How Do Organizations Matter?
Mobilization and Support for Participants at Five Globalization Protests

DANA R. FISHER, *Columbia University*

KEVIN STANLEY, *Columbia University*

DAVID BERMAN, *Columbia University*

GINA NEFF, *University of California, San Diego*

A key challenge to understanding the eruption of globalization protest since the late 1990s is the lack of data on the protesters themselves. Although scholars have focused increasingly on these large protest events and the transnational social movements that play a role organizing them, information about the protesters remains scant. We address this research gap by analyzing survey data collected from a random sample of protesters at five globalization protests in three countries. By disaggregating protesters from the local area and protesters who traveled to the protest event, the role that organizations play becomes clear: SMOs mobilize non-local participants and coordinate travel to protest events. These data also suggest answers to the broader questions that have emerged about global civil society. In contrast to the expectations in recent scholarship, we find very few protesters came from outside of the countries in which the protests were taking place. Instead, we conclude that SMOs use the Internet to connect domestically grounded activists to transnational struggles and to mobilize them to participate in large-scale protest events. In other words, organizations do, indeed, matter in the globalization movement and have significantly expanded the protesting population beyond local citizens.

In recent years, citizen protests have taken place around the world in response to meetings of international institutions and multilateral regimes. These protests, which are responses to aspects of globalization and expressions of civic dissatisfactoin with global governance, bring about a relatively new type of citizen mobilization: large demonstrations that take place concurrent with these meetings. Scholars have begun to explore the ways in which this movement is different from its predecessors, focusing on its transnational connections (e.g., Ayres 2001; Edwards and Gaventa 2001; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Smith 2001; Smith and Johnston 2002; Tarrow 2002a, 2002b) and the role that new communication technologies play in the movement (e.g., Almeida and Lichbach 2003; Langman and Morris 2003; Myers 2002; Rheingold 2002). Although a limited number of studies have looked at data

collected from actual protest participants (e.g., Lichbach 2003; Vasi 2002; Wood 2003), a key challenge to understanding the recent eruption of these protests is the limited data available on the protesters themselves. To date, little of the collected data can be used to compare protests taking place around the world. In addition, it remains unclear how people mobilize to participate in what we are calling the *globalization movement*,[1] what role social movement organizations (SMOs) are playing, and how these large protest events that focus on aspects of globalization are different.

We study the ways that organizations are connecting activists within the globalization movement by analyzing the role of SMOs at these globalization protests using data collected at five protest events in three countries. Our article is separated into three sections. First, we explore the emerging literature on globalization and protest, paying particular attention to the role of SMOs. Second, we present data on the 1,514 protesters randomly surveyed at five globalization protests between November 2000 and September 2002. Third, we discuss the role that SMOs played in these globalization protest events and the relevance of these findings.

Globalization and Protest

Beginning in Seattle in 1999 with the demonstrations against the World Trade Organization (WTO), protests that target international institutions and multilateral regimes have become more visible. Since Seattle, large international protests have taken place in cities around the world, including Washington, DC, Prague, Genoa, Quebec City, Cancun, Miami, and New York City. With the eruption of these international protests, scholars have centered their study of citizen mobilization around the different aspects of globalization (e.g., see Ancelovici 2002; Ayres 2001; Ayres and Tarrow 2002; Bourdieu 2001; Caniglia 2002; della Porta and Tarrow 2001; Fox, Brown, and Net Library, Inc., 1998; Guidry, Kennedy, and Zald 2001; Maney 2001; Mertes and Bello 2004; Meyer and Tarrow 1998; Nepstad 2002; Reimann 2002; Sen et al. n.d.; Smith 2001; Smith and Johnston 2002; Tarrow 2002a, 2002b; Tilly 2004). In contrast to earlier work on social protest that asked whether protest participants are acting rationally (for a full discussion of the collective behavior literature see McPhail 1991; Smelser 1962; Turner and Killian 1972), scholars have begun to explore the ways that, in the words of Jackie G. Smith and Hank Johnston (2002), "globalization brings with it an expanding array of political institutions that create both opportunities and constraints for activists" (p. 9). Much of the research on the globalization movement explores transnational connections among movement activists. In addition, a number of studies have considered the role of newer communication technologies in making these connections possible (e.g., Almeida and Lichbach 2003; Putnam 2000; Ray 1999; Rheingold 2002; Tilly 2004; see also Fisher and Wright 2001).

Perhaps Sidney Tarrow (2001) best defines transnational social movements, as "socially mobilized groups with constituents in at least two states, engaged in sustained contentious interaction with powerholders in at least one state other than their own, or against an international institution, or a multinational economic actor" (p. 11; see also Hanagan 1998; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Lewis 2000; Meyer and Tarrow 1998; O'Brien et al. 2000; Risse-Kappen 1995; Rothman and Oliver 1999; Smith, Chatfield, and Pagnucco 1997). Although there is some disagreement about whether transnational activism is a new phenomenon (e.g., Atwood 1997; Boli and Thomas 1998; Korey 1998; Tarrow 2002b), most scholars agree that transna-

---

1. The expressions "globalization movement" and "anti-globalization movement" are often used interchangeably; despite the fact that the movement is critical of some aspects of globalization, it has also appropriated the term "globalization" for its own use (Graeber 2001). Many within the movement have called for "globalization with a human face," "globalization from below" (Brecher, Costello, and Smith 2001), and the "globalization of people and ideas" (Hardt and Negri 2000) and have "never felt comfortable with" the term "anti-globalization" (Graeber 2001:12). We use the term "globalization movement" rather than the alternatives.

tional collective action in the form of protests surrounding the meetings of international institutions and multilateral regimes is relatively new. A number of studies in the late 1990s, however, explored earlier transnational mobilizations around these types of meetings. David C. Atwood (1997), for example, looks at social movement mobilizations around the United Nations sessions of disarmament beginning in 1978 (but see Cortright and Pagnucco 1997). William Korey (1998) describes similarly the collective action around the 1993 World Conference on Human Rights. Within the context of these studies, the globalization protests are a larger, more recent example of an emerging form of activism.

Globalization protests do not always have the same goals: in general, people tend to protest *against* aspects of economic globalization and *in support of* political globalization such as multilateral environmental governance[2] (for a full discussion see Fisher 2004; see also Bhagwati 2001; Tarrow 2002a). There are stark differences, for example, between the 1999 protests in Seattle against the practices of the World Trade Organization (e.g., Smith 2001) and the 20,000-person demonstration in Kyoto, Japan, during the 1997 United Nations Conference of the Parties-3 on Climate Change (Reimann 2002). Although these globalization protests are qualitatively different, they are similar in that they bring together large groups of people—in many cases from different countries—through transnational coalitions to protest during the meetings of international institutions and multilateral regimes.

As these transnationally connected social movements emerge, scholars have found that many forms of collective action have become more common. David S. Meyer and Sidney G. Tarrow (1998), for example, find that "movement activists have learned to combine institutional modes of action with non-institutional convention" (p. 5; see also Tarrow 1998). In fact, these new movements employ what Francis Fox Piven and Richard Cloward (1992) call normal *and* non-normal politics. Smith (2001) describes the extensive array of work conducted by international non-governmental organizations involved in transnational social movements: "By facilitating flows of information across national boundaries, organizations with transnational ties helped cultivate movement identities, transcend nationally defined interests, and build solidary identities with a global emphasis" (p. 5). In other words, modes of collective action have become more interconnected; transnational social movements combine action forms that have been associated with less institutionalized organizational forms—such as protesting—with those that have been associated with more institutionalized organizational forms—such as lobbying (for a full discussion of the relationship between organizational forms and action forms see Buechler 1997; Koopmans 1993; Oliver 1989; Staggenborg 1988). For example, in planning the Human Dike protest in the Hague at the 2000 Conference of the Parties-6 climate change negotiations, the organization Friends of the Earth organized both the protest *outside* the event as well as a relatively large delegation of non-governmental organization (NGO) observers lobbying *inside* the conference. Similarly, the World Bank/International Monetary Fund permits one representative from each NGO that registers to observe at its annual meetings.[3] All other members of the organization, however, are forced to express their opinions through other action forms—such as protesting (for a full discussion, see Fisher 2004).

Along with the broadening of action forms, social movements have become more connected—both within and between nation-states—through the use of electronic communication technologies.[4] For example, Mark Lichbach (2003) observes that the World Wide Web "has facilitated the formation of a transnational civil society" (p. 42; see also Rheingold 2002). In other words, Lichbach and others have identified the role of the Internet in making possible the transnational social movements and large-scale protest that we see in the globalization movement. In his chapter in the 2001 *Global Civil Society Yearbook*, John Naughton spe-

cifically discusses the role of the Internet in coordinating protest: "Given that the Internet offers campaigners a communication system which is cheap, reliable, ubiquitous, efficient and uncontrolled, it would be astonishing if they did *not* make extensive use of it. . . . The real significance of the events surrounding the Seattle WTO meeting lay not so much in protestors' reliance on communications technology as in what the technology enabled them to do" (pp. 155–56; emphasis in original). The Internet has emerged as an important tool for collective action, including "communication networks via webpages, listservs, and electronic newspaper links" (Almeida and Lichbach 2003:256).

With these coordinated international protests taking place around the world, some scholars have posited that transnational movements like the globalization movement constitute what they would call a global civil society (e.g., Wapner 1996; see also Beck 2003; Clark, Friedman, and Hochstetler 1998; Edwards and Gaventa 2001; Florini 2001; Gaventa 2001; Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu 2002; Glasius, Kaldor, and Anheier 2002; Naughton 2001; Said and Desai 2003; Sassen 2002). Although the definition varies, most scholars agree that global civil society connects individuals involved in transnational collective action around a particular issue. Ulrich Beck (2003), for example, defines global civil society as "new actors and actor networks, the power potentials, strategies, and organization forms of de-bounded politics" (p. 55). Similarly, Ann Florini (2001) discusses the "networks linking civil society organizations across territorial boundaries" (p. 30) in her review of what she calls *transnational* civil society (see also Florini 2000). In short, global civil society involves connections among people from more than one country mobilizing around a common concern.

At the same time, however, other scholars maintain that participants in these large-scale demonstrations are more locally grounded. Sidney Tarrow (2002b) explains transnational social movements as made up of *rooted cosmopolitans*: "individuals and groups who are equally at home in their own societies, in other societies, and in transnational spaces" (pp. 2–3; see also Tarrow 2005). Although Saskia Sassen (2002) focuses her discussion on what she calls "global non-state networks," she, like Tarrow, finds global civil society to be grounded in the "micro-spaces of daily life rather than on some putative global stage" (p. 217). The differences among the perspectives of these scholars remain unresolved.

What also remains to be understood is the role of SMOs within this transnational social movement. Perhaps David Graeber (2001) best summarizes the role of organizations in the globalization movement as "not opposed to organization; it is about creating new forms of organization. . . . The result is a rich and growing panoply of organizational forms and instruments—affinity groups, spokescouncils, facilitation tools, break-outs, fishbowls, blocking concerns, vibes-watchers and so on" (p. 14). In fact, SMOs, some of which would classify themselves as NGOs, have played a significant role in large-scale protests targeting international organizations and multilateral regimes. However, even when NGOs are allowed inside some international meetings with officially-sanctioned observer-status, they are not permitted to observe many key negotiations (for a full discussion of the challenges to civil society actors' engagement in global governance, see Fisher and Green 2004). As a result, SMOs have increasingly organized large-scale demonstrations at many international meetings as a way of voicing citizen opinions regarding the negotiations taking place inside the meeting. For example, Public Citizen and Global Exchange played a leadership role at the 1999 Seattle demonstrations (see Smith 2001 for a full discussion), and Ozone Action organized activist training camps to prepare protesters going to the climate change negotiations in the Hague in 2000 (Fisher 2000). As Paul D. Almeida and Mark Irving Lichbach (2003) observe, "Transnational protesters have developed a novel collective action frame . . . and a novel organizational form to complement it" (p. 250). In fact, in a study of "organizational forms of global civil society," Helmut Anheier and Nuno Themudo (2002) find that a "very large proportion of existing CSOs [civil society organizations] fall outside conventional classification criteria" (p. 196). In other words, these globalization protests are linked to SMOs in new and innovative ways. However, the specific role of these organizations—both in connecting the activists within the glo-

---

2. These two characteristics are not meant to represent an exhaustive list.

3. In some cases, different branches of the same organization, such as the European and American sections of an NGO, are allowed to send one representative to the same meeting.

4. These technologies include, but are not limited to, the World Wide Web, e-mail, Web logs (blogs), and listservs.

balization movement and, more generally, in participating in the protests (one of their most visible action forms)—remains unclear.

This article explores the level of globalization protesters' organization and their embeddedness in their localities. By examining the role of SMOs in informing people about scheduled protest events and in supporting participation at large-scale protests, we study the role of organizations in this transnational movement. The remainder of our article is separated into three parts: first, we outline how and where data were collected; second, we present analyses of the data; and third, we discuss the implications of our findings for understanding the role of SMOs in the globalization movement.

Data and Methods

Data were collected by randomly surveying participants at five globalization protests held from November 2000 to September 2002. All five protests were legally permitted rallies in outdoor public places and were large gatherings of broad coalitions of organizations as well as unaffiliated activists and others who joined the protest. All of the demonstrations took place on Saturdays to maximize citizen participation. Four of the demonstrations were chosen because they were seen as the most important globalization protests in North America by the globalization movement itself.[5] The demonstration at the Hague in November 2000 was chosen as one of the most significant international environmental protests of this time period. By including this environmental protest, the data include both demonstrators who were protesting *for* an international environmental regime, and those who were protesting *against* international economic institutions.

Data Collection

Survey participants were chosen using a field approximation of random selection at the demonstrations. Starting from different points, field surveyors "counted off" protesters standing in a formal or informal line, selecting every fifth protester to participate. Because field situations varied, random selection was achieved at some events by choosing every fifth person standing in a line to enter a rally area, and at other events by choosing every fifth person in a line or row as determined by the researcher working in a particular area.

The survey was designed to be short and non-invasive, so as to facilitate data collection in the field and encourage the widest possible participation among the demonstrators. It includes six short questions designed to elicit responses easily coded into categories regarding how the respondent came to be participating in the protest. This article addresses those survey questions that are focused on the role that organizations played in affecting participation in protest events. Beyond survey data collected from protesters, data were collected through pamphlets, fliers, and other materials distributed by the organizers of each protest. In addition, media coverage of each protest was monitored, along with the websites of the coordinating coalitions of each protest, the movement news websites (such as Indymedia.org), and other globalization information websites.

Protests Surveyed

Data from five globalization protests are included in this article: 1) the Human Dike at the 2000 Conference of the Parties-6 (COP-6) of the United Nations Framework Convention

5. Protest.net, Znet, and Indymedia.org all list protests at the World Economic Forum, the G-8, and the annual World Bank/IMF meetings as among the most important international demonstrations.

Table 1 • Summary of Protest Participants Surveyed

	Protest Topic, Location, and Date				
	COP-6: Human Dike The Hague Nov. 2000	WEF: Another World Is Possible New York Feb. 2002	World Bank/IMF: A20 Washington, DC Apr. 2002	G8: G-6B Calgary Jun. 2002	World Bank/IMF: Mobilization for Global Justice Washington, DC Sep. 2002
Reported attendance	5,000	7,000	50,000–70,000	1,200	3,000–5,000
Participants surveyed	204	317	177	86	730
Refusal rate	2.9%	9.8%	· 7.8%	2.3%	11.4%

on Climate Change, the Hague, the Netherlands; 2) the Another World Is Possible March at the 2002 World Economic Forum, New York City; 3) the A20 Stop the War at Home and Abroad/Mobilization for Global Justice at the spring 2002 meetings of the World Bank/IMF, Washington, DC; 4) the 2002 G-6B Demonstration during the G-8 meetings, Calgary, Canada; and 5) the Mobilization for Global Justice at the fall 2002 meetings of the World Bank/IMF, Washington, DC.

Overall, 1,663 demonstrators were sampled. Of the sample, 1,514 (91 percent) agreed to participate in the survey. In total, 149 people refused to take the survey, representing an overall refusal rate of 9 percent. Both the G-6B (2.3 percent) and the Human Dike (2.9 percent) had significantly lower refusal rates than the other demonstrations. In contrast, both the Another World Is Possible March (AWIP) and the Mobilization for Global Justice had relatively high refusal rates (9.8 percent and 11.4 percent, respectively). Some possible explanations for the differences in refusal rates include the concern within the globalization movement about police infiltration of demonstrations after September 11, 2001, the large police presence at the demonstrations, and the high number of anarchists present at certain protests.[6] Members of the research team surveyed throughout the crowds, including areas where participants were wearing the traditional anarchist uniform: black and red with a bandana covering their faces. Within these areas, members of the research team observed a higher refusal rate than in other areas of the crowd.[7] Table 1 presents the reported attendance, the number of survey participants, and the refusal rates for each of the protests. Using data collected from field notes, media accounts, and protest materials provided by organizations involved with the protests studied, each of the five protests will be briefly summarized in turn.

The Human Dike at the Conference of the Parties-6 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Hague, the Netherlands. The COP-6 was convened November 13–24, 2000, to finalize the text of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, the legally binding agreement limiting

6. Both the AWIP March at the meeting of the World Economic Forum and the Mobilization for Global Justice at the World Bank/IMF Meetings happened in conjunction with planned direct action events. For the World Economic Forum meetings, an anarchist block organized by Reclaim the Streets held a separate rally from the one that was surveyed at the southwest corner of Central Park, and planned disruptive direct action for later in the day. Over 4,000 police officers were assigned to the protests during the World Economic Forum (Hays 2002). For the Mobilization for Global Justice, the DC Anti-capitalist Convergence issued a call to "Shut down the city" and to "Take back the freedom to control our lives." Over 650 people were arrested the Friday before the main demonstration, during the direct actions of the "People's Strike" to shut down business activity in DC (Fernandez and Fahrenthold 2002). Although no exact number was reported, the popular media mentioned the "swarms" of police present at the Saturday event (Andrews 2002; Reel and Fernandez 2002).

7. In total, the research team collected data from 30 people (or less than 2 percent) who identified themselves as coming with an Affinity group—or an organized group of anarchists or other unaffiliated protesters.

greenhouse gas emissions in developed nations. On Saturday, November 18, 2000, an estimated 5,000 protesters filled and piled sandbags to form a dike around a section of the conference center within which the climate change negotiations were being held. The purpose of the Human Dike, in the words of Ilse Chang, the local coordinator for the event from the Dutch environmental organization Milieudefensie, was to "show that people are concerned [with the issue of global climate change] and want action now" (interview by Dana Fisher, November 16, 2000). Tony Juniper of Friends of the Earth International compared the supportive nature of the Human Dike demonstration with the obstructive character of the globalization protest that took place during the meeting of the World Trade Organization in 1999: "In Seattle, they were trying to stop the meeting . . . we are trying to make climate policy better" (interview conducted by Dana Fisher, November 16, 2000). Consistent with this purpose, the protest organizers respected the boundaries maintained by the security workers for the United Nations-sponsored conference. In fact, the president of the negotiations, Dutch Environment Minister Jan Pronk, came out of the meeting to lay the final sandbag on the Human Dike in front of demonstrators and press from around the world.[8]

Researchers completed interviews with 204 protest participants from 25 countries. Eight people refused the survey and four people were unable to respond to questions in the languages spoken by those conducting the surveys.[9]

The Another World Is Possible March at the World Economic Forum, New York City. The World Economic Form (WEF) is a meeting of invited global elites ranging from heads of state to heads of the world's largest corporations. As described by Ben Wright (2002) of the BBC, "the Forum is meant to be a sort of town hall meeting for the world's movers and shakers, a place where Colin Powell can mingle with German trade unionists and Archbishop Desmond Tutu can swap ideas with the president of Coca-Cola." Held annually in Davos, Switzerland, the WEF was moved to New York for the 2002 meeting as a gesture of support for the city after the attack on the World Trade Center. Similar to the meetings of the World Trade Organization, World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund, the WEF has become an annual opportunity for globalization protesters to voice grievances against corporate globalization as well as other global concerns such as labor conditions, AIDS, and environmental degradation. According to a World Wide Web alert posted by Another World Is Possible (AWIP), a coalition of more than one hundred SMOs that organized the protest, the purpose of the 2002 WEF protest was to "tell the 'Masters of the Universe' that they don't have the answers to our problems. Join us in the streets as we visualize solutions that build a better world where the people are in control."[10]

On Saturday, February 2, 2002, approximately 7,000 people gathered for a rally at the southeastern corner of Central Park to protest the WEF and to march to the Waldorf-Astoria hotel where the meeting was being held (Sanger 2002). All interested organizations and individuals were invited to participate. Although groups that practiced varying action forms were invited to join the protest, the organizers asked participants to honor their request that the protest be completely non-violent and exclude direct action; or, in the parlance of globalization demonstrations, they asked for a "green" demonstration. As expressed in an AWIP flyer distributed at the demonstration, "many local activists would prefer not to alienate our local heroes (i.e., police and fire fighters) right now, especially since so many of them are feeling screwed by the same system we are protesting." Unlike the Human Dike protest,

---

8. Although the protesters were supportive of a strong international treaty for climate change, they were protesting against the regressive positions of certain advanced nations that were holding back the negotiation process.

9. Interviewers conducted surveys in English, French, Dutch, and German depending on the choice of the protester.

10. See the *Artists Network of Refuse and Resist!* web page.

which was organized to show support for the negotiations underway, the WEF march was organized to protest *against* the practices of the WEF. Even with the plea for a non-violent demonstration from the protest organizers, 38 people were arrested during the Saturday protest (Sanger 2002).

Protesters were surveyed at the rally prior to the march. Surveyors entered the rally site from the four corners of Grand Army Plaza, on Fifth Avenue between 59th and 60th Streets, where the rally was taking place. Researchers completed 316 surveys with participants from four countries. Twenty-seven people refused to answer questions and one person did not complete the full survey.

The A20 Stop the War at Home and Abroad/Mobilization for Global Justice at the Spring Meetings of the World Bank/IMF, Washington, DC. The spring joint meetings of the World Bank/IMF have also become an annual gathering of globalization protesters in Washington, DC. During the spring meetings in April 2002, globalization protesters were joined by activists calling for peace in Palestine, as well as by activists calling for peace "at home and abroad." For the remainder of this article, we will refer to this protest in the same manner as the protest organizers, as the "A20"—so-named because it took place on April 20.

On Saturday, April 20, globalization protesters, as part of the A20 coalition to "Stop the War at Home and Abroad," gathered at the Sylvan Theatre, an outdoor stage in the shadow of the Washington Monument. A20 protesters clustered in groups preparing for the march while listening to lectures and musicians on the stage. When the march began, the A20 protest participants were joined by other demonstrators, who had been organized by International A.N.S.W.E.R. (Act Now to Stop War and Racism; for more information about how the Palestinian march was joined with the planned peace and globalization marches, see Kaplan 2003). The march was described as a blend of "teenage anti-capitalists with black bandannas over their faces marching alongside Muslim mothers wrapped in traditional headdress and pushing baby strollers alongside campus peace activists" (Fernandez 2002). From researchers' observations and media reports, it appeared that participants in the Palestine rally far outnumbered the globalization protesters. Perhaps as a result, this protest lacked the direct action component seen at the Another World Is Possible March and was generally uneventful with respect to arrests and vandalism. The mainstream media reported local police estimates of the crowd at 50,000 to 70,000 (Fernandez 2002).

Surveys were conducted at the Sylvan Theatre prior to the march, and alongside the A20 and Mobilization for Global Justice feeder-marches to allow for easier identification of globalization protesters. Researchers surveyed 177 participants from 28 of the 50 United States. Twenty-four people refused to participate in the survey.

G-6B Demonstration during the G-8, Calgary, Canada. The meeting of the Group of Eight (G-8) annually convenes leaders of eight industrialized democratic countries (Canada, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, and the United States) in one of the member countries to discuss global issues. After the significant violence that broke out at protests during the 2001 G-8 meetings in Genoa (for a full description see della Porta and Tarrow 2001), the organizers of the G-8 chose a relatively isolated location for the 2002 meeting. Thus, the 2002 meeting was held June 26–27 in Kananaskis, Alberta, Canada—a remote location in the mountains—to discuss global economic stability, the war on terror, and African development. As an additional measure, the Canadian government closed Kananaskis to protesters. As a result, the G-6B (or "Group of 6 Billion," signifying the global population) social forum was held in tandem with the G-8 meeting 2,100 miles from Kananaskis in Calgary on Saturday, June 22.

The G-6B protest was organized by the International Society for Peace and Human Rights. It called for policies and actions that benefit the developing world, as opposed to the richest and most militarized states, and the creation of equal benefit without military

action, poverty, and decreased civil rights.[11] The protest website reported 1,200 people in attendance at the events in Calgary.[12] Despite speculation that the protest might be unruly, few arrests were made and little property damage was reported. Eighty-six protesters from four countries were surveyed during the large demonstration on July 22. Two people refused to be surveyed.

Mobilization for Global Justice at the Fall Meetings of the World Bank/IMF, Washington, DC. Like the spring meetings of *World Bank/IMF*, the fall meetings have become an annual gathering of globalization protesters. The locations of the fall meetings rotate, and the 2002 meetings were held in Washington, DC, on September 28 and 29. Many of the same characteristics, messages, and organizing features of that spring's A20 protest applied during the fall protest. On Saturday, September 28, participants in the Mobilization for Global Justice rally gathered at the Sylvan Theatre and then marched to the World Bank/IMF headquarters where the meetings were being held. Protesters voiced concern on a number of issues including Third World debt, corporate power, AIDS, environmental degradation, and the war with Iraq.

Attendance for the protest fell far short of the 20,000 expected, with crowds estimated at 3,000 to 5,000 (Reel and Fernandez 2002). As a result of direct action taking place on the Friday prior to the protest, which involved the breaking of windows at a Citibank building and the arrest of 649 people (Fernandez and Fahrenthold 2002), there was a very large and highly publicized police presence. In the words of Monte Reel and Manny Fernandez (2002), "swarms of police may have kept some protesters away" (p. C1; see also Andrews 2002). In fact, rumors spread throughout the rally prior to the march that busses of protesters were being held outside the city. Despite the reduced attendance and the earlier unrest, the protest was generally festive, with speakers and musicians on the Sylvan stage prior to the march.

As with the A20 protest, demonstration participants were surveyed at the Sylvan Theatre prior to the march. The research team surveyed 730 participants from 11 countries, with 83 people refusing to participate. It is important to note the much higher number of people surveyed for the fall 2002 World Bank meetings than for any of the other demonstrations included in this article. In fact, protest participants from this event represent 48 percent of the total number of surveyed globalization protesters. This high number is the result of a large research team attending the protest and is not attributable to the size of the overall protesting population at this event. Consequently, much of the subsequent analysis will disaggregate survey data by protest site to ensure that the data from this protest do not bias our overall findings.

Variables and Measurement

The survey includes four questions that focus on the role organizations play in globalization protests. The variables are described below.

How They Heard. Protesters gave an open-ended response regarding how they heard about the protest. These responses were coded into the following categories, based on the source of the information: a) social network, including friends and family; b) social movement organization, if the protester reported hearing about the protest from a specific organization or organizations or via social movement advertising such as flyers, or if they heard from the movement's news website Indymedia.org; c) media, including traditional print and broadcast media as well as websites for the traditional media; d) Web, for unspecified websites; e)

11. For a full report of the G6B, see International Society for Peace and Human Rights.
12. See International Society for Peace and Human Rights web page.

e-mail, for respondents who reported having received an e-mail regarding the protest;[13] and f) other, for respondents whose answers did not fit into any of the categories listed.[14]

With Whom They Came. Protesters answered an open-ended question: with whom did you come to the protest? Their responses were coded into three broad categories: a) friends and family; b) alone; or c) SMOs, which includes those participants who came to the protest with an affinity group.[15]

Support. Protesters were coded as having received support if they received direct financial support for their participation in the protest. Surveyors asked all survey participants a follow-up question regarding whether their travel to the protest was subsidized or free. Participants who received subsidized travel were also coded as having received funding.

From Where They Came. This variable involved coding whether protest participants came from outside the country in which the protest was taking place. Because countries within the European Union are relatively small in size and travel within the European Union is similar to travel within the United States or Canada, participants at the Human Dike protest in the Hague were coded as traveling transnationally to attend the protest if they came from outside the European Union.[16] In addition, data were coded regarding whether the respondents came from local or non-local sites. Protesters at the Another World Is Possible March in New York City and at the G-6B demonstrations in Calgary were coded as local if they reported that they had traveled from within those cities to the protest. For the protests in Washington, DC, protesters were coded as local if they reported traveling from the Washington, DC, area—which includes parts of Virginia and Maryland.[17] The protesters at the Hague were coded as local if they responded that they traveled from within the Netherlands.[18]

Findings

As a first step in understanding the role that organizations have played in these large-scale globalization protests, we begin by looking at the aggregate results from the five protests. Overall, there were statistically significant differences between the ways that the protesters heard about and traveled to the protest events. Table 2 presents these findings. Although the majority of protest participants traveled to the protest with friends, family, or alone (60.1 percent), organizations played a significant role in informing people about the protest and bringing participants to the events (40.5 percent and 39.9 percent, respectively). In addition, roughly one-fifth of the overall protest participants (20.3 percent) reported receiving funding or support from organizations to attend the protest events. Even though these numbers are

13. Those respondents who reported having received an e-mail from a friend or family member were coded as hearing from their social network. Those who reported having received an e-mail from an organization were coded as hearing from an organization. Those respondents who did not clarify were coded as e-mail.
14. These responses run the gamut, including some protesters who just happened upon the event without having heard about it ahead of time and others who reported having heard about the event from a government agency.
15. Although the numbers vary, few respondents reported coming to their respective protest with an Affinity group: only one person from the Human Dike protest, one person from the Another World Is Possible March, zero people from the A20, three people from the G-6B, and 25 people from the Mobilization for Global Justice.
16. Based on European Union membership as of May 2004.
17. At the first World Bank protest included in this study, which took place in September 2002, surveyors did not ask for clarification when people reported coming from Virginia or Maryland to attend the protest. At the subsequent protests in Washington, DC, that were included in this study, a follow-up question was added.
18. Although the Netherlands is a country, to travel from one end to the other will take less than two hours—the same amount of time that it can take to travel from one part of New York City, or the DC area, to the other.

Table 2 • Summary of Results from All Five Protests (N = 1,514)

Heard about the protest:		Traveled to protest:	
From a SMO	40.5%	With a SMO	39.9%
From a social network	29.2%	With family, friends or alone	44.8%
From the media	15.2%	Alone	15.3%
From the Web	8.4%	Chi-square (2 d.f.)	225.7
From an e-mail	4.6%	p-value	.000
Other	2.1%	Received funding/support	20.3%
Chi-square (5 d.f.)	1040		
p-value	.000		

noteworthy, other social actors appear to have played important roles in informing people and escorting them to protest events. Approximately 29 percent of protest participants heard about the protest through the friends and family in their personal social networks. It is important to note, however, that respondents who heard from friends who are also members of a common SMO likely responded to the question stating that a friend had told them about the event. As has been previously mentioned, e-mail notification about the protest was coded based on the source of the e-mail. As such, e-mails sent from friends in a mutual organization ended up in the social network category.

Disaggregating the Protesting Population

Although the overall results are a useful first step in exploring the role organizations play in globalization protest, to understand this role fully, it is necessary to disaggregate participants living in the area where the event was taking place from those traveling to the protest. In other words, organizations play a different role in recruiting and supporting participants coming from outside the local area. Specifically, after disaggregating the origins of protest participants, we are able to see more clearly the significance of the role of organizations. Table 3 presents the percentages of international, local, and non-local participants at each of the five protest events.

Levels of Transnationalism. First, we look at protest participants who traveled from outside the country in which the protest was taking place. Although the literature on transnational social movements and global civil society suggests that the protesting populations at these events would be very transnational, they are not. Each protest had a slightly different level of

Table 3 • Local, Non-Local, and International Protest Participants

	Protest Topic, Location, and Date				
	COP-6: Human Dike The Hague Nov. 2000	WEF: Another World Is Possible New York Feb. 2002	World Bank/IMF: A20 Washington, DC Apr. 2002	G8: G-6B Calgary Jun. 2002	World Bank/IMF: Mobilization for Global Justice Washington, DC Sep. 2002
International	5.0%[a]	3.2%	0%	2.3%	2.2%
Local	32.3%	58.1%	24.3%	52.9%	38.6%
Non-Local	67.7%	41.9%	75.7%	47.1%	61.4%
	n = 201	n = 315	n = 177	n = 85	n = 707

[a] International participation is operationalized as coming from non-European Union countries.

international participation: at the A20 protest in Washington, DC, no participants reported coming from outside of the country to attend; at the G-6B in Calgary and at the Mobilization for Global Justice in Washington, DC, around two percent of the protesters surveyed reported coming from outside of the country (2.3 percent and 2.2 percent, respectively); and at the AWIP protest, 3.2 percent of the participants reported coming from outside the country. The highest level of transnational participation at these protest events took place at the Human Dike protest in the Hague (5 percent). Although 67 percent of the protest participants came from outside the Netherlands, because of the proximity of the countries in the European Union, international participants for this protest were coded as those who came from outside the Union. As will be discussed in further detail in the sections that follow, the high level of transnational participation at this event is related to organizations' significant role in bringing people to the climate change negotiations; many of the protest participants were registered as NGO observers at the negotiations and spent the Saturday of the meeting protesting outside the hall in which the negotiations were taking place.

Local versus Non-Local Participants. Because the number of transnational participants at these events is so low, disaggregating those who came from outside the local area to attend the protest may provide more information about the role that organizations played in these protest events. There was a significant non-local presence at all five of the protests.[19] In fact, overall, non-local participants made up almost 60 percent of all protest participants at the five globalization protests included in this study. Here again, each protest had a somewhat different breakdown. The G-6B Summit in Calgary and the AWIP March in New York City, for example, had a smaller non-local presence at the protests (47.1 percent and 41.9 percent, respectively). Unlike the protests in Washington and the Hague, these protests took place away from the regular sites of multilateral meetings: the Calgary protest was over 2,000 miles away from the G-8 meetings, and the AWIP March took place at the relocated site of the WEF. These changes made long-range planning more difficult, and, thus, were likely to have affected the number of protest participants traveling from out-of-town. The AWIP March was also the first globalization protest in New York City after September 11, 2001, and many people were likely hesitant to travel to New York City to protest at that time. The Mobilization for Global Justice, Human Dike, and the A20 had higher levels of non-local participants (61.4 percent, 67.7 percent, and 75.7 percent, respectively).

Using a Pearson chi-square test of local versus non-local participation across the different protests, we tested the null hypothesis that the pattern of local participation is the same for all protests. The results are statistically significant, and the null hypothesis is rejected ($\chi^2 = 71.6$, d.f. = 4, $p < .001$). Because the various projects differ significantly in the percentage of local versus non-local participants, we will compare local and non-local samples from each protest for the remainder of the analyses. This breakdown will ensure that the large sample collected at the Mobilization for Global Justice in 2002 does not bias our results.[20]

How They Heard. Broken down into local and non-local participants, Table 4 summarizes how the protest participants heard about each protest event. Overall, there are significant differences between the ways that the local and non-local participants heard about the protests.

19. Non-local protest participants include those participants who came from outside the country to protest.

20. As has been previously noted, nearly one-half (48 percent) of our cases were collected at the Mobilization for Global Justice protest. Based on Pearson chi-square tests of the aggregate data from the other 4 protests against this protest, we reject the null hypotheses that the two groups come from essentially the same population, suggesting that the Mobilization for Global Justice protest was different from the others. However, as will be discussed in the following sections, the disaggregated data show that organizations played a smaller role in the Mobilization for Global Justice protest than in the others. As our primary concern is the role of organizations in informing and transporting non-local participants, aggregating the data collected from these protests will also blunt the strength of our findings.

Table 4 • *How Respondents Heard about the Demonstration*

	Organization (%)	Social Network (%)	Media (%)	Web (%)	E-mail (%)	Other (%)	Pearson's χ^2
Human Dike							
Local ($n = 65$)	64.6	20.0	9.2	4.6	0	1.5	
Non-local ($n = 136$)	79.4	16.9	0	2.9	0	.7	14.7**
Another World Is Possible							
Local ($n = 183$)	30.1	28.4	27.9	6.6	4.9	2.2	
Non-local ($n = 132$)	43.2	26.5	15.2	6.8	6.1	2.3	9.5*
A20							
Local ($n = 43$)	39.5	30.2	11.6	7.0	9.3	2.3	
Non-local ($n = 134$)	54.5	29.1	3.0	1.5	7.5	4.5	10.2*
G-6B							
Local ($n = 45$)	4.4	31.1	46.7	11.1	4.4	2.2	
Non-local ($n = 40$)	55.0	15.0	12.5	5.0	12.5	0	33.1***
Mobilization for Global Justice							
Local ($n = 280$)	25.7	31.4	27.9	11.1	2.9	1.1	
Non-local ($n = 447$)	36.0	35.1	8.5	12.5	5.2	2.7	51.4***
All Five Protests							
Local ($n = 616$)	30.5	29.2	26.1	8.8	3.7	1.6	
Non-local ($n = 889$)	47.4	29.3	7.5	8.2	5.2	2.5	111.6***

d.f. = 5.
*$p < 0.1$ **$p < 0.01$ ***$p < 0.001$

Table 5 • *With Whom Respondents Came to the Demonstration*

	Alone (%)	Friends or family (%)	Organization (%)	Pearson's χ^2
Human Dike				
Local ($n = 65$)	26.2	41.5	32.3	
Non-local ($n = 136$)	11.0	11.8	77.2	38.7***
Another World Is Possible				
Local ($n = 183$)	23.5	56.8	19.7	
Non-local ($n = 132$)	14.4	43.2	42.4	19.6***
A20				
Local ($n = 43$)	14.0	62.8	23.3	
Non-local ($n = 134$)	9.0	29.1	61.9	20.0***
G-6B				
Local ($n = 44$)	18.2	70.5	11.4	
Non-local ($n = 40$)	15.0	35.0	50.0	15.6***
Mobilization for Global Justice				
Local ($n = 278$)	20.1	55.4	24.5	
Non-local ($n = 445$)	10.6	45.6	43.8	32.0***
All Five Protests				
Local ($n = 613$)	21.2	56.0	22.8	
Non-local ($n = 887$)	11.2	37.1	51.8	128.6***

d.f. = 2.
*$p < 0.1$ **$p < 0.01$ ***$p < 0.001$

At all events, the role of organizations in informing non-local protesters is larger than that of local participants. The protest at which organizations played the smallest role in informing participants about the event was the Mobilization for Global Justice (25.7 percent for local and 36 percent for non-local participants). As has been previously mentioned, attendance at this protest was much smaller than had been previously expected. Because of the direct action the day before and the highly publicized arrests as a result of these actions, as well as the heightened police presence in Washington that day, organizations likely dissuaded their members from attending the protest. Organizations played the largest role in notifying participants about the Human Dike (64.6 percent for local participants and 79.4 percent for non-local participants). As has also been previously mentioned, the NGO observers involved in the international negotiations left the meeting to participate in the protest on that Saturday. The organizers of the protest—Friends of the Earth and the Dutch group Milieudefensie—were very successful at getting the word out to their members about the protest.

As one might expect, the traditional media played an important role in informing local participants about the protest events (9.2 percent at the Human Dike, 27.9 percent at the Another World Is Possible, 11.6 percent at the A20, 46.7 percent at the G-6B, and 27.9 percent at the Mobilization for Global Justice). The media played a much less significant role in notifying non-local participants. In contrast to these differences, both local and non-local protest participants were almost equally as likely to have heard about the protest-event through their social networks. These numbers were most varied between local and non-local participants at the Human Dike (20 percent and 16.9 percent, respectively) and the G-6B (31.1 percent and 15 percent, respectively).

With Whom They Came. Turning to how protesters traveled to the event, significant differences are also noted between local and non-local participants. On average, about half of all non-local participants traveled to the protest with a SMO, in contrast to the 22.8 percent of all of the local participants who traveled with an organization. However, the numbers vary among each protest event. The highest percentage of non-local participants traveled with an organization to the Human Dike (77.2 percent). Respondents at this event reported organizations' hiring busses to travel from France and coordinating subsidized ferry rides from the United Kingdom. The smallest percentage of non-local participants traveled with an organization to the AWIP event (42.4 percent). As has been previously mentioned, the fact that this event was the first large-scale protest to take place in New York after September 11 likely dissuaded some organizations from bringing busses of participants to the event. The majority of local participants at these events, however, traveled to the protests with their friends or family. At the high end of the spectrum, 70.5 percent of the local participants at the G-6B traveled with their friends or family. In contrast, at the Human Dike, where organizations had brought many participants so that they could lobby negotiators inside the meetings, friends and family members played a less significant role in bringing local people to the event (41.5 percent). Table 5 presents how protest participants traveled to the events.

Who Received Support. Similar to the findings regarding how participants heard and with whom they traveled, there are significant differences between local and non-local participants regarding whether or not they received support in the form of funding or subsidized travel to each event. Table 6 presents these data. It is important to note that protesters have many different sources of funding and support for attending such globalization protests. In many cases, SMOs were able to provide subsidized transportation in addition to providing

Table 6 • Received Funding to Attend the Demonstration

	Received Funding? (%)	Pearson's χ^2		Received Funding? (%)	Pearson's χ^2
Human Dike			G-6B		
Local ($n = 65$)	12.3		Local ($n = 45$)	4.4	
Non-local ($n = 136$)	31.6	8.7**	Non-local ($n = 40$)	32.5	11.5***
Another World Is Possible			Mobilization for Global Justice		
Local ($n = 183$)	2.2		Local ($n = 260$)	5.7	
Non-local ($n = 132$)	11.4	11.4***	Non-local ($n = 445$)	33.5	69.8***
A20			All Five Protests		
Local ($n = 43$)	4.7		Local ($n = 569$)	5.2	
Non-local ($n = 134$)	42.5	21.0***	Non-local ($n = 887$)	31.1	145.8***

d.f. = 1.
$*p < 0.1$ $**p < 0.01$ $***p < 0.001$

logistical support and publicity for the protest itself. Also, many locally based SMOs helped to organize housing for non-local protest participants. Overall, 31.1 percent of the non-local participants reported having received some type of support, as opposed to just 5.2 percent of the local participants. It is likely that a large portion of the support received by non-local participants was in the form of subsidized transportation—as 73.7 percent of the non-local participants that reported receiving support also reported that they had come to the demonstration with an organization. Again here, the results vary somewhat among the protests: non-local participants at the A20 reported receiving the most support (42.5 percent), and non-local participants at the AWIP March reported receiving the least (11.4 percent). Of the local participants, those who attended the Human Dike in the Hague reported receiving the most support (12.3 percent). In order to increase local turnout, the local organizers of this event—Milieudefensie—offered to reimburse participants from the Netherlands for their train rides.[21]

Discussion and Conclusion

The results of this study support the notion that organizations do, indeed, matter within the globalization movement: they play a significant role in mobilizing and supporting participation in large-scale globalization protests and provide information and support vital to helping participants come to demonstrations. Their role is particularly important for participants who come from outside the local area: approximately 47 percent of the non-local protest participants surveyed at the five globalization protests heard about the event from an organization; over 50 percent of the non-local participants came to the protest with an organization; and about 31 percent of the non-local protesters received support to attend these protest events. It is important to note that the full effect of organizations is likely to be underestimated in much of these data. Many people probably heard about and traveled to these protests with friends from an organization. These findings about the ways that organizations provide support for social movements and collective action, however, are not particularly new to the globalization movement. In fact, organizations have been found to play similar roles in collective action, at least since the civil rights movement (e.g., Morris 1984).

21. The price of a second-class roundtrip train ticket to the Hague from Groningen, which is one of the farthest points in the Netherlands, is around 38 Euros.

What is new, however, is the way that protest participants have communicated about these events. Many of the protesters reported hearing about the protest event via e-mail or on the Web. In addition, more than 80 percent of the participants surveyed reported using the Internet to learn about the issue, organize accommodations or transportation, and/or coordinate with other people coming to the protest.[22] This result is consistent with the scholars who find the Internet to be a key tool for mobilizing protest participants (e.g., Almeida and Lichbach 2003; Langman and Morris 2003; Rheingold 2002). In recent years, SMOs have created Internet resources, and a significant percentage of these participants likely received their information from e-mail lists and websites run by, or affiliated with, SMOs.

Although some scholars have posited that these types of connections make possible the social movement networks of global civil society (see Beck 2003; Glasius et al. 2002; Naughton 2001; Sassen 2002), because so few of the protest participants came to these protest events from outside the country in which the protests were taking place, these data do not provide much support for the transnationality of the protesting population at globalization protests. In fact, the findings of this article suggest that the notion of global civil society needs reclarification. Contradicting those scholars who posit that global civil society involves individuals who are "above and beyond national, regional, or local societies" (Anheier, Glasius, and Kaldor 2001:3), the participants in these large-scale protest events, which have come to be seen as a hallmark of global civil society, did not represent a global population. Instead, they represented concerned citizens within nation-states.

At the same time, many local organizations involved in the globalization movement connect their members to transnational advocacy networks and coalitions via the Internet. Internet resources have made it possible for activists to stay more closely connected to the SMOs with which they are affiliated. As a result, the organizations that provide these electronic resources are able to engage activists in a struggle that targets transnational actors, such as international institutions, by connecting domestic activists to a larger transnational movement. Indeed, the coalitions that organized each of these protest events included organizations that work transnationally. These conclusions are consistent with the reasoning of Almeida and Lichbach (2003) who find that "much of the 'transnationalness' that distinguishes this ascendant form of collective action" can only be seen by looking outside the protests that are taking place near the actual international meetings (p. 252).

Although this article has focused on the ways that SMOs have supported non-local participation in globalization protest events, we also find a significant local presence at each of these protests; at least 24 percent of the protesters surveyed at each location came from the area surrounding the protest event. This finding is consistent with the notion put forth by Sidney Tarrow (2002b, 2005) in his work on what he calls *rooted cosmopolitans*. In other words, the presence of such a large percentage of local protesters at international protest events suggests that many people in the globalization movement may be engaged citizens who are connecting international concerns with locally based action. It also suggests that the participants in globalization protests may be engaged in political action on an on-going basis through local organizations, rather than being involved only in periodic transnational events.

This article points to six particularly relevant future research directions. First, although this article provides data to understand *how* organizations matter, research is needed to explore the organizational forms involved in large-scale protest. In particular, who are the organizations connecting protesters transnationally, how do they work, and are they, in fact, creating innovative organizational forms like the literature suggests (e.g., Anheier and Themudo 2002; Graeber 2001; Lichbach 2003)? Second, given the high levels of Internet usage by protest participants at these events, research is needed to understand how SMOs have used this technology to connect similarly minded individuals around the world, as well as the implica-

22. Data about participants' usage of the Internet were not collected from participants of the Human Dike Protest.

tions of these transnational connections to social movements and protest more broadly. Third, data are needed that explore globalization protesters' levels of on-going political engagement and how often they participate in protests in tandem with international meetings. Fourth, globalization protests that have a high level of anarchist participation, direct action, and a large police presence—such as the Mobilization for Global Justice and Another World is Possible—had higher refusal rates. Thus, more research is needed to develop methods for collecting data on these particular participants in the globalization movement. Fifth, the protests included in this study all took place in the developed world. As protests continue to take place around the world in response to the meetings of international institutions and multilateral regimes, future research should look at globalization protests in the developing world to see if organizations play a similar role in bringing non-local participants to the events. Sixth, as citizens around the world voice their concerns about the war being waged in the Middle East, research should look at the connections between the anti-war movement and the globalization movement. By continuing to conduct rigorous research on large-scale protest events, we will learn about an action form that has become an influential aspect of citizens' political mobilization.

References

Almeida, Paul D. and Mark Irving Lichbach. 2003. "To the Internet From the Internet: Comparative Media Coverage of Transnational Protests." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 8(3):249–72.

Ancelovici, M. 2002. "Organizing Against Globalization: The Case of ATTAC in France." *Politics & Society* 30:427–63.

Andrews, Edmund L. 2002. "World Financial Officials Back New Debt Framework." *The New York Times*, September 28, p. A6.

Anheier, Helmut, Marlies Glasius, and Mary Kaldor. 2001. *Global Civil Society Yearbook 2001*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anheier, Helmut and Nuno Themudo. 2002. "Organisational Forms of Global Civil Society: Implications of Going Global." Pp. 191–215 in *Global Civil Society 2002*, edited by M. Glasius, M. Kaldor, and H. Anheier. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Another World Is Possible (AWIP). 2002. "Protest the WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM New York City from Jan 31st–Feb 5th." *The Artists Network of Refuse and Resist!* Retrieved October 4, 2004 (http://www.artistsnetwork.org/news2/news98.html).

Atwood, David C. 1997. "Mobilizing Around the United Nations Special Sessions on Disarmament." Pp. 141–58 in *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics*, edited by J. Smith, C. Chatfield, and R. Pagnucco. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Ayres, Jeffrey M. 2001. "Transnational Political Processes and Contention Against the Global Economy." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 6(1):55–68.

Ayres, Jeffrey and Sidney Tarrow. 2002. "The Shifting Grounds for Transnational Civic Activity." *Social Science Research Council*. Retrieved October 4, 2004 (http://www.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/ayres_text_only.htm).

Beck, Ulrich. 2003. "The Analysis of Global Inequality: From National to Cosmopolitan Perspective." Pp. 45–55 in *Global Civil Society 2003*, edited by M. Kaldor, H. Anheier, and M. Glasius. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bhagwati, Jagdish. 2001. "Why Globalization is Good." *Items* 2(3/4):7–8.

Boli, John and George M. Thomas. 1999. *Constructing World Culture: International Nongovernmental Organizations since 1875*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2001. "Uniting to Better Dominate." *Items* 2(3/4):1–6.

Brecher, Jeremy, Tim Costello, and Brendan Smith. 2002. *Globalization from Below: The Power of Solidarity*. 2d ed. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Buechler, Steven M. 1997. "Beyond Resource Mobilization?" Pp. 193–210 in *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues*, edited by S. Buechler and F. Cylke. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Caniglia, Beth S. 2002. "Elite Alliances and Transnational Environmental Movement Organizations." Pp. 153–72 in *Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements*, edited by Jackie Smith and Hank Johnston. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Clark, Anne Marie, Elisabeth J. Friedman, and Kathryn Hochstetler. 1998. "The Sovereign Limits of Global Civil Society: A Comparison of NGO Participation in UN World Conferences on the Environment, Human Rights and Women." *World Politics* 51:1–35.

Cortright, David and Ron Pagnucco. 1997. "Limits to Transnationalism: The 1980s Freeze Campaign." Pp. 159–74 in *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics*, edited by J. Smith, C. Chatfield, and R. Pagnucco. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

della Porta, Donatella and Sidney Tarrow. 2001. "The Antiglobal Movement, the Police, and Terrorism." *Items* 2(3/4):9–11.

Edwards, Michael and John Gaventa. 2001. *Global Citizen Action*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Fernandez, Manny. 2002. "Demonstrators Rally to Palestinian Cause; Arab Americans, Supporters Drown Out Other Issues." *The Washington Post*. April 21, p. A1.

Fernandez, Manny and David A. Fahrenthold. 2002. "Protests Produce Very Few Problems; Hundreds Arrested In Rally's 1st Day." *The Washington Post*, September 29, p. C1.

Fisher, Dana R. 2000. "Social Movement Organizations and Protest: A Reclarification of the Mobilization of Civil Society." Presented at the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, August, Washington, DC.

———. 2004. "Civil Society Protest and Participation: Civic Engagement within the Multilateral Governance Regime." Pp. 176–99 in *Emerging Forces in Environmental Governance*, edited by P. Haas and N. Kanie. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Fisher, Dana R. and Jessica F. Green. 2004. "Understanding Disenfranchisement: Civil Society and Developing Countries' Influence and Participation in Global Governance for Sustainable Development." *Global Environmental Politics* 4(3):65–84.

Fisher, Dana R. and Larry Michael Wright. 2001. "On Utopias and Dystopias: Toward an Understanding of the Discourse Surrounding the Internet." *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*. Retrieved October 4, 2004 (http://www.ascusc.org/jcmc/vol6/issue2/fisher.html).

Florini, Ann M. 2000. *The Third Force: The Rise of Transnational Civil Society*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Press.

———. 2001. "Transnational Civil Society." Pp. 29–40 in *Global Citizen Action*, edited by M. Edwards and J. Gaventa. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Fox, Jonathan A., L. David Brown, and NetLibrary Inc. 1998. *The Struggle for Accountability the World Bank, NGOs, and Grassroots Movements*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gaventa, John. 2001. "Global Citizen Action: Lessons and Challenges." Pp. 275–87 in *Global Citizen Action*, edited by M. Edwards and J. Gaventa. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Gemmill, Barbara and Abimbola Bamidele-Izu. 2002. "The Role of NGOs and Civil Society in Global Environmental Governance." Pp. 1–24 in *Global Environmental Governance: Options & Opportunities*, edited by D. C. Esty and M. H. Ivanova. New Haven: Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy.

Glasius, Marlies, Mary Kaldor, and Helmut Anheier. 2002. *Global Civil Society 2002*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Graeber, David. 2001. "The Globalization Movement: Some Points of Clarification." *Items* 2(3/4):12–14.

Guidry, J. A., M. D. Kennedy, and M. Zald. 2001. *Globalizations and Social Movements: Culture, Power and the Transnational Public Sphere*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hanagan, Michael. 1998. "Irish Transnational Social Movements, Deterritorialized Migrants, and the State System: The Last One Hundred and Forty Years." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 3(1):107–26.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hays, Tom. 2002. "Protests Start Out Calm, Expected to Stay that Way during Forum." *Associated Press*. February 1. Retrieved October 4, 2004 (http://www.lexis-nexis.com).

Indymedia.org. *Independent Media Center*. Retrieved October 4, 2004 (http://www.indymedia.org).

International Society for Peace and Human Rights. 2002. "Final Report on the G6B People's Summit." Retrieved October 4, 2004 (http://www.halifaxinitiative.org/updir/g6b_report.pdf).

Kaplan, Esther. 2003. "A Hundred Peace Movements Bloom." *The Nation*, January 3, pp. 11–16.

Keck, Margaret E. and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Koopmans, Ruud. 1993. "The Dynamics of Protest Waves: West Germany, 1965 to 1989." *American Sociological Review* 58: 637–58.

Korey, William. 1998. *NGOs and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: A Curious Grapevine*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Langman, Lauren and Douglas Morris. 2003. "Globalization and Social Movements: The Impact of the WSF." Presentation at the American Sociological Association Meetings, August, Atlanta, GA.

Lewis, Tammy L. 2000. "Transnational Conservation Movement Organizations: Shaping the Protected Area Systems of Less Developed Countries." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 5(1):105–23.

Lichbach, Mark. 2003. "The Anti-Globalization Movement: A New Kind of Protest." Pp. 39–42 in *Peace and Conflict 2003*, edited by Monty G. Marshall and Ted Robert Gurr. College Park, MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management, University of Maryland.

Maney, Gregory M. 2001. "Transnational Structures and Protest: Linking Theories and Assessing Evidence." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 6(1):83–100.

McPhail, Clark. 1991. *The Myth of the Madding Crowd*. New York : A. de Gruyter.

Mertes, Tom and Walden F. Bello. 2004. *A Movement of Movements: Is Another World Really Possible?* London and New York: Verso.

Meyer, David S. and Sidney G. Tarrow. 1998. *The Social Movement Society: Contentious Politics for a New Century*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Morris, Aldon D. 1984. *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change*. New York: Free Press.

Myers, Daniel J. 2002. "Social Activism through Computer Networks." Pp. 124–37 in *Renaissance in Social Science Computing*, edited by Orville Vernon Burton. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Naughton, John. 2001. "Contested Space: The Internet and Global Civil Society." Pp. 147–68 in *Global Civil Society Yearbook 2001*, edited by Helmut Anheier, Marlies Glasius, and Mary Kaldor. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nepstad, Sharon E. 2002. "Creating Transnational Solidarity: The Use of Narrative in the U.S.-Central American Peace Movement." Pp. 133–52 in *Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements*, edited by Jackie Smith and Hank Johnston. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

O'Brien, R., A. M. Goetz, J. Art, and M. Williams. 2000. *Contesting Global Governance: Multilateral Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Oliver, Pamela E. 1989. "Bringing the Crowd Back In: The Nonorganizational Elements of Social Movements." *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change*. 11:1–30.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard Cloward. 1992. "Normalizing Collective Protest." Pp. 301–25 in *Frontiers of Social Movements*, edited by Aldon Morris and Carol McClurg Meuller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Protest.Net. "Protest.Net: A Calendar of Protest, Meetings, and Conferences." *Protest.Net*. Retrieved October 4, 2004 (http://protest.net/).

Putnam, Robert D. 2000. "Chapter 9: Against the Tide? Small Groups, Social Movements, and the Net" Pp. 148–80 in *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Ray, Marcella Ridlen. 1999. "Technological Change and Associational Life." Pp. 297–330 in *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*, edited by T. Skocpol and M. P. Fiorina. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Reel, Monte and Manny Fernandez. 2002. "Protesters' Momentum Weakens." *The Washington Post*, September 29, p. C1.

Reimann, Kim. 2002. "Building Networks from the Outside In: Japanese NGOs and the Kyoto Climate Change Conference." Pp. 173–90 in *Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements*, edited by Jackie Smith and Hank Johnston. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Rheingold, Howard. 2002. *Smart Mobs: the Next Social Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas. 1995. *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Non-State Actors, Domestic Structure and International Institutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rothman, Franklin Daniel and Pamela E. Oliver. 1999. "From Local to Global: The Anti-Dam Movement in Southern Brazil, 1979–1992." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 4(1):41–57.

Said, Yahia and Meghnad Desai. 2003. "Trade and Global Civil Society: the Anti-Capitalist Movement Revisited." Pp. 59–85 in *Global Civil Society 2003*, edited by M. Kaldor, H. Anheier, and M. Glasius. London: Oxford University Press.

Sanger, David E. 2002. "Economic Forum Shifts its Focus to New Dangers." *The New York Times*, February 3, p. A1.

Sassen, Saskia. 2002. "Global Cities and Diasporic Networks: Microsites in Global Civil Society." Pp. 217–38 in *Global Civil Society 2002*, edited by M. Glasius, M. Kaldor, and H. Anheier. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sen, Jai, Anita Anand, Arturo Escobar, and Peter Waterman. n.d. *The World Social Forum: Challenging Empires*. New Delhi: Viveka Foundation.

Smelser, Neil J. 1962. *Theory of Collective Behavior*. New York: Free Press.

Smith, Jackie. 2001. "Globalizing Resistance: The Battle of Seattle and the Future of Social Movements." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 6(1):1–21.

Smith, Jackie G., Charles Chatfield, and Ron Pagnucco, eds. 1997. *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Smith, Jackie G. and Hank Johnston. 2002. "Globalization and Resistance: an Introduction." Pp. 1–12 in *Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements*, edited by Jackie Smith and Hank Johnston. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1988. "The Consequences of Professionalization and Formalization in the Pro-Choice Movement." *American Sociological Review* 53:585–606.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement*. 2d ed. New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2001. "Transnational Politics: Contention and Institutions in International Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4:1–20.

———. 2002a. "From Lumping to Splitting: Specifying Globalization and Resistance." Pp. 229–50 in *Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements*, edited by Jackie Smith and Hank Johnston. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

———. 2002b. "Rooted Cosmopolitans: Transnational Activists in a World of States." Paper presented at the Amsterdam School of Social Research Workshop on Contentious Politics: Identity, Mobilization and Transnational Politics. 6 May.

———. 2005. "Rooted Cosmopolitans and Transnational Activists." Chapter 3 in *The New Transnational Activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tilly, Charles. 2004. "Chapter 5: Social Movements Enter the Twenty-first Century." Pp. 95–122 in *Social Movements, 1768–2004*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Turner, Ralph H. and Lewis M. Killian. 1972. *Collective Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Vasi, Ion Bogdan. 2002. "From Global Justice to Domestic Anti-War: Social Movement Spillover and Mobilization." Presentation at the American Sociological Association Annual Meetings, August, Chicago, IL.

Wapner, Paul. 1996. *Environmental Activism and World Civic Politics*. New York: SUNY Press.

Wood, Lesley. 2003. "Breaking the Bank and Taking to the Streets—How Protesters Target Neoliberalism." Presentation at the American Sociological Association Annual Meetings, August, Atlanta, GA.

Wright, Ben. 2002. "WEF: New York's Big Deal." *BBC News*, Febrary 1. Retrieved October 4, 2004 (http://www.news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/1795521.stm).

Znet. "Znet: A Community of People Committed to Social Change." *Z Communications*. Retrieved October 4, 2004 (http://www.zmag.org/weluser.htm).