

‘... (Excepting Barricades Erected to Prevent Us from Peacefully Assembling)’: So-called ‘Violence’ in the Global North Alterglobalization Movement

AMORY STARR

Department of Sociology, Chapman University, USA

ABSTRACT *This paper examines ‘violence’ in the Global North alterglobalization movement. It reviews major theories of violence and non-violence used by social movements and their analysts, indexes the kinds of movement events which get described as violence, and then analyzes the significance both of the movement’s tactical experiences and of the discourse itself.*

KEY WORDS: Alterglobalization, anti-corporate, Black Bloc, militancy, social movements, protest, non-violent tactics, violent tactics

One night in mid-July 2004, I arrived home late and tired. As I sat to check my email my housemate dropped his chin to his arm and slid across the table toward me. He looked up and whispered ‘the FBI raided two activist houses in Denver today’.¹ As the significance hit my stomach, the phone rang and one of my best friends told me he’d also received a call from the FBI. Expecting to be next, we emptied our house of items like camp stove fuel, moved spare computers to friends’ houses (in case they took ours), and checked our library for any fliers or pamphlets that could be misconstrued. The next day, the FBI visited my friend at work and I dropped other tasks to organize Know your Rights trainings.²

The fear in our house, a residence and meeting place for activists, resulted from two policy shifts that had been worrying activists in the USA since the establishment of ‘homeland security’ in the wake of 9/11 and which had become chillingly real in the last few months since the Miami FTAA protests.³ The first was that protest policing now meant criminalization and preemptive attack on protesters *independent of tactics* (ergo you cannot choose your level of confrontation with the police by choosing your tactics carefully). The second was that the property crime which some sectors of the alterglobalization movement occasionally enact was not only being characterized as violence but was also being investigated as ‘terrorism’. Grand jury investigations were shaking communities of activists across the country in response to *property crime*. We knew that Sherman Austin had been sentenced to a year in federal prison for the links on

Correspondence Address: Amory Starr, PO Box 1198, Venice, CA 90294, USA. Email: starr@trabal.org

his website.⁴ We knew that sentences imposed on Jeff Luers⁵ and other activists accused of arson of SUVs and other political property crime were longer than the sentences for rape.

The slippage from property crime to terrorism in the official policy estimations of threat has been aggressively popularized by the mainstream media. In Miami during FTAA November 2003 the local television stations steadily reported ‘violence’ while looping an image of some people tearing down lightweight orange plastic fencing. ‘Direct Action’ (DA) was getting loosely collapsed with property crime even by some movement insiders. (This happened mostly because DA is so effective that police often respond brutally and criminalize DA protesters. Since the level of *risk* in participating in DA seemed similar to property crime, some people got sloppy about making the distinction.) Every protest is now portrayed as dangerous due to the participation of ‘anarchists’ (some of whom do strict DA and others who occasionally do property crime). Indeed, the word ‘anarchist’ continues to be a cipher for violence despite a glaring absence of contemporary evidence. The hundreds of incessant and illegal searches in Miami in the days leading up to the protest failed to result in a single weapons or illegal drug charge. (This must have been the most upstanding group of citizens in the USA!)⁶

Although activist public relations teams rarely take on the issues of property crime or anarchists. They rightly endeavor to stay focused primarily on the destructive economic and military policies which are the focus of protests and secondarily on violations of civil rights, particularly conditions in jail. These teams do not spend their time emphasizing that while property crime is a chosen tactic by some in the movement it’s really quite a long trip from there to ‘terrorism’, nor do they defend the presence of anarchists in the movement (many of whom do not fit any visual or behavioral stereotypes). This strategy leaves uncontested the media and police definitions of anarchist and violence.

Rather than avoiding the question of violence, this paper explores a set of issues organized around the question: ‘is the alterglobalization movement violent?’ The paper reviews theories of violence and non-violence used by social movements and their analysts, indexes movement events which get described as violence, and then analyzes the significance both of the movement’s tactical experiences and of the discourse itself. The analysis draws on participant observation,⁷ independent media reports, activist discussions in many fora, public texts such as activist videos, and empirical books, *The Black Bloc Papers*,⁸ and *On Fire*.⁹ Methodologically, please note that this is an international movement and the Global North is not its center.

Violence and Non-violence in Social Movements

Armies

As the alterglobalization movement is seeking structural social change, not reform, and is (even when not explicitly self-identified as) anti-capitalist,¹⁰ the following review of social movement tactical discussions is restricted to tactics which aim to achieve revolutionary social change, not social reforms. What is now meant by ‘revolution’ involves sites of struggle and forms of power unfamiliar to many socialists and ‘non-violence’ is hegemonic in Global North struggle. Regardless of how out of fashion, theories of armed struggle must be taken seriously in any scholarly examination of social movement tactics.

The Maoist conception of ‘people’s war’ proposes that revolution can only be secured through the action of a protracted armed struggle using military strategy. ‘The seizure of

power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution.'¹¹ The people's war cannot begin until the masses have been organized to political consciousness and the purpose of all organizing is readiness for war. The people's army is led in war by a party, which is a vanguard.

Lenin engaged in extensive debate with pacifists:

We cannot, unless we have become bourgeois pacifists or opportunists, forget that we are living in a class society from which there is no way out, nor can there be, save through the class struggle . . . Only after we have overthrown, finally vanquished and expropriated the bourgeoisie of the whole world, and not merely in one country, will wars become impossible.¹²

He articulated for armed struggle 'two *different* aims, which must be *strictly* distinguished: . . . assassinating individuals, chiefs and subordinates in the army and police [and] the confiscation of monetary funds both from the government and from private persons'.¹³

Che Guevara agreed with Mao on the importance of armed struggle but they parted company on the question of whether all conditions needed to be ready, and on whether peaceful struggle should be 'exhausted' before fighting (Guevara thought so). But perhaps the most famous difference between Guevara's Focoism and Maoism is the role of guerillas, the 'armed nucleus, the fighting vanguard' which fights 'a war of the people' and provides its 'great force'. The revolutionary contributions of the guerillas are not in self-defense or protecting civilians but in 'counter-attack' which 'catalyzes the people's energy and transforms the *foco* into a pole of attraction for the whole country'.¹⁴ Guevara's colleague Régis Debray made the most important argument for the development of guerillas *first* as a military foco which then becomes a political foco and the vanguard of the revolutionary movement. He argued that a legal organization in civil society becomes an 'end in itself' and is 'overwhelmed with work'.¹⁵

In his famous 1961 book *The Wretched of the Earth*, Frantz Fanon imagines violent struggle as having 'positive and creative qualities' in the unity and sense of connection among people focused on 'their only work'. One of the most compelling arguments Fanon makes is that the experience of participation in violent revolution imparts a particularly democratic political consciousness which 'rebels against any pacification' and 'allow[s] no one to set themselves up as "liberators"'.¹⁶

Non-violence

Mahatma Gandhi's and Martin Luther King, Jr's theories have been systematically distorted. Both had deep understanding of the necessity of radical change in their societies and saw the need to take aggressive, direct, and risky action in order to achieve it. Gandhi emphasized the role Indians played in collaborating with colonialism: 'We assisted them.' His theory of passive resistance does not require fancy military knowledge or army training, only 'control over the mind', the willingness to disregard unjust commands. He stated to the British Empire that Indians would not be able to defeat the military by force, but announced 'we cease to play the part of the ruled . . . If you act contrary to our will, we shall not help you; and without our help, we know that you cannot move one step forward.'¹⁷

Martin Luther King, Jr was also widely misrepresented as a pacifist. He had both a practical and a moral commitment to non-violent tactics. He begins his discussion of the

topic by describing as a false issue the repudiation of 'self-defense', asserting that 'the right to defend one's home and one's person when attacked has been guaranteed through the ages by common law'. He then distinguishes between such a situation and 'demonstrations'. In demonstrations, self-defense must be avoided only because it will 'distract' from the 'evil one seeks to dramatize'. He then argues on a practical level that the use of aggressive violence in revolution is 'futile' unless the resisting group is a majority, the government has lost 'effective control of its armed forces', or the resisting group has 'the sympathy of the vast majority of the . . . people'. King argued for tactics which 'appeal to conscience' in order to build a society which is the peaceful meeting of free people.¹⁸

Malcolm X is not the only activist scholar to articulate the importance of self-defense, but he is an important touchstone whose concepts have been distorted in a manipulated polarization with 'pacifists'. His argument for self-defense was precise: 'In areas of this country where the government has proven . . . either its inability or its unwillingness to protect the lives and property of our people'¹⁹ he argued that black people had the right to enforce the law 'by any means necessary. This doesn't mean that we're for violence.'²⁰ The politics of Black Power which developed in response to faltering federal enforcement of civil rights legislation drew on Malcolm X's ideas in creating a new way of thinking about power. Rather than supplicate to and wait for white power to do the right thing, Black Power encouraged experimentation in building autonomous community power. As one of many experiments, the Black Panther Party and other groups, *in order to defend black communities from ongoing racist police brutality*, asserted their legal right to bear arms in protection of fellow citizens, similar to Malcolm X's proposal for 'prepared' accompaniment for people attempting to exercise their right to vote.²¹

Property crime

Sabotage was adopted as a new weapon of struggle for the working class by the General Confederation of Labour in 1897 at the instigation of Émile Pouget. Pouget's *Le Sabotage* argues that 'Sabotage as a form of revolt is as old as human exploitation.' As embraced by the labor movement, sabotage was defined as acts 'intended to slacken and reduce the output of production . . . or to restrict trade and reduce the profits . . . when no other way of redress is open'.²² *Le Sabotage's* American translator affirmed that sabotage 'has nothing to do with violence, neither to life nor to property'. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, an American IWW activist famous for advocating sabotage, argued that

In order to understand sabotage or to accept it at all it is necessary to accept the concept of class struggle. If you believe that between the workers on the one side and their employers on the other there is peace . . . and the worker can get enough . . . then there is no justification and no explanation of sabotage intelligible to you.²³

Sabotage was used widely in the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa during the 1960s. In the last few decades, sabotage has been largely abandoned by the labor movements and embraced by environmentalists. Edward Abbey is credited with conceptualizing 'monkeywrenching' in his 1975 book²⁴ and the practice has been taken up by international groups such as the Animal Liberation Front, Earth Liberation Front, and Earth First!, which also use the terms 'ecotage' and 'ecodefense'. Ecotage is property destruction intended to prevent ecological destruction. It includes acts such as disabling bulldozers, digging up

roads and spiking trees, billboard modification, desurveying, and road reclamation. Earth First! describes monkeywrenching as 'a step beyond civil disobedience. It is nonviolent, aimed only at inanimate objects . . . the deliberate action taken by the Earth defender when all other measures have failed, the process whereby the wilderness defender becomes the wilderness acting in self-defense'.²⁵ The largest current sabotage movement is the uprooting of biotech crops and destruction of biotech seeds, a movement which has garnered the participation of moderate sectors of agricultural and environmental movements.²⁶

Important Recent Studies

Ward Churchill's 1986 text *Pacifism as Pathology* argues that movements against oppression, if they are sane, must select the tactics most likely to succeed in ending oppression. In rare circumstances, violence may be the only effective way of stopping an oppressive act or system. (Self-defense against rape is a good example of this.) 'Any revolutionary movement within advanced capitalist nations must develop the broadest possible range of thinking/action by which to confront the state . . . a continuum of activity . . .' The elevation of abstract principles of pacifism or non-violence above the goal of ending oppression is pathological – yet has become 'axiomatic'. This is not to say that pacifism is not a useful tactic; Churchill particularly encourages privileged pacifists to place their bodies in the way of immanent state violence against oppressed groups. Churchill's reading of history is that Gandhian non-violence was successful only in the context of simultaneous 'violent peripheral processes' in which 'others physically gutt[ed]' the British Empire. Martin Luther King, Jr's pacifism succeeded by leveraging itself into power created by other groups' 'incipient anti-state violence'. By acknowledging that claimed 'successes' of non-violent movements occurred in a larger context of violent resistance, Churchill reveals a racist division of labor between violent anti-[neo]colonial movements and non-violent (hence, safe) privileged – and delusional – movements in the heart of the empire.²⁷

Donatella Della Porta defines political violence as 'a particular repertoire of collective action that involved physical force, considered at that time as illegitimate in the dominant culture'.²⁸ Along with Piven and Cloward²⁹, and Gamson³⁰ she finds that the use of violence in modern societies increases the chance of success of the overall movement and that the use of violence varies directly with the degree of police repression.

In his 1997 book *The Subversion of Politics* George Katsiaficas documents in great detail autonomous movements in European cities which fought not only 'freedom from material want' but also 'the colonization of everyday life' through a political culture of 'immediate actionism'. European Autonomes occupied and blockaded institutions, housing, and neighborhoods throughout the 1980s and 1990s. Liberated neighborhoods were explicitly connected with anti-imperialist struggles and anti-fascist struggles to protect immigrants in the neighborhood, as well as those marginalized by processes of domestic economic restructuring. Militant groups used massive, coordinated property crime to compel corporations to obey social demands. 'Proletarian shopping' gave new meaning to 'looting' and challenged the sacredness of private property.

Such militancy was de rigeur in Europe by the time the WTO held its second Ministerial in Geneva in May 1998, leading to an insurrection of 10,000 and property destruction focused on agencies of multinational corporations. In the 1988 IMF protests ten years before the first WTO protests, 'eighty thousand protesters arrived to demonstrate

... thousands of bankers were compelled to cut short their meetings and leave Berlin a day earlier than they had planned ...' Katsiaficas points out that militancy and spontaneity, although never hegemonic, influenced and shaped progressive movements significantly. 'The initiative of the Autonomen resulted in larger actions, and they were the militant organizers creating a context in which other forms of participation ... had meaning'.³¹

The Alterglobalization Movement

The alterglobalization movement emerged into US consciousness in November 1999 as images of heavily armed police, tear gas, and masked protesters breaking windows and burning garbage in the street joined the heretofore numb acronym 'WTO' on television screens, permanently transforming its signification. For the rest of the world, the Seattle protests were a welcome surprise; Americans had quite suddenly discovered that there were problems with free trade and had joined in the fight for democratic control over international institutions. Europe and Canada had started battling in earnest in 1998. Seattle n30 was the third *global* 'day of action'/'ambush'/'carnival against capital'. Manila and New Delhi were among more than a hundred cities which sent congratulations and welcomed us to the global struggle. In cities around the world, solidarity protests burgeoned at the news and demonstrations were held for the release of activists imprisoned in Seattle. Only in the USA did the issue of 'protester violence' overshadow the momentous event and freeze the alterglobalization movement in the US imaginary as a violent masked youth pursuing some obscure and likely juvenile purpose.

The activist film *This is What Democracy Looks Like*³² showcases the meaning of non-violent direct action – and what the police will do if it is effective. It shows the police attacking calm, organized, non-violent,³³ often seated protesters, who were linked to one another to block delegates' entry. It also distinguishes between blockades and property crime, which took place at different locations and times on n30.³⁴

After Seattle, an extensive debate took place among activists about the legitimacy of property crime and diversity of tactics. Those who believed in property crime explained its political message. Many of those who felt that it 'discredits' the movement accepted the point that they couldn't speak for all viewers. While few people changed sides, the bitterness subsided and efforts to respect and not interfere with one another became central. An independent critique of property crime has been raised by activists of color who feel that such tactics rely on (bitterly contested) race and class privilege while increasing the risk of police violence and arrest to vulnerable protesters.

The North American result of this debate is an evolving framework of 'diversity of tactics', which provides equal respect to candlelight vigils, property crime, permitted marches, and everything in between. 'Diversity of tactics' maintains a united front of solidarity among activists and organizations with divergent beliefs about tactics while also isolating (geographically and/or temporally) within a protest day actions involving different levels of 'risk' through 'zones'. In preparation for a protest, the process of developing 'action guidelines' establishes solidarity. The 16 2000 'action guidelines' are typical: '1. We will use no violence, physical or verbal, towards any person. 2. We will carry no weapons. 3. We will not bring or use any alcohol or illegal drugs. 4. We will not destroy property (excepting barricades erected to prevent us from exercising our First Amendment Rights).' Two years later, the politics of solidarity had evolved to include agreements 'not to turn each other in', meaning specifically that pacifist protesters will not

report or otherwise draw police attention to activists using property crime tactics. The 'Overarching principles' for the September 2002 IMF/WB protests read '1. Separation between permitted and non-permitted events by time and space to insure safe space for internationals, high risk folks or others who want to be assured of avoiding police repression in any form. 2. Cultivation of a sense of unity between all aspects of the action whether permitted or non-permitted.'

The separation is achieved through color-coded zones. 'Green' zones host 'safe' activities which are supposed to run no risk of arrest or police attack (either because they involve only legal activities or because they have state permits). These are areas and activities considered safe for children, elders, immigrants and other vulnerables. 'Yellow' hosts civil disobedience and non-violent direct action which, depending on the situation, could result in arrest or police attack, but which also could end up being safe. 'Red' zones could include property crime, trying to cross police lines, or non-violent direct actions such as a lock-down in a particularly sensitive area – something expected to attract police aggression.³⁵ Since planned red actions are more secretive and might be organized with a small affinity group, participants might also be more vulnerable simply because fewer people will be around. Red zones are rarely pre-announced and often move around with particular groups, but they have a territorial mandate, which is to employ themselves far from the pre-established, mapped, and well-advertised green zones.

After Québec City, where diversity of tactics included 'permanent' green zones soon awash with tear gas and where yellow ceased to have any meaning, it seemed that red actions make it impossible for yellow or green actions to take place at all. While militant activists are responsive to concerns about 'safety', they also constantly remind other activists (1) that police will attack *any* kind of action which they perceive as a threat (even pacifist ones) and (2) that militants' frequent defense of pacific actions is more significant than their role in precipitating police violence.

For the WEF in New York there was an increased awareness of the relationships between areas and actions. We used the phrases 'yellowish-green' and 'greenish-yellow', and talked at length about how to effect a transition from a 'green day' to a 'yellow night' while ensuring that we informed people fully. At the last minute, a spontaneous spokescouncil halted this transition entirely due to the presence of children and other 'unarrestables',³⁶ who were trapped by police barricades in the area that was supposed to 'turn yellow'.

Praha 2000 is the activist video about the September 2000 protests of the IMF/WB meetings in Prague.³⁷ It is perhaps the most comprehensive tactical exploration in wide distribution. The action was organized so that three 'lines' approached the meeting site from different directions, each using a different tactic. These were the Black Bloc, Tute Bianche, and the Pink Bloc.

Although Black Blocs do not take up arms, they express a militant culture, at times engaging in self-defense, property crime, and attempts to breach police barriers. The Black Bloc has been organized and perceived quite differently at different actions. In DC in April 2000 (a16), the Bloc acted primarily in defense of other protesters (often unprepared for police violence), and were greeted with cheers. In Prague in September 2000, they mounted the most aggressive actions in trying to battle with police. They wore and carried some defensive shielding and hurled cobblestones in an effort to break through police lines to the convention center. In Québec in April 2001 the Black Bloc assertively breached Canada's 'wall of shame', a massive fence surrounding the meetings. 'It was there that the

bloc as tactic, in pulling the widely unpopular fence down, really connected with the feeling of the march, and many in the city as a whole.’³⁸ Black Blocs often communicate and coordinate with other sectors, respecting and supporting green and yellow actions, receiving uneven solidarity and protection in return. Black Blocs have been criminalized and heavily targeted by police.

Tute Bianche expresses fierceness which avoids violence, radicalism which does not seek to take the state, politics beyond ideologies, a face for the invisible. Individuals from many groups participate in the Tute Bianche tactic on demos. Tute Bianche blocs are generally aligned with immigration rights, guaranteed income, the Zapatistas, prisoners, marginalized radicals (including communists and anarchists), and are in solidarity with ‘everyone else made invisible by the free market’.³⁹ Their intention to put into practice Zapatismo in different contexts is one of many such experiments. The Tute Bianche tactic involves staying together in a tight group while wearing personal body armor made of household products such as cardboard, foam, and empty plastic water bottles. Over the armor, many wear white painter’s coveralls and life preservers, resulting in a comic, bulky look. They carry collective inflatable shielding such as massive rafts of balloons and inner tubes. They approach the police lines ponderously, stop and announce their intention, as citizens, to pass ‘with arms up’ peacefully through the police lines to attend the meetings, and then push against the police, producing comic mayhem.

Every time the police charged a legitimate and peaceful march or demonstration, it was always the fault of ‘the autonomists’ . . . So we invented . . . All things that were visible and clearly for defensive purposes only. We wanted people to understand on which side lay reason, and who had started the violence. When we decide to disobey the rules imposed by the bosses of neo-liberalism, we do it by putting our bodies on the line, full stop. People can see images on the TV news that can’t be manipulated: a mountain of bodies that advances, seeking the least harm possible to itself, against the violent defenders of an order that produces wars and misery. And the results are visible, people understand this, the journalists can’t invent lies that contradict the images; last but not least, the batons bounce off the padding. But the question goes beyond the purely practical aspect and is symptomatic of what we call ‘bio-politics’, the new form of opposition to power (cf. Foucault).⁴⁰

The humorous (yet effective!) style of the Tute Bianche draws on the European traditions of dada, surrealism, and the absurd. A call to action for the June 2000 Bologna protests stated ‘the program foresees actions in every streets and squares to disturb, *turn into ridicule* and block the OECD summit’.⁴¹ The tactic has succeeded in overcoming police and entering a detention facility (via Corelli, Milan, January 2000), with the result that the press was able to follow them in and expose the concentration-camp conditions. The exposure led to the closure of the facility. Another successful Tute Bianche assault closed a biotech conference (Mobilitebio, May 2000), followed shortly by townships – and the country – renouncing genetically modified organisms.

The third line in Prague was the Pink Bloc or Tactical Frivolity, which is a manifestation of the carnivalesque Reclaim the Streets tactics developed by anti-roads and squatting groups in London in the 1990s. These tactics take the streets using creative blockading methods such as fake car wrecks, tripods, puppets, music, and dance in festive celebration which asserts confidence in happy and creative alternatives to the oppressive structures

being confronted and the joy in struggling for liberation even in the face of frightening oppression. In Prague this bloc wore extravagant pink costumes. They organized an amateur samba band, involved a distinctly queer aesthetic, and invoked the surrealist tactic of absurdity as a political critique. The Pink Bloc tactic (also sometimes called Pink & Silver) has since spread across Europe and North America.⁴²

The emphasis on humor and absurdity was not confined to the Tute Bianchi and the Pink Bloc. Even the Black Bloc in Prague brought a ten-foot diameter beach ball for play in the spray from the water cannon. (This carried the phrase 'Balls to the IMF' and also served as a shield.) Nor are the tactics of stone throwing confined to the Black Bloc. In Prague all three lines were attacked violently by police.

While black, white, and pink certainly do not capture the huge variety of tactics practiced at street protests, these tactics are now internationally shared conceptions of militancy which demarcate differences which local groups fine-tune to specific political contexts and action goals and which enable groups arriving at a mass action to find their framework of expression with others.

This introduction should establish that radical (non-permitted) actions include a variety of tactics, with complex, interesting strategies. I now turn to the movement as a whole to examine the generalized claim that it is 'violent', distinguishing thirteen different types of events which can be construed as violence. The first three types are easily distinguishable as sabotage of *property*, while the other ten could be construed as violence against *persons*.

Moving or Appropriating for Defensive Purposes State Property Put in Place to Prevent Protest

The most famous event of this type was the breach of the fence at the Québec City FTAA protests (April 2001). Public property may also be appropriated to build a barricade against the police, when protesters are trying to secure their control over a specific area. Dumpsters and garbage cans are also treated in the category of 'public' items. Garbage fires are a relatively effective defensive barrier.

In Europe, Barricade Building Also Involves Appropriation of Private Property, Including Cars

In Genoa, the creation of barricades and the burning of cars was particularly intense, but it mirrored the aggressive way in which the state had barricaded streets with tall fences, violating neighborhoods. 'If the cops attack us with everything they have and we need to build barricades, we will make them with whatever is immediately available. We will not sit around in the street trying to figure out whether this or that car are bourgeois or proletarian.'⁴³

'Property Crime Street Theater'

The destruction of corporate property (such as banks, ATMs, signage, windows) is undertaken with several goals. One is to raise the costs of a corporate operation in the neighborhood by making that particular retail outlet slightly less profitable (attacks on Starbucks outlets protest their competitive effect on local coffeehouses). 'While

capitalism stalks us as consumers at the same time as dumping us as workers, it has the audacity to squeal when we brick its windows.⁴⁴

A second goal is to raise the social costs of an international meeting, such as a WTO Ministerial, so that cities will not want to host such meetings in fear of inviting costly property crime to corporate friends as well as a temporary image of urban blight. It is common, but not universal, that property crime against shops is systematic in that multinational corporations are attacked and small stores, immigrant shops, etc. are left unharmed. This was the case in Seattle, Gothenburg, and Genoa.⁴⁵

... very soberly done and thoughtful – walking down the Corso Torino in the aftermath of some of the fighting it was completely clear to see – every single bank was smashed to pieces and *nothing* else was ... Most people involved know very clearly what they are doing and can tell you why.⁴⁶

Not all agree that a distinction should be made between corporate shops and locally owned ones: ‘Capitalism is ... a social relation which ... has to do with the fact that wherever we go ... we are confronted with a world of commodities that only money can buy.’⁴⁷

The third and most interesting conception of corporate property crime is as performance art (‘working class art’⁴⁸) which creates a rupture and ‘breaks the spell’ of private property. Destroying the boundary which separates public space and need from the private profit-making machines brings to sudden attention the arbitrary sacredness and legal sanctification of private property while also revealing it as highly vulnerable. The rupture is most often accomplished by graffiti, ‘adbusting’ (modifying billboards or rearranging the letters in a corporate logo), and breaking windows. The most famous property crime as ‘street theater’ was José Bové’s⁴⁹ dismantlement of a McDonalds in his home town in Southern France. About this political action, he says:

We wanted to do this protest in broad daylight, with a large group of people, a non-violent action, but symbolically very strong, and up front with the authorities. We were careful to explain ahead of time to the police that our objective was to dismantle the McDonalds. ... Then an officer from the police department called us to say that he was going to ask the manager at McDonalds for a sign of some kind so we could destroy that, that it be more symbolic. We told him: ‘Are you kidding? That’s nuts. We’re going to dismantle the doors and windows.’⁵⁰

On the Wearing of Masks

Wearing a mask is clearly neither a gesture against property nor a gesture against persons; however, it is often interpreted as a *threat* of some kind of violence. Activists wear masks at protests for a variety of reasons. Some wear a handkerchief in explicit solidarity with and evocation of the Zapatistas, who announced themselves internationally as ‘The voice that arms itself to be heard. The face that hides itself to be seen.’⁵¹ Others mask themselves in symbolic solidarity with people in the Global South who must *always* protest anonymously because their civil rights are not protected. Others, acknowledging that many fellow citizens in the North are also not secure in the exercise of their civil rights, encourage everyone to mask as a practical measure to shield the vulnerable in our own

societies. Others mask in acknowledgement of the intense surveillance already in place at protests (constant videotaping etc.). A few mask because they plan to do illegal actions and want to avoid capture and charges, because they have reason to believe that police have reason to watch or pre-emptively arrest them, or in order to avoid being identifiable as a witness. Finally, people wear masks as protection against teargas. (Even a handkerchief helps (a little) if you don't have a gas mask.) Interestingly, in anticipation of protests, several US cities have attempted to outlaw the wearing of scarves, bandanas, or masks, even deep in winter. Some cities have also banned gas masks, denying even passive defense against police weapons.

Mobile Defense

One of the activities for which militants are broadly celebrated and welcomed (one of the best-documented cases is the role of the Black Bloc in Washington DC IMF/WB protests in April 2000) is intervening to physically protect fellow activists from imminent police attack. A group of non-violent protesters is sitting down in the street, the police have decided to advance (using chemical weapons, horses, batons, water tank, or an arrest team), and the protesters indicate their intention to hold their ground in a vulnerable position. A mobile defense group might act to protect the protesters through one of a number of means. They might undertake an action to distract the police and draw their attention to another location. They might put their own bodies (perhaps with shielding and protection for chemical weapons) in between the police and the immobile protesters to take the brunt of the attack and perhaps deflect it. They might build a barricade between the protesters and the police which would have to be cleared before horses or bikes could advance. They might physically attack a water cannon with projectiles or block its motion with their bodies. (A water tank was successfully turned back in Québec City by militants standing in its path.)

Throwing Back Tear Gas Canisters

Although throwing something at the police would satisfy many people's definition of 'violence against persons', activists see this as another form of defensive community service. When tear gas canisters are lobbed at protesters, they pose an immediate and dangerous threat to unprotected activists, passersby, and residents of the neighborhood. Tear gas can be life threatening to elders, people with asthma, children, and fetuses. Since police firing tear gas are always wearing high-quality gas masks, activists believe that tear-gas canisters pose less risk to public health on the police side of the line (often a large area cleared of civilians). Any danger of returning projectiles is minimized by police (and their horses') helmets and body armor. Activists who have gas masks (and some who do not) will grab the canisters as quickly as possible and hurl them back. This requires protective gloves as the exploding canisters can cause serious burns. Some activists bring catcher's mitts and in Québec City a clever activist even brought his hockey stick to return the canisters. (An image that *Sports Illustrated* printed across two full pages.)

Unarresting

When someone is being taken into custody, militants may mount a distraction of some kind nearby in hope that the police will have to loosen their grip on the arrestee, who then escapes. They may also dart in and simply grab the person out of the cops' hands. Unarresting is a high-risk activity undertaken by militants when they believe that they are better prepared for police violence than the person in custody. In addition to physical risk, unarresters also risk severe charges if apprehended for interfering with or assaulting police officers (charges which most activists carefully avoid). Unarresting is particularly important in cases where a person is being beaten, when activists believe that person's rights will not be respected in custody, or in the case of 'vulnerables', such as people of color, immigrants who may not have papers, transgender people for whom incarceration itself is very dangerous, and targeted or high-profile activists who may be charged with conspiracy or incitement to riot (both felonies). Militants would not spontaneously 'unarrest' people who have chosen to get arrested as civil disobedients, but would go to the aid of anyone (known or unknown to them) who asked for their help or seemed in danger.

Throwing a Donut, Teddy Bear, or Plastic Water Bottle at Police in Riot Gear

In various circumstances, protesters throw lightweight objects at the police. Sometimes these actions are pre-meditated acts of humor. Doughnuts are often carried for this specific purpose. At a16, this was just one of many lighthearted purposes for which marshmallow 'Easter Peeps' were used. (A row of peeps was also deployed between cops and protesters and joined by a boisterous iteration of the popular chant 'Whose Streets? Our Streets!' – 'Whose Peeps? Our Peeps!', an event which reportedly diffused a tense standoff.) In Québec City, a group affiliated with the Deconstructionist Institute for Surreal Topology (DIST) built a catapult with which to hurl teddy bears and other stuffed animals over the fence. All were surprised when the police arrested an activist and charged him with possession of the catapult as a weapon. In response, DIST issued a press release announcing a government program modeled on the US gun surrender programs to get citizens to voluntarily turn in their teddy bears.

Throwing Your Empty Beer or Wine Bottle at Forces Who Have Been Occupying Your Neighborhood for Several Days

Reports from Québec City documented that 'locals started throwing bottles and rocks up at the cops and got another round of teargas for their troubles . . . It was Saturday night, and the bars and streets filled with angry working-class whites, blacks and South Asians of St. Jean-Baptiste and Limoilou who had been perpetually gassed the whole day.'⁵² These neighborhoods had graciously survived the indignity of fences and passcards. Shops had painted on their boarded-up windows 'welcome protesters, we are open'. But none had expected also to be occupied and doused with gas for days on end. Even the nearest shopping street to the protest area, a permitted Green Zone, was gassed and pepper sprayed by water cannon. Not having agreed to any 'action guidelines', residents created an air of general insurrection.

Attempting to Cross Police Lines

As practiced by Tute Bianche, this tactic is classic civil disobedience in which the protesters attempt to non-violently walk through police lines. Tute Bianche has already been discussed extensively above.

Engaging Police with Cardboard Shields, Mattresses, Long Poles, and Oversized Beach Balls as Defense

Mobile defense as described above can involve (rather imbalanced) direct combat. If police are physically attacking immobile protesters at close range with sticks or pepper spray, militants may physically engage police in hand-to-hand combat in defense of the passive group. It is important to be aware that militants prepared to engage in this 'combat' would be shielded with home-made armor, but would be essentially unarmed. In North America, they do not carry serious weapons of any kind.

Home-made Weapons Employed in an Attempt to Breach Police Lines with the Intent of Passing through and Entering the Meetings

There has not been a single case of weapon preparation or use by alterglobalization protesters in the USA and only a few Molotov cocktails in Canada. On the few occasions when the police have seized what they claimed was a weapon they have had to withdraw the charges. In this manner North American activists are different from their European counterparts who do carry Molotov cocktails and similar weapons which can be used to start fires behind police lines. Weapons such as knives or guns are not carried by any First World protesters, but in Europe and Québec rocks and pavement stones are dug up and thrown at police, which could cause serious injury. This is a normal part of European protest, not unique to the alterglobalization movement. 'I see our weapons as almost being tokenistic, symbolic – it illustrates the depth of our discontent . . . But come on – a stone against a helicopter, a stick against an armoured car – and they call us violent? To be honest, there is no comparison – they are the real butchers, they are the ones whose hands are covered in blood . . .'⁵³

'Day of Our Rage'/General Insurrection

Genoa was the first action about which much of what was written clearly defends the whole notion of insurrection. The response to police attack of all the mobilizations, regardless of their intents or permits, led to a general insurrection in which

members of reformist organisations and parties who got outraged by the police violence . . . chose to respond in the best possible way . . . This resulted in the most organised riot . . . there were people at the front with shields, gloves and masks . . . taking care of the tear gas, and behind them loads of people with rocks and some petrol bombs . . . formed barricades which were carried forward every time the cops retreated . . .⁵⁴

The fact that this insurrection was so broadly joined and went beyond any single organization is ‘a fact that many people have an interest in concealing’.⁵⁵ Activists valorized insurrection as a tactic.

you understand more why you are struggling and that others are benefiting from it . . . You have compassion and empathy for the people you see trying to get by . . . It is difficult not to feel hatred and bitterness when you . . . realise that you, your families, your friends and the people around you, all these lives are geared towards serving the interests of someone else . . . Our job at least in this city is to reach out to as many people as possible – here – to try and challenge the corporate views . . . I came to Genoa to be with people, who like me, felt that intense rage against inequality and injustice and also because there were other people there who were my enemies, who were meeting there to discuss how best to serve their interests better and to continue to screw the rest of us over. I wanted to feel that solidarity, that warmth of people like me, and I also wanted some outlet for my anger, and they as the most powerful politicians in the world seemed a justifiable target.⁵⁶

because it was a G8 summit, all the world’s media were there, and the news and the images of the rioting will have been carried back to almost every country in the world . . . It is very valuable for them to be able to see images of things they are familiar with – poor people fighting the police – taking place in the ‘rich’ West . . . that maybe there are people like them in the West fighting for the same things they are fighting for . . . The riots in Genoa will send a message of hope to people all over the world . . .⁵⁷

Police Riot

The vast preponderance of violence which occurs at protests is perpetrated by police. Weapons used in police riot include striking weapons, chemical weapons, electric weapons, projectiles, water cannon, and concussion grenades. The purportedly ‘less lethal’ weapons are often used counter to the instructions, invalidating that status. An informative report for the European Parliament, presented in 1998, made a ‘scientific and technological options assessment’ for ‘political control’.⁵⁸ Police response to European protests included the first use in Sweden of live ammunition against protesters since 1931, occurring in Gothenburg at the EU Summit (15 June 2001). Only a month later, at the G8 meetings in Genoa, police raided a sleeping place brutally (lining people up along the walls and beating them) and fatally shot a protester, Carlo Giuliani.

And that was the status *before* 9/11. After 9/11, harassment, surveillance, and sentences increased against alterglobalization activists abruptly associated with terrorism either through dramatic and bizarre reclassification of sabotage and property crime or through the purported discovery that protest events were choice platforms for terrorist attacks. Two years after 9/11, the Seattle coalition of unions, anti-poverty groups, environmentalists, and students gathered to oppose the FTAA meetings in Miami. No fewer than forty law enforcement agencies, seven of which were federal, violated protesters’ rights – even targeting elders and those attending permitted and educational events. The policing plan was to ‘limit’ protest in order to ‘prevent violence’. In practice, unidentified agents did not

only 'prevent, limit, and disrupt' constitutionally protected speech and assembly but also created a 'deliberate and pervasive pattern of intimidation'⁵⁹ including 'hunting'⁶⁰ activists violently and indiscriminately for over thirty blocks from the actual meeting site. This police operation seemed intended to terrorize citizens (both participants and observers) from future acts of dissent.

It is a ridiculous presumption in a way to believe that we can 'decide' how the police will react to us. We had ensured we were going to get a violent response by gathering in the streets in such large numbers and announcing our intention to get inside . . . This is a provocative and confrontational stance to take, whether or not you are throwing molotov cocktails . . . The police respond to the level of violence you threaten and to your effectiveness. If you are ineffective but violent, you will probably get a response from the police, if you are ineffective and non-violent then you will probably not get much response from the police, but if you begin to be effective, whether you are using violence or not, then you will be met with a violent response.⁶¹

This becomes increasingly clear when permitted, pacifist demos are attacked, as they regularly are in the Global South, and increasingly in the Global North.

In the USA, accusing protesters of 'violence' is enough to turn public opinion against them. In contrast, European governments have little space to rationalize their policing or to blame the protesters. The acute historical memory of fascism and nationalist repression are near at hand and easily connected with the imposition of globalization. The murder of Carlo Giuliani was promptly described as 'assassination'.

and young people are shot dead for daring to think there can be another way. The message from the world's authorities is clear: go back to your homes, do not meddle in what doesn't concern you, return to your televisions, to smoking dope and stealing traffic cones and leave the intricacies of global economics alone – because if you don't we will kill you.⁶²

Not uncommonly, such attacks are pre-emptive, such as the beating of activists in their sleeping place in Genoa.⁶³ Starhawk, an influential North American activist, wrote: 'I can no longer use the same word to describe what I've seen even the most unruly elements of our movement do in actions and what the cops did in Genoa.'⁶⁴

Quietly, many activists recognize that experiencing, witnessing, or watching media coverage of arbitrary police violence crystallizes issues of power, order, and discipline, with reliably radicalizing effects. 'We left our copy of the European Convention on Human Rights behind agreeing that a lemon⁶⁵ would be more useful.'⁶⁶

Analysis and Conclusions

Neither strategy nor tactics used by any part of the Global North alterglobalization movement qualify as 'a people's army' according to Maoist, Leninist or Focoist criteria. Not only are these strategies not being used, they are not being discussed even by those who advocate 'Class War!' In the terms of violent revolutionaries, the movement would be understood as 'normal insurrection' or as part of exhausting civil means of organizing while building political consciousness. The insurrection in the

Global North primarily takes the form of property crime, with intermittent (and sometimes laughable) attempts to breach police lines. The weakness of these attempts, particularly in the USA, makes the criminalization of even the most militant activists truly surreal.

It is crucial to understand that the use of property crime at street protests is not an indication of incipient violence against persons but rather a disciplined, intentional strategy of protest in the avowedly non-violent tradition of sabotage. The struggle to assert the non-violence of property crime is fierce. After the May 1998 Geneva WTO protests, 'The convenors replied that they regretted the damage to small shops but that this violence was nothing compared to the violence organized in the WTO building.'⁶⁷ In Québec City, José Bové asserted that 'The first violence is the free market. It's killing people all over the world. And even if some windows go down, that is not violence.'

Although the alterglobalization movement remains for the most part disciplined not to battle with living opponents, the various acts enumerated above do function as a psychological decolonization, consistent with Fanonian theory. Taking control over public space, throwing back tear gas canisters, and breaking windows 'breaks the spell' of corporate colonialism and police power over everyday life.

Contents of bank files and drawers were scattered about with the ashes, photocopiers were melted, sleek cars were black and crushed . . . it seemed as if everyone was totally fascinated and unable to speak . . . It's not often that one gets to see what lies behind the sleek machines and walls that run our lives. It was kinda like seeing something you've been taught to respect and fear, become nothing but flimsy garbage.⁶⁸

The movement doesn't even qualify as 'violent' in the terms of the major so-called 'pacifist' thinkers, Gandhi and King, who first of all were unconcerned with property crime as a form of violence and who secondly would probably categorize the movement's occasional gestures against persons (always police) as self-defensive. Although Gandhi and King recommended against the use of self-defense at demonstrations as it can confuse the message, they did not oppose self-defense in principle.

One of the few consistencies with revolutionary theory is the common Black Bloc Debrayist view of NGOs, all of whom are classified as 'reformist' on the basis of their tactics, regardless of ideology and goals. At the same time, today's North American militants are rabidly anti-vanguardist, a complete break with the Focoist tradition. Jazz, who defends 'hav[ing] a go at police and . . . smash[ing] symbols of capitalist wealth', argues that 'armed struggle is elitist activity conducted by a small group meeting in secret. This is bullshit – we will all do it for ourselves.'⁶⁹

On a global level, however, the EZLN (an army) seems to be a Focoist vanguard for the entire movement. Zapatista-hosted encuentros of global civil society are credited as the origin of Peoples' Global Action (PGA),⁷⁰ the WTO campaigns, n30, and Indymedia. A constant reference point for the movement, the Zapatistas will be among the three or four most trusted voices in the movement – although activists are likely to disagree about the others! So it is important that at the 2001 Cochabamba meetings of the PGA, the non-organization's hallmarks were revised to remove the term 'non-violent' for two reasons: First, because there were disagreements about the definition of violence (life versus property) and second because it suggested lack of respect for the history of some struggles, particularly Third and Fourth World ones.⁷¹

Despite failure to qualify as violent revolutionary activity, today's militancy meets Della Porta's definition of violent social movements because it is 'seen as illegitimate in the eyes of society'. 'Legitimacy' is a terrain not only enforced unilaterally by the state but is also part of activists' internal processes, particularly when assessing how to play to the media. While many activists believe that any image that can be construed as 'violent' discredits, delegitimizes, or distracts from the movement's message, others argue that the media tend not to cover demonstrations *unless they violate what is considered to be legitimate*. Typically, 'The first march . . . went off peacefully . . . Police were persuaded to back off . . . All the various groups marched. There was no trouble and, of course, no coverage in the media.'⁷² Militant tactics attract the interest of the mainstream press more consistently than any others (pacifist messages and images are often ignored, regardless of the size of the demo). The task is how to connect that coverage with the movement's message and agenda. Even when this is not done, it is not insignificant that media coverage of militant actions displaces 'official' news.

A further complication in the dynamic of the anti-'globalization' mobilizations is that objectively it is the militancy of the *casseurs* that have created the real problem for the authorities. The capitalist institutions under attack can quite successfully barricade themselves in, but it is not acceptable to the state that the black bloc reduce the whole city to rubble outside, stealing the agenda in the media as well with its violence.⁷³

Massimo de Angelis agrees with Della Porta that a movement's criminality is not determined objectively. 'Criminalisation of a movement has little to do with the breaking of the law . . . Criminalisation occurs when a wall is successfully built between the movement and the rest of society.'⁷⁴ It is here that the 'struggle for hegemony'⁷⁵ determines both the very life chances of activists and the future of the movement. De Angelis also explains how this criminalization occurs. It 'begins with seduction' in which 'they agree with the problems, but are not sure about our methods'. Those methods are then analyzed: 'Violence can always be found hidden in methods that do not recognise the ways of official authority.' But the most forceful place where de Angelis challenges Della Porta is his claim that 'both "non-violent" and "violent" risk missing the key point that historically, the rigid contraposition between violence and non-violence belongs in the realm of our opponents . . . The mark of being "violent" is always branded on those who are different, while normalised violence remains invisible'.⁷⁶

Poignantly demonstrating de Angelis' point at the June 2003 protests of the USDA's biotech festival in Sacramento, California, police confiscated permaculture seed balls (on the grounds that they could be used as projectile weapons – never mind that no slingshots were to be found), and arrested people who were trying to replant and protect an evicted community garden. At a teach-in, Starhawk proposed that 'Violence doesn't look like executives sitting around conference tables, but the decisions they make can be immensely violent . . . Action to feed ourselves and our communities suddenly exposes the violence and power that underlies the system.'

Despite what seems at times to be vociferous disagreement on these issues, alterglobalization activist groups are easily willing to agree to a principle of using no violence toward persons. The active debates in fact are about property crime, barricade breaking and building, and self-defense. In Europe, the difference is now referred to as 'fluffies vs. spikeys', a lighthearted reference to the fashion differences between Pink and

Black Blocs. In these discussions, human life is honored and the working-class background of the police is acknowledged.⁷⁷ Moreover, all sectors are willing to collaborate in pacific events when necessary. For example ‘the immigrants’ march . . . was to be entirely peaceful as the immigrants themselves were to be on the march and couldn’t risk getting arrested as they would then be sent back to whatever country they had just escaped from, with who knows what consequences.’ Militants ‘were happy to stick to that knowing’⁷⁸ that the next day was ‘the day of reckoning, the day of our rage’.⁷⁹

Jazz suggests a new language which respects both perspectives while maintaining a space for debate: ‘too much energy has been wasted on endless violence/non-violence debates. In fact, nowadays I prefer to use the word “confrontation” rather than “violence”.’ People can still debate the appropriateness and proper form of ‘confrontation’, without demonizing and endangering those who prefer militancy. He goes on to argue that ‘at the heart of this demonisation is an attack on the idea of confrontation against the state’.⁸⁰

Consistent with Churchill’s diagnosis of pathology, North American activists spend a lot of time debating how to make protests ‘safe’. As already noted, militants point out that any effective action will not be safe, regardless on the tactics used. Commenting on Genoa, Starhawk rejects the attempt to protect moderate protesters or adhere to a non-consensual vision of ‘legitimacy’ by condemning the Black Bloc:

I no longer see any place of safety. Or rather, I see that in the long run our safest course is to act strongly now . . . In a life or death situation, there’s a great temptation to attempt to exert more control, to set rules, to police each other, to retreat to what seems like safe ground . . . Agreements are only agreements when everyone participates in making them. If one wing of the movement attempts to impose them, they are not agreements, but decrees, and moreover, decrees that will not be respected and that we have no power to enforce . . . We have a right to ask for solidarity from everyone who wants to be out on the street together.⁸¹

Despite the soul searching, as first-timers flood the streets without knowing of ‘action guidelines’ or ‘diversity of tactics’, there is increased likelihood both of undisciplined insurrection and of oppressive lack of solidarity. So far, burgeoning anti-EU protesting has shown the former character while the US anti-war/anti-imperialist movement has shown the latter.

Amory Starr is an activist and educator in anti-corporate and alterglobalization movements, including community currency, labor organizing, permaculture, and mobilizations against free trade and the IMF/WB. She is author of the first comprehensive study of the emerging anti-globalization movement, *Naming the Enemy: Anti-Corporate Movements Confront Globalization* (London: Zed Books, 2000), which was written before the Seattle protests, and *Global Revolt: A Guide to Alterglobalization* (London: Zed Books, 2005) which introduces the movements’ points of consensus, debates, and tactics. She teaches race, social movements, and political economy at Chapman University.

Notes

1. We later learned that the ‘raid’ was a visit by FBI + local SWAT team, fully armed without search warrant.
2. Know Your Rights resources: <http://www.nlg.org/>, <http://www.aclu-mass.org/>, <http://www.adcsf.org/HandlingFBIDraft03-24-03.pdf>

3. See Amory Starr, 'Free trade in the Americas: the very best in extrajudicial operations', Report on the FTAA meetings in Miami, November 2003, *The Commoner*, No. 9 (Spring/Summer 2004).
4. See <http://www.freesherman.org/>
5. See <http://www.freefreenow.org/>
6. Not surprisingly the wholesale criminalization of activists in Miami healed divisions in the movement. Prior to Miami, moderate sectors had blamed police violence on various edgier tactics; after Miami, activists realized that the subtle distinctions articulated within the movement had no impact on policing, which aimed to intimidate all activists from dissenting – even union members attending a permitted rally.
7. Participation in some permitted, but mostly non-permitted, actions and direct action spokescouncils at the following protests: Seattle WTO 11/1999; D.C. IMF-World Bank 4/2000; Los Angeles DNC 8/2000; Cincinnati TABD 11/2000; Québec City FTAA 4/2001; D.C. IMF-WB-anti-war 9/2001; New York City WEF 2/2002; Sacramento USDA/Biotech 6/2003; Cancún WTO 9/2003; Miami FTAA 11/2003; San Francisco The World Still Says No To War 3/2004; San Francisco Reclaim the Commons 6/2004; and Transform Columbus Day 2000, 2001, and 2002 in Denver. The participant-observer's perspective is from what could be called a 'rank-and-file' affinity group. I acknowledge that North America (from which all of the participant observation data are drawn) is quite marginal as a location for action.
8. *The Black Bloc Papers*, compiled by David and X. (Baltimore, MD: Black Clover Press, 2002, printed by Insubordinate Editions, a project of the Claustrophobia Collective, Baltimore, MD, available through AK Press).
9. *On Fire: The Battle of Genoa and the Anti-capitalist Movement* (London: One Off Press, 2001).
10. See Amory Starr, *Naming the Enemy: Anti-corporate Movements Confront Globalization* (London: Zed Books, 2000).
11. Mao Zedong, 'Problems of war and strategy', 6 November 1938, in: *Selected Works of Mao Tse-Tung*, Vol. 2, pp. 219–320 (Peking, China: Foreign Language Press, 1975).
12. Vladimir Lenin, 'The military programme of the proletarian revolution', written September 1916, *Jugend-Internationale Magazine*, Nos 9 and 10 (September and October 1917). *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 77–87 (Moscow: Progress Publishers).
13. *Proletary*, No. 5 (30 September 1906). From V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th English edition (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965), *Second Impression*, Vol. 11, pp. 213–223. Translated from the Russian, edited by Clemens Dutt.
14. Che Guevara, *Guerrilla Warfare* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1985).
15. Régis Debray, *Revolution in the Revolution* (New York: Grove Press, 1967).
16. Frantz Fanon, 'Concerning violence', in: *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961), pp. 52, 57, 61, 73, 74, 93–95 (New York: Grove Press, 1968).
17. Mahatma Gandhi, *Hind Swaraj*, chapters 7, 20 (Ahmedabad, India: Navjivan Publishing House, 1908).
18. Martin Luther King, Jr, *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?*, pp. 55–59 (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967).
19. Malcolm X, Les Crane Interview, 2 December 1964, in: B. Perry (Ed.) *Malcolm X: The Last Speeches*, pp. 83–89 (87–88) (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1989).
20. Malcolm X, Corn Hill Methodist Church, Rochester New York, 16 February 1965, in: Perry (Ed.) *Malcolm X*, pp. 151–181 (175).
21. Malcolm X, Audubon Ballroom, New York City, 15 February 1965, in: Perry (Ed.) *Malcolm X*, pp. 111–149 (144).
22. Arturo M. Giovannitti, Essex Co. Jail, Lawrence, MA, August 1912., translator and intro. to Pouget 1910 (1913).
23. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, *Sabotage* (Cleveland, OH: IWW Publishing Bureau, 1916).
24. Edward Abbey, *The Monkey Wrench Gang* (1975) (Salt Lake City: Dream Garden Press, 1985).
25. <http://www.earthfirstjournal.org/efj/primer/Monkeywrench.html>
26. While there are constant reports of such attacks all over the world, I was unable to find an international compilation quantifying these actions. An archive is kept at [~ ban/ar.htm](http://www.tao.ca/~ban/ar.htm)"><http://www.tao.ca/~ban/ar.htm>
27. Ward Churchill, *Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America*, pp. 91–92, 41–42, 44, 73–81, also notes 120, 123 (1986) (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring, 1998).
28. Donatella Della Porta, *Social Movements, Political Violence, and the State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
29. Frances Fox Piven & Richard Cloward, *Poor Peoples Movements: Why they Succeed, How they Fail* (New York: Vintage, 1977).
30. William A. Gamson, *The Strategy of Social Protest* (Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press, 1975).

31. George Katsiaficas, *The Subversion of Politics: European Autonomous Social Movements and the Decolonization of Everyday Life*, pp. 115, 137, 113, 131 (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, 1997).
32. Independent Media Center Seattle and Big Noise Films, *This is What Democracy Looks Like* (September 2000), <http://www.thisisdemocracy.org>
33. In the data section, the currently hegemonic meanings of terms will be used. 'Pacifist' tactics exclude both offensive and self-defensive violence against persons and property. 'Pacific' events meet the standards of pacifism behaviorally, but may choose that tactic for strategic rather than philosophical reasons. 'Non-violence' says nothing about property and eschews offensive violence against persons.
34. The first Independent Media Center (IMC) was set up for the n30 protests. It was a storefront at which everyone was welcome to identify as a reporter and to drop off audio, visual, and text materials. These were hurriedly edited into a half-hour daily news feed sent by satellite, a minute-by-minute newswire on www.indymedia.org, a daily newspaper, and streaming and pirate radio. All of the videotape was dubbed and this massive collection was available to video activist collectives, who produced a number of films. An initial version of the film was released in January; as more IMC footage was explored, another version was released in September 2000. The IMC model has now been replicated around the world for ongoing open democratic and participatory news reporting and remains the best source of information about activist events. See, for instance, Chris Atton, 'Reshaping social movement media for a new millennium', *Social Movement Studies*, 2(1) (2003), pp. 3–16.
35. The term 'red zone' has also been used, as in Genoa, to define the territory immediately surrounding the convention or meeting hall, a totally militarized zone (at very high cost to the taxpayers and inconvenience to workers and residents). In this case, the red zone is the one which the most militant groups seek to breach.
36. The term 'arrestable' refers to people who are prepared to be arrested at a given action. 'Unarrestable' refers to people who would face particular hardships if arrested, such as transgender people, people on probation, immigrants without legal status, etc.
37. <http://praguevideo.indymedia.org/> See also the video *Tactical Frivolity ... Protesting against World Bank and IMF, Prague, September 2000* (Lancaster, UK: Mirabelle Productions).
38. "'Anti-capitalism" as ideology ... and as movement?', *Aufheben*, 10 (Autumn 2001), available at <http://www.geocities.com/aufheben2/index.html>
39. Giorgio, a member of Ya Basta from Rome, quoted in *The Guardian*, 19 July 2001, in: Linden Farrer, 'Dance around the G8: pink silver, pink, and silver: contested identities against the G8', available at <http://www.pworks.demon.co.uk/magazine/campaign/pinksilver/htm>.
40. 'Changing the world (one bridge at a time)? Ya Basta after Prague', Steve Wright talks with Hobo from Radio Sherwood (www.sherwood.it), a media project that is closely linked to Ya Basta (uploaded 28 October 2000). This interview will shortly be appearing in the new webzine *Aut*, available at <http://www.geocities.com/swervedc/yabasta.html>
41. <http://www.nadir.org/nadir/initiativ/agp/free/tute/genua.htm#Bologna> (my emphasis).
42. The US anti-war group Code Pink does not use Pink Bloc tactics.
43. K, 'Being black block' [sic], pp. 31–35, in: *On Fire*, p. 33.
44. Jazz, 'The tracks of our tears', pp. 80–99, in: *On Fire*, pp. 99, 98.
45. REVO eyewitness account, 'Sweden: in the front line in Gothenberg', *Workers Power Global Week*, No. 52, E-newswire of the LRCI, 22 June 2001, available at <http://www.workerspower.com>
46. Anonymous, 'Being busy', pp. 41–54, in: *On Fire*, p. 49.
47. K, 'Being black block', pp. 31–35, in: *On Fire*, p. 33.
48. Jazz, 'The tracks of our tears', pp. 80–99, in: *On Fire*, p. 96.
49. Asked his impressions of Seattle n30, Bové described the protests as 'Absolutely non-violent. Nothing happened in Seattle ... There was no real damage, nothing more than what would happen at a Confédération rally in France in Montauban.' 'A world struggle is underway', interview with José Bové by Lynn Jeffress (with Jean-Paul Mayanobe), *Z Magazine*, June 2001.
50. Ibid. available at <http://www.zmag.org/ZMag/articles/june01bove.htm>
51. Subcomandante Marcos, 'Opening Remarks at the First Intercontinental Encuentro for Humanity and against Neoliberalism', 27 July 1996, San Andres Sacamch'en de los Pobres, Chiapas, Mexico.
52. Shawn Ewald, 'Coming off the fence: A20 Quebec City', available at <http://www.schnews.org.uk/sotw/quebec-coming-off-the-fence.htm>
53. Jazz, 'The tracks of our tears', pp. 80–99, in: *On Fire*, p. 88.
54. K, 'Being black block', pp. 31–35, in: *On Fire*, p. 35.

55. Ibid.
56. Diego Jones, 'Shooting blanks?', pp. 7–15, in: *On Fire*, pp. 8–9.
57. Anonymous, 'Being busy', pp. 41–54, in: *On Fire*, p. 50.
58. Directorate General for Research, 'Scientific and Technological Options Assessment: An Appraisal of Technologies of Political Control', European Parliament, Luxembourg, 6 January 1998, available at <http://www.uhuh.com/nwo/euoparl.htm>
59. *Bentley Killmon et al. v. City of Miami . . . Tom Ridge, John Ashcroft et al.*, Class Action Complaint, US District Court for the Southern District of Florida, Miami Division, filed 24 March 2004, available at <http://www.stopftaa.org/downloads/killmoncomplaint.pdf>
60. Miami Activist Defense, Press Release, 'Miami Mayor Diaz's "model for homeland defense" equals suspension of the Constitution and brutality for FTAA dissenters', 26 November 2003, archived at www.stopftaa.org/legal
61. Anonymous, 'Being busy', pp. 41–54, in: *On Fire*, p. 49.
62. Richard K. Moore, 'Beyond Genoa— where to now?', pp. 135–139, in: *On Fire*, p. 135.
63. Indymedia Italia, 'Genoa G8: what happened?', available at <http://italy.indymedia.org/news/2001/07/7517.php>
64. Starhawk, 'Staying on the streets', pp. 125–134, in: *On Fire*, p. 130.
65. To protect from tear gas, a cloth is made wet with lemon or vinegar and held over the nose and mouth.
66. John Hughes, 'Life during wartime', pp. 23–29, in: *On Fire*, p. 25.
67. 'Peoples' global action against "free" trade and the WTO', *PGA Bulletin*, No. 2 (June 1998), available at <http://www.agp.org>
68. Brian S, 'Reporting from the frontline', pp. 17–22, in: *On Fire*, p. 18.
69. Jazz, 'The tracks of our tears', pp. 80–99, in: *On Fire*, pp. 91, 98.
70. Midnight Notes, *Auroras of the Zapatistas: Local and Global Struggles of the Fourth World War*, p. 105 (Brooklyn: Autonomedia, 2001).
71. See <http://www.agp.org>
72. Adam Porter, 'It was like this before . . .', pp. 75–79, in: *On Fire*, p. 75.
73. "'Anti-capitalism" as ideology . . . and as movement?', *Aufheben*, 10 (Autumn 2001), available at <http://www.geocities.com/aufheben2/index.html>
74. Massimo de Angelis, 'From movement to society', pp. 109–124, in: *On Fire*, p. 117.
75. Ernesto Laclau & Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* (London: Verso, 1985).
76. Massimo De Angelis, 'From movement to society', pp. 109–124, in: *On Fire*, p. 118.
77. John Hughes, 'Life during wartime', pp. 23–29, in: *On Fire*, p. 23.
78. Anonymous, 'Being busy', pp. 41–54, in: *On Fire*, p. 43.
79. Jazz, 'The tracks of our tears', pp. 80–99, in: *On Fire*, p. 87.
80. Ibid.
81. Starhawk, 'Staying on the streets', pp. 125–134, in: *On Fire*, pp. 128–133.