social movements that challenge them within their borders. All of these interactions will affect the way that states participate in transnational social movements.

Political Parties and Social Movements

Another neglected collective actor in research in transnational social movements is the political party. A political party is a type of political organization "that purports to have as one of its goals the placement of its avowed members in governmental office." (Harmel and Robertson 1985, 507) Like states, political parties are bureaucratic bodies that congeal around a set of ideas or platform. Most of the literature on political parties assumes their containment within a particular nation state, and often a multiparty state. However, histories of international communism, international socialism and green parties remind us

that political parties can also be international if not transnational actors. In addition, in one-party states, the role of political party has particular features, operating as a political and ideological core of the state. In multiparty liberal democracies and in one party socialist states, it is clear that political parties operate differently to social movement organizations. Whereas the primary task of social movements is to challenge authorities through 'bottom up' displays within campaigns, political parties work to maintain power nationally, even though they may also balance this activity with claimsmaking social movement activity targeted at other states or transnational or international authorities. The operation of states and political parties is under-analyzed in the transnational social movement literature. Examining two cases of transnational social movement spaces where states and political parties have played significant roles can offer us a more nuanced and comprehensive sense of the variation.

The World Festival of Students and Youth

The idea of a youth and student festival emerged in Europe in 1945 during the post-war period of optimism in the struggle against fascism. In London, youth of allied countries who had fought against fascism, from both East and West gathered, at the "World Youth Conference" held by the World Youth Council. The conference brought together for the first time representatives of more than 30 million people from 63 countries (The Guardian 2005). At that conference the International NGO, the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY) was launched to coordinate this global youth movement and governments from both East and West supported it (Roy Moses, 381). Shortly thereafter, the International Union of Students (IUS) was founded on the 27th August 1946 at the World

Student Congress (WSC) in Prague, by student organizations of 43 countries. Like the WFDY the creation of the IUS was a continuation of a war-time anti-Nazi student coalition called the International Student Council which had been set up partly on the initiative of the British National Union of Students who hoped to maintain open lines of communication with student organizations in allied countries during World War II. (Altbach 1970, 161-2).

From the earliest period, critics argued that these INGOs were influenced by socialist and communist states and political parties. As American Jesuit theologian John Courtney Murray wrote in 1946;

"There is no doubt that Moscow understands the power of youth. It is consciously enlisting the aid of youth in furthering its own purposes, whose sinister character is ably concealed beneath the aura of idealism that youth finds so seductive. The World Federation of Democratic Youth will be an agency of communist penetration. And communist forces have already signified their determination to influence the new International Student Federation, launched at London and Prague. Leaders of various international youth organizations whose inspiration is Christian, or at least humanist, are aware of this problem. They do not view with indifference the prospect of Moscow capturing the world student and youth movement. And they are taking steps to meet the problem."

Nonetheless, the motto of the first festival, held in Prague was one of vague universal humanism: *Youth Unite, Forward for Lasting Peace!* It was lauded as a massive success. 20,000 young people from around the world joined 40,000 Czechs. There were 75 sports events in which 1337 athletes from 27 countries participated. There were 279 concerts of classical and folk music performed by 96 groups and 3459 artists. A daily festival newspaper was published in four languages (Kotek 1996, 117).

Despite the diversity of participants in the first festival, it became clear that the organizing bodies of World Festival of Democratic Youth and the International Union of

Students, and the National Preparatory Committee in Prague were all heavily influenced by communist political parties and the socialist states associated with the USSR. The Festival and its organizers quickly became influenced by East-West rivalries. After the Marshall Plan in 1947, the Soviet Union strengthened its hold over communist parties around the world. Until September 1947, Western Communist parties didn't realize how definitive this rupture was. But Zhdanov's 1947 speech at the newly launched Communist Information Bureau (Comminform) explained that henceforth mankind was to be considered as being divided into two diametrically opposed camps: "on the one hand the anti-democratic camp of America and its Western allies; on the other the anti-imperialist and democratic camp of the Soviets and their brother communists."

The World Federation of Democratic Youth and Students quickly adopted the Soviet line, expelling the only non-communist in the Secretariat and shifting from a period of collaboration between different ideologies to one of vanguardism (Kotek 1996, 125). The Soviet Youth Anti-Fascist Committee critiqued the WFDY in December 1947 and said that the organization must understand that the time of 'flirtation with Catholics, socialists and the like was over' (ibid). By the time of the joint WFDY/IUS conference in 1948 in Calcutta, the two organizations were promoting the Zhdanov doctrine, pushing many to leave the WFDY (Kotek 130). National student unions from the West were also increasingly critical of the IUS. However, only the Swiss amongst the Western student unions even considered disaffiliation (ibid). Historian Joel Kotek found that while these unions disapproved of the communist control of the organization, they wanted to preserve one of the only remaining bridges between East and West and model the possibility of coexistence (Kotek 131).

However the tensions between communists and non-communists increased with the revelation of increasing human rights abuses in Soviet states and the lack of criticism by the IUS and WFDY leadership.

Nonethless, the festival continued to grow – with the 1951 festival in Berlin attracting 1.5 million participants, according to a confidential East German police report that reached the US State Department. 1,418,831 East Germans, 12,649 W. Germans, and 22,158 non-Germans participated. The non-German participants hailed from 104 countries and included 4000 from France, 1500 from Italy and 900 from Britain. The Festival opened in a stadium with foreign delegations parading in national costume, a speech from GDR President Pieck and the release of doves as a symbol of peace. A cultural program followed with ballet, folk dancing and gymnastics. During the festival there were nearly 150 daily events, with exhibitions, cultural performances. Artistic competitions, involving 69 groups and 270 soloists from 32 countries took place. Also attached were the university summer games, where 2000 athletes from 42 countries competed in 14 main categories (Kotek 1996). Called the greatest postwar gathering of young people. One party paper argued "the festival was open to all those young people who wanted peace, whether they were religious or not, socialists, communists, or non-party..., workers peasants or students who love laughter and fraternal songs" (cited in Kotek 1996, 191). Many of the groups who participated could be seen as what Lenin called 'transmission belt organizations' through which the Communist Party can influence civil society (Johnston 2011; 28). But even though many of these organizations were seen by the organizers as channels for controlling political participation, they were also spaces for interaction and sometimes unpredictable

challenges. Historian Joel Kotek explains, "only a few of the young people went to Berlin out of political conviction; most went to enjoy themselves and to meet thousands of young people from other countries. But of course their very presence served the aims of Soviet propaganda. In theory the Festivals were non-political, and their programmes consisted essentially of cultural and social events. But in practice politics were ever present (Kotek 1996, 189)."

The format was intended to impress. "There was a massive parade of the FDJ (Free German Youth). For 8 hours, in the presence of 500,000 participants, 1.5 million East German youth marched past the leaders of the GDR and 22000 foreign delegates. At the head of the procession were the Young Pioneers, who carried little red flags and waved bunches of flowers above their heads. They were followed by a column of young people bearing an immense portrait of Stalin. There followed giant photographs of Mao Tse Tung, Wilhem Pieck, the first President of the GDR and the leaders of the Communist and Workers' Parties from the 'peoples democracies' and 'other guides of the people." (Kotek 1996) The festival promoted a vision of state socialism to participants from the West, but also to participants from the emerging post-colonial nations.

The culture of the festival and its direction by the Soviet communist parties diminished after the death of Stalin, as my introduction to this piece shows, a consistent culture has endured, even after the collapse of the Soviet Union (Cornell 1965). Marches and giant rallies are central to the festival, as are smaller exchanges between delegates, panels on different social and political topics and social events. The festivals have long operated as platforms for leftist parties and states to articulate their political objectives in

the rhetoric of social movements. Wilhelm Pieck, President of the GDR and of the Socialist Unity Party (SED) announced that he would open the 1951 Berlin Festival and anticipated that "these delegations will give the world and the German people living proof that the desire of millions of young people for peace is stronger than the diabolical plans of imperialist warmongers to plunge humanity into a catastrophic new world war. These delegations will show that the youth of the world stands four-square in the camp of the peace headed by the mighty Soviet Union. (Kotek 1996, 191)" In 1985, the Chairman of the Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR located the festival as part of the global peace movement in the booklet for the 12th festival planned for Moscow in 1985, "At present, when the international situation has been aggravated to the extreme and the imperialist circles of NATO, led by the United States, are pursuing a policy which is pushing the world to the brink of a devastating nuclear war, the convocation of the festival has acquired a special significance (Aksenov 1985:6)."

This suggests that one could understand the festival as a tool of the Soviet Union and its allies. But the events have also consistently been spaces for social movement mobilizations and capacity building. Michel Julian describes his participation in the Berlin 1973 Festival, which celebrated the slogan "For anti-imperialist Solidarity, Peace and Friendship", and attracted delegations from 119 countries, 120,000 foreign delegates and 750,000 East Germans (Julian 1973, 92 - 94). He writes, « Each day had a specific theme of solidarity: Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos one day, women's rights another, and the Arab countries another. These themes were reflected in the cultural highlights of the day as well as in massive open-air demonstrations that were themselves often augmented by folk

singers and street theatre groups. » (Julian 1973, 98) The festivals offered opportunities for inter-cultural interactions, exchanges and challenges. Participants from the Global South were able to critique their colonizers in festival sessions, making things quite uncomfortable for the British, French, and US delegations. The festival also served as an opportunity for non-communist groups to organize, to promote their ideas, and to network. In Vienna in 1959, the Secretariat of International Union of Socialist Youth argued that 'the festival offered an unique chance to contact the youth from communist controlled countries 'without the communist propaganda being able to misuse such contacts in discrediting IUSY and making people doubt our uncompromising fight against all levels of Imperialism and Dictatorship ()." At times, there has even been organized 'counter-propaganda' by noncommunists to the festival participants. This occurred in 1959 in Vienna and in 1962 in Helsinki where the state support of the festival was limited.

This combination of functions continues in the festivals up to the present day. On the one hand, the 2005 festival in Venezuela included a speech by President Hugo Chavez who argued that the US is "the cruelest, most violent empire the world has ever known," and added, "either we dismantle imperialism, or imperialism will do away with us....The world has two choices, socialism or barbarism... "the cradle of our project is here in Venezuela. But we count on, rely on, the people of the U.S., of the world, in our project. The Festival is just a first step. The Festival must transcend, multiply itself, and renew its commitment to struggle. The people of the world conscious and united can topple the empires and save the world (Pechinovsky 2005)." But in addition to such political rallies, a

range of social movement activities and cultural activities flourished – promotional materials for the 2010 festival explained:

Delegates will participate in much more than a conference. Four conferences will take place over the festival, as well as a large number of regionally-themed seminars from the Americas, Europe, Africa, and Asian and the Pacific; there will be sports events including a soccer contest against imperialism, and a marathon for peace; and poetry, hip hop, music, photography, and painting contests.

There will also be fourteen inter-exchange meetings – large gatherings where youth from different struggles and communities from all around the world can compare their experiences – including aboriginal youth, young trade unionists, youth of faith for peace, students, young artists, recent detainees, independent media, young artists, youth involved in municipal politics, and young women.

The schedule of the 17th WFYS is perhaps best described as magnificent. The program comprehensively covers a wide-range of youth and people's struggles for peace, sovereignty and self-determination, sustainability and socialism, and against war, racism, sexism, homophobia, racism, xenophobia and other social malaise caused by imperialism (Ryerson Free Press 2010).

These festivals are both political platforms of states and parties, as well as the spaces of transnational social movements.

Each festival is organized by a host National Preparatory Committee (NPC) or National Festival Committee – that often involves the leadership of the hosting Communist Party and Communist Youth organizations or those sympathetic to them. There are also National Preparatory Committees in each participating country, which tend to involve a broader set of national organizations, but often including communist parties, and an International Organizing Committee (IOC) or International Preparatory Committee that includes representatives of WFDY and until it collapsed, the IUS.

The costs of hosting these festivals are massive. An estimate was made of \$100,000,000 for the cost of the 1957 to the Soviet government. Although a large part of this was defrayed by a lottery, and sales of festival buttons, and flags, the state itself provided the bulk of the financial resources for the festival. Although National Preparatory Committees raise funds to help their delegations to attend, this continues to the present day (Cornell 150). The International Preparatory Committee manages an International Solidarity fund, to which states and parties contribute – in order to support delegates from countries from the Global South (Cornell 147). At times, before the fall of the USSR, at times, organizations in the hosting countries were made to contribute to the funding of the festivals. For example, the Ernst Thalmann Pioneer Organization in East German held a paper drive to help fund the 1973 Festival in East Berlin. The most recent festival in South Africa was funded by South African national lottery money, amidst accusations of corruption?

The World Social Forum (WSF)

The World Social Forum is the most well known transnational social movement space of the 21st century. The first WSF was held in Porto Alegre Brazil on the initiative of 8 founding organizations (including ATTAC)¹. The idea for the event was brought to the municipal government of Porto Alegre and the state government, both of which were

¹ In addition to ATTAC, the initiating groups were Associacao Brasileira de Organizacoes nao Governamentais (ABONG, a Brazilian NGO), Comissao Brasileira de Justica e Paz (CBJP, the Brazilian Committee for Peace and Justice), Associacao Brasileira de Emprsarios pela Cidadania (CIVES, Brazilian Business Association for Citizenship), Central Unica dos Trabalhadores (CUT, Unified Workers Central), Institute Brasileiro de Analises Sociais e Economicas (IBASE, Brazilian Institute for Social and Economic Analysis), Justica Global (CJB, Center for Global Justice), and Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra (MST, Landless Workers Movement).

controlled by the PT, the Brazilian Workers party, who offered energy and support (Teivanen 2005). This first forum attracted roughly 20,000 participants from over 100 countries, including several thousand delegates from NGOs, and social movement groups, along with 436 members of parliament from a range of countries (Rucht 2011, 14). The forum was intended to provide a space for networking and coordination of those involved in the burgeoning movement against neoliberalism. Since 2001, there have been eight global forums (including polycentric events held in multiple countries in the same year), and hundreds of national, regional, local and issue or identity based social forums.

As Dieter Rucht (2011) notes, the World Social Forum is both a stage for making claims to outsiders and an internal infrastructure for building social movements (11-12). With the slogan 'another world is possible,' the forum was heralded as an opportunity for the global justice movement and its allies to strategize about alternatives to neoliberal globalization. It began partly as a counter-summit to the annual World Economic Forum, a meeting of corporate and government elites held in Davos, Switzerland. After three years in Porto Alegre, the forum travelled to Mumbai India and during and since that time, the forum process has spread internationally, with international gatherings every two years, regional and local social forums more frequently. Both a platform and a process, the World Social Forums have attracted huge numbers of social movements and NGOs, the biggest event thus far being held in Porto Alegre in 2005, where 150,000 people participated.

Central texts unify the forum process, and these events - the most notable of which is the WSF Charter of Principles (January 2001, second version June 2001). Since that time there

have been many other declarations, statements and calls made – but these have not had the weight of the Charter of Principles.

Participation in the WSF process is intended to be open, but exclusive. The principles explain that the WSF is "a plural, diversified, nonconfessional, nongovernmental and nonparty context... neither party representatives nor military organizations shall participate in the Forum. Government leaders and members of legislatures who accept the commitments of this Charter may be invited to participate in a personal capacity. (WSF Charter of Principles, June 2001 version) This exclusion was made for a number of reasons, including a perceived crisis of representation in the left, and a desire to disassociate the forums from an 'Old Left' associated with manipulation and sectarianism (Correa Leite and Gil 2005). As Rucht points out, this principle has not been consistently followed - the Belgian prime minister (2003), Venezuelan leader Chavez (2002) and Fidel Castro (2002) were denied the possibility of speaking at the Forum, but Brazil's presidential candidate Lula (2002), and once again in office (2005), as well as Hugo Chavez (2005, 2006) were welcomed (Rucht 18). These appearances are officially within a 'personal capacity', but the distinction appears at times blurry. There are various attempts to maintain the boundary while coordinating with the forum process including the World Parliamentary Forum, an autonomous event that takes place alongside the WSF gatherings organized by the International Council (Correa Leite and Gil 2005). At the first Parliamentary Forum, 210 parliamentarians from 29 countries pledged to develop a network and support upcoming global justice mobilizations (ibid 88). Another example is the Global Progressive Forum, coordinated by Party of European Socialists along with its

political group in the European Parliament, and the Socialists International and organizes roundtables within WSF events, and is a member of the governing International Council of the WSF (Global Progressive Council 2012).

The forum process as a whole is coordinated by International Council (IC) of over 100 organizations that has fluctuated over the years in its membership from 100 groups and networks in 2003 to 156 by 2010 (Rucht 2011, 19).² This council meets two to three times a year and communicates electronically more often (Cardon and Haeringer 2006 in Rucht 2011). As Rucht explains, the Council decides the location and basic shape of WSF meetings, as well as policies around organization, financing and program. There are also a small number of paid staff at the WSF office in Sao Paulo, Brazil. Each WSF event is coordinated by a local organizing committee and must raise its own funds. The first WSF was funded through a combination of NGO funding and support from the state of Rio Grande do Sol and the city administration of Porto Alegre, both controlled by the Workers Party (Correa Leite and Gil, 109). A 2006 WSF financial report reads, "Until 2006, each WSF Organising Committee (Brazil, India, Pakistan, Mali, Venezuela, Kenya, Senegal), Regional Forums (European, Mediterranean) National (Colombian, Palestinian, etc.), Thematic (Democracy, Human Rights, War and Drug Traffic), etc. basically had to raise its own funds for the event as well as for the local processes. In general terms, funds had been sought from governments and non governmental sources (usually the same sources). Little had been done to explore other sources of funding."

_

² Current members at Members at: http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/

The program of World Social Forum events have shifted through time, but have always involved a combination of events coordinated by the host committee and those submitted by participants. These involve panels, workshops, rallies, marches, theatre, musical performances, and exchanges. The program has evolved through time, becoming less dependent on large rallies with 'big name' speakers, and more decentralized in its planning, partly aided through the spread and use of new technologies (Byrd and Jasny 2011).

States, Parties and Transnational Social Movement Spaces

Clearly, states and political parties are deeply embedded in these movement spaces – most obviously in the WFYS, but also within the WSF. In both events, however, there has been a reluctance to explicitly acknowledge this fact. The rhetoric that surrounds these events deemphasizes the role of these political actors in favor of the more neutral social movements or 'organizations'. Even at an address given by Cuban Division Commander Raul Castro Ruz, Second Secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba and Vice-Chairman of the National Preparatory Committee for the 11th World Festival at the Closing Session of the International Preparatory Committee meetings in March 15, 1976 this involvement of parties remains unnamed. Ruz Castro describes the potential participants in the upcoming festival as follows:

We convey fraternal greetings to the prestigious youth organizations of the socialist countries which include tens of millions of young people who are building a new life; to the organizations representing Latin American and Caribbean youth, who under different conditions of struggle, making up a growing anti-imperialist movement; to the combatant youth organizations of Africa and the Middle East whose youth are in the front lines of the struggle against colonialism, neocolonialism, apartheid and Zionism on their continent; to

the Western Europe organizations which have played an outstanding role in the festival movement as have those of the United States, Canada and other capitalist countries in which they promote numerous actions in favor of the right of youth and against the domination of monopolies; to the organizations of Asia, which in the midst of great joy over the decisive victories scored by the peoples of Indochina, are increasing their struggles. Similarly, the exclusion of 'party organizations' in the World Social Forum charter, and the presentation of the Forum space as 'outside state and party politics' hides the way that states and political parties fund, host and participate in the Forum, both directly and indirectly through NGOs or individual participants. Whether this opacity is good, bad or inevitable is not my task to determine here. But recognizing that political parties and states have different tasks, histories and relationships than social movements, but are active participants within transnational social movement spaces may allow us to understand the activities, potential and challenges of transnational social movements more easily.

Proposing a Framework

The proposed framework is intended to be able to compare the influence of states and political parties on different transnational social movement events through time and space. I am going to consider both the WFYS and the WFS as recurring events, rather than as ongoing processes in order to simplify the methodology for evaluating the role of state and party actors. Each event can then be evaluated, and compared, both within an ongoing series of events in order to see shifts through time, or with other transnational social movement events.

My justification for this particular framework comes from a particular reading of social movement theory. I use McCarthy and Zald's (1977) insights on resource

mobilization to argue that variable access to resources will be a crucial influence on movement activity. I follow Michel's (1966) work on organizational tendencies and William Gamson's work on social movement strategy to argue that the organizational tasks of maintaining influence and continuity can both support and undermine social movement challenges. As McAdam, Tilly and Tarrow (2001) note, it is impossible to ignore the effect of a changing political context on the micro-level interactions that make up social movement activity.

I would evaluate the role of states and the role of political parties separately. Each event would be evaluated in terms of five elements of influence: 1. Funding, 2. Decision-making power, 3. Visibility in program, 4. Framing of Event statements, 5. Participation. I'll consider each in turn.

Funding

- What proportion of funding for the event is coming from state sources?
- How many states are funding the event?
- What proportion of the central funding is directly from a state body, or indirectly via an NGO funded by a state?
- What proportion of a national delegations funding is directly from a state body, or indirectly via an NGO funded by a state body?

Decision-making power

- What proportion of the individuals in the main decision-making body are members of the ruling governing parties of nation-states?

Program Profile

- What proportion of the total number of events include state representatives speaking (even if they are speaking as individuals)

Framing of Event Documents

- What proportion of the call to participate, opening declaration, and final declaration is written by bodies dominated by representatives of nation-states, even if they are participating as individuals.

Participation

- What proportion of participants are chosen as state representatives?

The participation/power of political parties would use a similar set of questions.

Evaluating Transnational Social Movement Events

More state or party involvement simply means that a higher likelihood that the event will be promoting the interests of political actors whose practices are tilted not only towards challenging authorities, practices and systems, but defending their own power, and position within organizations. This is not to say that the event is no longer an 'authentic' transnational social movement space, but only that that space has a particular configuration of state and party activity. One could simply evaluate state involvement in an event along the five measures, ranging from 0 of none to high at 10. As a test of the model, I've done some initial comparisons between the level of state involvement in the 1973 Berlin World Festival of Youth and Students with the 2003 World Social Forum in Porto Alegre. What I find isn't surprising, that state involvement is clearly more intensive in the World Festival of Youth and Students – and that this is relatively easy to measure in terms numerically. It is more difficult methodologically to evaluate the less formal influence state actors may have had on framing processes.

What is also clear is that an ordinal measure of state involvement or control is of course limited. It would be preferable to consider the effect of high involvement in one area (say, framing of documents) vs. another (funding) might allow us to understand the

different configurations of state-party-social movement relations within particular events, or even within particular decisions within particular events. This is another project for another day.

Like any framework, there are limitations in this approach. To begin, socialist states and liberal democratic states, rich states and poor states, central states and marginal states may operate differently, and it may not be particularly useful to compare them. However, they do share some functions, patterns of behavior and histories. Similarly, political parties in power as opposed to opposition parties may play a different role. It may be necessary to account for this in the model. There are also historical shifts that may influence the model there have been significant changes to the capacity, form and activity of nation states in general over the past fifty years - both since colonialism declined, and through the past thirty years of neoliberalism. Nonetheless, this framework offers a starting point for more detailed analysis.

States and political parties have long been active participants, funders, and controllers of transnational social movement activity, and they remain so today. By acknowledging that these players are present, that they have and continue to be influential within transnational social movement activity, and that their activity is multidimensional and complex, we can more effectively understand the features and potential of political life in the $21^{\rm st}$ century.

References

Aksenov, Vladimir A. 1985. *Looking Forward to the 12th World Festival* (Moscow: Novosti Press).

Altbach, Phillip G. 1970. The International Student Movement, *Journal of Contemporary History* 5: No. 1.

Byrd, Scott and Lorien Jasny. 2011. "Transnational Movement Innovation and Collaboration." In *Handbook on World Social Forum Activism.* Pp.

Cardon, Dominique and Nicolas Haeringer 2006. "Formed politiques et cooperation digitale. Les usage d'Internet par les Forums sociaux." Paris. Unpublished paper.

Cornell, Richard. 1965. *Youth and Communism: A Historical Analysis of International Communist Youth Movements.* Walker and Company: New York

Correa Leite, Jose and Carolina Gil. 2005. *World Social Forum: Strategies of Resistance.* Haymarket Books

Open Society Archive. 1973-2-23. East Germans Host 10th World Youth Festival. Box 26-3-46. http://www.osaarchivum.org/files/holdings/300/8/3/text/26-3-46.shtml

Gamson, William. 1990. *The Strategy of Social Protest, 2nd ed.* Wadsworth Publishing Company Belmont, California

Global Progressive Forum. 2012. "About Us" http://www.globalprogressiveforum.org/about-us

The Guardian. 2005. World Federation of Democratic Youth: Sixty years in service of youth rights, November 30, 2005 http://www.cpa.org.au/z-archive/g2005/1255wfdy.html (accessed Feb 2011)

Johnston, Hank. 2011. States and Social Movements. Polity: Malden MA

Julian, Michel. 1973. The World Festival of Youth and Students, *The Drama Review: TDR* Vol 17, No. 4. International Festival Issue (Dec 1973), pp. 90-98

Kotek, Jan. 1996. *Students and the Cold War,* translated by Ralph Blumenau. New York: St. Martins Press.

Lopez, Rolando, Theo van Koolwijk, Nandita Shah. 2006 *World Social Forum Financial Strategy Report and Recommendations*. http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/download/WSF finstrategy FinalReport EN.pdf

McAdam, Doug, Charles Tilly and Sidney Tarrow. *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, John and Mayer Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization & Social Movements: A Partial Theory."

Michels, R. 1962. Political Parties. Free Press

Moses, Nigel Roy. 2006. "Canadian Student Movements and the Cold War Battlefield, 1944-1954," *Social History/Histoire Sociale* no. 78, p.363 – 403.

Murray, John Courtney. 1946. "Operation University", Works by John Courtney Murray.

http://woodstock.georgetown.edu/library/murray/1946b.htm

Oleson, Thomas. 2011, Power and Transnational Activism. Routledge

Pecinovsky, Tony. 2005. Imperialism's design on Venezuela, Cuba condemned, *People's Weekly World Newspaper* 09/29/05 http://www.pww.org/article/articleview/7837/1/266/

Polletta, Francesca. 2007. 'It Was Like a Fever': Storytelling in Protest and Politics. University of Chicago Press

Rosenblum and Lesch. "Civil Society and Government" Nancy L. Rosenblum and Charles H. T. Lesch. In *The Oxford Handbook of Civil Society.* Edited by Michael Edwards. Oxford UP: Oxford. Pp. 285-297

Ryerson Free Press (Canada) 2010. Call out for the World Festival of Youth and Students http://ryersonfreepress.ca/site/archives/2365

Smith, Jackie. 2008 *Social Movements for Global Democracy*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tarrow, Sidney. 2001. "Transnational Politics: Contention and Institutions in International Politics." *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 2001. 4:1–20

Teivainen, Teivo. 2005. World Social Forum: Arena or Actor? In *Charting Transnational Democracy: Beyond Global Arrogance*. Edited by Janie Leatherman, Julie A. Webber. Palgrave MacMillan: New York. 247-264.

Tilly, Charles. 1985. War Making and State Making as Organized Crime in *Bringing the State Back In* edited by Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

Tilly, Charles and Lesley Wood. 2012. Social Movements 1768-2012. Paradigm Publishers.

United States Department of State. 1985. "Soviet Active Measures: The 12th World Youth Festival in Moscow." *Foreign Affairs Note.* June 1985

Weber, Max. [1921] 1964. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, 1st paperback edition, ed., Talcott Parsons. New York: Free Press.

World Forum of Parliamentarians. "Parliamentary World Forum - Final Declaration" 08.06.2002

http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/main.php?id menu=14 1 4 1&cd language=2

World Social Forum. 2001. "World Social Forum Charter of Principles", June 2001 version.

Appendix A - Operationalization of Framework

Funding

What proportion of funding for the event is coming from state sources?

1973 East Berlin

- o Cost: 25,600 participants is approximately \$30,000,000³
- o Income registration fees (est. \$100 x 25,600=\$2,560,000)
- World Solidarity Fund contributions from NPC, International Orgs, and individuals ⁴= 400,000
- Subbotniks (labor battalions) =?
- o Government funding (mainly from USSR) 5 = est. 27,000,000 (90%)=9
- o Party funding = ?

WSF 2003

Total income	\$ 3.298.5426
State and local government support	1.070.895
Federal government	17.431
International cooperation agencies	1.418.971
Registration fees	122,864
Mixed stock corporations	315.544
Financial investment results	62.244

Government funding = 33% = 3

Party funding = 0

Decision-making power

 $^{^3}$ Estimates of 1957 festival, \$100,000,000 for 34,000 participants, 1959, 1962, 1968 festivals were \$10,000,000, for 10,000-18000 participants (Open Society Archive).

⁴ Given that the fund for the larger Moscow Festival of 1957 had raised \$213,000, one might estimate a maximum of \$400,000 from the fund for 1973 (Cornell 147)

⁵ The Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR (KMOSSSR) raised 600,000,000 rubles for the 1957 festival through a lottery (Cornell 147)

⁶ Lopez et al., 2006

• What proportion of the individuals in the main decision-making body are members of the ruling governing parties of nation-states?

1973 East Berlin

"Arrangements are being handled by a 60-strong International Preparatory Committee (IPC), drawn from international organisations and national preparatory committees in participating countries. But the IPC, whose constituent meeting was in Sofia in January, 1972, meets infrequently, and the real power lies with a Permanent Commission, comprising 22 fulltime, paid officials, mostly from the WFDY, the IUS, and the East German Youth Organisation (FDJ). Its leading members are Roberto Viezzi (Italy), President of WFDY, a former member of the Italian Communist Party Central Committee and a member of the Italian Communist Youth Federation (FGCI); Alain Therouse (France), WFDY Secretary-General and a member of the French Communist Youth Organisation (MJC); Fathi el Fadl (Sudan)., IUS Secretary-General; and Dominique Vidal, the Festival Coordinating Secretary who is a Bureau member of the French Communist Students' Union (UEC)." (Open Society Archive 1973)

Later the following joined the IPC - The Latin American Continental Organization of Students (OCLAE) and the Pan-African Youth Movement (PAYM).

Hosts – Free German Youth (official youth wing of governing party)

- National Festival Committee headed by head of Socialist Unity party (governing communist party) Erich Honecker.
- By fall 1972, 50 national preparatory committees (under local communist auspices) had been established to select delegates (US Department of State 1985).
- USSR placed Soviet official Nikolai Smelov as head of program committee (US Dept of State 1985, 9) Themes in program reflected Soviet foreign interests.
- State control over decision-making = 7?
- o Party control over decision-making = 8?

World Social Forum

Brazilian host committee may have been influenced by host governments.

= 2?

Profile on Program

What proportion of the total number of events include state representatives speaking (even if they are speaking as individuals)

1973 need program

2003 need program

(http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/dinamic.php?pagina=programa_fsm2003_i ng)

Framing of Event Documents

- What proportion of the call to participate, opening declaration, and final declaration is written by bodies dominated by representatives of nation-states, even if they are participating as individuals.
- 1973
- Meeting of the IPC proposed the slogan for the festival reflecting Moscow's foreign policy, proposal opposed by the British delegation (US Dept of State).?
- WSF 2003
- 0

Participation

• What proportion of participants are chosen as state representatives?

WFYS 1973

- 25,600 participants from 140 countries (US Dept of State).
 - All India Samawadi Yuvjan Sabha withdrew from festival in protest of selection of delegates – arguing that they were representative of only communist parties in India (ibid)

National delegations are broad, contining range of positions, but official national delegations in the seminars, meetings and official functions are members of parties selected by communist controlled national festival committees (Cornell 146)

- Party representatives = 66% = 6 (Open Society Archives)
- WSF
- 0

Summary

	State Funding	State influence on Decision- Making	State reps profile on program	Framing of Documents	Participation (selection of participants)
World Festival of youth and Students 1973	9	7	Need program	?	6
World Social Forum 2003	3	2	3 (through parliamentary bodies etc)?	0	0