CIVIL RESISTANCE AND THE "DIVERSITY OF TACTICS" IN THE ANTI-GLOBALIZATION MOVEMENT: PROBLEMS OF VIOLENCE, SILENCE, AND SOLIDARITY IN ACTIVIST POLITICS©

BY JANET CONWAY*

This article examines the (re)emergence of large-scale civil disobedience and the accompanying debates about violence and non-violence in the contemporary anti-globalization movement. Rooted in the Canadian movement but in conversation with wider debates, the article tracks movement practices and debates from the Battle of Seattle through to the Quebec Summit. The debate took a new turn in Genoa, with massive police brutality and the killing of a protester, and again following the events of September 11, 2001. The central argument of the article is that the new forms of civil resistance embody a critique of prevailing forms of organization, participation, representation, and action in Canadian social movements. Respect for diversity of tactics emerged as a non-negotiable basis of unity in this context. The author goes on to argue that, by June 2002, this stance had hardened into an ideology that functioned to restrict genuine diversity and threatened democracy and pluralism in the movement. The article ends with reflections on how the threat of war and the emergence of a global anti-war movement has again transformed the landscape of the anti-globalization movement.

Cet article examine la (ré)émergence de la désobéissance civile à grande échelle, et les débats qui l'accompagnent en matière de violence et de non-violence dans le mouvement contemporain altermondiste. Axé sur le mouvement canadien, mais en parallèle avec des débats plus étendus, l'article observe les pratiques du mouvement et les débats intervenus depuis la Bataille de Seattle jusqu'au Sommet de Québec. Le débat a pris une nouvelle orientation à Gênes, à la suite de la brutalité policière massive et de l'assassinat d'un manifestant, puis à la suite des événements du 11 septembre 2001. L'article se concentre autour de l'argument selon lequel les nouvelles formes de résistance civile incarnent une critique des formes prédominantes d'organisation, de participation, de représentation et d'action dans les mouvements sociaux canadiens. Dans ce contexte, le respect de la diversité des tactiques est apparu comme base non-négociable d'unité. Dans sa lancée, l'auteur pose que, dès juin 2002, cette position s'était cristallisée dans une idéologie qui fonctionnait pour restreindre la diversité véritable, menaçait la démocratie et le pluralisme dans le mouvement. L'article se termine par des observations sur la façon dont la menace d'une guerre et l'émergence d'un mouvement mondial anti-guerre a une fois de plus transformé le visage du mouvement anti-mondialisation.

---

*Janet Conway is a long-time social movement activist. She teaches politics at Ryerson University in Toronto.

I. INTRODUCTION

With the November 1999 mobilization that shut down the World Trade Organization (WTO) meetings in Seattle, the "anti-globalization"[1] movement erupted onto the world stage.[2] Between the Seattle protest and the events of September 11, 2001 (9/11), massive and growing anti-globalization demonstrations confronted neo-liberal[3] elites wherever they convened. These demonstrations, especially their North American and European variants,[4] have been the forum for the emergence of a debate over "diversity of tactics."[5] The

---

[1] The term anti-globalization was coined by the media to label the major demonstrations being mounted in the late 1990s around meetings of the G8, the G20, the WTO, the World Bank, and the IMF. Anti-globalization has become an umbrella moniker for what is more accurately an internally heterogenous "movement of movements" broadly convergent in their opposition to the domination of forms of global economic integration by neo-liberal, corporate, American, or First World entities. The term has persisted despite activists' protests that they are not opposed to globalization per se. Many activists prefer the term "global justice" to name their movement.

[2] Most strands of the movement, North and South, are opposed to American-led, corporate-dominated, neo-liberal globalization—not globalism per se.

[3] Neo-liberalism is a conservative economic philosophy and political project that emerged in the 1970s in response to the uprisings and new social movements of the late 1960s. It mitigates against greater equality, environmental regulation, and labour protections by putatively reducing the role of the state in economic management in favour of the "free market." It appears as a bundle of policies promoting privatization, deregulation, and trade liberalization.

[4] For this reason, these very specific forms of activism in the North constitute the empirical focus of this paper; however it is important not to conflate this debate or these demonstrations with the incredibly diverse and pluralistic politics and practices of the worldwide movement against neo-liberal globalization and for global justice as a whole.

[5] White students and youth have played a very significant role in the debate over diversity of tactics within the anti-globalization street mobilizations of recent years and, in particular in their call for the (re)turn to "direct action." This demographic remains one segment of a much broader, more politically and culturally

debate has revolved around the acceptability of more disruptive or confrontational forms of direct action, the putative role of property damage, and the use of veiled threats of the escalation of violence in the struggle against neo-liberal globalization.

I will argue that the new forms of civil resistance in the Canadian anti-globalization movement embody a critique of prevailing forms of organization, participation, representation, and action in Canadian social movements. In a climate of intensifying global crises, a deep sense of urgency, felt most intensely by the young, has propelled the development of new modes of organization and action as well as new codes of solidarity. Militant youth movements have criticized and challenged long-standing traditions of non-violence as moralistic and authoritarian.

In the name of creativity, resistance, and democracy, many anti-globalization activists advocate "respect for diversity of tactics" as a non-negotiable basis of unity. Solidarity with the full range of resistance[6] has meant that no tactics are ruled out in advance and that activists refrain from publicly criticizing tactics with which they disagree. However, embracing diversity of tactics is not without ambiguity and risk: both strategically in terms of provoking repression and losing public support, but also in terms of democratic practice and culture within the movement itself where it may damage any prospect for broad coalition politics.

I will argue further that by the time of the G8 meetings of June 2002 in Calgary, "respect for diversity of tactics" had hardened into an ideology that was repressing debate, narrowing the base of support, and de facto restricting genuine diversity, creativity, and pluralism that have been the hallmarks of this remarkable movement.

---

diverse reality on the streets. In particular, the practices and discourses of the youth movement are influenced by much older traditions and debates about anarchism. There are also important gender and race dimensions of the debate over diversity of tactics that I do not have the space to explore here. See Kristine Wong, "The Showdown Before Seattle: Race, Class and the Framing of a Movement" 215 in Eddie Yuen, George Katsiaficas & Daniel Burton Rose, eds., *The Battle of Seattle: The New Challenge to Capitalist Globalization* (New York: Soft Skull Press, 2001) and see also Geov Parrish, "Imagine" 121 in the same collection; Sarah Lamble, "Building Sustainable Communities of Resistance" 179 in Jen Chang *et al*., eds., *Resist! A Grassroots Collection of Stories, Poetry, Photos and Analysis from the FTAA protests in Quebec City and Beyond* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2001) and see also Caitlin Hewitt-White, "Women Talking About Sexism in the Anti-Globalization Movement" 152 in the same collection; Starhawk, *Webs of Power: Notes from the Global Uprising* (Gabriola, B.C.: New Society Publishers, 2002), and Caitlin Hewitt-White, "Direct Action Against Poverty: Feminist Reflections on the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty Demonstration, June 2000" (2001) 20 Can. Woman Stud./ Les Cahiers de la Femme 186.

[6] In activist usage, the meaning of this phrase remains vague but it suggests that "resistance" to what is considered wrong or oppressive (in this case, neo-liberal globalization) legitimates anything done to oppose or weaken it.

Through an examination of the Canadian movement in conversation with the international debates, I will track movement practices and debates from the battle of Seattle through to the Quebec Summit. The debate took a new turn in Genoa with massive and systematic abuse of protesters by police and the fatal shooting of a young man, and then again with the events following 9/11. The subsequent War on Terrorism has transformed the landscape of civil resistance worldwide as has the emergence of a massive global anti-war movement.

I am an activist. My perspective on these debates is shaped by my own involvement in progressive social movements over the last fifteen years. I went to Quebec in April 2001 and have participated in many other actions prior and subsequent to the Quebec Summit. I am also a scholar of social movements and the politics they connote. My interest is both in the strategic questions the movements confront and in the meaning of these debates for progressive and democratic politics more generally.[7]

II. CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AND DIRECT ACTION

The terms "civil disobedience" and "direct action" have been used interchangeably in both activist and academic circles; their meanings are often conflated. Further, the meaning of these terms often suffers as assumptions of illegality and violence are imported into their use.

Civil disobedience is a specific form of extra-parliamentary political action involving the deliberate, principled, and public breaking of a law that is perceived to be unjust. Acts of civil disobedience are premised on the existence of liberal democratic institutions and the rule of law. The public and principled breaking of a law by otherwise law-abiding persons is meant to call attention to the unjustness of that law, both through heroic witness (being willing to risk arrest or jail), and through using or gumming-up legal channels themselves (for example, through a trial).[8] Classic examples of the use of civil disobedience from recent movement history include the lunch counter sit-ins of the civil-rights movement, the burning of draft cards in the anti-Vietnam War movement, and the blockades and occupations of the anti-nuclear movement.

Direct action is a larger and more generic category than is civil disobedience. The term refers to forms of political action that bypass

---

[7] In researching this paper, I interviewed three feminist women from three Canadian cities who have been heavily involved in non-violent direct action in their regions in the context of the anti-globalization movement. Thanks to Anna Kruzynski, Robin Buyers and Denise Nadeau for the hours they spent with me in June 2002. Thanks also to Kim Fry and the activist-participants in the "Diversity of Tactics in the Anti-Globalization Movement" Workshop at "Rebuild Ontario..Think Global, Act Local" Social Justice Summer Retreat organized by the Centre for Social Justice, Algonquin Park, Ontario, 22-25 August 2002.

[8] Starhawk, *supra* note 5.

parliamentary or bureaucratic channels to directly ameliorate or eliminate an injustice, or to slow down or obstruct regular operations of an unjust system or order. Strikes, street demonstrations, and occupations are classic forms of direct action.[9]

Virtually all contemporary forms of direct action are in some sense symbolic as the action dramatizes conflict of system-wide problems. For example, the act of squatting (moving into and living in) in a vacant building may provide housing for a dozen homeless people thus directly ameliorating their situation. However, as forms of political action, most squats point to a much larger phenomenon of homelessness and create pressure for public agencies to act against the squat or to provide affordable housing. In this sense, a single squat constitutes direct action and is symbolic at the same time.

Direct action can be legal, illegal, or extra-legal (extra legal is used here to refer to practices that are not currently contemplated by the law). It may or may not be an occasion of police action and arrests. While all civil disobedience is a form of direct action, not all direct action involves the intentional and principled breaking of an unjust law with the purpose of calling attention to it. Direct action can be situated anywhere on what young activists call "the violence/non-violence continuum."[10] Likewise, direct action can be situated anywhere on the illegal/extra-legal/legal continuum. There is no necessary correlation between non-violence and legality or, as activist victims of police brutality are quick to point out, between violence and illegality.

Both civil disobedience and direct action can involve property destruction and can still be considered non-violent by many activists. Here, non-violence is generally understood to mean the eschewing of the use of physical force against another human being. Generally, the mass street actions of the anti-globalization movement have been forms of direct action, some of them legal but many of them not, and have been almost completely non-violent on the part of the protesters. Within the demonstrations, there have been numerous direct actions of a great variety of types. The intensifying debate over diversity of tactics in the movement must be understood within a context of expanding commitment to, and enactment of, a wide variety of expressions of direct action.

III. DIVERSITY OF TACTICS

---

[9] For movement histories, theories, and discussions of various forms of non-violent resistance, see Peter Ackerman & Jack DuVall. *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conflict*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000); Pam McAllister, ed., *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Nonviolence* (Philadelphia: New Society: 1982) and Barbara Epstein, *Political Protest and Cultural Revolution: Nonviolent Direct Action in the 1970s and 1980s*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).

[10] Interview of Kim Fry (June 2002) Toronto.

The debate over diversity of tactics in the anti-globalization movement initially emerged in the context of the Seattle demonstrations in November 1999. By the April 2001 anti-Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) demonstrations in Quebec City, there was a full and specific articulation of the meaning of the term. Respect for diversity of tactics implies support for a bundle of organizing approaches, attitudes, and tactics. Since the Seattle demonstrations, proponents of diversity of tactics in the Canadian anti-globalization movement have argued both for an escalation and for a diversification of tactics beyond the routines of lobbying and legal, stage-managed demonstrations. They have argued for the valuing of a wider range of political activity especially in the institutionalized power centres of the movement such as labour unions and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Proponents of diversity of tactics have called for and have engaged in popular education, cultural work, and grassroots-community organizing. Driven by a sense of urgency resulting from mounting social and ecological crises, these activists have argued for a return to more militant and confrontational tactics, including direct action and civil disobedience. In the name of both escalation and diversity they have also called for and defended property destruction, from stickering, spray painting, and guerrilla murals, to window smashing and the defacing of signs.

Respect for diversity of tactics as an ethical framework presupposes the existence of "affinity groups" as the unit of organization and democratic decision making. Affinity group organizing has its roots in feminist, anarchist, and anti-nuclear movements in which small, autonomous groups decide on the nature of their participation in a direct action, organizing independently of any centralized movement authority.[11] Commitment to affinity group organizing often implies a repudiation of representative forms of democracy, institutions of the liberal democratic state, as well as labour unions and more bureaucratized movement organizations. Respect for diversity of tactics is part of a commitment to and practice of direct and participatory democracy in which all practitioners participate directly in decision making about tactics within their affinity groups. Large-scale anti-globalization demonstrations have been organized in significant part by networks of affinity groups who gather in spokescouncils.[12] Theoretically, these groups strive for consensus, but practically work towards coordination and mutual tolerance.

---

[11] Noel Sturgeon, "Theorizing Movements: Direct Action and Direct Theory" in Marcy Darnovsky, Barbara Epstein & Richard Flacks, eds., *Cultural Politics and Social Movements* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995) 35.

[12] Spokescouncil refers to the periodic gathering of representatives of affinity groups before and during major actions to confer and coordinate their respective activities.

The decisive feature of respect for diversity of tactics is an ethic of respect for, and acceptance of, the tactical choices of other activists. This tolerance of pluralism involves an explicit agreement not to publicly denounce the tactics of other activists—most controversially, rock-throwing, window-breaking, garbage can burning, and vandalism. So respect for diversity of tactics precludes, for example, the kind of non-violence agreement proposed by the Direct Action Network (DAN) that undergirded the Seattle organizing. The debate about diversity of tactics first emerged under that name when DAN organizers and other key movement leaders condemned the people throwing rocks and breaking windows in Seattle.

By the time of the demonstrations in Quebec City, those who were advocating diversity of tactics were also repudiating the dogmatism of non-violence, which they understood to be an authoritarian move to render certain forms of political resistance illegitimate. They criticized the overly rigid violence/non-violence binary that characterizes much of the discourse around non-violence. They also critiqued the highly ritualized forms of civil disobedience that had evolved during the peace movement, where protesters passively handed themselves over to the police.[13]

Respect for diversity of tactics is a code that is both strategic and ethical. Many proponents are themselves implicitly or explicitly non-violent. Respect for diversity of tactics does not necessarily imply engaging in or even agreeing with the full range of tactics; rather, it holds that everyone has the right and the responsibility to identify their own thresholds of legitimate protest and to make their own political, strategical, and ethical choices, while also allowing others to do so free from public criticism or censure.

IV. HISTORICIZING THE EMERGENCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF DIVERSITY OF TACTICS

A. *The "Battle of Seattle"*

Seattle has rightly been celebrated as a massive convergence of diverse movements expressing opposition to the WTO and, more generally, to corporate-led globalization.[14] However, the organization prior to the Seattle events

---

[13] See Starhawk, *supra* note 5 at 206 for elaboration of this debate.

[14] See for example Barbara Epstein, "Not Your Parents' Protest" in Yuen, Katsiaficas & Rose, *supra* note 5, 53; Peter Bleyer, "The Other Battle in Seattle" (2000) 62 Stud. in Pol. Ec. 25; Maude Barlow & Tony Clarke, *Global Showdown: How the New Activists Are Fighting Global Corporate Rule* (Toronto: Stoddart,

proceeded in ways specific to particular activist networks. The organization of direct action for Seattle began in the summer of 1999 with a series of conversations among a variety of West Coast activist groups in both the United States and Canada. The groups included People's Global Action, Earth First!, Ruckus Society, Rainforest Action Network, Art and Revolution, and a number of small community organizations. The groups were dispersed over half a dozen cities in Washington, Oregon, California, and British Colombia.[15]

Two months prior to the Seattle demonstrations, DAN emerged from a direct action training camp organized by the Ruckus Society.[16] DAN activists were predominantly white and young, and were drawn from the environmental direct action networks, international-solidarity coalitions, and anarchist movements. Their goal in Seattle was to shut down the WTO through non-violent direct action[17] and to fill the jails with protesters.[18]

DAN adopted a conventional non-violence agreement: no weapons, no violence (physical or verbal), no drugs or alcohol, and no property destruction. The guidelines were not statements of philosophical or ideological commitment; instead, they were meant to reassure groups with whom DAN wanted to collaborate in this specific action. Through the fall of 1999, DAN offered training in non-violent direct action, affinity group formation, and street-theatre skills to groups along the West Coast, and organized for the activist convergence that was planned for the two weeks prior to the WTO meetings in Seattle.[19]

Tony Clarke and Maude Barlow identify several additional streams of protesters at Seattle. The American-based Public Citizen worked with local coalitions and operated the nerve centre (a centre for coordination of activities) and alternative media centre. The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), joined by Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth, and others, organized the official march. The American group People's Global Action rallied popular support across the United States. In addition, cross-sectoral international coalitions in opposition to the free-trade agenda, which had been in formation for a decade, hammered out a common analysis

---

2001).

15 Stephanie Guilloud, "Spark, Fire and Burning Coals: An Organizer's History of Seattle" in Yuen, Katsiaficas & Rose, *supra* note 5, 225 at 226-7.

16 Iain A. Boal, "Glossary" in Yuen, Katsiaficas & Rose, *supra* note 5, 371 at 377.

17 *Supra* note 15 at 226-7.

18 Betsy Raasch-Gilman, "Chaos Theory and Nonviolence: A Trainer's Report on the WTO, IMF and World Bank Protests," online: Training For Change <http://www.trainingforchange.org /strategy/chaos-theory.html> (date accessed: 13 May 2003).

19 *Supra* note 15 at 226-27.

and position on the WTO and came to Seattle as a loose "common front" with a statement endorsed by sixteen hundred organizations worldwide.[20] While thousands converged in Seattle and attended each other's teach-ins and events, there remained a wide range of political positions and tactical approaches to the WTO.

On the morning of November 30, 1999, the day set aside by DAN for blockading the talks, thousands of mostly young protesters occupied Seattle's downtown intersections. Many engaged in a "lockdown," that is, they used lock boxes—pipe-like devices into which activists place their forearms. They lock themselves to a crossbar inside the pipe, and then lock themselves to each other or to a symbol of their protest to create an immovable presence. They can unlock themselves at any time but if they refuse, they create a time-consuming job for the authorities who must painstakingly cut through the pipes without cutting the arms inside. Activists successfully used this approach in Seattle to block the official meetings but at great cost to themselves. Police responded by spraying tear gas directly into the eyes of those locked down in an effort to obtain what has been described as "pain compliance."[21]

While this lockdown was happening downtown, a mass march of an estimated twenty-five thousand people, under the leadership of the AFL-CIO, convened at a football stadium. The march headed toward downtown, snarling traffic and complicating policing. However, the march bypassed the downtown intersections that were occupied by direct action protesters, thus avoiding conflict with the police and withholding the protection and legitimacy of their numbers from the blockaders. Some participants in the march proceeded on their own to join the ranks of the direct action activists in the downtown core, but most were dissuaded by the parade marshals from participating in the blockade.[22] Those who did join the direct action, as well as anyone in the vicinity, protester or not, were exposed to widespread and indiscriminate police violence. By December 1, 1999, a local version of martial law had been declared and mass arrests had begun.[23]

---

[20] Barlow & Clarke, *supra* note 14, 10-11.

[21] L.A. Kauffman, "Who Are Those Masked Anarchists?" in Yuen, Katsiaficas & Rose, *supra* note 5, 125. For a powerful account of the street and jail actions in Seattle and accompanying political debates between the AFL-CIO and those involved in direct action, see the film *This is What Democracy Looks Like* (Independent Media Centre and Big Noise, 2000).

[22] Alexander Cockburn & Jeffrey St. Clair, "So Who Did Win in Seattle? Liberals Rewrite History" in Yuen, Katsiaficas & Rose, *supra* note 5, 93 at 95 and see also *supra* note 18.

[23] Jim Redden, "Police State Targets the Left" in Yuen, Katsiaficas & Rose, *supra* note 5, 139 at 140 and Stephanie Ross, "Is This What Democracy Looks Like?" in Leo Panitch & Colin Leys eds., *Socialist Register 2003: Fighting Identities: Race, Religion and Ethno-Nationalism* (London: Merlin Press 2002) 281.

On the same day as the direct action and the mass labour march, small bands of black-clad activists smashed windows of corporations, notably Nike, McDonald's, Starbucks, and the Gap, and decorated downtown Seattle with political graffiti. With the police otherwise occupied, their actions proceeded largely unchallenged except by some other protesters who vehemently disagreed with their tactics.

Many activists, including participants in non-violent direct action (comprised in part of self-identified anarchists), had problems with the tactics of and the timing of the Black Bloc in Seattle.[24] The Black Bloc's actions were blamed for the intensification of police assaults on the non-violent blockaders. Activists worried about losing public support as the message of the demonstrations became lost in the barrage of media images that focused on shattering glass. Some protesters stood in front of store windows to protect them or cleaned up the broken glass afterwards. Others speculated that the people smashing windows were actually *agents provocateurs*.[25]

Some protest leaders from DAN and large non-governmental organizations (NGOs), like Sierra Club and Global Exchange, immediately condemned the property destruction, characterizing it as violent and vandalistic. More controversially, they called for the arrest of the people smashing windows and, in some cases, reportedly pointed offenders out to the police.[26] More than any other aspect of the Seattle events, it was this public denouncement coupled with active collusion with the police that fueled the post-Seattle debates about the need for respect for diversity of tactics. Many activists who disagreed with property destruction as an effective tactic were dismayed at the willingness of some leaders to cooperate with elite strategies—i.e. the strategies of the police, politicians, right-wing media commentators, and WTO spokespeople—of dividing activists into the categories of good and bad and collaborating with the same police forces that were systematically abusing explicitly non-violent activists in jail.[27]

---

[24] The Black Bloc engaged in and defended property destruction as a tactic in Seattle. The Black Bloc as an entity and a strategy is discussed below. See also Geov Parrish, "Imagine" in Yuen, Katsiaficas & Rose, *supra* note 5, 121.

[25] Barbara Ehrenreich, "Anarkids and Hypocrites" in Yuen, Katsiaficas & Rose, *supra* note 5, 99. The term *agents provocateurs* is used to refer to the phenomenon of opponents of the protesters disguising themselves as protesters and then, in the context of a mass action, instigating more confrontational, provocative, or violent behaviour in order to discredit the protesters or to provoke and legitimate repression by the police. In this context, the term usually refers to agents of the police.

[26] *Supra* note 22.

[27] For accounts of abuses of prisoners, see Kari Lydersen, "Jail Solidarity in Seattle" in Yuen, Katsiaficas & Rose, *supra* note 5, 131.

The use of non-violent direct action was a point of contention and division among the forces gathered in Seattle. Property destruction created further divisions. The political fissures of Seattle are a prominent theme among American movement-based commentators. Canadian participants and commentators, notably Peter Bleyer and Maude Barlow of the Council of Canadians and Tony Clarke of the International Forum on Globalization, portray the political and tactical divisions of Seattle as productive expressions of diversity.[28] Bleyer argues that the inside/outside strategy, in which activists were participating inside the convention as major NGOs with delegate status while the other activists, engaged in direct action, were creating havoc outside, was a constructive division of activist labour. In other words, Bleyer did not view the different activist strategies as working at odds with each other.[29] He downplays both the significance of the direct action and the political divides it marked with the mainstream of the AFL-CIO and some big NGOs. This more sanguine approach among Canadian activists may reflect deeper traditions of coalition politics and a more militant labour movement in Canada. However, similar dynamics, divisions, and debates were reprised in Quebec sixteen months later.

V. PERSPECTIVES ON PROPERTY DESTRUCTION IN THE ANTI-GLOBALIZATION MOVEMENT

The most contentious debates about violence and non-violence in the North American anti-globalization movement revolve around the nature and status of property destruction as a tactic. Proponents of diversity of tactics specify that property damage includes such political staples as stickering, billboard "corrections," or graffit. Few activists would dispute the value and creativity of these tactics, either within the context of large demonstrations and in their own right.

They rightly argue that the label violent is used somewhat indiscriminately, both within and beyond the movement, to refer to anyone acting outside the bounds of legitimate, that is routinized, legalized, and bureaucratized, forms of dissent. Those within the movement (including those engaged in non-violent direct action) tend to single out property damage, particularly window breaking, as violent. Notably, the debate here is not about

---

[28] Barlow & Clarke, *supra* note 14.

[29] Bleyer, *supra* note 14.

physical violence against persons, but about whether destruction of property is encompassed within the meaning of violent.

The smashing of corporate windows, police cruisers, and media vehicles remain very controversial and have occasionally given rise to fisticuffs on the spot between activists who try to prevent those who attempt to pursue these tactics. Proponents of property destruction in Seattle pointed out the irony of self-proclaimed non-violent protesters physically tackling those targeting corporate property. They reject the notion that property destruction is violent unless it involves causing pain to, or death of, people. Rather than an expression of rage or reaction, proponents claim that property damage is "strategically and specifically targeted direct action against corporate interests."[30] Proponents distinguish between private (capitalist) property and personal (use-value) property, targeting the former. They maintain that, as a tactic, property destruction unsettles middle-class culture and the reification of private property that is so entrenched in North America. "Property destruction allows for a change in landscape, a visual punctuation."[31]

Therefore, proponents argue both ideologically and strategically for certain *kinds* of property destruction. But within the discourse of respect for diversity of tactics there seems to be little room for discussion between affinity groups of what kinds of property can be destroyed and what kinds of damage are appropriate. Further, there is little discussion between groups about the relation of these acts to the larger political context or to any broader movement strategy.

It is a fact that both the mainstream and alternative media are captivated by property destruction and the climate of uncertainty and disorder that it fosters through its threat of escalating conflict. Some forms of property destruction—notably window breaking—have trumped all other movement tactics in terms of the mass production of images. This fact is not recognized as problematic among the proponents of property destruction, despite their rhetoric of respect for (and presumably, a valuing of) diversity of tactics.

VI. THE BLACK BLOC

Finally, while I support a clear distinction between the destruction of property and violence to people, discussions about property damage in the context of the anti-globalization movement are unavoidably haunted by the spectre of the Black Bloc and the host of political and strategic issues it raises. Because it is the most prominent apologist for, and practitioner of, property

---

[30] ACME Collective, "N30 Communiqué" in Yuen, Katsiaficas & Rose, *supra* note 5, 115 at 117.

[31] Rachel Neumann, "A Place for Rage" in Yuen, Katsiaficas & Rose, *supra* note 5, 109 at 111.

destruction, the Black Bloc's discourses and practices as a whole overdetermine the debate about property destruction in the context of the anti-globalization movement.

The Black Bloc originated in the European Autonomen movement[32] in which masked and black-clad anarchists engaged in a range of militant and confrontational tactics and defend each other from the police. In Seattle, the Black Bloc concentrated their efforts on property damage and avoided engaging the police.[33] In post-Seattle actions in Toronto, Ottawa, and Quebec City, the Black Bloc appeared to me to be a masked and costumed group of youths beating tattoos on poles and stop signs and marching in formation within large demonstrations. Yet in other situations, notably in Europe, all manners of mayhem have been attributed to the Black Bloc—hurling rocks, sticks, and Molotov cocktails at the police and looking for a fight. They played particularly explosive roles in Prague and Genoa.[34]

The Black Bloc is not a unitary phenomenon; its forms and practices vary from context to context, depending on the moment and the political traditions of particular places. But the fact of the Black Bloc's engagement in property destruction coupled with its doctrine of self-defense, that is, to fight the police if confronted by them, creates a troubling continuum between property destruction (a non-violent tactic) and more violent forms of engagement. When one is committed to dismantling police barricades, for example, and is padded, masked, and ready for action, engaging in street fighting with the police is not far away.

Numerous activists do engage in various forms of property destruction without masks and without any identification with the Black Bloc. Moreover, many are explicitly non-violent in their interactions with police. There are also traditions of property destruction in the anti-nuclear movement that are part of traditions of non-violent civil disobedience. But in the current context of the anti-globalization movement, property destruction has also become a tactic favoured by the Black Bloc. And it is this relationship, created by the discourses and practices of the Black Bloc, between property destruction in the context of the large anti-globalization demonstrations and a readiness, even an eagerness,

---

[32] *Supra* note 21 at 125.

[33] Kauffman attributes the origins of the Seattle Black Bloc to the radicalization of Earth First! and the West Coast forest activism of the late 1990s. See *supra* note 21 and Emily Walter, "From Civil Disobedience to Obedient Consumerism? Influences of Market-Based Activism and Eco-Certification on Forest Governance" (2003) 41 Osgoode Hall L.J. 531.

[34] For insider accounts of the Black Bloc in Quebec City, see Nicolas, "Anti-Capitalist Mobilization: The Black Bloc in Quebec" (2001) 52 Anarchy: A Journal of Desire Armed 29; and in Genoa, see Anonymous, "The Truth About the Genoa Black Bloc" (2001) 52 Anarchy: A Journal of Desire Armed 26 at 63.

to confront the police physically, that has so problematized property destruction as an acceptable tactic in the current context. Furthermore, when property destruction is enacted by masked activists, it is also vulnerable to appropriation, manipulation, and escalation by masked others: the police or their paid agitators, fascists, or criminal elements, some of whom appear to have participated in Genoa.[35]

According to George Lakey, at its best, non-violent protest is a form of prefiguration. Its power lies in its contrast to the violent power of the state in the theatre of protest—solidarity and pacifism in the face of naked aggression.[36] However, these assumptions were challenged in Seattle, particularly by those who engaged in and defended property destruction, not as a form of violence, but as embodying a distinct (and more militant and therefore better) political and strategic logic. As such, property destruction continues to raise troubling and challenging questions for the movement. In the post-Seattle period, Barbara Ehrenreich states:

> Clearly the left, broadly speaking, has come to a creative impasse. We need to invent some new forms of demonstrating that minimize the danger while maximizing the possibilities for individual self-expression. ... We need ways of protesting that are accessible to the uninitiated, untrained, nonvegan population as well as to the seasoned veteran. We need to figure out how to capture public attention while, as often as possible, directly accomplishing some not-entirely-symbolic purpose, such as gumming up a WTO meeting or, for that matter, slowing down latté sales at a Starbucks.
>
> Rock -throwing doesn't exactly fit these criteria, nor did the old come-as-you-are demos of the sixties. But neither do the elaborately choreographed rituals known as "nonviolent" civil disobedience.[37]

VII. FROM SEATTLE TO QUEBEC

More confrontational forms of political protest were on the rise in Canada before the events of Seattle. The mid-to-late 1990s saw the emergence of radicalized student and anti-poverty movements in many regions of Canada, especially in Quebec.

In Quebec, the Collectifs d'Action Non-Violentes Autonomes (CANEVAS), coalesced in 1996 and advocated non-violent direct action to resist corporate globalization. Its members blockaded a Montreal conference on

---

[35] See Jonathan Neale, *You Are G8, We Are 6 Billion, (*London*:* Vision, 2002) and see also Starhawk, *supra* note 5.

[36] George Lakey, "Mass Action Since Seattle: 7 Ways to Make Our Protests More Powerful" (October 2000), online: Training for Change <www.trainingforchange.org/strategy/mass_action.html> (date accessed: May 15 2003).

[37] Barbara Ehrenreich, "Anarkids and Hypocrites" in Yuen, Katsiaficas & Rose, *supra* note 5, 99 at 101.

globalization and staged a citizen's arrest of Henry Kissinger. In November 1997, they, together with Canadian Federation of Students-Quebec and the Mouvement Pour les Droits d'Éducation, blockaded Complexe G in Quebec City. The action was a protest against the neo-liberal agenda of the Parti Quebecois government forcing four thousand public servants to take the day off.[38] The group came to international attention in May 1998 as part of the worldwide movement against the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) when they shut down a Montreal hotel where the agreement was being discussed. This action gave the group its permanent name, SalAMI, meaning "dirty MAI" in French.[39] The new activism in Quebec student and anti-poverty movements was characterized by increased use of direct action, affinity groups, spokescouncils, street theatre, and popular education, as well as the rejection of both lobbying and reliance on major media.

SalAMI based its organizing work on three principles: *formation* (training), *transparence* (openness and not secrecy), *et action non-violent* (non-violent action). Although SalAMI was nominally a non-hierarchical collective, operating according to principles of participatory democracy, Anna Kruzynski reports that many activists were frustrated over the exercise of informal power and leadership in the group and for this reason eventually left SalAMI. Among those who left was Jaggi Singh, an anti-APEC (Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation) activist, then living in Montreal. He and others criticized SalAMI for its gap between theory and practice, its inability to self-criticize, and, most significantly, its "dogmatism on non-violence."[40] Singh and others who were dissatisfied with SalAMI went on to form the La Convergence des Luttes Anti-Capitalistes (CLAC).

The CLAC's basis of unity explicitly includes respect for diversity of tactics and is explicitly anti-capitalist and anti-patriarchal. In the context of negotiating free-trade agreements, the CLAC rejects lobbying as reformist[41] and, according to Kruzynski, refuses to work with groups who employ that tactic.[42] The CLAC went on to initiate the formation of the Comité des Accueils de Sommet des Ameriques (CASA) "in the absence of a grassroots, radical, and anti-

---

[38] Interview of Anna Kruzynski (28 May 2002).

[39] "FTAA 2001: The Quebec Odyssey—Time to Resist!," online: SalAMI <http://www.alternatives.ca/salami/HTML_an/ftaa_2001.html> (date accessed: 14 May 2003).

[40] *Supra* note 38.

[41] This is because in seeking (and maybe even gaining) incremental improvements, lobbying both legitimates an illegitimate system and confuses and impedes peoples' critical consciousness of the intimate relationship between liberal representative democracy and capitalism.

[42] Sebastien Bouchard, *La Victoire de la Bataille de Quebec: Bilan et Perspectives* (2001) at 5 [unpublished, archived with author at Ryerson University].

capitalist opposition to the Summit of the Americas and the FTAA in Quebec City."[43]

According to Kruzynski, the immediate cause of the break with SalAMI was Philippe Duhamel's (the unofficial leader of SalAMI) alleged public criticism of rock-throwing and vandalism. Embracing diversity of tactics implied that while one might disagree strategically with such behaviours, one refrained from publicly denouncing fellow activists. "Groups should have the space to do it if they think it's ethical," explained Kruzynski.

In the lead-up to the Quebec City mobilization, a large pan-Canadian coalition of groups collaborated in organizing the People's Summit[44] and mass demonstration. The CLAC was excluded from the *table de convergence* because it was committed to mass direct action within a diversity of tactics framework. A *table de convergence* describes the convening of movements and groups organizing the demonstrations in Quebec City. SalAMI participated in the *table* and organized non-violent civil disobedience, so the exclusion of CLAC presumably was not based on their commitment to direct action per se, but on an impasse around establishing agreed-upon tactical boundaries.[45] While the CLAC was explicitly committed to shutting down the Summit, SalAMI was oriented to attracting "*Monsieur et Madame du monde*" to Quebec City within an explicit commitment to strategic non-violence.[46] According to SalAMI,

> Our work is based on strategic nonviolence because it is smart and brings people on our side, because it minimizes repression ... because it is consistent with our beliefs about the society we want ... and above all, because it works!
>
> Nonviolent direct action through the use of affinity groups also allows for a genuine diversity of tactics, a real plurality in political views, and a spirit of respect for each other. To build participatory democracy we need trust, we need assurances that nobody simply because he/she "feels like it" or wants to "show us the way" will take it upon themselves to hurt other people or put our lives at risk through some irresponsible act of destruction or violence.[47]

To deal with the anticipated plurality of actions, organizers of the protest in Quebec City agreed on demarcating zones as green, yellow, and red according to the level of risk of confrontation or arrest. Red noted times or places where property destruction and self-defense would occur and police

---

[43] "CLAC Basis of Unity," online: CLAC <http://www.tao.ca/~clac/ anciensite/principesen.html> (date accessed: 4 June 2003).

[44] The People's Summit was a convergence of social movements and NGOs opposing the FTAA in a five day summit that occurred prior to and during the official Summit of the Americas.

[45] *Supra* note 42 at 4.

[46] Kruzynski, *supra* note 38.

[47] *Supra* note 39.

brutality and unplanned arrests could be expected.[48] The zones had virtual boundaries; they were not fixed geographically, but were assigned by organizers of specific actions. The zones were an attempt to share the protest space among groups who decided and declared in advance the kind of action they were planning and could determine its time and place. With the huge number of protesters, intensity of the tear-gassing, and the growing willingness of greater and greater numbers of people to defy the police, the red zone at the fence grew with the numbers of people willing to engage with the police in a more assertive way.[49]

Despite attempts at coordinating the use of space in order to allow for diversity of tactics, the flexible and expanding red zone impinged on the plans by other groups to engage in non-violent civil disobedience. The effectiveness of non-violent civil disobedience is premised on the prior, explicit, and disciplined commitment of activists to non-violent resistance, even in the face of police violence. A diversity of tactics framework undermines, and in some cases, eliminates the possibility of explicitly non-violent action because it precludes prior agreement between activists beyond specific affinity groups. Especially in the context of mass demonstrations, when different kinds of actions are occurring simultaneously and in close geographical proximity to each other, a diversity of tactics framework erodes the conditions for explicitly non-violent civil disobedience or direct action because it leaves open the possibility for violent escalation on the part of the activists.[50]

Given this highly politicized background, what happened in Quebec City? The answer to this question is complex as there are many stories with many angles.[51] Most sympathetic accounts highlight the following facts: the mobilization was massive, involving sixty thousand people at its peak; the People's Summit, which had run for five days prior to the official summit, had received tremendous media coverage and had involved three thousand people;

---

[48] Mandy Hiscocks, "Some Thoughts on Seattle, Quebec City and Diversity of Tactics" (Fall 2001) Kick It Over 10.

[49] One of the most contentious aspects of the Summit was the erection of a security perimeter. The fence (or wall) became the focus of intense public debate, political satire and activist confrontation.

[50] As organizers of the November 2001 actions against the IMF and the World Bank, Global Democracy Ottawa recognized this problem and prioritized the creation of space for explicitly non-violent direct action. See Global Democracy Ottawa, "Guiding Principles of the N16-19 Spokescouncil," online: <http://www.gdo.ca/principles.html> (date accessed: 13 May 2003).

[51] See Harriet Friedmann, "Considering the Quebec Summit, the World Social Forum at Porto Alegre and the People's Summit in Quebec City: A View from the Ground" (2001) 66 Stud. in Pol. Ec. 85; Chang *et al.*, *supra* note 5, Heather Menzies, "What Really Happened at the Quebec Summit" (2001) 15 Herizons 17; David McNally, "Mass Protests in Quebec City: From Anti-Globalization to Anti-Capitalism" (2001) 31 New Pol. 76; Ross, *supra* note 23; Brendan Myers, "A Protester's Story of What Really Happened at Quebec City" (June 2001) 8 The CCPA Monitor 26, and Starhawk, *supra* note 5 in addition to the sources cited below.

CLAC and its allies organized unsanctioned events, including a nighttime march on Thursday from Laval University to the wall involving two thousand people, mostly youth and students. On Friday, the wall became the focus of numerous actions and different forms of expression including a women's action organized by Nemesis (a feminist collective committed to non-violent direct action) and the Living River (a pagan mobilization initiated by American feminist, Starhawk). By late afternoon on Friday, April 20, a few activists had pulled down a section of the wall in the presence of seven thousand cheering supporters and the tear- gas began to fly. On Saturday morning, the wall had been secured again. Hundreds of people were quietly milling around it, studying the signs and symbols on the fence and adding their own to it. Police in riot gear were deployed at regular intervals behind the chain-link wall. They were silent, watchful, and non-interactive.

While the official march was coalescing in *la bas-ville* (the lower part of old Quebec City), confrontation at the wall intensified. As the march wound its way under the overpasses, clouds of tear-gas drifted down on it. At one juncture, where steep staircases allowed access to *la haute-ville* (the upper town in old Quebec City), radical cheerleaders (young women with pom poms), sang, chanted, and urged marchers to "go left" up the stairs and towards the confrontation at the wall. Thousands did, only to be caught in the choking fog of tear-gas. Meanwhile, in an uncanny replay of Seattle, organizers of the official march led tens of thousands of people away from the wall to a park far from the confrontation. According to some reports, parade marshals from the Quebec Federation of Labour aggressively prevented people from diverging from the official route.

The drama at the fence involved twenty thousand people over the course of three days, most of whom were young and all of whom were unarmed.[52] A few wore gas masks; most had vinegar-soaked bandanas. For many, it seemed that approaching the fence with fingers raised in peace symbols became a simple act of freedom that was met with noxious gas, water cannons, rubber bullets, and tear-gas canisters aimed at their bodies. Whatever the debates among activists about diversity of tactics, the outrageous wall, the massive and indiscriminate use of tear-gas, the harassment and snatch arrests, the police raiding of the community kitchen and medical facilities—in short the overwhelming use of force to maintain the perimeter—rapidly created powerful solidarity across the divides in the movement.

However, recognizing and celebrating solidarity is different from setting out to produce it. In the aftermath of Quebec, there were troubling accounts of a strategy among some proponents of diversity of tactics to

---

[52] *Supra* note 42.

deliberately expose non-violent protestors to police violence. In a sobering article, Michael Warren, a Canada World Youth organizer based in Halifax, reported on a pre-event activist gathering organized by CLAC and CASA. He recalls a speaker who wanted to discuss non-violent strategies being booed away from the microphone. Amid wide-ranging debates about tactics, Warren reports, "one recurring theme was basically endorsed by all: non-violent protesters should be deliberately exposed to police brutality, in order to radicalize them."[53]

It is also disturbing that many left-wing and anarchist accounts, both in words and images, celebrate the intensity and militancy of the confrontation with the police at the fence. Many completely omit any reference to the People's Summit or the official march, as if these dimensions of the Quebec City protests were politically irrelevant or reformist. Likewise, there is often little mention of the community organizing, public education, infrastructure support, and medical and food services that were such impressive dimensions of the Quebec mobilization.[54]

L.A. Kauffman, an American activist and commentator, urges caution about seeing and celebrating the militant actions at the fence "as part of a growing mystique of insurrection." She reports hearing more and more loose talk in the aftermath of Quebec about explosives, violence, and armed struggle. She suggests that this creeping recklessness among those who focus on mobilizing for big actions can be moderated through a renewed emphasis on deep local organizing that "privileges strategy over gestures."[55]

Despite such sobering observations and the hyperbole of some advocates of diversity of tactics suggesting that "things might happen,"[56] it is absolutely essential to recognize that the practice on the ground by protesters has been overwhelmingly non-violent. Activist practice at the demonstrations has been militant in standing ground and refusing to be intimidated and it has been overwhelmingly non-violent even in the absence of an explicit discourse of non-violence on the part of the organizers.

VIII. GENOA AND 9/11: THE NEW TERRAIN OF ANTI-GLOBALIZATION POLITICS

---

[53] Michael Warren, "If You Want to Win," online: A Good Life <http://agoodlife.ca/edge/michael01.html> (date accessed: 13 May 2003).

[54] Sarah Lamble, "Building Sustainable Communities of Resistance" in Jen Chang *et al. supra* note 5, 179 at 180.

[55] L.A. Kauffman, "Turning Point," online: Free Radical: A Chronicle of the New Unrest <http://www.free-radical.org/issue16.shtml> (date accessed: 13 May 2003).

[56] Like the phrase "solidarity with the full range of resistence" (see *supra* note 6), this phrase creates tension. It implies a threat without naming it.

Three months after the unprecedented mobilization in Quebec City, an astonishing 300,000 people protested against the G8 in Genoa, Italy. In the process, a young man named Carlo Giuliani was shot and killed by police. Thousands of demonstrators who had come only to march were attacked and hundreds were beaten bloody by police. Another hundred demonstrators were terrorized and beaten when police raided their sleeping area in a school, the headquarters of the Genoa Social Forum. Italy was rocked by massive protests and widespread popular condemnation of the *assassini*. During Europe's "summer of revolt," the political terrain of the anti-globalization struggle was being transformed by each successive protest, both by the rising repression and by the surging popular support of each ensuing protest.[57] The G8 was on the run.[58]

One month later, on September 11, 2001 (9/11), two hijacked jet liners crashed into the World Trade Centre in New York City, downing the towers and claiming the lives of over three thousand people. In a matter of hours, the seemingly unstoppable momentum of the anti-globalization mobilizations ground to a halt.

In Canada, the weeks after the 9/11 attacks were marked by widespread confusion and fear. Everywhere there was an outpouring of sympathy for the victims, accompanied by unconscionable manipulation by pro-American political and media elites. Solidarity was spun into defense of America as a bastion of peace and freedom against barbarous forces engaged in an ultimate war against Western Civilization. Any critic of the Bush administration, American foreign policy, or American-led globalization was suddenly suspected of sympathizing with terrorists.

The devastating and traumatizing attacks unleashed the hawks in and around the Bush administration, granting them overnight legitimacy as forces of good over the evil then represented by Osama Bin Laden and that quickly expanded to include the Taliban/Afghanistan, Saddam Hussein/Iraq, and North Korea. The War on Terrorism was declared to be open-ended, with an ever-growing list of enemies, most of whom are shadowy, nameless, and likely living among us.

In response, in Canada and elsewhere, governments moved quickly to pass anti-terrorist legislation, granting extraordinary powers to the police, restricting people's movements across borders, clamping down on immigration

---

[57] From mid-June to late July 2001, massive anti-globalization protests took place in Gothenburg, Barcelona, Salzburg, Genoa and Bonn. See *Leftturn* (Seattle, Left Turn: September 2001).

[58] For accounts of the Genoa protests, see Anonymous, *supra* note 34; Neale, *supra* note 35; Starhawk, *supra* note 5 and John L. Allen Jr., "Fascism's Face in Genoa" (9 August 2001), online: *The Nation* <http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20010820&s=allen> (date accessed: 13 May 2003).

and refugee approval processes, and enacting, if not explicitly legitimating, racial profiling.[59]

In this climate, important movement leaders in Canada like Canadian Auto Workers (CAW) President Buzz Hargrove urged calling off anti-globalization demonstrations against the IMF, World Bank, and G20 planned for November in Ottawa.[60] Others argued for the absolute necessity of continuing to mobilize.[61] For others, myself included, it was not a question of whether to demonstrate, but how to demonstrate. In the face of new police practices of preventive arrests, frequent deployment of riot police, mass search and seizure of protesters' protective wear, and the generalized criminalization of dissent, the need for open tactical debate in the movement was pressing. However, there continued to be virtual silence outside the small circles of those organizing particular events and a growing divide between the institutionalized centres of the movement in labour unions and NGOs, on the one hand, and the direct action and anarchist wings of the movement with their impressive numbers of young people, on the other.[62]

IX. ELITE RETREAT TO KANANASKIS AND HARD LESSONS FOR THE MOVEMENT

In response to the events of Genoa, the June 2002 meeting of the G8 was set for the remote Rocky Mountain town of Kananaskis. With five thousand troops, fifteen hundred Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), and an enforced no-fly zone, it was the "largest security operation in Canadian history," with a price tag of three to 500,000,000 dollars.[63] Activists spent months planning a week-long Solidarity Village only to be outspent and outmanoeuvred by governments and security forces at every turn. Negotiations with the Stoney Point First Nation over use of land came to an abrupt halt amid accusations of federal interference. The City of Calgary refused permission to use parks. According to David Robbins, an organizer with the Council of Canadians,

---

[59] See other articles in this special Civil Disobedience edition of the Osgoode Hall Law Journal including articles by Wesley Pue and Reem Bahdi.

[60] Thomas Walkom "Game Over…Or is It?" *Toronto Star* (15 June 2002), H1.

[61] Judy Rebick, "Quatar Reveals Impact on Sept 11 on Trade Battle," online: *Canadian Dimension* <http://www.canadiandimension.mb.ca/extra/d1118jr.htm> (date accessed: May 13 2003).

[62] Important actions in the weeks following 9/11 included the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty's shutdown of the financial district in Toronto on October 16 and the November 16-19 mobilizations in Ottawa against the World Bank and IMF that were organized by Global Democracy Ottawa. These actions were significant for their innovative practical responses to the new post-9/11 climate and for their development of the debate over diversity of tactics. Space limits preclude a fuller discussion here.

[63] Daniel Girard "Not Even Grizzlies Will Go Undetected" *Toronto Star* (15 June 2002) H1.

"there's a desire to disorganize and frustrate coherent organizing around this particular summit in order to create confrontation and discredit opposition to the G-8 and corporate globalization."[64]

Nevertheless, several thousand people turned up to the summit, the snake march, and the picnic without a permit, to muddy corporate facades, and to demonstrate with and without their clothes on. Again, the actions were organized under the rubric of diversity of tactics.[65] Significantly, unions, NGOs, and direct-action protesters in Canada were working together again after a post-9/11 hiatus. In Calgary, unionists were visible in all the activities, including the snake marches that disrupted traffic during Monday morning rush hour, and had participated in the convergence table leading up to and during the events.[66] The demonstrations were completely non-violent, although not without some heated moments. Protesters actively intervened to defuse potentially explosive situations between police and the more confrontational activist factions. Police in Calgary were on bicycles and in soft hat rather than riot gear.[67]

Several thousand people also turned up in Ottawa in response to a call to "take the capital." As in Calgary, the framework for organizing was respect for diversity of tactics. Coordinated separation of spaces allowed for different kinds of events, from an explicitly non-violent World March of Women-led "revolutionary knitting action" to a diversity of tactics, CLAC-led snake march. A large non-violent convergence march was organized on the second day around the theme that "no one is illegal" in response to repressive anti-terrorist laws.

In the lead-up to Calgary and Ottawa, new language had begun to appear among proponents of diversity of tactics advocating forms of resistance "that maximize respect for life."[68] This did not mean that organizing, especially

---

[64] *Ibid*. at H3.

[65] Starhawk, "Getting Our Tactics Right: Lessons from the Calgary G8 Mobilization," (July 2002), online: <http://www.starhawk.org/activism/activism-writings/tacticsright.html> (date accessed: 13 May 2003).

[66] Judith Marshall, "Rebuild Ontario..Think Global, Act Local" Public Remarks. Roundtable discussion of Kananaskis and Ottawa events around the June 2002 G8 meetings. Social Justice Summer Retreat organized by the Centre for Social Justice and others, Algonquin Park, Ontario, 24 August.

[67] While Kananaskis was locked down and under military occupation, city police forces in Calgary and Ottawa were on bikes and were walking with marchers. This police behaviour reflects both a response to intense public criticism of police actions in recent anti-globalization demonstrations and a more sophisticated approach to securing summits by choosing remote locations, preventing access to protesters, minimizing visibility of the more militarized wing of the operation, and eliminating contact between the militarized wing of the summit security forces and the protesters.

[68] A-Infos News Service, "Canada, Ottawa, Anti-Capitalist Anti-Authoritarian Callout," online: <http://www.ainfos.ca/02/mar/ainfos00257.html> (date accessed: 13 May 2003); Starhawk, *supra* note 5 at 210.

in Ottawa, was not extremely fractious. A refusal by CLAC, in the name of respect for diversity of tactics, to exclude violent tactics created a serious split in the Ottawa activist community. Most church-, labour-, and NGO-based activists (including Global Democracy Ottawa), simply stayed away from all Take the Capital activities.[69] As a result, the CLAC-organized snake march in particular represented a much narrower cross-section of the movement; it was comprised almost exclusively of young people with a high proportion of self-identified anarchists, including a number who were masked and carrying batons. The batons were used to produce the trademark rhythmic drumming on any available metal surface—stop signs, guardrails, and street grates.

Throughout both the snake march and the "no one is illegal" march, CLAC organizer Jaggi Singh kept reiterating over the bullhorn that "anything could happen," and that people should and will directly confront actions they perceive to be unjust in ways that they deem legitimate. As a participant in both events, I experienced this rhetoric as inflammatory and manipulative. Singh was holding open the possibility of violence as an acceptable aspect of protest in general and in the context of the event in which we were participating. As someone willing to support a militant action organized under the rubric of diversity of tactics, I felt that my presence was being manipulated to support a threat of violent escalation over which I had no say.

On the other hand, the Raging Granny[70] marching beside me had this to say: "Some of our members are uncomfortable taking part in these kinds of events because they're worried about what might happen. But, I think, when you consider the violence all around us, these (gesturing to the sea of young people) are just the lambs."

In Ottawa, there was some spray-painting and paint-bombing of banks. The windows of a police car were smashed during the snake march, but this action was immediately booed by protesters and did not escalate. Police were in regular uniform and kept their distance. Like the events in Calgary, Ottawa was acclaimed by police, press, and protesters alike as completely non-violent, despite the tensions created by those insisting on "solidarity with the full scope of resistance."[71]

In the aftermath of these actions, Starhawk published what amounted to a thorough rethinking of diversity of tactics. Coming from an activist with demonstrated commitment to both non-violent direct action and respectful

---

[69] Alex Munter, "A Choice to be Inclusive or Support DoT," online: Greenfyre <http://www.greenfyre.org/phpBB2/viewtopic.php?t=45> (date accessed: 13 May 2003).

[70] A tradition of activism among older women who dress up as grannies in flowered bonnets and shawls, sing songs of resistance, and are present as an identifiable group in many street demonstrations and other political events.

[71] Munter, *supra* note 69.

dialogue with the Black Bloc, her comments are especially persuasive. She argued that the time (post-9/11) and place (oil-rich and right-wing Calgary) demanded a powerful, militant, disruptive and explicitly non-violent direct action. However, such action could not happen because diversity of tactics had become the movement's default mode.

Although offering a critique of the morality of much non-violence politics and the staleness of its tactics, Starhawk argues that a commitment to strategic non-violence opens up political space that diversity of tactics has, in effect, shut down:

> Strategic nonviolence lets us mobilize broadly around actions that are more than symbolic, that actually interfere with the operations of an institution of power. Unions and NGOs, and at-risk groups can support and participate in such actions, which contain many necessary roles at varied levels of risk.
>
> Committing to nonviolence as a strategic move for a particular action allows us to organize openly, without security culture and with broad participation in decision-making..Transparency allows us to actually educate, mobilize, and inspire people to join us. While security culture may be necessary at times, it works against empowerment and direct democracy. People can only have a voice in the decisions that affect them if they know what is being decided...
>
> If we are to regain momentum in the post 9-11 climate for issues of global justice, we need actions that can mobilize large numbers of people to do more than simply march. We need to embrace discussion and debate, and trust that our movement is strong, resilient, and mature enough to tolerate our differences of opinion. We might agree that a diversity of tactics are [sic] needed in the long run to undermine global corporate capitalism, and still be willing to commit to strategic nonviolence for an action when it seems the strongest option. Otherwise, we end up without either diversity or tactics.[72]

X. CONCLUSIONS

The first G8 summit in Europe since Genoa, 9/11, and the war in Iraq is currently taking place in Evian, France and with it has come the return of massive anti-globalization protests. Organizers claim that 120,000 people demonstrated in the mass march on Sunday, June 1, 2003. Through the winter of 2003, the anti-globalization movement was transformed by the explosion of a massive, global anti-war movement in opposition to an American-led attack on Iraq. On February 15, 2003, over four million people took to the streets in over six hundred towns and cities across the world in an extraordinary, globally-coordinated effort to prevent war. In January 2003, over 100,000 people gathered in Porto Alegre, Brazil for the third annual World Social Forum to march against the American Empire, to showcase the existence of political and economic alternatives to neo-liberalism, and to assert that another world is

---

[72] Starhawk, *supra* note 65.

possible. Global opposition to neo-liberalism has been fueled by the war on Iraq. United States-led military aggression is increasingly recognized as an imperial civilizational project of global proportion.

In this new climate, the debate about diversity of tactics appeared increasingly marginalized. Organizers of mass anti-war demonstrations in Canada and elsewhere negotiated routes with police and marshaled the protests. Protesters carefully avoided property destruction or confrontation with police.

Anti-globalization activists were very prominent in the organizing and protesting against the war. But the movement against the war also broadened dramatically, incorporating many more people of colour, notably from Muslim and Arab communities, and people who have never before protested anything. New movement coalitions included the more traditional peace groups with their strong traditions of pacificism and non-violent civil disobedience.

There will almost certainly be renewed debates within the movement about tactics. Property destruction has re-appeared in Lausanne, Switzerland, as part of the most recent round of anti-G8 protests. So have non-violent direct actions blockading roads and bridges. But these activities are in the wake of massive anti-war coalitions and demonstrations that may change the conditions for debate within the movement. Most powerfully, in the face of such naked use of deadly force by the United States, Starhawk's argument for strategic non-violence may have greater purchase in the movement.

In Canada, from the late 1990s into the early years of this century, the notion of 'respect for diversity of tactics' held great appeal, especially among young activists. Against the historical backdrop of several decades of highly institutionalized forms of movement politics, it both named and validated important new activist practices in the face of growing global crises. More than ever, the movement and the world needs the creativity and courage of this new generation of activists in advancing non-violent strategies for social transformation. But in the face of unprecedented forces of power and domination, we also need to nurture the movement as a space of freedom and democracy, genuine diversity and pluralism, respect for life, and a love of peace in prefiguring the world we want.