

THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY

International Meeting on Global Trends and Human Rights

September 2001: Impacts on Human Rights Work

Geneva, 10-12 January 2002

**THE ANTI-GLOBALISATION MOVEMENT: STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES
AND LESSONS FOR HUMAN RIGHTS ADVOCACY**

Carlos Abin

© 2002, International Council on Human Rights Policy
ICHRP commissioned this document as a Working Paper.
ICHRP has not edited it and is not responsible for its accuracy or for the views and opinions expressed.
ICHRP welcomes the re-use, re-publication and re-distribution of this paper, appropriately cited.

THE RISK OF THE LABEL

1. I don't like labels. Labelling means simplifying and thus distorting reality. And far from truth or far from reality, there opens a wide way for prejudice, manipulation and repression, which are the main menaces that hang over the civil society organizations and activists whose points of view simply dissent from the official vision, or the dominant version or message.
2. "Anti globalisation movement" is a label, and a very pervasive one; as pervasive as perverse and confusing.
3. "Globalisation" has been defined and redefined in countless ways. Is it a trend of our present civilization? Is it the result of technological development, an outcome of progress? Is it an unavoidable course of events, something like a natural law out of reach for humankind? Is it perhaps the final recipe, the promise of welfare forever for everybody on earth? or is it a new phase of corporate evolution and self adaptation to continue performing exploitation and dominance?
4. The choice is relevant, because the definition of "globalisation" will determinate the very content of the so called "anti" movement. If this content is perceived -or showed- as absurd or irrational, the public image of the movement shall follow the path. Conversely, if the aims of the movement are clear, consistent and fair, it will be able to gain respect and broader support.
5. So we can conclude that this first point, the label endorsed to the movement, is a critical issue. It comprises both its strength and its weakness. If we conceive globalisation as a political process whose path is being set by human decision and human will; that it can be developed in many different ways. Many people oppose the international macroeconomic decision-making, both because of its content and because of the undemocratic way these decisions are being taken. In other words, the so called "anti globalisation movement" works, protests or fights against the

corporate version of globalisation, imposed by rich countries over poor ones, and by powerful interests over the majority of the people in the rich countries themselves. Some alternatives are being proposed, which could lead to a kind of globalisation firmly based on **solidarity and the recognition of human rights**.

THE QUESTION OF LEGITIMACY, THE RIGHT TO DISSENT

6. In the aftermath of the September 11th attacks, the question of legitimacy bursts on the scenario pushed out by the ominous warning: "you are either with us, or you are against us". The hegemonic power draws a line and drops a challenge. Each of us has to make her or his choice. Crossing the line out of the "with us" field is anyway dangerous, because the only alternative is the "against us" field, that is to say, a suspicious territory inhabited predominantly by "terrorists".
7. We have to manage to delete this line. We are clearly not with them, if to be with them implies support to war, acceptance of subordination of principles and values to the strategic interests of the USA and its allies, restrictions to democracy and civil rights, overruling of international law. We are clearly not terrorists. We are against terrorism of any kind and source, and further, our main concerns refer to the inequities that are the deep roots of terrorism and desperation. We are citizens. We are exercising our rights. Our legitimacy comes from citizenship. Our rights come from democracy. We have the right to dissent, the right to fight on behalf of our ideas.
8. The so called "anti globalisation movement" has to step out of this gambit, and the way to do it is the reaffirmation of citizenship, democracy, civil rights and international law. In other words, we shall find the core of our strength defending and reassuring the principles and values that the global powers declare in loud voice but deny in fact.

THE APPEAL TO INTERNATIONAL LAW

9. All of us shall surely agree about the incompleteness of international law, and its almost impossible enforcement in our present world. But in any case, international law is an historical construct - frail and imperfect as it is- that has been opening its way through the decades, organizing institutions, procedural requirements, international courts etc, that is to say an international legality, a normative system that intends to preserve peace as an universal value and to enforce a broad set of defined human rights.
10. In fact, international legality is a border that the global powers shouldn't cross over. And when they break this boundary -as the US is doing just now- (esto no es obvio para todo el mundo... se puede sacar el comentario entre guiones, o explicar mas cuales son las violaciones) they are, at the same time putting in evidence the weakness of the international legal system and their own weakness. Self-help justice is a kind of primitive justice, and is not safe for nobody, included the self-helper.
11. The weakness of international law is also our weakness.
12. The strength of the principles, values and goals of international law is our strength
13. The anti globalisation movement has to deepen its commitment with international legality and the effective rule of law, and fight for it with determination and perseverance.

THE FIGHT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

14. I know -or I should better say I feel- that the very heart of our struggle is the fight for human rights. Justice is one of the main sources of our strength. When we oppose to corporate globalisation, to the dominance of global powers -being those economic, cultural o military- we are struggling for the elementary rights of hundreds of millions who are excluded, condemned to a subhuman condition or driven into misery and desperation. From any point of view we choose, this fight is ethically the proper fight. It is an urgent affair, it demands our indefatigably activity, day by day, hour by hour, because any delay is unjust and means more suffering, more ruined lives, more rights denied. But at the same time we have to know and to admit that this fight only will be successful in historic times. The lack of patience shall make us weak, the lack of urgency shall make us non effective. That is a huge challenge to have in mind any time we decide a move, any time we choose a path.
15. And the fight for human rights implies the effort for a redefinition of its corpus in order to make it broader and better, taking account of the cultural diversity, making social, economic and cultural rights enforceable and linking them properly with the economic systems, including duties as the unavoidable related counterpart, finding new and better balance between individual rights collective ones.

GLOBAL AND LOCAL

16. The anti-globalisation movement is usually perceived as addressing global problems. But its strength must be built from the grassroots. Which means that the global struggle must be prepared, sustained and enhanced by local efforts: **one global struggle, a million local fights** should be our mantra.
17. The aftermath of September 11th attacks has pictured a scenario in which the opportunities of dissent may be strongly narrowed, civil rights restrained, citizenship diminished, democracy undermined, human rights demoted all in all by "security reasons". New battlefields are opening here and there. It is strongly necessary to jump into them and stand for the people's rights. Global strength will be made basically of local bricks.