

RESISTING GLOBALIZATION

ATTAC IN FRANCE: LOCAL DISCOURSES, GLOBAL TERRAIN

A Dissertation

by

MARIE DES NEIGES LEONARD

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

December 2005

Major Subject: Sociology

RESISTING GLOBALIZATION
ATTAC IN FRANCE: LOCAL DISCOURSES, GLOBAL TERRAIN

A Dissertation

by

MARIE DES NEIGES LEONARD

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,
Committee Members,

Head of Department,

M. Kathryn Henderson
Paul Almeida
Barbara Finlay
John Robertson
Mark Fossett

December 2005

Major Subject: Sociology

ABSTRACT

Resisting Globalization-

ATTAC in France: Local Discourses, Global Terrain. (December 2005)

Marie des Neiges Leonard, B.S.; M.S., Université Lumière Lyon 2

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Kathryn Henderson

The debate over the “globalization” process has been influenced by the emergence of social movements who deplore this process.

This research focuses on the French social movement ATTAC (Action for a Tobin Tax for the Aid of Citizens), that criticizes the problematic effects of globalization and of the new European constitutional order.

This study contends that anti-globalization movements, such as ATTAC, are not only resisting what is perceived as an unjust economic system (neo-liberal globalization), but also what they perceive as cultural uniformization, or a threat to cultural identity and cultural diversity.

I substantiate this claim by studying the membership of ATTAC: through qualitative research, including interviews and observations, I show the multiplicity of discourses in which members address the anti-globalization issue.

This study will contribute to the research on transnational social movements, as it demonstrates the prevalence of culture and identity concerns over globalization, something that has been overlooked by previous studies of anti-globalization movements.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this work to my ancestors, whose life stories are a part of me.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank the Glasscock Center for Humanities Research and the College of Liberal Arts for their research funding support.

I would also like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Kathryn Henderson, and my committee members, Dr. Paul Almeida, Dr. Barbara Finlay and Dr. John Robertson, for their encouragement, advice, critiques, guidance and support throughout the course of this research.

I would like to say thank you to the Department of Sociology for providing the environment and the help necessary for learning and for getting the baggage one needs to grow.

Finally, I would like to thank everyone who supported me during the great, good, bad, hard and dramatic times.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| ABSTRACT | iii |
| DEDICATION | iv |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | v |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | vi |
| CHAPTER | |
| I INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| II LITERATURE REVIEW | 7 |
| II.1 Globalization and contention: some definitions..... | 7 |
| II.1.i. Globalization | 7 |
| II.1.ii. Contention against globalization | 13 |
| II.2 Previous studies on anti-globalization movements | 19 |
| II.2.i. Marxist approach..... | 19 |
| II.2.ii. Political process theory | 24 |
| II.3 My choice of alternative approaches for the study of anti-globalization movements | 31 |
| II.3.i. New social movement theories | 31 |
| II.3.ii. Post-modern and feminist theories | 37 |
| II.4 Conclusion..... | 43 |
| III CASE STUDY CONTEXT..... | 47 |
| III.1 Political context: globalization/anti-globalization in France | |
| III.1.i. Globalization, Europe and France: a paradox? | 47 |
| III.1.ii. Anti-globalization contention in France..... | 52 |
| III.2 History of ATTAC | 60 |
| III.2.i. The birth | 60 |
| III.2.ii. The framing: “the world is not for sale” | 61 |
| III.2.iii. The mission: “understand in order to act” | 64 |

| CHAPTER | Page |
|---|------|
| III.2.iv. The structure..... | 67 |
| III.3 Demographics of ATTAC membership | 71 |
| III.3.i. The founding members..... | 72 |
| III.3.ii. The general membership | 72 |
| III.3.iii. The alliances | 75 |
| III.4 Conclusion..... | 77 |
| IV METHODOLOGY | 82 |
| IV.1 Methodological model: qualitative research method | 82 |
| IV.1.i. Qualitative research: general definition | 82 |
| IV.1.ii. Participant observation and interview methods | 84 |
| IV.1.iii. Ethnographic approach and feminist methodology in social movement research | 89 |
| IV.1.iv. Biases and issues | 94 |
| IV.2 Data collection methods | 100 |
| IV.2.i. Population..... | 100 |
| IV.2.ii. Contact / connection..... | 101 |
| IV.2.iii. Interview location..... | 103 |
| IV.2.iv. Interview techniques | 105 |
| IV.3 Analysis of the sociological/ethnographic relationship..... | 107 |
| IV.3.i. Interviews' interaction / relationship with the interviewees..... | 108 |
| IV.3.ii. Participant observation account | 118 |
| IV.3.iii. Difficulties and obstacles | 126 |
| IV.4 Analysis method..... | 138 |
| V CASE STUDY PRESENTATION..... | 142 |
| V.1 Introduction of ATTAC local chapters | 142 |
| V.1.i. General geographic context..... | 143 |
| V.1.ii. Current organizational status of the chapters | 144 |
| V.2 Introduction of interviewees..... | 151 |
| V.2.i. Presentation of interviewees' demographics..... | 151 |
| V.2.ii. Presentation of the interviews / texts..... | 155 |
| VI DISCOURSE ANALYSIS / DISCUSSION | 158 |
| VI.1 Presentation of themes and contents | 158 |
| VI.2 Local discourses on globalization | 159 |
| VI.2.i. So, what's globalization anyway?..... | 159 |

| CHAPTER | Page |
|---|------|
| VI.2.ii. Globalization and French culture | 165 |
| VI.2.iii. Globalization, “les acquis sociaux” and the actions of the government..... | 187 |
| VI.3 Conclusion..... | 199 |
| VII CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS | 205 |
| REFERENCES..... | 217 |
| APPENDIX A | 230 |
| APPENDIX B | 232 |
| APPENDIX C | 234 |
| VITA | 237 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Ecoutez, écoutez, à l'horizon immense,
Ce bruit qui parfois tombe et recommence,
Ce murmure confus, ce sourd frémissement
Qui roule et qui s'accroît, de moments en moments.
C'est le peuple qui vient.
Victor Hugo, *Rêverie d'un passant*.¹

Scholars (such as Sommier, 2003) have noted that after the rather long agony of the 1980s, social conflict seems to have resurfaced in the last decade of the 20th century. This observation might seem surprising to observers especially in a social and ideological context where contention and contentious mobilizations appeared to be dead. For example, Sommier (2003) argues, we have witnessed the disappearance of the working class, and hence the traditional Marxist idea of class struggle, to the advantage of a ceaseless increase of the middle-class, for whom the notion of social conflict sounds foreign. We also have observed the joint increase of unemployment and precariousness of wages which rendered any demands sterile and/or superfluous. Additionally, there was an irreversible decline of political organizations membership (whether for left-wing political parties or unions), as well as a weakening of the classical modes of action (such as strikes) because of a routinization of it. And eventually, there seemed to exist a culture of consensus and compromise, rather than struggle and contention. However, starting in the mid-1990s, a renewal of interest for the “street politics” (Sommier, 2003)

This dissertation follows the style of *Social Problems*.

¹ Listen, listen, in the immense horizon, This noise that sometimes falls and begins again, this confused murmur, this hollow quiver that rolls and arises, from moments to moments. It is the people who are coming. Victor Hugo, *Daydream of a passer-by*.

notably in 1995 in France, turned into larger mobilizations against globalization. This is a study of such contentious movements: particularly, this research will focus on French social movement ATTAC (Action for a Tobin Tax for the Aid of Citizens)² that criticizes the problematic effects of globalization (and somewhat of the new European constitutional order). My goal through this research is an attempt to situate, describe and analyze the concrete discourses (and practices) of ATTAC's members regarding globalization with a focus on the different claims and meanings produced. More specifically, this study contends that members in the anti-globalization movement ATTAC in France, are not only resisting what is perceived as an unjust economic system (globalized capitalism), but also, and perhaps even more so, resisting what they perceive as cultural uniformization, or what appears to be a threat to cultural identity or national identity, and cultural diversity. I substantiate this claim by studying the membership of ATTAC France: through qualitative research, including interviews and observations, I show the multiplicity of discourses in which members address the anti-globalization issue. I contend, on the one hand, that besides resisting a neo-liberal economic globalization, members of ATTAC are also really showing their resistance against what they see as a "subtly violent hyperculture" (Baudrillard, 2002) that will ultimately erase differences and otherness. On the other hand, I would like to explore, from the members' standpoint, how different issues are related to one another, and thus what constitutes simultaneously the unity and the variety of the movement.

² See details Chapter III.2 History of ATTAC, The Birth, Pp. 60.

If traditional forms of social protest have declined, as Waters (1998) notes, they have given way to new and alternative forms of intervention. These new manifestations, symptomatic of real transformation in terms of social movements, challenge the representations of collective action rooted in the 19th century which are shared by politicians and scholars. In fact, if these “new” social movements seem to indicate a renewal of the social critique, they show, however, different organizational structures, action repertoires, geographic involvement and political claims than what politicians and academics have been used to (Sommier, 2003). And they provide their members with an alternative form of political participation, a way of “doing politics” differently, which avoids formal political structures.

Amongst these new contentious groups is the anti-globalization movement. The globalization movement is formed of multiple actors who constitute different branches of an action intended to engage critically with, and propose alternatives to current forms of social organization (Farro, 2004). Authors (such as Steinhilber, 2002) contend that one of the most performant actors among the anti-globalization movement is undoubtedly French anti-globalization movement ATTAC (Action for a Tobin Tax for the Aid of Citizens). Over the past few years, the association has substantially put a critique of globalization on its agenda, and offered alternatives. ATTAC has presented people different opportunities of learning through education and political experiences, not offered today by the Left (whose parties lack forums and a program). Indeed, Maud Barlow and Tony Clarke (2000: 348) underline that we must pay particular attention to this organization: “ATTAC has become a place of encounters not only for unions but

also all kinds of militant/activist groups very different, all from civilian society.” In fact, social scientists consider that ATTAC got at the center of French social movement (Poupeau, 2002) and became the main interlocutor with the French media regarding anti-globalization issues or alternatives to globalization.

The central focus of globalization research so far has been on 1) the resistance of groups against economic oppression, 2) on transnational ties and networks that help bring together activists from different countries, and 3) on the political opportunity structures that have provided new venues for anti-globalization movements. Whether employing political process theory or resource mobilization theory the focus has mostly been on the relationship between institutional political actors and protest. For example, Smith (2002) and Ayres (2002) see the fact that global economy is neo-liberal (i.e. markets free of government intervention) as having influenced and structured contemporary transnational contention. However something has been overlooked: new social movement theorists argue that previously prevailing approaches have to be rethought, and that the expressive aspects of members in the movement have to be incorporated within the explanatory framework of collective action (Ruggiero, 2002). For example, new social movement theorists singled out the spheres of cultural production and identity as central to social movements, and have drawn attention to the symbolic challenges posed by their action. In the meantime, post-modern and feminist approaches have questioned all claims of master narratives, contending that all knowledge is socially situated, therefore partial, and that there is no universal, objective, value-free perspective. Through such perspectives, one means of understanding the

recent trajectory of the new kind of protest movement is to appreciate that its dynamics have been shaped by an underlying and fierce contest over people's interpretations and understandings of the supposed benefits of neo-liberal economic politics. Consequently, critical social movements are seen as operating out of very different discourses: in this case, indeed, the anti-globalization movement might reflect a resistance to or a challenge of a potential predominant social and cultural model imposed on nations and individuals, other than a reaction to sudden socio-economic change due to a globalized economy. Additionally, Steinhilber (2002) suggests that we need to understand the mechanisms of the cultural imperialism and the international symbolic domination of globalization. What has been lacking is fieldwork on anti-globalization movements such as ATTAC in France about the meanings of this resistance from the members' viewpoint and that is what the research presented here provides. I will in fact examine two issues throughout this study: one is the prevalence of culture and identity concerns over globalization in the members' discourses, something that has either been overlooked or not been explored by previous studies of this movement. The other issue has to do with how the variety of the members' local discourses merge with the movement's collective frame of grievances in its globality. Finally, this study contributes to the larger literature of social movements, by examining the relevance of specific theories connecting social movements to identity discourses, and by exploring the challenges to these theories, and to the larger social and political environment, raised by the existence of such a movement.

After reviewing in Chapter II the existing literature in social movement theory, comparing and selecting theories relevant to my study, I will then proceed to portray in

Chapter III the political context of my research, including a description of the organization ATTAC (its structure, organization, demographics) from which fieldwork is drawn. In Chapter IV I will introduce the methodology used for this particular case-study, explicating the different models (as well as their biases and limitations) that were applied during fieldwork as well as for the final analysis. In Chapter V I will present the interviews as well as interviewees situating them in social, cultural and political context. Finally in Chapters VI and VII I will conclude by integrating the core of my research with the analyses of ATTAC's members discourses and narratives.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

II.1 Globalization and contention: some definitions

In this part, I will first introduce the notion of globalization, as well as put into political and social context the anti-globalization debate. Secondly, I will also present theories that have addressed anti-globalization movements, and I will introduce the theoretical perspectives which I found to be the most helpful and relevant for this particular case-study.

II.1.i. Globalization

Economic globalization can be defined as “a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions, expressed in transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction and power.” (David Held and Anthony McGrew, Entry for Oxford Companion to Politics). For economist François Chesnais, more specifically, ‘neo-liberal’ globalization designates the “new regime of capitalist accumulation, dominated by the finance sector that constituted itself in the 1970s, thanks to a systematic liberalization and deregulation of trade, of direct investments and of financial fluxes” (Mathieu, 2001: 17). Suzanne Berger (2002) states that globalization is about tendencies towards the emergence of a single world market and a single set of prices for goods and services, capital and labor.

The global expansion of trade exchanges might have started in the fifteenth century, therefore in itself globalization is not a contemporary phenomenon. However, Suzanne

Berger (2003) explains, until recently, it was assumed that capitalism could be contained within national boundaries: therefore it was thought that somehow governments could stand on the frontiers of their national economies, and regulate the flow of labor, capital goods and services between their societies and the outside international economy. For example, Jean-Pierre Warnier (2004) shows, until the end of the 1970s, monetary, wages and economic policies of the industrialized countries had been inspired by the Keynesian principles. These policies were possible to maintain thanks to the customs borders and because the states still enjoyed a relative sovereignty and independence within their national borders. Then, starting in the 1950s, change occurred especially with the emergence and development of multinational corporations, while the states are trying to drop or at least lower down the customs borders. Globalization, as we know it today, seems to threaten to undo this historic compromise.

Several political and social changes have been driving the current globalization process: the end of post-1945 Keynesianism, new technologies of communication and transportation, the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989, the worldwide liberalization of financial markets and the rise of big new consumer markets and big new producers outside the old developed world. For Suzanne Berger (2003), one of the key distinctions between international economy of the past and the contemporary globalization process has to do with the actors. Up until the mid-19th century, international exchanges tended to be in the hands of a relatively small concentrated set of families, firms and institutions. By the mid-19th century new players were involved, and from then on the international economy was different from that of the past. According to Jeffrey Ayres

(2002), three transnational institutions are now promoting the neo-liberal agenda: the WTO (World Trade Organization), the IMF (International Monetary Fund) and the World Bank.

The transnational institution WTO was created in 1995, actually inheritor of the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade): its mission is to implement the liberalization of trade for goods and services at a world scale. The goal for the WTO is to help reduce the obstacles to free trade between producers, exporters and importers. The new element in the status of the WTO (compared with the GATT) is that it not only is a place of negotiation, but it also has an internal organ with judicial power that can settle economic conflicts between member countries. Currently, 148 states are members of the WTO, and French Pascal Lamy has been 'elected' General Director of the WTO in May 2005 (for 4 years). At the end of the Second World War, the creation of two international financial institutions (IMF and World Bank) corresponds to a double preoccupation: on the one hand, the desire to avoid another major economic and financial crisis as seen in the 1930s, with the consequent drop of world exchange; on the other hand, the will and need to rebuild and aid to the development of Europe. The overall idea and system is adopted during the Bretton Woods¹ financial and monetary conference in 1944. To join the World Bank, a state must be a member of the IMF. Finally, power is shared by the U.S. and Europe: traditionally, the General Director of the IMF is European, and the President of the World Bank is American. The IMF was officially created in 1945 with the mission to regulate the international monetary system

¹ See details on the Bretton Woods Agreement Chapter III.1.ii. Pp. 52.

of fixed exchanges, and to stop the too frequent monetary devaluations by providing (depending on specific guaranties) its resources to the member states that encounter difficulties. However, the role of the IMF has changed over the last thirty years, notably with the end of the fixity of exchange rates in 1971, consequently ending its primary mission. Therefore, by 1973, the IMF redefines its mission as an official instrument of financial regulation and of help to developing countries, in charge of helping these countries to avoid temporary financial crises. Today it is the principal actor in the issue of the Third World countries debt. There are 184 countries member of the IMF. The World Bank came to formal existence in 1945, following the international ratification of the Bretton Woods Agreement. The World Bank initially helped rebuild Europe after the war. Its first loan of \$250 million was to France in 1947 for post-war reconstruction. The World Bank's main mission is to provide finance to countries for purposes of development and poverty reduction, as well as for encouraging and safeguarding international investment. Since its inception, the World Bank expanded from a single institution to an associated group of coordinated development institutions. The group and its affiliates are headquartered in Washington, D.C. (in the U.S.). As of June 2005, the World Bank Group is headed by former United States Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz (as mentioned before, by convention the Bank president has always been a U.S. citizen). The 184 members of the World Bank are the same with the IMF.

Finally, there are also regional transnational authorities such as the European Union. The European Union was established as it is today by twelve states with the Maastricht Treaty in 1993, completing and including the European Community (previously called

the Economic European Community), as well as the PESC and the cooperation concerning Internal Affairs and Justice. The European Union is therefore a hybrid system in which, for certain domains, the States entirely submit their sovereignty to the Union, and for other areas, the States refer to intergovernmental cooperation. Among other things, the Maastricht Treaty has created a European citizenship that allows –for citizens of member states- free circulation and residence in all member states, the right to vote and be elected in the state where the person is a resident (for European and municipal elections). The European Union comprises 25 states as of May 2004 (and two additional states have already signed their adhesion treaty)

This model of global economic and political management promoted by global institutions (and the most powerful players) is called ‘neo-liberalism’, term coined by economist John Williamson in 1989 to describe the core of structural adjustment programs around the world (Green and Griffith, 2002). At the political level, these events and social changes brought an important development: a shift in power away from the state. Indeed, not only these institutions are promoting the neo-liberal economic system at the global level, but they have been expanding their roles in challenging the supremacy of the nation-states. Specifically, Suzanne Berger (2002) argues, the existence itself of such institutions means the end of national borders, hence of the possibilities of national regulation within society. So, one of the implications of globalization, according to Jackie Smith and Hank Johnston (2002), is that it creates new transnational actors who are challenging the supremacy of the nation-state in its conventional means of influence in the world system. Consequently, nation-states have

to take account of international regulations in the economic and political realms. Therefore, we could conceive economic globalization as a redesigning and centralizing of the world's political and economic arrangements that seek to integrate the economic activities of all countries within a single, homogenized development model.

For instance, various cultures would all be meant to eventually adopt the same values, tastes, lifestyles, and to be served by the same films, clothing chains, global corporations and fast-food restaurants. In that plan, labor standards, professional training, cultural productions, public health, housing, public services, and the environment will be deeply affected. Indeed, Charles Derber (2002) argues that one of the pillars of this new world system –besides the new global markets and the new rules administered- is globalized cultural beliefs without which, he claims, globalization would not exist. Furthermore, Stuart Hall (1997) explains that, for him, the new kind of globalization has to do with a new form of global mass culture, very different from the cultural identities associated with the nation-state in an earlier phase. More specifically, global mass culture seems to be dominated by the modern means of cultural production, dominated by the image which crosses and re-crosses linguistic frontiers much rapidly and more easily. Further, global mass culture is dominated by television, and by film, by the image, imagery and styles of mass advertising, all of which, Hall (1997) argues, leads toward a peculiar form of homogenization. According to him, global mass culture promotes a homogenizing form of cultural representation, enormously absorptive of things. As McLuhan (1964) suggests, globalization means that the “world becomes smaller each and every day. We see it turning into a global village.” According to Green and Griffith (2002), the past

twenty years have witnessed the growth of this phenomenon in its intensity, scope and visibility as a public issue. Particularly, we will discuss in Chapter III how the globalizations processes have been affecting France.

II.1.ii. Contention against globalization

According to Green and Griffith (2002), the globalization process and the erosion of national sovereignty drew growing public attention to the undemocratic and closed nature of increasingly powerful global institutions and the influence and lack of accountability of global corporation. In the late 1980s, the effects of globalization were already viewed by many as representing a potential threat to social cohesion (Bell, 2001). By the mid-1990s, liberalization as a panacea was called into questions even by free market economists (e.g. Krugman, Bhagwati) and prominent practitioners (e.g. George Soros). They gave way to cautious self-doubt, especially over the problem of liberalized capital markets. For example, the financial Asian crisis of 1997², as well as the Mexican peso crisis of 1994 or the catastrophe of free market reform in Russia³, all created serious doubts in the minds of neo-liberal theorists, policy makers or practitioners (Green and Griffith, 2002).

Additionally, the debate over globalization, as Eddy Fougier (2001) shows, has been influenced by the emergence of social movements who deplore this globalization process, especially by challenging the prevailing neo-liberal orthodoxy, through protests

² Partly caused by an excessive liberalization of financial markets (which was misdiagnosed by the IMF).

³ Where life expectancy fell sharply in the period after 1990.

at meetings of international institutions mentioned above that symbolize globalization (e.g. protests at the G8 summit in Seattle in December 1999 and in Evian, France, in May 2003). Part of the framing contest surrounding the globalization debate has centered on the label “anti-globalization”. Franck Poupeau (2002) argues that the struggle isn’t solidly against globalization in general, or internationalization, but against specific globalized policies implemented by international institutions and multinational corporations. Therefore, activists at the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre (in January 2002) chose the slogan “another world is possible.”

For Stuart Hall (1997), these movements are clearly a response to globalization which questions the international institutions’ legitimacy and accountability mentioned above. Eddy Fougier (2001) notes that, instead of leading to some kind of ‘retreatism’ or withdrawal on the part of individuals, this defiance towards public institutions has directed people into new forms of contention and collective political involvement. Indeed, Lesley Wood (2004) explains how protesters actually target transnational institutions (such as the WTO or the World Bank) when they march to their ‘front doors’, chant, hold signs and distribute leaflets against their policies, break their windows, occupy their offices and generally disrupt business as usual. Although the most visible sites of anti-globalization protest have been the summits above mentioned, local events have also been organized: for example, Wood (2004) notes, these protests target a wide range of institutions which include banks, stock exchange, local and national governments, McDonald’s restaurants and Nike stores in their opposition to

neo-liberalism. Lilian Mathieu (2001) also shows that besides protests, there have also been counter-summits (such as World Social Forum in Porto Alegre, Brazil, in 2001 and 2002, European Social Forum in St Denis, France, in 2003) where critics of liberal globalization are formulated and political alternatives proposed. Hence, as Isabelle Sommier (2003) explains, it seems that the denunciation of neo-liberal globalized policies became the master frame or “major algorithm”, as she calls it, allowing all the different movements participating in the contention against globalization to develop more specific, localized issues they wished to contest, whether they have to do with the environment, social inequality or patriarchal domination. So, as Green and Griffith (2002) show, even if there is diversity in the movement, the commonality is a desire to transform the current neo-liberal arrangements, especially in its most visible symbols, the institutions of global economic governance. Indeed, as Eddy Fougier (2001) argues, the movements’ demands are about more transparency in the decision process within the main institutions and corporations: for example, they call for increased international regulation and pressure on companies to regulate themselves through the introduction of a “code of conduct” for themselves and their suppliers (Green and Griffith, 2002). According to Jeffrey Ayres (2004), by the late 1990s, activists had successfully developed a contentious transnationally-accepted master collective action frame to challenge the prevailing contemporary neo-liberal globalization processes and ideology.

However, Isabelle Sommier (2003) notes that for a while, the anti-globalization movement went practically unnoticed from the public. According to her, it suddenly

came under the spotlight during a WTO meeting (a special “Millenium Cycle” meeting) in Seattle from the 30th of November to the 3rd of December 1999. About 1,200 associations came from 87 different countries requesting the institution to put a stop to the liberalization of trade and asking for a reform of the institution itself. About 40,000 people participated in the protest, which is unprecedented for a contentious action against a transnational institution (Almeida and Lichbach, 2003). According to Danielle Tartakowsky (2001), the protest in Seattle in December 1999 is one of the first major popular challenges in the U.S. to the expansion of the neo-liberal global economic policies. Thus, for Tartakowsky (2001), it then became an emblematic victory and imposed itself as the founding myth of the movement (for example, a protest in Washington will later be referred to as the “second Seattle”). Franck Poupeau (2002) also argues that the anti-globalization contention movement gained increased visibility after the Seattle protest. Indeed, Jackie Smith (2002), argues, what she calls the “Battle of Seattle” is a turning point for collective action against globalization because protesters have showed that there is a capacity for social movements to challenge international trade agreements and to sustain popular concern about not only the labor rights, but also human rights and environmental issues. Then, Sommer (2003) notes, these international summits and meetings become a point of rally or assembly point for the anti-globalization protesters on regular basis (in Prague 2000; in Genoa 2001). In fact, Eddy Fougier (2001) claims, the “resonance”, or the stir made by contentious groups against globalization such as Global Trade Watch in the U.S. is precisely connected to this desire from the activists, from the citizens of the world, to regain control of democracy

which they perceive is denied by the increasing influence of financial markets and multinational corporations.

Additionally, some key changes in the social movement sector, particularly in France, need to be noted (Bell, 2001) if we are to understand why the mobilization against globalization took off in the late 1990s. During the 1980s, social movements in France appeared to run out of *raison d'être*, as enthusiasm for collective action gave away to a new individualism and, the Left, which was in power, along with the country itself started to confront the effects of a deregulated economy (Bell, 2001). Then by the late 1980s and the 1990s, the increasing effects of globalization and of the neo-liberal policies start to be viewed as a threat to social cohesion (Bell, 2001). At the same time, as noted by Alberoni (1992), the ideology of consumption and personal success of the 1980s starts to crumble, and, as argued by Boltanski and Chiapello (1999: 424), there is a renewal of the social critique denouncing the worsening of poverty and exploitation, as well as an 'artistic' critique against the "disenchanted" and oppressive effect of capitalism. These new manifestations of discontent are seen as symptomatic of real transformations happening at the political and economic levels (Sommier, 2003). Combined with a loss of faith in conventional political representations, these critiques produced a new form of militancy, as showed by the significant growth of associations (the number of which doubles in France between 1975 and 1990). The development of new forms of mobilizations and particularly of the new social movements (such as anti-globalization movements) in the 1990s reveals several tendencies regarding the area of collective action: according to Sommier (2003), it shows a decline of industry conflicts

accompanied with a transfer of these struggles towards the area of everyday life; it also gives evidence of a new culture of contention that blurs the boundaries between public space and private space. For example, anti-globalization movements in general attract militants who mobilize less as producers (or company owners, as it would be the case for industry conflicts) but as subjects (and even as consumers, as seen in the United States) resisting the overwhelming dominance of the economy.

Finally, Franck Poupeau (2002), as well as other observers, have noted that the fact that the transnational institutions such as the G8, the WTO are meeting in locations that are more and more remote and difficult to access (Canadian mountains, Switzerland...) can appear to be a measure vis-à-vis the public opinion not to give so much visibility to the contestation. In the same way, Lilian Mathieu (2001) shows how, since the contentious actions against globalization started, we witness a “privatization of public space”: for example, the ‘red zone’, within the boundaries of which the G8 summit in Genoa was to be held –and for this reason prohibited to the crowds- was, for the protesters, the symbol itself of illegitimacy of these types of summits. In this sense, we can say that, as Jeffrey Ayres (2004) argues, the rise of anti-globalization movements represents one of the most significant illustrations of social conflict and contentious political behavior of the past several decades. Green and Griffith (2002) claim that it could be called a “movement of movements” or even a “mood”.

II.2 Previous studies on anti-globalization movements

In this part, I will explore the different main theories that have made significant contributions to the field of social movements in general: I will particularly look at Marxist (and neo-Marxist) theory, and then political process theory, which are doubtlessly the major contributors in the attempt to explain the emergence, creation, life as well as death of social movements.

II.2.i. Marxist approach

Sociological studies of social movements have been dominated for most of the twentieth century by theories of ideology and by theories of organization and rationality. Marxist oriented scholars in particular have emphasized the class origins and interests of movements and the ideological programs accompanying them. They focused on the tensions and conflicts in social structure as the sources of movement formation, dissent and protest activity. Marxist interpretation of power acknowledges that the power disparity between the elite and excluded groups is substantial, but it hardly regards this state of affairs as inevitable. So the insurgent potential of excluded groups comes from the 'structural power' that their location in various politico-economic structures affords them. Additionally, the opposition between labor and capital is seen as the central contradiction of contemporary capitalist societies and other forms of domination are linked to and subordinate to it. However, Barker and Dale (1998) argue, the resistance of capitalist domination is motivated by more than simply "material" deprivation, it is also motivated by subordination and humiliation. Indeed, Barker and Dale (1998) note, if

accumulation of capital –the heart of capitalism- admittedly leads to a struggle between capital and labor over the extraction of surplus value to fuel further accumulation, the idea of class struggle implies larger issues. In fact, Barker and Dale (1998: 75) write, the term refers to “compelling patterns of social relations, which are as much political-legal, cultural and psychological in their implications, as they are economic.” Class struggle is thus rooted in a clash of opposed needs. Still in the end, according to Marxist theorists, exploitation (especially that between competing accumulation centers, in capitalism) is at the core of what engenders constant tendencies to resistance, thus providing the root of class struggle (Barker and Dale, 1998).

Using Marxist theory, previous research states that anti-globalization movements organize against “a set of changes in the international economy that tend to produce a single market for goods, services, capital and labor.” (Panayotakis, 2001) Indeed, neo-classical trade models or Marxist theory authors see the opposition to globalization as the product of economic and structural change: they contend that this opposition is driven by a defense of economic interests, whether defined in sector or class terms. Therefore these studies focused on the economic and structural explanations of such movements. They see this kind of anti-globalization movements primarily as a movement struggling to free itself from the hegemony of the dominant capitalist ideology (Panayotakis, 2001). So anti-globalization movements are seen mainly as a struggle really about economic inequality and social class only at the global level. In this perspective, anti-globalization movements started when responding to the global economic slowdown as well as increased international competitiveness for markets,

which characterized the 1970s, political and business leaders in several key northern developed states undertook dramatic political and economic reforms designed to channel the globalization of the world's economy in a so-called neo-liberal direction. Also, Marxists see the subjective transformation of consciousness as a crucial process to the generation of insurgency. For example, according to Marxist theorists, the strikes that practically paralyzed France in the winter of 1995 were an expression of a generalized anxiety and of a rejection of an economic system which, in the name of market forces, was threatening social progress made by and in the name of workers (Bell, 2001).

Additionally, Swingewood (1998) notes, Antonio Gramsci has been the first major Marxist thinker to focus more on the relations between culture, economy, class and power, and Gramsci's notion of hegemony might prove fruitful when applied to the investigation of anti-globalization movements. Even though Gramsci has not explicitly stated his views on social movements in a scholarly organized fashion, we can draw his theoretical approach from his work, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (Gramsci, 1995). The Gramscian concept of hegemony can be defined as "cultural, intellectual, and moral leadership exercised by in-establishment groups." (Kebede, 2005: 84). The nature of this hegemony can manifest itself in the ideological, political and economic realms. Following this perspective then, Worth and Kuhling (2004) argue that globalization can be considered as a "hegemonic project" representing "an ideology of neo-liberalism" articulated "to saturate various levels of global civil society" (Worth and Kuhling, 2004: 32). Hegemony is legitimized and maintained by the social, political and cultural capital that in-establishment groups possess (Kebede, 2005). Also, the concept of hegemony

according to Gramsci departs from classical versions of Marxism, and critiques the “positivist theorization of the economic as the ‘basis’ and culture as mere ‘reflex’ (Swingewood, 1998: 15). Hegemony, in Gramsci’s perspective, is articulated through “a multitude of power relations”, whether cultural, social or practical (Worth and Kuhling, 2004: 34) and more specifically, culture and its institutions must exist as separate independent elements if hegemony is to work. Indeed, for Gramsci, although culture is historically contextualized (in agreement with a Marxist perspective), it transcends “narrow, class, ‘corporate’ interests” and involves some notion of universal values produced by all dominant classes which form the basis for cultural hegemony (Swingewood, 1998: 16). Consequently, Worth and Kuhling (2004: 32) argue, the anti-globalization movement can be viewed as a form of counter-hegemony that “engages with the ideology of neo-liberalism”. More largely in this view, counter-hegemony can be seen as creative reactions “intended to challenge the cultural, political, intellectual and economic leadership exercised by in-establishment groups” (Kebede, 2005: 82), or as “infra-political practices that reveal more implicit forms of cultural resistance to capitalism and consumerism” (Worth and Kuhling, 2004: 32). According to Worth and Kuhling (2004), the Gramscian approach allows for the exploration of collective actions, especially in the case of anti-globalization movements, as “fragmented forms of resistance to global power relations” ultimately attacking the capitalist relations of production (Worth and Kuhling, 2004:34). Social movements are therefore conceived as agents of social change emerging as a result of a crisis in authority and legitimacy and become not only challengers of the economic order but also of the intellectual and the

cultural orders. This way, Swingewood (1998) remarks, individuals are considered active agents who have on the one hand internalized cultural values and conceded legitimacy to the dominant social order, but –because of (or thanks to) this reflexive internalization of values- have on the other hand the capacity of judging these values critically and “through praxis (...) generate possible alternatives.” (Swingewood, 1998: 74).

However, economic and structural explanations alone cannot account for the magnitude, form, constituency, and ideology of the opposition to globalization. Indeed, the problem is that traditional Marxist-based political slogans seem to have been abandoned in favor of references to equality and freedom (students not singing the “Internationale” but demanding Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, an old republican slogan), and these are ideals and values that do not give references to a Marxist-class-based ideology. Additionally, for Touraine, this neo-Marxist interpretation of anti-globalization movements and such would have worked if it had been applied to the most disadvantaged groups in society, rather than to occupational categories whose common feature was that they addressed their demands to the state with a view to safeguarding their relatively protected situation (Bell, 2001). In effect, according to Sommier (2003), participants in anti-globalization protests and movements who are actively involved generally come from strong cultural and social capital background. For example, former members of the World Bank formed a movement called Transparency International. Equally, lawyers within Global Trade Watch or Public Citizen, economists at ATTAC or Third World Network, engineers within anti-GMO groups, or faculty members/scholars

at Focus on the Global South compose the ranks of the global justice movement. Furthermore, in a study on the mobilization during the Genoa protests against the G8 summit in July 2001, the researchers found that 50% of the participants were students and almost 11% unemployed (Andretta, Della Porta, Mosca and Reiter, 2002). Nevertheless, a Gramscian-Marxist perspective may expand our grasp of social movements, especially in relation to the study of anti-globalization association ATTAC.

II.2.ii. Political process theory

During the 1960s, both Europe and the U.S. witnessed the development of the study of social movements and revolutions. American scholars, such as Charles Tilly (1984), Doug McAdam and Sidney Tarrow, focus on a structural analysis of movement emergence, emphasizing the changes in institutional structures. They all share the same conviction that social movements and revolutions are shaped by the broader set of political constraints and opportunities, unique to the national context in which they are embedded.

The term political process was first found in an article by Rule and Tilly about “Political Process in Revolutionary France, 1830-1832”. Tilly (1984) relates the emergence of social movements to a broad political process: he focuses on the overall dynamics that determine social insurgency and its characteristics, rather than on social movements as specific organized actors. In this view, social movements are being defined as “sustained series of interactions between power holders and persons successfully claiming to speak on behalf of a constituency lacking formal representation, in the course of which those persons make publicly visible demands for changes in the

distribution or exercise of power, and back those demands with public demonstration of support”. Social movements are therefore compared to an organized and self-conscious challenge that implies shared identity among participants. Particularly, this perspective focuses on the critical role of various grassroots settings in facilitating and structuring collective action.

The term conveys two ideas: first a social movement is held to be above all else a political rather than a psychological phenomenon. Secondly, a movement represents a continuous process from generation to decline, rather than a discrete series of developmental stages. Therefore for Tarrow (1994), the central tenet of the political process model is that, movements are created when political opportunities open up for social actors who usually lack them. Actually, Tarrow talks about “contentious collective action”: collective action can take many forms, but according to Tarrow, it becomes contentious when it is used by people who lack regular access to institutions. So movements mount to challenge through disruptive direct action against elites, authorities and other groups. Indeed, McAdam (1982) argues that we need a discussion of the larger political context in which insurgency occurs: “movements do not emerge in a vacuum” and they are not simply “a ‘knee-jerk’ to system strain”. Or, as Tarrow (1994) puts it, the collective action problem is social, not individual. Rather, as the political process model claims, social movements are an ongoing product of the favorable interplay of different factors: rather than focusing on internal or external factors to the movement, the political process model describes insurgency as the product of both.

Specifically, three sets of factors are identified by McAdam (1982) as shaping the generation of insurgency: expanding political opportunities available to insurgent groups, indigenous organizational strength and readiness, and the presence of certain shared cognitions within the minority community that is held to facilitate movement emergence (i.e. a level of consciousness within the movement's mass base). Sidney Tarrow (2002) also acknowledges four key concepts, which are similar to McAdam's categories: political opportunities, mobilizing structures, collective action frames and repertoires of contention. It is actually the confluence of these factors that is considered to be at the source of movement emergence.

The political process model emphasizes the importance of shared and socially constructed ideas in collective action. Thus, theorists focus on the political structuring of social movements but also on the critical catalytic effect of new ideas as a spur to collective action (or in other words, crucial importance of expanding political opportunities as the ultimate spur to collective action).

For the political process model, political movements and revolutions are set in motion by social changes. McAdam (1982) indicates that among the events and processes likely to prove disruptive of the political status quo are wars, industrialization, international political realignments, prolonged unemployment and widespread demographic changes. However, McAdam argues that social processes such as industrialization or urbanization promote insurgency only indirectly through a restructuring of existing power relations. So the political process model finds here a long-run transformation of the structures of power and collective action with social

processes that usually operate over a longer period of time. Nevertheless, the generation of social insurgency presupposes the existence of a political environment increasingly vulnerable to pressure from insurgents.

Also, political process model theorists argue that the form and timing of collective action is structured by the available political opportunity. This means that insurgents can be expected to mobilize in response to and in a manner consistent with the very specific changes that grant them more leverage. McAdam (1982) also notes that it is the resources of the minority community that enable insurgents groups to exploit these opportunities. In the absence of those resources “the aggrieved population is likely to lack the capacity to act even when granted the opportunity to do so”. This means that in order to generate a social movement, a given ‘aggrieved population’ must be able to ‘convert’ a favorable structure of political opportunities into an organized campaign of social protest. For example, McAdam (1982) says, if no networks exist, the aggrieved population is capable of little more than “short-term, localized, ephemeral outbursts and movements of protest such as riots.” Tarrow (1994) confirms the idea that riots (or mobs) are usually not considered to be a social movement because participants typically lack more than temporary solidarity. Actually, mobs and riots (and spontaneous assemblies) are considered to be more an indication that a movement is in the process of formation than movements themselves. Indeed, the literature shows that movement participants are recruited among established lines of interaction. This means that, in a Durkheimian argument, the more integrated a person is into the minority community, the more readily he or she can be mobilized for participation in protest activities. This

supports Oberschall's (1973: 125) conclusion: "mobilization does not occur through recruitment of large numbers of isolated and solitary individuals. It occurs as a result of recruiting blocs of people who are already highly organized and participants." That is also Tarrow's (1994) observation: movements succeed when they are well organized – even though they are not interest groups-

Finally, an important element of the political process model is the concept of political opportunity structure: Tarrow (1994: 85) defines it as "consistent dimensions of the political environment which either encourage or discourage people from using collective action". Tarrow (1994) explains that this concept emphasizes resources external to the group that can be taken advantage of even by weak or disorganized challengers. Among the most significant changes in political opportunity structures, Tarrow (1994) mentions: increasing access (to power, to participation), unstable alignment (e.g. electoral instability), influential allies (e.g. political party activists, union organizers), and divided elites (conflicts within and among elites). In this regard, Tarrow (1994) says, movement formation is the product of people seizing and making opportunities. So, this concept, argues Tarrow (1994), can help explain how movements are diffused, how collective action is communicated and new networks are formed from one social group to another, as opportunities are seized and created.

Applied to the study of anti-globalization movements, the political process model focuses on the political processes at play in such a movement (Ancelovici, 2002; Almeida and Lichbach, 2003). For example, some case studies show the effects that global political institutions and economic processes have had on various groups'

mobilization of protest (Smith and Johnston, 2002). So basically, the political process model does not ask whether neo-liberal arrangements encourage transnational contention but how and what kind. Indeed political process theory research looks at how the global economy/politics affect opportunities (and constraints) for activists at the local and international levels. In that regard, for example, the break with the Bretton Woods regime in the 1970s and the resulting neo-liberal turn in the global economy played an important role in shaping the incidences of national, regional and transnational protests, which erupted in the 1990s to challenge the neo-liberal globalization paradigm (Ayres, 2004). In short, the neo-liberal arrangements themselves provide new avenues of protest by creating new international political opportunities. Also, taking the example of a case study in Canada (the campaign against the Free Trade Agreements, end of 1980s), Ayres (2002) argues that new mobilizing structures support transnational activism, such as organizations, networks and coalitions that sustain contentious activity over time. For him, it is the economic globalization that has altered the political context for mobilization. Particularly, the dynamic of mobilization for contention has changed and has started relying more on both domestic and transnational political opportunities, as neo-liberalism becomes increasingly international. Also, as Ayres (2002) notes, the states and domestic political institutions do not constitute the targets of protests; activists are targeting international institutions and influences outside the state. For Jackie Smith (2002) as well, the turning point in social movement research was to show how global economics / politics affect social actors at the local and international levels. Taking the example of the protests of 1999 in Seattle, Smith (2002) argues that the origins of the

Seattle protest movement comes from prior mobilizations against trade agreements, but it was new in the case of Seattle because of the participation of people from the U.S. and other industrialized nations. For her, not only the protest relied on formal and informal local organizations (churches, community organizations, friendship networks) to frame the movement's agenda, but it also relied on transnational mobilizing structures which helped shape leadership and strategies (throughout skills, experience in international organizing, expertise in international law). Therefore, Smith (2002: 211) notes, organizations with transnational ties were crucial to the Seattle protest: they helped transcend national interests in order to "build solidary identities with a global emphasis."

However, McAdam (1982) argues that while expanding political opportunities and indigenous organizations are important, they do not by themselves produce a social movement. Mediating between opportunity and action are people, and the subjective meanings they attach to their situations. Therefore, as Piven and Cloward say, "the emergence of protest movement entails a transformation both of consciousness and of behavior." (1979: 3-4). In summary, this means that, as McAdam argues, movement emergence implies a transformation of consciousness within a significant segment of the aggrieved population. Before any collective protest can emerge, people must collectively define their situations as unjust and subject to change through group action. Of course, faithful to the political process model, McAdam (1982) argues that shifting political conditions supply the necessary cognitive 'cues' capable of activate the process of cognitive liberation.

In counterpart, Giugni (1998) argues that one of the problems with the political process model, when studying the outcomes of social movements, is that it usually looks at the impact of movements on government policy or legislation. This flaw, Giugni argues, comes from the fact that the political process model views social movements as essentially targeting political authorities and institutions, hence it sees them as mainly trying to provoke political change. However, for Giugni (1998), the effects of social movements are often indirect, unintended and sometimes even in contradiction to their goals.

Also, the political process approach analyzes on the 'how' of social movements. It focuses on the conditions that facilitate or constrain the occurrence of conflicts, taking the existence of potential grievances for granted. For social movement scholars such as Giugni (1998), social movements have a cultural dimension and not just political aspects: e.g. mobilization may result in strengthening of internal solidarity and identities, the creation of countercultures, shifts in public attitudes toward a given issue.

II.3 My choice of alternative approaches to the study of anti-globalization movements

II.3.i. New social movement theories

In contrast to former theories, Sutton (2000) claims, the new social movement (NSM) theories concentrate on the 'why' of movement activity: they try to relate social movements to large and small scale structural and cultural changes. For Sutton (2000), NSM theorists do not see new movements as simply contemporary manifestations, they also display apparently unique features which old movements did not. Sutton (2000)

identifies four main areas where post-industrial new social movements are said to differ from previous social movements: in their goals and values, in their organizational forms, in their participants and in their campaigning style. To speak of new movements in this sense is to agree with discourses of post-industrialism, post-material values and cultural forms. Post-industrialism includes several features such as shift away from manufacturing to service employment, a consequent power shift away from capitalist entrepreneurs towards a newly emerging 'technocracy', the installation of theoretical knowledge as the key of the new society and the long-term displacement of the working class as a potentially revolutionary collective actor. NSM are thought to arise at least in part as attempts to take back control of the individual's everyday life –and to resist the “colonization of the life-world” in Habermas' words-. Indeed, European scholars of social movements such as Kriesi Hanspeter, Herbert Kitschelt and Alberto Melucci have put an emphasis on cross-national analysis of movement emergence and on the link between culture and politics. Even McAdam (1996) agrees that the new social movement perspectives (and especially the European approach) have made “cultural and cognitive factors central to the study of social movements”.

Indeed, new social movement theorists Johnston, Laraña and Gusfield (1994) focus on the idea of identity -individual, collective and public- as a central aspect of movement formation. They also look at the ideas of shared grievances and perceptions of injustice as constituting an ideological base for mobilization. If grievances and collective identity are not exactly the same, their close association lies nevertheless in the fact that, the organization of how social movements' adherents think about themselves, is structured

by how shared wrongs are experienced, interpreted and reworked in the context of group interaction. Hence, Johnston, Laraña and Gusfield (1994) suggest that all social movements are linked, to some degree, with issues of individual and collective identity via local grievances that affect everyday life. For instance, in her study of low-income women participation in social movements, Giovanna Di Chiro (1992) claims that not only these women participate in environmental justice movements to protest against living conditions, but they are as well challenging and redefining discourses and practices about gender, race, class and even dominant notions of scientific expertise. Therefore, this has to do with meanings and symbols, not solely with policy changes or structural impact. In this sense, Melucci (1989) claims, contemporary movements detach themselves from the traditional model of political organization and they relate more to daily life and individual identity. According to him, they belong to different historical periods and consequently he has abandoned the concept of class relationships. In fact, he advocates for an understanding of this multiplicity of synchronic and diachronic elements. In this sense, the idea of 'newness' raises the question of the appearance of a new paradigm of collective action: for Melucci (1994), the elaboration in daily life of alternative meanings for individual and collective behavior is the principal activity of the hidden networks of contemporary movements. He argues that the logic of a system is to be found at the level of social life where actors interact to define the possibilities and constraints of their action. Therefore we must rethink social action into the process by which meanings are constructed through interaction: for Melucci (1994), it is the actors who, through their relations, produce and recognize the sense of what they are doing.

In the same way, Touraine (1971) argues that the conflict is no longer between two categories or classes (e.g. the capitalists and the working class). In effect, for Touraine (1971), class antagonisms are truly social conflicts involving both social relations and cultural orientations, but social movements cannot be reducible to objective class interests. It is between worldwide flows, networks or markets and 'identities'. What is at stake is the capacity for individuals and groups to be "free", responsible and coherent actors by combining instrumental action with cultural identity. 'Passions' that were political and economic are now cultural. Similarly, Hanspeter Kriesi (1995) argues that new social movements emerged in the 1970s with postmaterialist demands (such as peace, recognition for cultural diversity, minority rights, etc...) as opposed to the redistributive demands of "old" social movements.

Following this argument, Joseph Gusfield (1994) argues that social movements are associations with both actions and meanings. Gusfield (1994) also explains the distinction between public and everyday arenas –macro and micro- precisely by reintroducing and revising the collective behavior approach. For him, social choices and movements are embedded in daily interaction: and they have a reflexive character. They are something members of a society reflect on, think about and are aware of. Thus he concludes that social movements exist when members of a society share the recognition that specific social rules are no longer taken for granted. And the success of a movement is measured in how the movement has changed the rules that are admissible in public arenas. Therefore, for Gusfield (1994) there are two dimensions of social movements: first they are processes seeking to produce change in the political or institutional

character of the society. And second, they are signs that a segment of social life is potentially under challenge and that alternatives are possible. Finally, for Gusfield (1994), there is a theatrical component to social movements that is central to the way meanings are disseminated: in this sense, modern movements from the essential linkage between public arenas and everyday life. Also, Johnston, Laraña and Gulfield (1994) advocate for an interpretive sociology working on the 'micro-structural' factors prior to mobilization.

Applying new social movement theory to the study of anti-globalization movement, Sarah Waters (1998) argues that since the 1990s, a different kind of social movements have emerged: according to Waters (1998), the forms of social movements which now operate within its political system differ significantly from earlier movements. For example, over the past decade, France has experienced a rise of new types of social movements which have to come to play a dominant role in mobilizing protests and articulating changing demands. New social movement theory, Waters (1998) notes, explains that these movements embody new post-materialist issues and themes: they express new issues (for the AIDS victims, against racism, etc...) which are absent from or inadequately represented within the mainstream political agenda. So the strong feature of contemporary movements in France, according to Waters (1998) is their strong civic dimension: actually, they embody a civic conception of political action. In fact, Marcos Ancelovici (2002) argues that, although Marxist in its essence and its struggle (criticizing free markets and capitalism), anti-globalization movements such as ATTAC have managed to avoid references to old themes of the Left (such as class struggle)

thereby avoiding the stigma of being Marxist or corporatist, and widening its appeal to a large audience. Also, as Ancelovici (2002) underlines, the total absence of working class members seems to show that there isn't "a relationship between joining ATTAC and defending specific economic interests". Furthermore, ATTAC does not appear to hold a specific discourse on social class issues, nor does it make reference to the working-class movement (or any labor movement for that matter). Instead, Ancelovici (2002: 447) remarks, "issues are framed in terms of citizenship, democracy, solidarity, global markets, financial institutions, and corporations". For instance, Martin-Barbero (2002) identifies the current resurgence of identity processes (ethnicities and regions in particular) as a response to a globalization that is dissolving society as a community of meaning. Indeed, he argues that the undergoing of identity revival is a way to "respond to the excision of cultures from local space time and bend to the logic of a global power that is taking refuge in a logic of communal power" (Martin-Barbero, 2002: 622). In fact, Gordon and Meunier (2001) claim that "the real threat to France from globalization is (...) not economic but cultural." Authors seem to argue that what worries people is the loss of their culture and identity, or the disappearance of France itself. In his study of perceptions of the globalization process, Fougier (2001) confirms that globalization is perceived by French people (in recent French polls) in terms of its effects on national and cultural identity (and not in terms of free trade as it is the case of Americans' perceptions, for example).

II.3.ii. Post-modern and feminist theories

Postmodernism can first be defined as a rejection of the Enlightenment project. Modernism [or modernity] with the culture of Enlightenment –optimism, progress and newness- has been seen as the heart of modern Western societies. This ‘ideology’ was inevitably imbricated with the Enlightenment reason, the belief in progress and an empirical science and positivism. Modernity signified a culture of innovation, a rational ethos challenging tradition in the name of empirical knowledge and humanism. It was also accompanied by the emergence of an advanced industrial capitalism and the experience of modern mass democracy as well as a depersonalized administration.

In a broader sense and more general way, the idea of post-modernism refers to “social and cultural patterns of sensibilities that can be analytically distinguished for the purpose of highlighting social trends.” (Seidman, 1994) Although M. Rose (1991) has traced the origins of postmodern use into a variety of intellectual contexts in the 1930s, it became theorized and analyzed as a new and distinctive aesthetic in the field of architecture in 1945. It referred to mass-produced, prefabricated housing as a reaction to the idea of functionality in modernity and very much unlike the modernist architecture of the Bauhaus for example [with its consciously defined utopian goals of renewing urban space.]. Functional perspective is then seen as ugly. Therefore, a reflection and discussion out of this rejection created a new architecture with a mixture of styles [modern/ancient] in a pastiche way. Seemingly, empirical sociology has undergone a widely debated crisis: it was faced with the choice between seeking a new application of its skills or seeking new skills. According to Bauman (1994), there is already a

development at work [similar to anthropology] which assimilates Wittgensteinian and Gadamerian hermeneutical themes and inspiration based on ‘interpretation’ [“hermeneuein” in Greek means ‘to interpret’]. Also, through articulate experiences, and through a “thick description” -the only reasonable cognitive strategy according to Geertz (1973)-, sociologists may be able to see the many “life-worlds” and many language-games at work.

First, not only postmodern thought questions and breaks up the traditional opposition organizing knowledge coming from the Enlightenment –i.e. science Vs literature, science Vs narratives- but it also deconstructs supposedly opposed concepts. This is done throughout a new way of analyzing the construction of meanings and relationships of power. It can be seen in feminist perspectives using poststructuralist theory. Indeed, feminist theorists have questioned the Enlightenment paradigm of knowledge: they criticize the essentialist discourse of gender [whether androcentric or gynocentric] that posits a bipolar gender order. For some of them, oppositions and dualities just express a male-centered perspective. Thus they favor the standpoint theory that holds that knowledge is always produced from a specific social position exhibiting particular interests, values and beliefs. For example, Scott (1988) argues that poststructuralism allows for articulating alternative ways of thinking about gender without simply reversing old hierarchies or confirming them. According to her –and following Derrida’s (1972; 1976) perspective-, the deconstruction method consists in two related steps: “the reversal and displacement of binary oppositions.” For example, in the ‘equality Vs difference’ [between men and women] debate, Scott (1988), and feminist followers,

rejects the idea that equality and difference constitute an opposition. To her, when equality and difference are paired dichotomously, they structure an impossible choice. Moreover, this opposition serves to obscure differences among women, in behavior, subjectivity, gender identification and historical experience. So the alternative to this binary construction of sexual differences would be to claim a more complicated historically variable diversity, to refuse to oppose equality to difference and to insist continually on differences (plural) as the very meaning of equality itself. So, as Barbara Johnson says, “the deconstruction of a binary opposition is thus not an annihilation of all values or differences; it is an attempt to follow the subtle, powerful effects of differences already at work within the illusion of a binary opposition.” (1980: x-xi)

Second, this kind of perspective reflects another pivotal /central point to the postmodern turn: it favors a social knowledge as involving multiple standpoints and the interconnection between social analyst and society [contrary to the Enlightenment that emphasized and promoted a theory of knowledge based on the duality between the knowing subject and the world.]. In effect, as showed by Smith (1996), appropriation/authority by men over knowledge (for example sociology) over centuries, has had an important consequence: according to the mainstream male sociological perspective [positivist too], the body of social knowledge should be based on “objectivity”. This implies a separation of “the knower from what he knows” (1996). According to Harding, the conventional epistemology sees knowledge as objective, not situated in a context (whether cultural or social), “homogeneous, unitary and coherent” (Smith, 1996). And of course, the subject of knowledge is disembodied. Thus in this

perspective, in order to get to that absolute objectivity, one should suspend one's sex and one's knowledge of who is speaking and for whom. Instead, Harding (1996) defends, we must break from the supposedly value-neutral empirical methods in sociology. This represents a shift toward (or a return to) a subjective epistemological attitude inside sociology with a special relationship between object and subject. For example, anthropologist K. Blu (1980) argues that there must be a translation from "the insider's experiences, sentiments and ideas in terms intelligible to an outsider." Indeed, for Hartsock (1998), only experience matters as an immediate knowledge: Hartsock also considers that practical daily life activity contains understanding of the world. Feminist theorist Donna Haraway (1996) also claims that there is a need for deconstruction of scientific knowledge and a need for multiple perspectives. She argues against "various forms of unlocatable, and so irresponsible, knowledge claims", and for situated and embodied knowledges: hence her affirmation that "feminist objectivity means quite simply situated knowledges". For Haraway (1996) indeed, feminist epistemologies of scientific knowledge should be about a subjective multidimensional vision where partiality and location are the condition, not universality. In fact, Smith (1996) writes, it is precisely by recognizing a subjectivity in individuals' experience –their rootedness in time, place and personal experience- that it becomes valuable. According to Haraway (1996), that is precisely what feminism seeks in science: the politics of interpretation, translation, and "the partly understood". Since vision is interpretive, critical and partial, so is translation. Ultimately, for Haraway (1996), only by joining partial view and uncertain voices into a collective subject position can we hope for a view from

somewhere and be accountable for it. Hence, feminist post-modern epistemologies are going to blur the boundaries to expand our vision.

Thus Seidman (1994) suggests that sociology has a new task under the postmodern condition: according to him, it should focus on “making the opaque transparent, on exposing the ties linking visible biographies to invisible societal processes.” So the question is being asked as to whether there is a possibility for a postmodern sociology. Again according to Seidman (1994), the answer follows the same critique as for postmodern anthropology. Sociologists must renounce to scientism –implying the assumption of an existing ‘Truth’ or an epistemologically privileged discourse-, and abandon their search for the one correct explanation or concept. That would be achievable through a shift from sociological theory (grounded in question for universal laws) to a ‘social theory’ (understanding life with no objectivist orientation). Then, social theories can take the form of broad social narratives and are connected to contemporary social conflicts and public debates. Opposing the grand narratives, Seidman (1994) advocates a postmodern social narrative event-base and therefore careful about its temporal/spatial boundaries. These narratives offer alternative images of the past, present and future. Seemingly, Lyotard’s (1984) postmodernism argues there are no universal laws: quite the contrary, for him, there is heterogeneity, diversity and ‘dissensus’ of discourses. He has in fact abandoned the representation and truth of the grand narratives. Hence post-modern theorists present critical alternatives to current dominant images, because they give up the centrality of the ideas of progress Vs decadence that have served as the unifying themes of modernist social thought. These

“new” social narratives should be shifting from an essentialist language of self and agency to conceiving the self as having multiple and contradictory identities, affiliations and interests.

Using a post-modern perspective to the study of social movements, Melucci (1989) claims that social movements are a “heterogeneous, fragmented phenomena, which internally contain a multitude of differentiated meanings, forms of actions, and modes of organization, and which often consume a large part of their energies in the effort to bind such differences together”. Thus he sees social movements as localized and fragmented with no prospect of total revolution or planned social transformation. In this sense, Melucci’s work can be seen as a postmodern reading of the field of social movements – concentrating on diversity and fragmentation-. Melucci (1989) even goes further claiming that contemporary movements detach themselves from the traditional model of political organization and they relate more to daily life and individual identity. He argues that the logic of a system is to be found at the level of social life where actors interact to define the possibilities and constraints of their action. And therefore we must rethink social action into the process by which meaning is constructed through interaction: for Melucci (1989), it is actors who, through their relations, produce and recognize the sense of what they are doing. Thus for Melucci (1989), new social movements are not occasional emergencies, they are a permanent reality. In addition, as Sarah Waters (1998) shows, contemporary movements, such as anti-globalization movements, operate within a fragmented and heterogeneous system of alliances lacking clear or dominant influences: they are in this sense “political spaces” more than they are political

structures, i.e. they favor individuals and groups over structure and organization. Laura Macdonald (2002) as well, argues that contemporary social movements such as anti-globalization movements are not unitary actors: according to her, they have diverse ideological and organizational traditions, and therefore, differences are negotiated both internationally and intranationally. According to her, this heterogeneity and how these differences are negotiated are precisely a fundamental factor in movements' responses to neo-liberal agendas. Indeed, Clifford Geertz (1986) claims that we need to take seriously into account the position of individuals in the globalization process. There has been a marked tendency in many discussions of the world-system to ignore individuals (and more precisely the contemporary construction of individualism) for the apparent reason that globalization refers to very large scale matters, in contrast to the "small-scale" status of individuals. Geertz (1986) and Robertson (1997) argue that individuals are as much a part of the globalization process as any other basic category of social-theoretical discourse.

II.4 Conclusion

In conclusion, on the one hand, we need to acknowledge the contributions of political process theory and Marxist theory: for example, Marxist theory worked to explain the orientation and organization of the labor movement and workers' consciousness related to historical stages in the development of industrialization and the organization of production.

Then, political process theory has allowed us to look at social movements as a form of politics, instead of just an anomic reaction to strains in the social structure or irrational

crowd behavior. Political process theory also provides a framework for explaining the broader political context, and further the political opportunity structures that encourage and permit the emergence of social movements.

On the other hand, as Bell (2001) argues, political process theory has important limitations in the sense that it says very little about the meaning of social movements, particularly for the actors involved in them. Additionally, as new social movement theories and post-modern theories have shown, the decisive conflicts are no longer limited to the productive enterprise, as Marxist theory claimed, but concerns –among other things- the struggle for control of the cultural norms which in turn influence the overall orientation of society (Bell, 2001). Therefore, I claim that we need to add to the study of the political processes, and the visible aspects or economic conditions of the rise of such a movement, and take on a post-modern turn by looking at diversity and fragmentation. In fact, this research is oriented toward the study of the latent, non-visible, cognitive and cultural dimensions throughout the multiplicity and subjectivity of the members' narratives.

Additionally, particular concepts from new social movement theory and from post-modern, as well as feminist theories will provide a frame for the analysis of this research.

In the case of new social movement theories, this study will benefit specifically from two ideas: first, the argument made by NSM theorists that anti-globalization movements embody post-materialist issues. In the 1970s, Inglehart (1977) had hypothesized that the value priorities of Western publics were shifting from materialist

values toward post-materialist values. He further argued that there would be a movement away from the concern of survival toward concerns with, for example, spiritual questions. Additionally, as Touraine (1971) has argued, the conflict is between worldwide flows, networks, and 'identities', and what is at stake is the capacity for individuals and groups to be free, responsible and coherent actors by combining instrumental action with cultural identity. So what is central to NSM theory is in fact the study of cultural, symbolic and cognitive factors and grievances (particularly grievances connected to everyday life) in social movements because these are conceived as primordial in contemporary movements. We will examine how this argument compares with the particular study of ATTAC's members' discourses on globalization. The second idea drawn from NSM theorists is that anti-globalization movements are not related to the working class movement and that there are no references to the notion of class struggle, as previously observed in former workers movements. Touraine (1971) in particular argues that the conflict is no longer between two categories or classes. In this regard, Mathieu (2001) suggests, anti-globalization movements seem to have attracted relatively heterogeneous generations and statuses among participants and militants (from intellectuals to union members to activist citizens). Sommer (2003) confirms this observation by claiming that new social movements, and particularly anti-globalization movements, seem to be distinctive from the former workers' movements: indeed, there seems to be a different kind of membership composition, more based on young individuals, women, and also middle-class, all with a strong cultural capital. Again, we

will investigate through our study of ATTAC members' demographics, as well as discourses, the relevance of this argument.

Finally, particular concepts and ideas amongst post-modern theories, as well as feminist theories, will drive the analysis of my case-study. First, both sets of perspectives contend that social movements are heterogeneous fragmented phenomena containing differentiated meanings (Melucci, 1989). Hence, it is argued, there are no unitary actors in social movements: a closer attention must be paid to heterogeneity of discourses and individuals in movements. Post-modern theorists and feminists have in fact rejected the notion of 'grand narratives': therefore, the general idea is to abandon absolute standards, universal categories and grand theories when studying social phenomena. In this case, consequently, knowledge becomes knowledges. Second, at the same time, local, historically contextualized and pragmatic types of social inquiry are favored: hence a focus on interpretive sociology that contextualizes and situates narratives of and in social movements. The idea here is to reintroduce the subjectivity of the social actor in order to understand how social movement participants' shared wrongs/grievances are experienced, interpreted and reworked in the context of group interaction. By bringing in and recognizing the subjectivity and multiplicity of individuals' experiences, and by emphasizing the politics on critical interpretation (with a focus on meanings), post-modern and feminist theories claim that we might be able to better understand contemporary social movements. We will confront these ideas to the present fieldwork study and see if this heterogeneity and multiplicity of voices and standpoints is reflected in discourses of members of ATTAC.

CHAPTER III

CASE STUDY CONTEXT

In this chapter, I will present the French political landscape and its particular place in the anti-globalization debate. I will also introduce the anti-globalization movement ATTAC, its foundation, its official discourse, its membership (particularly its demographic component), and its relationship to French politics. This will allow us to understand the context in which the discourses of ATTAC members on globalization issues are produced. This in turn will relate those individual discourses to a larger ensemble of discourses on globalization, whether generated by the French political parties, the French state, or by the heads of the organization ATTAC.

III.1 Political context: globalization/anti-globalization in France

In this part, I would like to explain how the globalization processes seem to have affected European countries (France more precisely) according to the current literature, and particularly, I would like to show what is contextually and politically specific to France in the debate over the issue of globalization.

III.1.i. Globalization, Europe and France: a paradox?

In scholarly discussions over globalization “and its discontents”, Anton Brender (2004) argues that globalization has more specifically affected the European countries because they were not “armed” or prepared to deal with the end of some “illusions” that are now lost: first the end of communism happened, or the failure of a socialist economy, an impossible revolution that could not replace the capitalist system; and then there is the end of the European domination or hegemony on the rest of the world after the

second world war. Indeed, globalization played a decisive role in this march towards a world where Europe isn't the center.

However, one might see a paradox in looking at France for example, as resisting globalization. France has enjoyed a trade surplus since 1993 and is today the 4th largest exporting country in the world (Ancelovici, 2002). Until September 2001, the growth rate was increasing while the unemployment rate (after a decade in the double digits) had recently gone down to 9%. As underlined by Philip Gordon and Sophie Meunier (2001), as well as by Anton Brender (2004), starting in the 1980s, France has been able to adapt to globalization by abandoning its “dirigist” past, by launching policies centered on competitiveness and by converting to market liberalization. Therefore French companies have been able to adapt to globalization through international mergers and acquisitions over which the once all-powerful state has had little influence. The French social system is now in competition with other societies'. In fact, as Ancelovici (2002) underlines, the Socialist Party's acceptance of market mechanisms and the gradual reform of the “dirigist” state that followed the U-turn of President Mitterrand in 1983, had led several authors to announce the end of French ‘exceptionalism’. France's dirigiste post-World War II model was based on a state-led capitalism, a unique combination of capitalism and state-directed economy: initially, the focus was on the role of indicative planning in creating a “*économie concertée*” (a strong obligation for

the French nation, according to Charles de Gaulle¹). The government intervened heavily in the economy, using indicative five-year plans as its main tool. For example, high profile projects, were launched such as the extension of Marseille harbor (soon becoming number three in Europe and number one in the Mediterranean), the expansion of the French auto industry with state-owned Renault at its center, and the building of the first highways between Paris and the provinces. The French economy recorded growth rates not accounted for since the 19th century; and in fact, this period is known in France as the peak of the “Trente Glorieuses” (“Thirty Glorious Years” of economic growth between 1945-1975). This French dirigiste model of capitalism since 1945 has come to serve as an archetype of French ‘exceptionalism’. However, the conceptualization of its crucial characteristics has changed over time: subsequent studies portrayed this as a highly selective industrial policy. Therefore, from the mid-1970s, successive governments of the Right and the Left recognized that mounting problems required structural reforms to be made to the French model of capitalism. The Gaullists then converted to a neo-liberal discourse, opting with their allies for a program of privatizations in 1986-1988 and 1993-1997 (Lovecy, 1999). In addition, Jill Lovecy (1999) shows how by 1984, both the socialists and the Gaullist right in France had abandoned elements crucial to their state-centrist traditions: for example, the socialists had implemented their commitments to ‘decentralization’ (with Deferre’s remodeling of France’s Jacobin’s framework of center-periphery relations), and the Gaullists under

¹ Known as a war hero and leader of the ‘Free France’ in World War II, Charles de Gaulle was the head of a provisional French government in 1944–1946. Called to form a government in 1958, he inspired a new constitution and was the Fifth Republic's first president from 1958 to 1969.

Chirac, had dramatically emerged as the champions of a neo-liberal strategy of privatizations. Then, Lovecy (1999) notes, by 1985, these new institutional arrangements had been reinforced by parallel developments at the supranational level in Europe. Both France's adherence to the European Convention of Human Rights, and her membership to the European Economic Community (now European Union) had thus resulted in expanding areas of its legislation and its implementation, being subject to challenge through these new institutions established in Strasbourg or Luxembourg. In fact, Gregory Flynn (1995) explains, the strategy that France has pursued up to today, to achieve its needs for both security and status, political and economic, has been European integration.

However, Gregory Flynn (1995) notes that the new Europe has forced the French to rethink the dimensions of their national identity. Surely, France has long had two souls, Flynn (1995) argues, one national and one European, but it has been capable up to now, of successfully ignoring or avoiding their compatibility issues. Changes in the European context in the recent years have coincided with deep structural changes in French politics and society. Indeed, according to Flynn (1995), the challenges of the new Europe, also bringing a new pattern of external constraints with them, has affected how France views itself. For him, what the French have lost with the collapse of postwar Europe is not so much their identity of being French per se, but an integral piece of what it meant to be French. Therefore, the disappearance of a permissive context confronts France with the need not only for new policies, but for something much deeper, namely a new expression of what it means to be French in today's Europe.

So, the challenge of remaking the hexagon is substantial but on the surface at least, does not appear to be more substantial than that faced by many other countries. For example, it would seem that the magnitude and difficulty of adjustment for Germany after reunification is greater than that faced by France. The public proclamations of France's difficulties, however, would seem to imply that something particular has been transpiring in this country. For example, in a 1999 poll, Fougier (2001) notes that financial and economic globalization is perceived by 65% of the individuals surveyed as a source of worsening of social inequalities. Gordon and Meunier (2001) also show how in recent polls, a majority of French people believe that globalization threatens their national identity. Additionally, most surveys and polls show that French people are more worried than other Europeans. For example, in the 2003 Eurobarometer poll ordered by the European Commission, 58% of the French citizens consider that globalization could be a threat to French economy, particularly to the national companies, whereas the Germans (61%), the British (61%) or the Italians (63%) believe that globalization represents a good opportunity for their national economies; also, 71% of French people (higher percentage than any other European nation) believe that globalization would have a rather negative effect on the employment in France. At the same time, still in the 2003 Eurobarometer survey, about 63% of French people had initially given a favorable opinion to globalization when asked about their general opinion on the development of globalization (71% of Germans, 60% of British, 67% of Italians were favorable). However, 47% of French people claim that globalization would have a negative effect on their personal situation and their family if it intensified. In other words, it seems that

only when confronted to the question of the potential impact of globalization on their personal lives are French citizens more pessimistic or more inclined to take a critical stand on the question.

III.1.ii. Anti-globalization contention in France

First, scholars have claimed that in France, more than in any other Western European country, protests constitute a fundamental mechanism of political change and renewal, where they seem to form a part of the regular workings of the system (Waters, 1998). As Stanley Hoffman (1971: 111) notes: “there are few other nations where protest movements have been so frequent and so diverse in their origins, channels, and purposes, and so similar in their manifestations, as France.” However, by the mid-1980s, France has experienced a resurgence of new social movement protests after a period of relative absence from French political life (Waters, 1998). But if this period is marked by a resurgence of social protest, it did not simply involve a revival of past movements and struggles. Indeed, by the mid-1980s, most of the key movements of the preceding decade have disappeared. In fact, as noted by Sommier (2003) and Waters (1998), the union movement has exhausted itself since the end of the 1970s: union membership is down and union strikes have decreased significantly. For example only 9% of the ‘active’ population (workers) in France is unionized (8% in the private sector, 26% in the public sector), as opposed to 28,9% in Germany, 32,9% in Great Britain and 91% in Sweden (Sommier, 2003). In turn, this decline shows a profound crisis of traditional types of political participation (whether union or party membership). Meanwhile, newer forms of mobilization and new types of associations have either emerged or have

undergone a considerable expansion by the mid-1980s. It includes and encompasses at the same time some traditional organizations (Human Rights League, Movement Against Racism, Terre des Hommes); it also includes more recently founded organizations concerned with international issues (Amnesty International, Doctors Without Borders), charitable concerns (Restaurants of the Heart), as well as ad hoc structures formed in order to generate support for a specific social issue (“Les sans-papiers” or “The undocumented”). So, compared with the old movements (particularly the workers’ movement), the demands of these new forms of contention are centered on everyday life, culture, life conditions, the environment, i.e. post-materialist values (Sommier, 2003; Inglehart, 1977, 1990, 1997), that are opposing the functionalist and productivity logic of the neo-liberal system. Finally, this French “association boom” revealed its importance during the anti-globalization protest in France and around the globe. According to Francesco Alberoni (1992) the emergence of new movements responding to the neo-liberal system, is occurring at a time when the ideology of consumption and individual success –as supposed ideal values for the greater good- are declining.

Secondly, political observers have precisely described France as ‘the’ country of contention against globalization (Fougier, 2001). Indeed, Gordon and Meunier (2001) explain how globalization poses a particular challenge to France: first, France has had a long statist, dirigist political and economic tradition (as explained earlier), so it is particularly difficult for such a society to accept the fact that the state might not be able to provide jobs, redistribute incomes and protect against unwanted imports. Second, globalization appears to threaten the global stature of a country that has long prided itself

on its international prominence. Indeed, to the extent that globalization means ceding world leadership to the United States, especially since the Bretton Woods Agreement in 1944, it is particularly difficult for France to accept. Preparing to rebuild the capitalist economies of European states, as World War II was still raging, delegates from all 44 allied nations gathered in the New Hampshire resort of Bretton Woods (in the U.S.) for a United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference. The delegates signed the Bretton Woods Agreement in July 1944: the agreement was setting up a system of rules, institutions, and procedures to regulate the international political economy. But mainly, it was effectively achieving the common goals of the leading states that had created it, especially the United States. Hence, Gordon and Meunier (2001) argue, the perception by French citizens that French society is threatened by a globalization often equated with Americanization.

France is also the country famous for its defense of the idea of “cultural exception” as a protectionist policy against globalization: in fact, French government has rejected several agreements and treaties based on this “cultural exception” argument. The expression was ‘coined’ in the 1980s, by then French Minister of Culture Jack Lang, and was especially used during the Uruguay Round negotiations of the GATT in 1993. Briefly, the function of the GATT was to establish some rules for trade at a global scale². The new issues of services and intellectual property were added by the United States to

² The GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) was the only international instrument fixing the rules of trade at the global level at this time. It has since been replaced by the WTO (World Trade Organization) in 1995.

the traditional GATT agenda: the U.S. wanted then to apply free trade to “cultural goods.” This meant that the U.S. sought to have trade in the cultural area treated under the same conditions as trade in other commercial goods. This led to a strong reaction in France: the French engaged in a vigorous battle in order to exclude the audiovisual productions from the negotiations based on the principle of “cultural exception”, and successfully resisted the U.S. pressure on this cultural issue. France thus managed to preserve the right to subsidize and protect its cultural goods with quotas. For France’s President, François Mitterrand, this was “a question of civilization.” So rather than using the language of trade negotiations, as Gregory Flynn (1995) shows, Mitterrand then chose to use the language of identity to mobilize French support for his political position. Policy in this case was equated with the defense of French national identity through the concept of “cultural exception.” In the same way, Anton Brender (2004) argues, the “no to Maastricht” slogan in France, during the referendum campaign of 1991 to vote on the Maastricht Treaty (treaty forging the European political and economic union) is considered by some French observers as what started the resistance against a certain globalization. Indeed, the European construction (as in the Maastricht Treaty, the “German” Europe and Brussels’ bureaucracy) was then perceived as profiting from globalization already. According to Ancelovici (2002), the Maastricht Treaty itself put the idea of a “pensée unique” (single/uniform thought), i.e. neo-liberalism in this case, at the center of the public debates over public policy. The Treaty was nearly defeated by French voters by a slight margin (51% against 49%) during the referendum planned in France by then President Mitterrand in September 1992.

Then, it has been argued by several authors (Sommier, 2003; Tartakowsky, 2001; Berger, 2002, 2003; Brender, 2004; Ancelovici, 2002), that even before the groundbreaking anti-globalization protest of 1999 in Seattle, by the end of 1995 France experienced the biggest mass mobilization since the events of May 1968. Indeed, the French strikes and protest movements of winter 1995 (November-December) against RPR Prime Minister Alain Juppé's plan of reforms, that paralyzed the country for 3 weeks, seem to represent the premonitory sign or forerunner of the anti-globalization movements that will emerge a few years later all over Europe. The protesters were challenging the government's proposals to reform established pension and health care funding arrangements, social security and the status of France's publicly owned utilities. The authors contend that the 1995 movement can be analyzed as the first significant rejection or refusal of the neo-liberal conditions that are relayed by the politicians and the French government. The protesters of the 1995 strikes placed the contention and the debate not only at the national level, but also at the European level (through a criticism of Maastricht Treaty criteria) and at the international level (through a resistance to transnational corporations and the "tyranny of the financial markets"). Brender (2004) argues that people were simply expressing their resistance to the progressive elimination of national specificity, and their desire to preserve the French social security system and the public services system. Particularly, workers in France's rail and public transport system were the driving force behind a much broader strike and social movement which included public employees from the telecommunications, the postal service and the education sector (Krishnan, 1996). Indeed, the issue of pension funds was the main issue

for the remaining of public sector workers as much as for the workers of the rail and public transport sector. Also, noticeably, the protests saw alliances formed between unions and the movements of the “without” or the “excluded” (le mouvement des “sans”, e.g. the homeless, the undocumented immigrants, the unemployed), although these alliances might have been temporary or punctual (Sommier, 2003), while political parties were noticeably absent from the movement. Hence, Lovecy (1999) argues, throughout contention, these movements invoked the republican citizenship themes of social protection and economic intervention to defend social rights. Indeed, in an article published by daily French newspaper *Le Monde* on December 7th of 1995, journalist Erik Izraelewicz describes the strike wave of December 1995 as the first strikes in an advanced industrial nation against globalization: he calls it “the first upheaval against globalization” (Ancelovici, 2002: 434). After several weeks of conflict, Juppé withdrew his reform plan. From that moment on, a “galaxy” of social movements is constituted, which includes more associations and community organizations than simply workers’ unions (Tartakowsky, 2001): some of these movements appeared in the late 1980s, but most of them were founded after 1990³. For example, militants from *Droits devant!* (Dd!, created in 1995), from the *Comité des sans logis* (CDSL, created in 1993), and of the *Droit au logement* (DAL, created in 1990), all associations fighting for the human rights (particular of the minorities in France), against homelessness and for better housing conditions for everyone, constitute a part of this “galaxy” on the one hand. The *Association pour l’emploi, l’information, la solidarité* (APEIS, created in 1987), the

³ For reasons explored in Chapter II.1.ii. Contention against globalization, Pp. 13.

Action contre le Chômage (AC!, created in 1994) and the Mouvement national des chômeurs et précaires (MNCP, created in 1986), all organizations and associations engaged in a battle against unemployment and the precarious conditions of the unemployed, compose the other part of the “galaxy”. With the support of workers’ unions (CGT, FSU, SUD PTT, CP), as well as with the help of the CADAC (Commission des associations pour le droit à l’avortement et la contraception, a women’s rights, pro-choice association that appeared in 1990), militants from all these different associations will write a political manifesto, the “L’appel des sans” (the “Call of the without”). Then, this “galaxy” of movements will even widen during the protest movement of the unemployed in the winter of 1997-1998.

Finally, Fougier (2001) demonstrates, France is after all the country of José Bové, a sheep farmer who, in August 1999, dismantled a McDonald’s restaurant in Southern France to protest against U.S. sanctions, the World Trade Organization and globalization in general. Incidentally, José Bové is the leader of the Confédération Paysanne (a farmers’ association created in 1987, representing $\frac{1}{4}$ of the French farmers, according to Mathieu, 2001) that is a founding organization member of ATTAC. In fact, the Confédération Paysanne has been particularly sensitive to and has publicly raised the issues of biodiversity and food safety: according to the association, it is the liberalization of commerce for agricultural products that could have fatal consequences for the environment and for consumers’ health (Mathieu, 2001). Additionally, the Confédération Paysanne is also protesting the U.S. trade sanctions against French agricultural products. At any rate, thanks to the media portraying him as a hero, José

Bové became an overnight self-declared “leader” of angry French farmers: this event made him an instant “Astérix” protecting France against foreign invasions (as the French comics character defending ancient “Gaule” against the Romans). Also, as Gordon and Meunier (2001) note, there have been and still are countless number of articles, books and TV or radio programs criticizing globalization in the 1990s: for example, there has been an ‘assault’ on neo-liberalism and the role of the media, led by the late French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, as well as numerous attacks on globalization in the monthly paper *Le Monde Diplomatique*. For example, Bourdieu published several articles/opinion pieces in *Le Monde* or *Le Monde Diplomatique*, especially after the strikes of winter 1995, on the one hand criticizing the neo-liberal ideology, and on the other hand urging associations and organizations to use the momentum of the 1995 movement to oppose neo-liberalism with expertise discourses (Sommier, 2003). French politicians, finally, have rapidly adopted and exploited a rhetoric of “the need to master globalization”. For example, France is the only country from which the government has sent a official state representatives (Secretary of State for External Commerce, François Huwart and Secretary of State for Solidary Economy, Guy Hascoët) to attend the Alternative World Social Forum in Porto Alegre (Brazil) in January 2001. For all these reasons, it only seems relevant to focus this study on France’s resistance to globalization. Finally, as Lilian Mathieu (2001) remarks, this big wave of contentious movements against neo-liberal globalization has been dominated by the French social movement ATTAC almost right at the beginning or at least by the mid-1990s.

III.2 History of ATTAC

According to Franck Poupeau (2002), ATTAC became a central actor within the French social movement precisely because ATTAC concentrates in its organization a great number of pre-existing collective movements, associations and unions that are the most active in France at the moment. ATTAC was attractive to these other organizations because its founders took position for more participative democracy within the association, breaking with traditional hierarchies in older movements (for example the trade unions). Also, ATTAC has become the main interlocutor for the French media regarding anti-globalization issues: for example, it is asked to take a stand on José Bové's actions against a McDonald's, or on the September 11th attacks against the World Trade Center. Therefore, as Maud Barlow and Tony Clarke (2000) have underlined, it is time that we now pay a particular attention to ATTAC, as it is a fundamental player in the anti-globalization movement in France and worldwide now. In this part I will therefore discuss the genesis, the structures, the demands and the types of intervention of ATTAC.

III.2.i. The birth

Anti-globalization French movement ATTAC was officially born on June 3rd 1998 in France, created by Bernard Cassen (Professor at the University of Paris VIII and Director of *Le Monde Diplomatique*, monthly magazine), who was elected the first President of ATTAC. It all started in December 1997, with an initiative of *Le Monde Diplomatique*: in an editorial entitled "Disarming the Markets", Ignacio Ramonet (then Director of Publication at *Le Monde Diplomatique*) discussed what he called the

“tyranny of financial markets”, and ended with an appeal suggesting the creation of an organization around the idea of the Tobin Tax. The Tobin Tax refers to a tax on financial transactions (or a small tax on currency transactions designed to curb speculative capital flows) that was proposed by the late North American Yale professor and Nobel Prize economist James Tobin, in 1972. Hence the name of the organization, ATTAC, which stands for Association pour la Taxe Tobin pour l’Aide aux Citoyens or Action for a Tobin Tax for the Aid of Citizens. According to Cassen (2003), the name ATTAC came to Ignacio Ramonet because he was thinking of American director Robert Aldrich’s 1956 movie called “Attack”⁴, so he basically conceived the acronym first and found out what it would stand for afterwards. Actually, the initial response to Ramonet’s editorial back in December 1997 was a flood of phone calls and letters. By March 1998, there was more pressure from individuals and associations to proceed with something concrete. So the first step in the creation was to bring together organizations that had responded to the appeal. The basic strategic choice for its initiator(s) was to build ATTAC out of existing structures, whether civic associations, social movements, newspapers or unions. They all then agreed on the statutes, a political program and a provisional leadership. The first national meeting of ATTAC was held on October 17th of 1998 in the city of La Ciotat (region of the Bouches-du-Rhône, southeast of France).

III.2.ii. The framing: “the world is not for sale”

At its creations, the founders agreed on three general points:

⁴ A movie about cowardice and corruption among American officers fighting the Germans in Belgium during World War II.

(1) A challenge to the hegemony of ultraliberalism requires the construction of credible alternatives; (2) the taxation of financial transactions, particularly the Tobin Tax, could contain economic insecurity and inequality; (3) the urgency of checking the damage of financial globalization requires a civic burst transcending traditional cleavages in France and the world. (Ancelovici, 2002)

The movement thus claims global objectives and common goals as defined in its agenda.

For ATTAC (Ancelovici, 2002), globalization is defined by the convergence of two trends: the restructuring of the mode of state intervention in the economy, the liberalization and opening of national markets, and the emergence of global, primarily financial, markets on the one hand; and the incorporation of an increasing share of human activities in the market on the other hand. Indeed, ATTAC's strong claim is that "financial globalization increases economic insecurity and social inequalities. It bypasses and belittles the choices of peoples, democratic institutions, and the sovereign states in charge of the general interest. It replaces them with strictly speculative logics expressing the sole interests of transnational corporations and financial markets." (ATTAC, 2000) Then, the effects of globalization as identified by ATTAC (ATTAC, 2000) are threefold: globalization is a race to the bottom (as far as labor standards, cultural production, public services and the environment are concerned). It also means a decline of sovereignty and democracy: in Cassen's words, "democracy itself is the prime victim of free trade and globalization" (Cassen, 1997). Finally, the commodification of living organisms (for example, the privatization of agronomic and biotechnological research and the concentration of firms in the seed industry) constitutes a real "hold-up

of the living” in the name of progress and competitiveness. It in fact substitutes a logic of profit and efficiency for the common good.

The platform adopted in 1998 states the general goals of the movement as follows: “to re-conquer space lost by democracy to the sphere of finance, to oppose any new abandonment of national sovereignty on the pretext of the ‘rights’ of investors and merchants, and to create a democratic space at the global level”. So ATTAC’s principal or general aim is a combat against this “tyranny of the markets”: they challenge and question the legitimacy of the international economic institutions. To them, the issue is the domination of financial speculation completely disconnected from the real state of the production and the trade of goods and services. Hence the idea promoted by ATTAC of the Tobin Tax, which ATTAC sees as the first step toward a transformation of the world economy: as Sommier (2003) explains, the project of a tax on all financial transactions would correspond to a 0.05% deduction that would limit speculation on the exchange markets. And according to ATTAC, “even fixed at the particularly low rate of 0.05%, the Tobin Tax would yield nearly \$100 billions per year. Collected essentially by industrialized countries, where the leading financial markets are located, this sum could then be given to international organizations to fight against inequality, promote education and public health in poor countries, and foster food safety and sustainable development.” (ATTAC, 2000) In the end, for ATTAC, globalization is essentially a political product, so the solution lies in politics: “to challenge the domination of finance in a world where everything progressively becomes a commodity, where everything is

sold and bought, is to challenge the organization of economic, human, social, and political relations.” (ATTAC, 2000)

III.2.iii. The mission: “understand in order to act”

Ancelovici (2002) notes that one of the self-proclaimed *raison d'être* of ATTAC is “to develop a more specific discourse, an alternative and yet serious vision of the economy that will redefine the public debate while mobilizing the citizenry”. Yet, despite the presence of a scientific committee with high standards, ATTAC claims to be first and foremost an organization “with a real base” not just a “club of researchers or activists”, it is a “civic movement”.

In effect, according to Bernard Cassen (2003), ATTAC is “an action-oriented movement of popular education”. Cassen (2003) explains that the notion of “popular education” in France goes back to the 19th century. The “Ligue de l'Enseignement” (Teaching League) was formed in 1866, and many organizations were created afterwards. However, today, it takes a different form: militants must be well-informed, intellectually equipped for action. In fact, Vincenzo Ruggiero (2002) explains, the emphasis on knowledge is central to members of ATTAC. For Lilian Mathieu (2001), the originality of ATTAC precisely resides in the way the founders and now the members wish to pursue their main objectives: a great part of ATTAC's activities is dedicated to the production and diffusion of knowledge and information through books, booklets, flyers, pamphlets, and interventions in the media. This diffusion of information is available on the Internet which facilitates the transmission at the national and international levels –the association has 200 translators who provide propaganda

material in 10 languages: each month, ATTAC's website is contacted at least 800000 times from 90 different countries (Ruggiero, 2002). Through the diffusion of their monthly magazine ("Lignes d'ATTAC" in paper version), of their web newsletter ("Grain de Sable"), and their book collection ("Mille et Une Nuits" edition, with their publisher Fayard), ATTAC wishes to accomplish two things: one is to provide arguments for a counter-expertise on globalization, and the other is to help nurture a "movement of popular education turned to action" (Sommier, 2003). For Steinhilber (2002), through this "popular education" and through new political experiences, ATTAC has opened to people different opportunities of learning, which is something that is not offered today by the Left parties for example. Danielle Tartakowsky (2001) also argues that ATTAC's founders meant to encourage a new practice of politics through "scientific counter-expertise, field practices, scholarly knowledge and militant knowledge, national and international realities." In fact, Sommier (2003) argues, ATTAC is the French organization that is the most massively oriented towards the production of counter-expertise, and it has in this regard reached the level of some other countries, such as the U.S., where the notion and tradition of counter-expertise (such as seen with the presence of numerous think-tanks) is older and stronger. ATTAC's mission could be thus summarized into the trinity of "information, formation, action".

The action is also partly performed through protests. In fact, Mathieu (2001) notes, ATTAC has been one the most active organizations during the latest contentious mobilizations that have disturbed international summits (Davos, WTO, FMI, EU, and G8 summits). For Sommier (2003), the protests or rallies or forums, "transnational

episodes” as she calls them, are moments of articulation between national movements: they allow the exchange of experiences, the diffusion of repertoires of action, slogans, issues, general information. ATTAC organized protests everywhere in France against the MAI treaty in 1998. Two World Social Forums in Porto Alegre (Brazil) in 2001 and 2002 saw 60,000 participants, with 15,000 delegates, 800 of which were French, some specifically from ATTAC (which was coordinating the participation of all the French organizations at both forums). Then Genoa Social Forum happened. As Lesley Wood (2004) remarks, the most visible sites of anti-globalization protest have been the summits of the WTO, IMF, and the World Bank. The demonstrations precisely happen at the location of these transnational institutions because it is their very existence, and their legitimacy, that ATTAC is questioning and challenging. However, they also happen at the local level, wherever issues have been identified as a consequence of globalization. Waters (1998) notes that actually, movements like ATTAC are using new forms of protest that have innovative strategies, especially at the local level: symbolic action, festivals, gorilla theater, media-directed events, petition movements and other civil disobedient acts. For example, some of ATTAC’s members, allied with members of the farmer’s association Confédération Paysanne are launching regular “raids” against GMO plantation farms throughout France where they tear out experimental cultures in the fields. Or, for example, in order to denounce the “fiscal paradises” through which capital fluxes transit, members of ATTAC have performed a mock/parody “landing” in June 2001 on Jersey Island (to mock the June 1944 “landing” by British and American troops). Through these types of actions, members wish to physically or symbolically

“take over” the object of their contestation. Generally, Jochen Steinhilber (2002) adds that the strength and originality of ATTAC comes from the fact that it has opened to people different opportunities of learning through education and political experiences, which are not offered today by the Left parties (because they don't have the forums). It also has strength precisely because it is organized nationally and locally. Actually, Ancelovici (2002) underlines that throughout its entire agenda or framing, ATTAC draws a clear causal link between local and national problems and changes in the international economy.

III.2. iv. The structure

ATTAC's structure is relatively formal. There are written rules, procedures, a division of labor, territorial units, and formal membership criteria (Ancelovici, 2002). The association is directed by a administration bureau of 30 members who are elected by the members (18 of whom are elected by the 70 founders of ATTAC and 12 by the membership at large), and possess a scientific council composed of 110 members who provide their expertise in different fields.

Membership dues are the primary source of ATTAC's funding: they are collected at the national level, and 25% of the total is redistributed to local committees depending on their membership level. Most of the rest of the funding comes from donations and public subsidies. For example, the government of Raffarin (a right wing government) had allocated 500 000 euros for ATTAC to organize the European Social Forum in St Denis in the fall of 2003 (Hassoux, 2005). Also, local governments have been known to support ATTAC's actions: the Provence regional government for example, (and

especially with the support of the President of the Regional Council, Socialist Michel Vauzelle) had given 30 000 euros, three years in a row, to help ATTAC plan and organize its “Summer Session University” in the south of France (Hassoux, 2005). These summer universities are part of the education action promoted by ATTAC for the formation of its members: they consist of intensive ‘seminars’ and colloquia over 3 or 4 days, usually in the summer (August) –when most public sector employees take their vacation time-. The seminars are ‘taught’ or moderated by members of ATTAC who are professors, academics, specialty experts or activists in other organizations. Each summer university presents an overall theme: for example, the 2005 Summer University dealt with the issues of “neo-liberalism, society, state, democracy”. Then each seminar is composed of different topics: for example, in the case of the 2005 Summer University, “the consequences of free-trade”, “what kind of Europe do we want?”, “rights and justice under neo-liberalism”, “anti-globalization movement and feminist movement”, “culture”, and “energy”. The seminars are not necessarily held in an actual university building; they can take place in symposium or conference centers and other types of public places. Since the summer university system started (first in 2000), the universities have traditionally been held in the south of France, not in Paris, in order to connect with the large number of participants and ATTAC members who do not necessarily reside in the capital (although the Summer 2005 University was held in Poitiers, closer to the northwest of France than to the south). Also, symbolically, the first University was located in La Ciotat (small town near Marseille, southern France), where the first national meeting of ATTAC as an organization was held in 1998. Anyone can attend the

summer universities, although the number of seats is limited: people have to register (by email or postal mail) well in advance; additionally, there is a registration fee from 8 Euros to 82 Euros depending on the salary of the participants (self-reporting). However, for non-ATTAC members, the fee is set at 305 Euros, which according to ATTAC is the basic fee to be able to attend any kind of conference of this caliber. Besides the formal educational training that members receive, the summer universities provide something else: they allow members to discuss and exchange ideas, thoughts, tips, as well as to connect with different ATTAC chapters, to network and expand their connections, and finally to share experiences and grievances, regroup and gain strength from meeting other active participants. It is part of what Touraine (1991) calls cultural participation. Such degree of formalism in ATTAC's structure helps to mobilize resources (money, information, members) and challenge authorities for a more extended period of time.

However, despite its formalism, ATTAC is a decentralized and participatory structure: local committees/chapters enjoy a relative autonomy to decide what strategies and events they want to pursue within the bounds of the organization's general orientations. Each chapter has a president, a secretary and a treasurer, so in this sense they are independent of the national committee. So, according to Sommier (2003), with its organization and functioning in general assembly, and with the limitation of the number of permanent members (six for 35,000 members), ATTAC comes close to an idea of direct democracy. The number of local committees has actually dramatically increased: by 2002, there were 230 local committees throughout France. Additionally, ATTAC's leaders have taken positions in favor of a participative democracy of

proximity. However, these local committees were not part of the original plan as ATTAC was more conceived as a lobby group producing counter-expertise: thus local committees are not part of ATTAC's statutes. The creation of this horizontal network was completely a bottom-up process that took the national direction by surprise. Local committees play a crucial role in providing a space for innovative ideas and practices, but the main decisions and the funding remain centralized in the hands of the Parisian national direction. However, Cassen (2003) argues that nothing happens unless local chapters want it to: they are literally the backbone of the organization.

Also, although ATTAC was founded in France, it has spread outside of the country. In fact, it has many sister organizations abroad: by January 2002, there were 40 ATTAC organizations in Europe (in all EU member states), the Americas, Africa and Japan. By 2004, ATTAC was present in fifty countries. However, there is no presence in England for example because, according to Cassen (2003) England already has Oxfam, Friends of the Earth, and War on Want and other similar types of anti-globalization groups that have had a strong pre-existing presence all over England. This international presence is not the result of a planned strategy: according to Christophe Ventura (International Office secretary of ATTAC), "the creation of ATTAC associations outside of France is a spontaneous phenomenon." The international ATTAC movement was officially created at an international meeting in Paris, on December 1998. As noted in the ATTAC website presentation of the movement, this international movement was created for a better "democratic control of financial markets and their institutions." There are today about 80,000 members throughout the world. According to Cassen

(2003), in Europe, ATTAC's growth has especially been strong in the Nordic countries, which has come as a surprise to the organization leaders since this area (Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland) has had robust traditions of free-trade. Also, ATTAC has about 10,000 members in Germany and about 3000 members in Switzerland. According to Kolb (2005), ATTAC Germany was officially created in the fall of 2000: but the original initiative came in 1999 from Peter Wahl, then executive director of the development organization WEED (World Economy Ecology and Development) who formed a coalition with different organizations (e.g. Kairos Europa and Pax Christi both religious organizations working on justice or peace issue; Share, an environmental and antinuclear movement), which finally transformed into a network that officially became ATTAC. The headquarters of ATTAC Germany are located in Frankfurt. As for ATTAC Switzerland, before it was officially founded in 1999, there existed local sections for a few months that coordinated into ATTAC Switzerland. According to Florence Proton, General Secretary of ATTAC Switzerland (with whom I corresponded through emails), most of the membership comes from the academic field or the public sector: for example within the board there are college students, professors and researchers.

III.3 Demographics of ATTAC membership

According to Bernard Cassen (2003), there is currently no reliable data on the demographic characteristics of ATTAC in France [at best there are some opinion polls and samples]. However, I will attempt to present information, as gathered through ATTAC's website, newspapers, or other scholars, on ATTAC's founders and general membership, as well as its alliances with the political world.

III.3.i. The founding members

ATTAC was essentially founded by moral/legal entities (and it is the innovating aspect of the movement, according to Danielle Tartakowsky, 2001): some media (Le Monde Diplomatique, Politis, Charlie Hebdo, Témoignage Chrétien, Transversales), some associations (AC!, Amis de la Terre, Artisans du Monde, Droit Devant!, Raison d'Agir, CEDETIM, Réseaux des Services Publics Européens), and some unions (Confédération Paysanne, Groupe des 10), to name a few⁵. ATTAC was also created by founding members who are public personalities, whether from the media, from the entertainment sector, from academia, justice or politics, to give a symbolic effect: Susan George, Manu Chao, René Dumont, Viviane Forester, Gisèle Halimi, Bernard Langlois, Daniel Mermet, Ignacio Ramonet, Bernard Cassen, Jacques Robin, René Passet among others. However, not a single political party was involved in the creation of ATTAC. Only, later on, some political parties' local chapters will join.

III.3.ii. The general membership

The first members to join did so in October 1998. And as previously mentioned, the first national meeting took place in La Ciotat with 3,500 members at the time (October 1998). The membership of ATTAC-France is made of both individuals and legal entities such as unions, newspapers, and municipalities. There are currently about 35,000 members, and in recent years, teachers, intellectuals, and students represented about a third of its membership. There are also about 556 organizations (mostly unions and associations) that are members as legal entities.

⁵ See complete list of founding members organizations in Appendix C Pp. 234.

On the one hand, it seems that among individuals, recruitment is mainly done within lower-middle classes upwards, particularly in the public services, with a significant proportion of teachers and students, but employees and executives of the private sector are also present. There are also a few farmers and unemployed. Intellectuals though play a central role as active members rather than just symbolic members as observed in the willingness to popularize complex economic issues. In terms of age structure, under 35 years olds only account for 25 to 30% of the total membership. According to Cassen (2003), the youth culture is difficult to capture in any organized form: he sees it as a generation that goes from one big demonstration to another (Genoa, Barcelona, etc...) without ever really engaging in day-to-day activities, in a kind of political zapping. Additionally, most of the time, young adults are not involved in leadership positions, except at an intermediary level: instead we find more 45-50 years olds who have been participating in movements since the 1970s.

On the other hand, we do know that the working class or popular sectors (and workers in sectors directly challenged by globalization, such as the textile industry) is not represented in the movement. Actually, it has been noted by several authors that ATTAC has little or no impact yet on these categories. There is a strong predominance, however, of trade unions of the public sector (in particular teachers union): this is surprising considering that teachers are not directly affected by the consequences of globalization; however, other public sector employees (e.g. the transportation services, the utilities, French telecom) are directly impacted by globalization. In this sense, there does not seem to be a relationship between joining ATTAC and defending specific

economic interests. Nonetheless, despite the active presence and involvement of some unions (such as the Confédération Paysanne and its leader José Bové), the three major labor confederations (CGT, CFDT, FO) and other labor unions are underrepresented or have a very low profile: this seems to reflect ATTAC's declared willingness to construct an autonomous organization, not to be used by bigger players. Indeed, as previously mentioned, social classes are absent from ATTAC's discourse, and there is no reference to the labor or working class movement. Finally, immigrant associations as well as environmentalist organizations, and representatives of the entertainment sector are significant absentees. This absence of environmentalist organizations distinguishes the movement from US anti-globalization movements. Also noteworthy, some labor confederations, such as the CFDT have taken contrasting stand on globalization issues: the CFDT, for example, considers that globalization can actually benefit French workers.

Finally, according to Christophe Ventura (international office secretary of ATTAC) "the big difference between an NGO and [ATTAC] is that we are an organization with a real base. We are not a club of researchers and activists. We are a civic movement." (Ancelovici, 2002: 440) In fact, according to Sylvie Derrien, former coordinator of local committees for ATTAC, about a third of the members are active, in the sense that they regularly attend and participate in events (such as the mobilization against the G8 Summit in Evian, France, and the participation to a counter-summit, in May and June 2003).

III.3.iii. The alliances

1999 sees the creation of an ATTAC's coordination at the French National Assembly at the initiative of the Green Party (by Yves Cochet) and other parties (PS, PC, PRG, MDC). It is accompanied by a document entitled "ATTAC and politics". Today the coordination at the French National Assembly has 130 deputies, as well as 40 members at the French Senate. There is also an ATTAC Coordination at the European parliament.

In May 2001, the French Prime Minister who was seeking to find a "anti-globalization advisor", met with some ATTAC's representatives. In July 2001, the General Secretary of the Socialist Party, François Hollande, met with representatives of ATTAC, and made a declaration in favor of the Tobin Tax. Also, after some campaigning by French elected officials, also supported by different French initiatives within European instances, 400 elected representatives throughout the world have now declared their support in favor of the Tobin Tax. Finally, despite the fact that then socialist Prime Minister Lionel Jospin (his government) has officially rejected the idea of a Tobin Tax, we must note that the ATTAC coordination at the National Assembly is dominated by socialists, and the coordination at the European parliament is led by a socialist deputy.

These examples illustrate one of the main "threats" weighing on anti-globalization movements like ATTAC: political threat of manipulation. The presence of elected officials in Porto Alegre in January 2001 (as mentioned earlier) confirms this fear. Indeed, the dynamism showed by ATTAC with recruitment, participation, and

action in politics appeals to political parties and unions who see their membership or active participation decline. In fact, ATTAC's militants often underline that their success in terms of participation proves that the "depolitization" of French society thesis is wrong, and shows instead the desire of people to participate more actively in the life of society ("la vie de la cité"). So, the attempt of exploitation and/or manipulation by political parties or unions is dreadful for ATTAC's founders (and members).

However, ATTAC's statutes themselves already show their defiance towards any "entrism". Through its constitution, ATTAC meant to react to the anarcho-unionist attempts of manipulation, claiming that "ATTAC is not a political party and has no vocation to become so." Indeed, as noted by Mathieu (2001), ATTAC refuses to be the "launching belt" of any political party: its statutes affirm that the association cannot present a candidate to any elections, that it refuses to support any political party in any elections, and that it is forbidden for ATTAC's members to run for an election under the label "ATTAC". However, ATTAC's founders have expressed the strong idea that ATTAC will be drawn to be "doing politics".

Also, the latest elections in France in May 2005, namely the referendum on the European Constitution⁶ to which ATTAC had proposed to vote "no" shows that ATTAC is in fact independent from the major parties. Actually, an article in *Libération* (June 4th, 2005) by Didier Hassoux shows how the Socialist Party (who had campaigned for the "yes" to the European Constitution) calls ATTAC's stand "betrayal" and plans to make

⁶ Referendum on the European Constitution organized in May 2005 in France by President Chirac, to which 55% French people voted no.

them “pay” for it. As an example, it seems that ATTAC will have a difficult time gaining the financial support (22 000 euros) it requested to help with the organization and planning of its famous “Summer Session University” that is to take place in Poitiers during the 2005 summer (Hassoux, 2005). Indeed, in May 2005, ATTAC had requested financial support for its “Summer University” to Socialist Ségolène Royal (President of the Regional Council of Poitou-Charentes, where Poitiers is located), who had been a strong supporter of the “yes” to the Referendum on the European Constitution: it seems that since the 29th of May, things are stalling (Hassoux, 2005).

III.4 Conclusion

First, as Lilian Mathieu (2001) underlines, if ATTAC’s main preoccupation and demand is a fight in favor of the Tobin Tax, this must not conceal the diversity of the fights and struggles at the local levels. Ancelovici (2002) argues that in contrast to traditional Leftist arguments, social classes are absent from ATTAC’s discourse. There is no reference to the labor or working class movement and even old-fashioned “capitalism” is barely mentioned. Issues are framed in terms of citizenship, democracy, solidarity, global markets, financial institutions and corporations (not in terms of the hegemony of transnational bourgeoisie). Mathieu (2001) also says that even if this contestation against globalized capitalism seems to take on the classical themes of the 1970s Left or extreme-Left, it does so without any reference to a pre-established theoretical framework, and it is very careful to avoid falling into some kind of revolutionary “prophetism”. Actually it is because this “politics against global markets” frame avoids old themes of the Left, such as the class struggle, and stresses the inclusive

identity of citizen, that it is widening its appeal. This frame also provides a convenient way to criticize free markets and capitalism without having to rely on a Marxist vocabulary and framework. It allows actors to avoid two stigmatizing charges in contemporary France: that of being archaic (Marxism) and corporatist.

Furthermore, I will argue in this study, besides the official aims and goals of the movement, there are also local struggles and particular grievances as defined by each member of this social movement organization. Therefore, we need to look not only at the collective action frames, but also at the diversity of distinct individual/local grievances to see how they both connect and build the unity of the movement. In other words, we need to show how the diversity and convergence of discourses are an integral part of the movement life, and perhaps strength. As Sidney Tarrow (1998: 122) puts it: “it is in struggle that people discover which values they share, as well as what divides them, and learn to frame their appeals around the former and paper over the latter.”

Second, ATTAC as a transnational movement contributes to the anti-globalization movement scene in two ways: through the originality of its structure and mission; and through its successful activities (linked to the first factor).

On the one hand, the specificity of ATTAC lies in its structure in the sense that it has the originality to be directed by a scientific committee/council composed of researchers, academics and other associations' militants, that is in charge of writing the texts defining the platform and missions of ATTAC and above all explaining what is at stake in the fight over globalization (Sommier, 2003). The organizational structure is itself linked to the originality of the mission of ATTAC which resides in the work of popular education.

Indeed, the objective pursued through the diffusion of a prolific literature (publication of books, pamphlets or newsletters on-line, probably the major activity at ATTAC) is to give a counter-expertise on globalization and encourage the popularization of these alternatives to the militants. ATTAC is actually, according to Sommier (2003), the French organization the most massively geared towards the production of a counter-expertise. This way, it has contributed to fill the gap between the French movements and other countries, such as the U.S. where the tradition of the think-tanks is much older and stronger. In this desire for expert knowledge to be diffused at every level, we see the expression of a strong civic dimension that is claimed by the association (Mathieu, 2001). It actually exemplifies a particular conception of civic engagement or dedication that members should follow in their fight against neo-liberal globalization at the transnational level. In fact, Sommier (2003) notes, most of the new social movements (such as anti-globalization movements) have more easily internationalized their action than traditional organizations (such as union confederations). Anti-globalization movements have rapidly organized contention at the global level, very much the way ATTAC did. Also, similarly to anti-globalization groups, ATTAC promotes the idea of actions rooted in the local and the daily life of its members and of the social actors in general, while connecting everything to larger audiences and issues (at the regional or international levels), following the principle of “think global, act local” shared by numerous transnational movements (Sommier, 2003). Finally, however, whereas anti-globalization mobilizations are played out between the local (with groups engaged in local actions) and the global (the international institutions such as WTO), leaving the

national level relatively absent from the background, ATTAC takes another route (Sommier, 2003). Indeed, ATTAC as an organization precisely denounces the lack of involvement and resignation of the state and the governments: it is in fact calling on the French state in particular on issues such as social housing, unemployment, etc...(Sommier, 2003).

On the other hand, the victories of ATTAC can be read under different angles. First, in a couple of years, the association managed to come to the center of the stage of French social movements for several reasons: indeed, ATTAC concentrates a great number of very diverse collective groups, associations and some unions, which had not been realized before (Poupeau, 2002); in fact, Sommier (2003) argues, the critique of neo-liberalism as proclaimed by ATTAC puts the organization at the center of different struggles that makes it so successful and attractive (the fight of the “without”, the denunciation of food safety related issues, or the critique of the disengagement of the state). ATTAC also took a specific stand in favor of a participative democracy of proximity, which attracted numerous local organizations and individuals. Finally, ATTAC has been the main supporter of the Confédération Paysanne, especially its leader, emblematic figure José Bové, when it/he was under attack and on trial⁷ for destroying fields of GMOs. Second, ATTAC is one of the most active associations in protest mobilizations against the latest international summits of the G8 or the WTO (Mathieu, 2001). Equally, during the two social counter forums in Porto Alegre (2001

⁷ After José Bové’s court trial, 45% of the French said “they supported or felt sympathy for him”, compared with 4% who were opposed or hostile (Gordon and Meunier, 2001: 23).

and 2002) that have seen 60,000 participants, ATTAC had been mandated to be the coordinating force for all French organizations present at the forums (Poupeau, 2002). In this regard, ATTAC successfully became the speaker for numerous and diverse groups, simultaneously being placed at the heart of the construction and nurturing of a collective consciousness questioning globalization. Actually, ATTAC is the most famous French group outside of France that also possesses the largest transnational network (Sommier, 2003). Mathieu (2001) further explains that the large presence of French militants at mobilizations in foreign countries and cities has largely contributed to the popularity of ATTAC. And eventually, it is argued (Sommier, 2003; Poupeau, 2002) that ATTAC was at the center of mobilization against the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (which was going to render illegal regulations protecting cultural investments in Europe) in 1998: the mobilization by famous individuals members of ATTAC (actors, writers, filmmakers) as well as the national and local demonstrations had provoked the collapse of the negotiations.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

IV.1 Methodological model: qualitative research method

The gap between a familiar ‘we’ and an exotic ‘they’ is a major obstacle to a meaningful understanding of the Other, an obstacle that can only be overcome through some form of participation in the world of the Other.

Loring Danforth, *The Death Rituals of Rural Greece*, in Clifford Geertz *Works and Lives. The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford University Press, 1988.

In this chapter I would like to describe the conditions of production on my knowledge, that is, how it was acquired, using what methods and what methodological framework in general, in which context and situation. Furthermore, I will also explore how my presence/research was received, perceived by the population I describe. Particularly, I will depict my relationship with the interviewees, and how all those played out in the production of the knowledge itself. I will give a contextual account of my observations during fieldwork as a participant in different meetings and assemblies. I will relate, as fieldworker experienced specific difficulties and biases with which I struggled during all the process.

IV.1.i. Qualitative research: general definition

There is a long tradition in the social sciences of qualitative research. This has been understood as involving extensive participant observation fieldwork and in-depth case-oriented study of a relatively small number of cases.

Qualitative research seeks detailed knowledge of specific cases, with the goal of finding out “how” things happen. Such studies may include ethnographies of groups, places,

organizations, or activities; analyses of people's lives and experiences; historical comparative analysis, and case studies of a wide range of phenomena, including social movements, revolutions, state-building and other political phenomena. Goodwin and Horowitz (2002) note that despite the many differences in approaches, techniques, and theories in qualitative studies, most of them are similar in their emphasis on capturing or representing in considerable depth or detail what is or was going on in one or a few cases of something judged socially significant. They also argue that the most important link among qualitative studies is their rich descriptions or narratives of cultural, emotional, and social life, sometimes in comparative framework. Indeed, most qualitative studies are generally not about attitudes, norms, roles or other abstract concepts but more about what people actually say and do in specific places and institutions, including their interactions with others over time, i.e. how social things occur or develop in social and temporal context. In order to accomplish this, qualitative sociologists will attempt to remain as close as possible to the actual phenomena that they are trying to understand. I argue with Goodwin and Horowitz (2002) that qualitative sociologists believe that their cases have to be understood contextually or holistically, and with attention to temporal ordering. Therefore, cultural and historical specificity matter enormously.

Finally, Marcus (1998) suggests that the advantage of qualitative research, especially involving field work is that, even if the researcher's question –his/her problematic- is already set in a theoretical framework, the subject of his/her study not only reveals itself during the fieldwork but also evolves, changes, takes new and unexpected turns, because the fieldwork itself creates the subject of the study “as it goes

and because it goes” (Marcus, 1998). Fieldwork not only transforms the researcher’s starting question regarding his/her subject but also creates new questions, new subjects that then become part of the initial question, problematic, subject.

Finally, J.P. Olivier de Sardan (1995) says that qualitative methodology, and especially fieldwork, proceeds with “intuition, improvisation and bricolage”, and such was my experience.

IV.1.ii. Participant observation and interview methods

To undertake the fieldwork on which this thesis is based, I chose two methods: participant observation and interviews.

First, participant observation can be defined as observing and participating in social action as the action is happening (Lichterman, 1998). The expression was coined in 1924 by sociologist Lindeman who was connected to the School of Chicago (Kirk and Miller, 1986). Starting in the 1930s, participant observation becomes the distinctive sign of ethnographic research in all Western societies, after Bronislaw Malinowski systematized it in terms of methodology in his study of the “Argonauts of Western Pacific”. Participant observation can teach us about the meanings of movements that would be difficult if not impossible to learn through other methods alone (Lichterman, 1998). So basically, this method involves the researcher “getting to know” the people they are studying by entering their world and participating in that world. This means you put yourself “in the shoes” of the people you are studying in an attempt to experience events in the way they experience them. Sociologists who use participant observation aim to discover the nature of social reality by understanding the actor's perception /

understanding / interpretation of the social world. While it has historically been associated with the symbolic interactionist perspective, it is also used in other approaches. It is about “really understanding, through personal experience, what is going on in any given situation” (Lichterman, 1998). David Downes and Paul Rock (1998) justify participant observation in the following way:

It is a theoretical commitment that drives the sociologist into participant observation. The claim is made that social behavior cannot be understood unless it is personally experienced. Sociologists who lean on external accounts and objective evidence can have no appreciation of why people act. Neither can they understand environments and history as their subjects do. Interactionists and others who elevate meaning to a central place contend that participation is indispensable to the interpretation of human conduct.

In other words, participant observation is a method that attempts to understand the motives and meanings of people's behavior from the viewpoint of those involved in the behavior being studied. While in the field, the researcher is engaged in multiple interactions at multiple levels in permanence: far from just being a witness, s/he is immersed in verbal or non-verbal social interactions, whether complex or simple, conversations, chats, solicitations, or presentations. Hence at all times, throughout participant observation, “the researcher is a co-actor” (J.P. Olivier de Sardan, 1995). Therefore, it is not a question of going native, it is a question of “living a multiplex life: sailing at once in several seas” (Geertz, 1988).

In the case of the study of social movements, Lichterman (1998) argues that by observing and participating in action as the action is happening, we can discover the meaning of group life itself, which activist groups as much as other groups must take for

granted most of the time in order to keep working together. We will understand more about not only social movements but volunteer groups and a variety of informal public groups if we attend closely to what it means to be a member, what it means to be publicly involved. Additionally, Lichterman (1998) notes, researchers usually think of activists as storming barricades, lying down in roads, confronting the police. However activists or social movement members engage in discussions before and after actions. Their discussions may be of many different natures: for example, they draw up position statements, or they argue about public issues or on what they should be discussing. According to Lichterman (1998), the function of these discussions is to serve as strategy sessions in which activists figure out which definition of the issue will get the broadest following or the widest press coverage. They can also serve for activists to figure out their opinions as members of society, as citizens. Sociologists of culture who have increasingly taken on C. Wright Mills' perspective on studying motives by looking at discourses rather than people's psyches. I join others and argue with Lichterman's (1998) claim that participant-observers can find out what traditions, symbols and stories make activism meaningful as it is happening in everyday life.

In the case of my research, more precisely, participant observation can be considered, as J.P. Olivier de Sardan (1995) calls it, an "observation from inside", at least to the extent that I can become an insider without actually living with people. I chose this method because it allowed me to integrate myself in the movement's routine, everyday life, different activities, and the movement's culture at the local level, and thus get a better sense of what the life of the chapters is about. It also helped me get

acquainted with people in general within each local chapter, so that they knew who I was after my participation in several meetings or other activities.

My participant observation was overt. As the name suggests, overt participant observation involves the researcher being open with the group they are going to study. In other words, before joining a group the researcher is likely to inform the group's members (either personally or through the agency of a 'sponsor' or privileged informant) about such things as the purpose of the research, its scope, how long the research will last and so forth. In this respect, therefore, the research is done with the permission and co-operation of the group and the fact of being open with the group being researched carries with it certain advantages and disadvantages as far as the overall conduct of the research is concerned.

As J.P. Olivier de Sardan (1995) reminds us, "the researcher is a voyeur but he is also a listener." So, if the interpretation process is connected to the observation (hence to the description) of subjects, we should not forget about listening. In fact, the production of analysis by ethnographers based on people's discourse remains a central tool of fieldwork research. This is so because, Olivier de Sardan (1995) argues, the representations of local or native social actors are an essential element to any comprehension of the social. To be able to give an account from the actors' standpoint is probably the greatest ambition of ethnographers (Olivier de Sardan, 1995). The interview hence remains a privileged means to produced discursive "data": individuals are solicited for their "competency" on their local society/community, or more simply for their personal experience as social actors.

For the purpose of this research, I chose to apply semi-structured interview. As noted by Fielding (1993), this type of interview implies that certain major questions are asked generally the same way for each interview. Hence, it is recommended in that case to have a questionnaire in hand, which I did, that serves as a “canvas” or a guide: it organizes the questions in advance so that the important themes of the research are kept in mind at all times. However, this does not mean that we are doing a police investigation: the interview in the case of fieldwork research must be conceived as an interaction between individuals, who are partners in interaction, with their own impression management, cognitive resources, knowledge, etc...So in this sense, the semi-structured interview gives the individuals enough freedom to adapt the research instrument to the level of comprehension and the specific context (Fielding, 1993). This way, it allows the researcher to respect the dynamic of the interaction itself without forgetting his/her problematic. Hence, the interviewer and the interviewee are able to take their own path and rhythm within a certain guideline: for example, it is better in order to handle the fact that in responding to a question people might provide answers to the next question; it also allows both the interviewer and the interviewee to admit that there are detours and digressions, hesitations and contradictions during the interview, and that there are part of the dialogue. In fact, Vera Taylor (1998) for example, used the semi-structured interview in social movement research because of its compatibility with her commitment, as a feminist scholar, to allowing women to describe their experience in their own terms, to developing more egalitarian relationships with interviewees, and to encouraging interviewees to introduce new research questions based on their own

lived experiences. In the end, it was, for Taylor (1998) a matter of allowing herself to become personally involved with interviewees in several instances. It is not only a question of making everyone feel comfortable or at ease, but it is also, for Olivier de Sardan (1995) a question of “epistemological attitude”.

In the case of my research, the interviews are the central element of the case-study, as they are the main “locus of production of interpretative models” (Olivier de Sardan, 1995), that is, they constitute the core of my study. The interviews, through the questions I asked to others, responded to the questions I asked myself, i.e. my problematic and my object. They are part of the idea of immersion of the researcher in the field: hence, by listening (and observing) to the subjectivity of people, by using the form of ordinary dialog, interviews allowed me to familiarize myself to people’s culture, people’s contrasted and heterogeneous discourses.

IV.1.iii. Ethnographic approach and feminist methodology in social movement research

What, then is truth? A mobile army of metaphors, metonyms, and anthropomorphisms – in short, a sum of human relations, which have been enhanced, transposed, and embellished poetically and rhetorically, and which after long use seem firm, canonical, and obligatory to a people.

Friedrich Nietzsche, *On Truth and Lie in the Extral-Moral Sense*. New York, 1954.

In a general sense, ethnography (from the Greek “ethnos”, group of people, and “graphein”, to write) simply means a description of the ‘facts’ observed. In 1922, Bronislaw Malinowski established the goal of ethnographic writing: to write a document

that gives the reader a sense of what it is like to live in the land of others (Paul Stoller, 1989).

For Jean Copans (1996), ethnography is “to do fieldwork”, whether it is through observation and experience, or through texts. So doing ethnography may not only be defined as the theoretical research of an object of study but also as a method of research, a certain kind of research practice. Eventually, then, the goal is to convey in words what it is like to be somewhere specific in the lifeline of the world. For Laplantine (1996), ethnography is “first and foremost a physical experience of total immersion, consisting of a sort of reverse acculturation.” Indeed, for Laplantine (1996), the ability to interiorize/internalize the significations that individuals attribute to their own behavior requires the “integration of the observer in the field of observation itself.” Therefore, ethnographers’ aim should be “to render more familiar what appeared to be originally strange, and to be able to astonish ourselves with what looks familiar to us” (Laplantine, 1996). For Marcus (1998), the goal of ethnography is potential discovery and increased understanding of processes and relationships in the world, as well as demonstration of global cultural diversity. Indeed, Marcus (1998) argues that we need to reconceptualize the way we look at this subject through ethnography in order to efface the macro-micro dichotomy itself as a framing rhetoric for ethnography that seriously limits ethnography’s possibilities and applications in the context of a post-modern condition of knowledge. What ethnography brings, according to Marcus (1998), is a critique (influenced by the work of French post-structuralists, the semiotics of Barthes, the notion of discourse in Foucault, Bakhtin’s notion of polyphony and feminist criticism) of

the dominating authority of the ethnographic writer in a text that is actually composed by many voices/perspectives out of fieldwork. For James Clifford (1988), what characterizes contemporary ethnography is a way of thinking and writing culture based on and supported by fieldwork experience. In fact, the new ethnography is marked by an increased emphasis on the power of observation. So, the work for any ethnographer is to immerse himself/herself in the field in order to attempt to observe. Furthermore, Clifford (1988) argues, “experience” has served as an effective guarantee of ethnographic authority: indeed, the ethnographer accumulates personal knowledge of the field.

Additionally, according to Clifford Geertz (1988), the crucial peculiarity of ethnographic writings is the fact that they have a highly situated nature in their description (i.e. this ethnographer, in this time, in this place, with these informants, these commitments, and these experiences) which gives a “take-it-or-leave-it” quality. However, this idea of having been “there”, of having objectively met “the Other” is, for Claude Lévi-Strauss, essentially impossible: for him, there is no continuity between experience and reality. What we need to understand and admit instead is that social facts are not discovered, they are “invented”, i.e. invented in contexts in which thought, action and feelings are inseparable, all part of our fully lived experience¹. Actually, Denzin (1989) also argues that there is “no real person behind the text except he or she exists in another system of discourse.” In effect, Derrida (1972) contends that there is no clear window into the inner life of a person. It is in fact “filtered through the glaze of language, signs and the process of signification.”(Denzin, 1989) So the focus on this

¹ See Roy Wagner. 1981 *The Invention of Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

type of method is put on the meaning and interpretation. Hence, the work of ethnography is primarily interpretive. Indeed, as James Clifford (1988) argues, after the first moment of the research, which is observation, then, starts what constitutes the second moment of the dialectic of experience, the interpretation. So experience is actually closely linked to interpretation. In other words, J.P. Olivier de Sardan (1995) argues, the researcher is like a medium who wishes to understand and comprehend two levels of meanings: first the level of his subjects (informants) throughout fieldwork, second the level of analysis through writing (hence interpreting). This role held by fieldwork leading to an understanding is evoked by Wilhelm Dilthey (1976) in the concept of “Verstehen” (to understand): this notion implies an experience of empathy towards those we meet and encounter. Clifford (1988) calls this ethnographic comprehension a “coherent position of sympathy and hermeneutic engagement.” Additionally, Dilthey is also among the first modern theorists to compare the understanding of cultural forms to the reading of “texts”. The idea is that culture can be viewed as an assemblage of texts to be interpreted: this is what Clifford (1988) calls the “textualization”. Therefore, as Clifford (1988) claims, not only description is tied to interpretation, but also “ethnography is the interpretation of cultures”. In this sense, it becomes necessary to conceive of ethnography as “a constructive negotiation”, as “a discursive practice” (Clifford, 1988). This dialogic ethnography implies “rendering negotiated realities as multi-subjective” (Clifford, 1986) and polyphonic as possible so we can actually hear all the voices.

Additionally, according to Vera Taylor (1998), social movements research is one of the areas in which a strong tradition of qualitative method persists, and many of the

questions feminists raise about the knowledge production process in social research can be seen as general criticisms of the scientific method and the strong pressures toward quantification and away from contextualized knowledge that signal scientific precision. Feminist scholarship begins in the recognition that the positivist model of science is merely one model of reality, that science is shaped by human beings and filtered through human consciousness, and that traditional positivist science reflects and reinforces dominant culture and values. The objectivity assumption (or the notion that there is an independent reality to be known separate from the subjective knower) is integral to the textbook definition of science. In contrast with a positivist science, the subject of knowledge for feminist standpoint theories is to be visible, situated, embodied and heterogeneous. Relativity is reintroduced and allows for seeing plural/multiple truths. Feminists therefore advocate research techniques designed to break down the false separation and hierarchy between the researcher and the researched. This includes not only participating in the activist community being studied but empowering the community by encouraging their involvement in the research process. Taylor (1998) argues that the kind of “insider” knowledge gained from alternative methodologies that allow us to “enter the field” can result not only in the development of situated knowledges located in a particular time and space but they can open possibilities for more general and universal theoretical visions.

IV.1.iv. Biases and issues

La seule vérité, c'est la mémoire. Mais la mémoire est une invention.
Manuel de Oliveira in Wim Wenders "Lisbonne Story" (movie).

My methodology presented several unique opportunities as well as certain limitations.

First there is a concern over the so-called "subjective" nature of qualitative research, especially fieldwork involving participant observation and interviews. In other words, researchers practicing participant observation are sometimes accused of lacking objectivity or critical distance from the groups or institutions in which they insert themselves. In France, ethno-psychiatrist George Deveureux (1980) was probably the first to attempt a reflection on "the exploitation of disturbances created by observation" in the social sciences. Indeed, it seems that one of the biases in the ethnographic method is the situation of interaction itself: let us recall that it is a face to face between a researcher and a subject. Pierre Bourdieu (1996), who used the interview technique in his fieldwork on "the misery of the world", underlines the asymmetrical character of the relationship: first of all, it is the interviewer who engages the game and makes up the rules of the game. Indeed, as noted by C. Briggs (1986), the interview is an inter-cultural encounter more or less imposed by the interviewer. The interviewer then starts the game, sets up its rules and assigns (unilaterally somehow, and usually without any preliminary negotiations) the objectives and uses of the interview to the respondent (Bourdieu, 1996). Additionally to this symbolic 'violence', there is what Hyman (1954) characterizes as the "interviewer effect", that is, the influence that age, gender, ethnicity,

social status, religious or political opinions may have on the answers of the individuals. At any time in the field, Laplantine (1996) suggests, we are never objective witnesses observing objects, but subjects observing other subjects in the context of an experience in which the observer is himself observed. It would be impossible for an ethnographer to try to escape this “circle” into which, on the contrary, he must deliberately enter. Following physicist Heisenberg’s principle², Laplantine (1995) reminds us that we can never observe the behaviors of a group as if we, researchers, weren’t here. What the researcher experiences through the interaction with his subjects is a part of his research. And of course, if the observer has an effect (perhaps a ‘disturbance’) on a given situation, or even creates a new situation, due to his presence, in return, he also is affected (or ‘disturbed’) by the situation. This is a dialectical relationship. As Olivier de Sardan (1995) explains, the social sciences have abandoned the positivist illusion that “data” or pieces of real can be taken out of reality and preserved as they have been objectively selected by the researcher. This “false objectivity consciousness” has also been criticized by Briggs (1986), who denounces the “mystification” of the interview. We do know now that observations and interactions are structured by what the observer is researching, by his language, by his problematic, his training and his personality. So, as Olivier de Sardan (1995) argues, the researcher should take advantage of this phenomenon: the modification process is part of the research itself, as the researcher is one of the social actors of the field he studies. Therefore, if this disturbance created by

² Which states that we cannot observe an electron without creating a situation that modifies it.

the researcher must not be ignored, it should not be viewed either as an “epistemological obstacle that needs to be neutralized” but as a “infinite source of knowledge”.

So perhaps, the solution to this particular issue lies in the recognition that it is indeed a bias, and in how we understand and are aware of the distortions/disturbances: the distortions are embedded in the very structure of the relationship, they cannot be ‘erased’. In fact, Fielding (1993) argues, ignoring the effects of the interviewer (his characteristics and behavior), and neglecting the cultural context in which the researcher is located, would both be the precise sources of bias. The observer and the subject both “perform” the interview with their own impression management, as previously mentioned; they both have preconceive notions of the interaction (what it is and perhaps what it should be), the problematic in which the researcher is engaged; and they both have their own stereotypes, opinions, feelings and ideologies in mind. In other words the researcher has to be aware of the “imposition effect” (Bourdieu, 1996). We must also, Olivier de Sardan (1995) advocates, be more confident in the empirical process itself, in the researcher’s desire for knowledge, his research training, with a special attention to the idea of understanding (the notion of *Verstehen* as developed by Dilthey) which presupposes empathy or even sympathy.

Also, one should not underestimate the reactive capacity of the interviewees, or their resources for resistance, their possible counter-manipulations, etc...As Bourdieu (1996) underlines, the respondents can “play” to attempt to impose their own definition of the situation. They can also turn to their advantage an interaction, giving an image that they both wish to give to others and to themselves. So, there is, on the part of the

subjects, a possible resistance to the disturbances, the “imposition effect”, or the attempt of objectivation. This is why, if research interview relationships differ from most of the exchanges of existence, it is still a social relation. Accordingly, Olivier de Sardan (1995) describes the interview process as an “invisible negotiation”.

Second, the interviews and their outcome –the interviewees’ discourse-, raise another issue about the truthfulness of the interviews’ content. This problem of lie/truth comes to mind for every researcher at one point in the field when doing interviews. In fact, Stoller (1989) asks, “who do we meet? Do they accept us? Do they tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth? And what does truth telling (whatever that is) depends upon? Is it a matter of personal chemistry? Is it a matter of how the ethnographer fits into the always already world of the field? Is it a matter of socioeconomic situation conditioned by world-wide socioeconomic and political forces?” There is, according to Olivier de Sardan (1995), a contradictory injunction that is part of the essence of the interview: indeed, the researcher is professionally expected to give credit to the words of his subject (however strange or suspect they might sound). This is not a “trick” that the researcher uses: it is the condition to access the logic and universe of those he interviews, and it is through this seriousness of professionalism that the researcher can possibly fight his own preconceive notions or prejudgements.

On the one hand, Stoller (1989) warns us, informants routinely lie to ethnographers for any number of reasons (we don’t know you, we know you but we don’t trust you...). Even when an anthropologist has gained the confidence of people after several years, he or she may still be the victim of misinterpretation, innuendo or

deceit. On the other hand, when dealing with interviews, hence with memory, Anne Muxel (1996) notes that memory is not logical or chronological: instead memory follows simultaneity, association of ideas and jumps from one thing to the next.

So the way the researcher can find validity in the subjects' discourses is through a kind of "ethnographic pact", that Bellah calls "symbolic realism": for him (as for Olivier de Sardan, 1995), the "reality" of the subjects' words to which the researcher gives credit can be found in the signification that the subjects bring to their words. It is therefore up to the researcher to build his own interview politics through a critical deciphering/interpretation that will deal with the meanings given by the subject. So it is the interpreter's responsibility to apprehend and comprehend how the realit(ies) as constructed by a particular person, i.e. what supports this reality (the cultural, social, political, geographical and historical context). Finally, the goal here isn't to reach a veracious version but instead to put into the light the contrast of discourses, the intrinsic contradictions to make heterogeneity of discourses part of the object of study, looking for significant differences and nuances.

Finally, there are some concerns shared by social scientists concerning the issue of representativity and generalizability which are critical to qualitative sociology and to sociology in general. In effect, qualitative research is said to suffer from an alleged "small-N-problem", failing to examine a sufficient number of cases for building solid generalizations or good theory (Goodwin and Horowitz, 2002). The issue of "small-N-problem" is considered to prevent qualitative sociology from claiming generalizable finding.

In the case of my research, I am well aware that I have a limited number of interviews, which do not constitute a statistical sample. I will not therefore pretend, in a positivist illusion that I can generalize my findings to an entire society. However, as Kirk and Miller (1986) argue, “qualitative research implies a commitment to field activities. It does not imply a commitment to innumeracy.” Additionally, as Olivier de Sardan (1995) argues, fieldwork interviews “often times talk about representations or practices, not about (their) representativity.” If indeed, I had wanted to produce exhaustive data showing statistical distribution, I would have chosen another methodology, such as surveys. However, I precisely chose another methodological process: my perspective is more “actor oriented” (Long and Long, 1992), which implies a focus on individuals in their discourses, concerning their motives, their values, interests and representations. My analysis is qualitative, synchronically and diachronically embedded, i.e. a case study that is necessarily contextualized. Therefore, the validity of the generalization does not depend on representativity of the case but on the analytical reasoning. As Clifford (1988) has claimed, “modern ethnography does not aspire to the study of the whole diversity or development of humanity.”

Eventually, all these preoccupations, however legitimate, concerning the issues of validity, representativity, generalization and reliability of fieldwork research involving interviews must not hide the research/quest for meaning and interpretation. This is all part of a comprehensive sociology. We must emphasize that the strength of qualitative research has been to create a deeper and richer picture of what is going on in

particular settings, although it has also been able to employ comparisons among a relatively small number of cases to great effect.

IV.2 Data collection methods

IV.2.i. Population

My ethnographic material, as a case study, is drawn from over five months of research within the anti-globalization movement ATTAC in France, over the winter of 2003 and the summer of 2004.

Some of the material was gathered through participant observation (attendance at several meetings, forums, informal gatherings) which offered me the opportunity to interact continually with a variety of people, some of them whom I interviewed later on, some of them whom I just saw during these encounters. I also gathered the core of my material through a series of multiple, in-depth interviews with seventeen persons in different cities of France, BelleVille, GreatVille, NiceVille, and PleasantVille³. These individuals are all members of ATTAC, some of them part of the local chapter executive committee, some rank-and-file members, more or less active. Respecting the wishes of ATTAC's members I interviewed or met at meetings, as well as complying with the requirements of the confidentiality rule of the study, I will not be using their real names. Instead I will give people and places fictitious names and will use these all throughout the study.

Eight are men and nine of them are women. There was no deliberate decision on my part on how many women or how many men would be interviewed, or in other words, I

³ These are all code names (as well as later on the names of the interviewees) to preserve confidentiality.

didn't calculate before hand how many I wanted to interview of each gender. Although, in previous fieldwork on other research, as a woman researcher I have been accustomed to the fact that I have had better, more direct and open contact with women than men. Indeed, as we will see later, the relationships with the women were actually quite different from the men as far as their attitude towards me (as a female researcher) goes, and as far as my own response to this perceived attitude goes. Also, my first intent was to find individuals from different areas of France, urban and rural. To the exception of one area which is semi-rural and close to a bigger urban center, the other areas where I have found interviewees are mainly the main urban centers on the PleasantVille-NiceVille-BelleVille axis, which is on the East part of France. I will explain the difficulties of doing so and not succeeding in my initial intention later in the chapter.

This study is therefore inscribed in what J.C. Mitchell (1983) calls "situation analysis" or "case study": this process consists of a concentration of the "gaze" on the life of individuals or on a group of social actors engaged in a sequence of activities during a extended or short period of time.

IV.2.ii. Contact / connection

In order to establish contact with ATTAC's members, I operated through three approaches.

First, knowing that ATTAC had a French website (as it also has a website per country where it is present, managed by each country), I started in the Spring of 2003 by browsing on their national website, looking for contact information for local chapters throughout France. Most of the local chapters also have their own website that is more or

less regularly updated. I started contacting local chapters' members in all the regions of France through email about six months before I went to France (December-January 2003) for the first set of my fieldwork research. As we will see in further detail in the chapter on the organizational part of ATTAC, there is a national bureau and then there are local chapters that have their own organization, and that can choose their own executive committee and the way they want to manage their chapter. I contacted each local chapter without having to refer to the national bureau first. It usually took a couple of weeks for someone to reply to my emails; it sometimes took several emails to get a response, and some of the chapters never responded to my request. The advantage of going through the Internet and the web site of the different local chapters was that I could easily get information on meetings' date, time and place, which allowed me to meet most of the executive committee officers of the local chapters. I also could gather information about their different activities, e.g. protests, forums and other types of activities that I could participate in simply without necessarily having had previous email contact with the people.

Second, I also asked people of my acquaintance including friends and family if they knew of members of ATTAC. It happened that some of my family members knew members of ATTAC in their town, or at least in their region, and that is how I contacted these individuals. This in turn helped me gain entry through snowball sampling: I actually got introduced to the local chapter by one informant like this and it allowed me to acquire contact information quite easily and to gain access to more people whom I wouldn't have met otherwise because they almost never come to local meetings.

Third, and as mentioned above, by going to meetings and other activities I directly met with people whom I later interviewed even though they had not responded to the emails that I had sent. Even though emails are a way for members of ATTAC to communicate, and although the internet is a crucial instrument of communication for the movement and for the members, I found that emails are probably not the favorite means of communication, as ATTAC's members were more comfortable with contact through telephone or face to face. This is quite common throughout French culture in everyday life: the internet is more used in professional settings or at a personal level to obtain information. When making individual contact with one another, people prefer and rely more heavily on other means of communication such as the telephone (including cell phones) or direct face-to-face contact. Almost everyone that I interviewed [with the exception of one woman who emailed me after an interview to add some comments], when asked if they could be contacted by email for a follow-up interview or discussion, all responded that getting in touch with them through telephone would be best and that they either did not use their email or did so mostly to read ATTAC's information and newsletter. I will describe more precisely in chapter IV.3.i. the relationship with the interviewees and how I was "received" by people face to face individually or at meetings.

IV.2.iii. Interviews locations

The interviews took place in different locations. In part, it depended on ATTAC's members' professional activities. For the majority of them, it was more convenient to be interviewed at the end of the day, after work, or in the morning on the

week-end. It was also preferable to them to meet at a bar/café downtown in the city which is usually where they worked. On the one hand, as we will see later (in Chapter IV.3.iii. on difficulties and obstacles I encountered), the idea of having a conversation in a café did not appeal to me thinking about the quality of the recording of the interview. On the other hand, I realized that meeting at a café/bar was a relaxing activity for the interviewees, and that they had their favorite bar where they go on a regular basis (judging by how many people came up to them to greet them). Not only was this a less stressful time and place than meeting in their office or at their house, because they were more “available” in mind and time, but such social spaces could be the context for political conversations relevant to their activism. Indeed, for the meetings in BelleVille, the place of choice was a café/bar called The Barrel: I found out through my respondents that it was the ‘official’ habitual place for ATTAC members in Marseille to gather for informal meetings or after executive meetings (the “second headquarters” as someone mentioned it). As a matter of fact, while I was there once interviewing Liz, someone came up to her to greet her, and it was indeed a member of ATTAC BelleVille. On three occasions though, I had interviews at the home (apartment or house) of my family members: the persons knew I did not have a means of transportation and proposed to meet me at my family’s home as it was much easier for them to drive there. I will describe later how this situation created some unease, at least on my part. Finally, in a couple of occasions, I met with individuals in their office or a work place (as opposed to a café setting or a home): because of their schedule, the only possibility was to go meet

them at their office. I will give a complete account of these encounters in the part on the analysis of the interactions (Chapter IV.3, Pp. 107).

IV.2.iv. Interview techniques

Since my case study has to do with people's thoughts and own interpretations of what the movement stands for, and what they, individually, fight against, I chose to perform some semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions during the inter-personal interactions. For this I had a questionnaire at hand that served as a guideline, going through the different themes I wished to approach (see Questionnaire in appendix): each interview then focused on the same themes. Besides the focus on specific themes, the interviews also provide us information on people's socio-economic status, which will be helpful to understand the context of the discourses (as examined in Chapter V.2.i., Pp. 151). However, the interviews themselves often became conversational, in the form of a discussion or even sometimes debate as I responded to the people's questions as well about my research, my motives, my own thoughts on the topic, and my life in general. We can relate this process to the idea of interactive interviewing as developed by Ellis, Kiesinger and Tillman-Healy (1997): the authors define this method as an "interpretive practice for getting an in-depth and intimate understanding of people's experiences with emotionally charged and sensitive topics" (1997: 121). The emphasis is then on the communicative process: Laslett and Rapoport (1975) suggest that researchers listen to their own feelings and experiences, since both the interviewer and the interviewee are engaged in a process of making sense of the topics at hand. The advantage of such a method, where the interviewer, as well as the

interviewee, is involved, is that it helps “respondents feel more comfortable sharing information” (Ellis, Kiesinger and Tillman-Healy, 1997: 123). Indeed, through a more intimate and trusting ‘discussion’, instead of a traditional interviewing where hierarchies are marked (between the scholar and ‘his’/‘her’ subjects), we can gain a better understanding of individuals’ viewpoints because each participant is able to reveal more of him/herself. For this reason, the duration of the interviews varied, as I let people freely answer in the way and length they wanted, trying not to set limits on the interview process. The length of the interviews hence ranged between about 60 minutes to 180 minutes, considering that the off-record conversation lasted between 30 and 45 minutes.

In order to facilitate the transcription⁴ and then reading and interpretation of the interviews, I used a tape recorder. Also, the advantage of recording interviews on tape is that I was not distracted during the interaction, by the note writing. My mind was thus ‘free’ and more available to the interview process itself, to the conversation, to the interaction in general. The fact that the interviewees gratefully accepted to be recorded facilitated the interactions also. In fact, I even got some remarks from interviewees who commented on the fact that a tape recorder was an excellent tool and that they expected me to record them, in order to be faithful to their discourse. In three cases though, I did not use a tape recorder: in two cases, with Nikonoff and Leglatin, it was a timing issue, as they had told me they would not have too much time to devote to me and therefore I did without tape recorder, and only took notes of the conversations. The third case was

⁴ All interviews were transcribed in their entirety but only some paragraphs were translated from French to English for the purpose of this study and included as such in the core analysis.

because the person was really invited for a social gathering, and I happened to be there, hence I was not expecting to interview anyone that night. Therefore, I did not record (tape or writing) our conversation, I only have the memory of the interaction, as well as some documents that the person sent me afterwards (newspaper clips, archives from the local chapter).

IV.3 Analysis of the sociological/ethnographic relationship

If anthropologists are to produce knowledge, how can they ignore how their own sensual biases affect the information they produce?

Paul Stoller *The Taste of Ethnographic Things. The Senses in Anthropology*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989.

Traditionally the assumption was that the observer made little impact on the groups or organizations being studied. Researchers were told to keep their opinions to themselves while gathering the data. “Blending in” was the goal and it was simply assumed that it did not matter what the researcher actually did to collect data (Goodwin and Horowitz, 2002). Then, by the 1970s, participant-observers began to realize that, who they were influenced the data they were getting. There were public debates about whether researchers should remain sufficiently autonomous to enable a critical perspective or try to get in far enough to know “what is really going on” in a social setting.

As Devereux (1980) has argued, researchers cannot and probably should not try to neutralize or deny these epistemological tensions, they should instead take account of the disturbance created by the researcher, and by the situation of interaction itself. Thus, in order to have a richer understanding of the content of the interviews, the researcher

should not only try and analyze the subjects' reactions to his/her presence, but also his/her own reactions to the subjects. It is a question of finding the right epistemological distance, perhaps with the gaze of an astronomer, close and far at the same time that is constantly zooming in and out between a big angle and a close-up.

Hence in this part, I will explore the relationship I experienced with the people I met in interview situation first, and then in the participant observation context. It is essential to understand the nature of the interaction if we wish to grasp the context of the production of people's discourses.

IV.3.i. Interviews' interaction / relationship with the interviewees

Individual interviews are, as previously mentioned, a controlled technique within which an interaction is happening, and where social roles are more marked between the one who is asking questions and the one who is invited to answer, more so than in a daily 'regular' conversation. However, the nature of the semi-structured interview, as explained before, rendered the interview itself more flexible, respecting the dynamic of the discussion.

In this part, although I am not going to describe each interview in details, I will show how the interview process itself took place and developed, for example, what common interview "rituals" I experienced. Since the interview is a dialogue, I will also relate the relationship the interviewees had with me, how they connected (or not) with me, how they interacted with me. And finally, I will discuss my impressions of the interview process as it unfolded, that is, how I perceived the interviews and the interviewees. As Bourdieu (1996) noted, the research interview is a social relation,

therefore it has some effects on the results obtained. It is thus important to know the conditions of production of that social relation in order to understand the outcome.

The interview rituals were similar in all cases: the introduction, the “drink” offering, the informal chat, and the formal interview. In most cases, as previously stated, I met my respondents in public places such as cafés or bars. I was usually there before the meeting time, waiting for the respondents to arrive, trying to choose a comfortable space. In a couple of occasions though, the people were waiting for me, at the café, or in their office or home. With most of them, I had had direct contact (through meetings of the local chapter to which I went regularly) or indirect contact through phone calls to arrange for the meeting time and place. So by the time we actually met for the interview, they already knew who I was and what I was doing. However, on the day of the interview itself while introducing myself, I reiterated the goal of the interview, placing my work in the academic context, and at the same time referring to words such as “testimony”, or “personal experience story telling” to which they were sensitive. Following the introduction was usually an offer from them to buy me a drink (mostly coffee or beer depending on the time of day) or prepare me a drink (if it was in their home). The coffee ritual time helped a transfer into an informal chat, where it was question about general topics such as the town, their residence in town, the town’s attractions on the one hand, and more personal topics such as their family, their origins, their job, on the other hand. Actually, J. Spradley (1979) insists on this type of what he calls “descriptive questions”: according to him, it is often a good idea to start the conversation with an informal talk including “descriptive” questions as it appeals the

respondent into a mode of discussion that is familiar to him. It was usually also a time when the respondents asked about the mode of address: in the French language, you can address someone with a formal pronoun (“vous”) or a familiar pronoun (“tu”). The familiar pronoun is usually employed with family, friends and people who are close to one another. Most people asked me if we could use the “tu” address as they felt I was familiar to them and they did not see a reason for the interaction to remain at the formal level of address, to which I agreed. In some cases, however, this passage to the “tu” felt like a political “tu”, with an unsaid reference to the familiar tone of the left parties (such as the Communist Party) which have a certain mode of language and interaction; in this case, the “tu” is less of a familiar closeness as it is a political rite or convention. In two particular occasions (with Lorena of BelleVille and Matt of NiceVille) this suspicion on my part was confirmed by the fact that they referred to other ATTAC’s members as “comrades” which has a communist party connotation when used in a political context. With Lorena of BelleVille, although her using the “tu” was partly related to this political convention, it did not create a disturbance on the interaction, as I had met her on several occasions already and had connected quite well with her on a regular basis (phone, email, meetings). And as described in the part on interview location, she even offered dinner for me on the day of the interview. However, the issue I had particularly with Matt of NiceVille is that he was an older man to whom I felt I owed respect in a formal address (as French cultural norms would require it), and I felt this “tu” address was a bit ‘forced’ on me and never quite felt comfortable during the entire interview having to use it. In any case, the use of the “tu” address was generally meant to ease the interaction

(“it’s easier”, “it’s better like this no?”, some of the respondents said) and make it more conversational.

At any rate, the interview beginnings are often times a bit tense: I first give the informed consent form to the interviewee for him/her to review and sign. Then the official start of the interview occurs when I put the tape recorder on and I have the printed version of the questionnaire close by me. Then the style of language and discourse changes from a familiar everyday tone to a more intricate, somewhat technical or academic tone and mode, depending on the person. What changes also is the passion in their voice which usually becomes more intense as soon as we start mentioning the themes of globalization and ATTAC. So the last part of the ritual is the interview itself: generally, all the respondents were very talkative about all the questions I had, although some more than others. For example Liz of BelleVille gave me the longest interview, it was as if she was barely breathing, she wanted to tell me as much as possible.

As noted by authors (Olivier de Sardan, 1995; Bourdieu, 1996), the interview is not a linear process: there are digressions, going back and forth from between questions and themes, inconsistencies and contradictions. I observed all that during each interview: for example, Henry of NiceVille mentioned that he did not listen to the radio when in the course of the interview, he mentions a couple of radio talk shows several times to give a concrete example to his own argument; or he explains how he is really against the idea of “popular education” promoted by ATTAC, when he has been a teacher his whole life and continues to do so on an unofficial basis. With Adriana in PleasantVille, the interview did not start or end in the order of the questionnaire; it was really an open

conversation, where she addressed some questions at the beginning or at the end alternatively without following the preconceived order. Finally, with Matt of NiceVille, we digressed out of my questionnaire for quite a while but then came back to it. However, one commonality to all interviews was the difficulty the respondents had to give their own definition of what they think globalization is about or represents. Considering their silence at that moment, and the time of elaboration for their answer, it is almost as if they do not understand the question. In those instances, the respondents use metalanguage (i.e. comments on their own discourse) to explain/justify/excuse their answer (or lack thereof): for example Bryan of GreatVille says “this is going to sound stupid...” or “I’m just saying something stupid but...” In one particular occasion, when I was asking Henry of NiceVille about the effect of globalization on culture, he confused my question with a question on ‘cultural change’, therefore his answer was always off, no matter how many times and how differently I asked the question to a point of frustration when I gave up. On another occasion, with Lorena of BelleVille, because she had difficulties expressing her definition, I then proceeded to “help” her conceptualize her opinion, but quickly stopped, realizing I was about to impose my own problematic or agenda on her, which would inevitably lead to a distortion of her discourse. Then I realized that when addressing the issue of the effect of globalization and/or what globalization meant for them at the local level, the respondents did not hesitate to answer: for them, as we will see in the detail of the discourse analysis, it was easier to relate globalization to their personal lives than to give a somewhat abstract general definition that did not mean anything to them. So in the end, it wasn’t that they did not

understand the question, it is that the question was not put in context for them, was not 'situated'. So Bill of BelleVille spent a long time of the interview referring to his personal situation when explaining the effects of globalization; Lorena of BelleVille referred to her son's schooling to explain globalization; and Cristina of GreatVille related globalization issues to what she does personally at the local level in her job, in her community and her everyday life; so did Carmen and Liz of BelleVille.

The quality of relationship I had with the respondents was very different according to each individual. However, three common observations seem to overlap through all interviews: the mutual interest we had in each other; the social proximity or social distance depending on the cases; and finally the impression of sympathy.

During the informal conversation, before the actual interview began, the respondents were asking me as many questions as I was asking them about their personal lives. All of them were interested in knowing about my background, my origins, my Ph.D. and mostly my life in Texas. Almost none of them had been to the United States, so they were genuinely curious about my life here, my everyday life that is, the university, the people. They wanted to know where I was coming from, in every sense of the word, i.e. what my motivations were, what my research interests were, what I thought about the U.S. government, what I thought about life in Texas. Some of them (Jane of NiceVille; Carmen of BelleVille; Liz of BelleVille; Bryan of GreatVille; Adriana of PleasantVille; Lorena of BelleVille) even commented on my work, by congratulating and complimenting me for doing such a study and for being 'involved' this way. It was a way for them not only to make acquaintance, but also to 'define' who

the interviewer was, to gauge me as a researcher coming from the United States (but French) to in turn ask them questions, a sort of rite of passage to be able to be integrated or 'adopted'. It is also a matter of reciprocal exchange: indeed, as previously stated, the interview is a dialectical relationship, hence a dialogue. In some ways, we were then symbolically exchanging gifts: asking questions, giving answers about ourselves, one to the other and vice versa, all part of the same ritual of the interview. In one particular occasion however, because of the set up of the interview location (the waiting room of Jane of NiceVille, who is a psychotherapist), I first felt as if I was the one under scrutiny, being interviewed, and she was in charge of the questioning and the interview process; she even made suggestions as to how and when to start the interview I was expected to perform. In another case, with Leglatin (who is a university professor), because of the strongly didactic tone of the conversation, the questions about my background (especially the part about the U.S.) felt more like judgemental remarks with an ironic tone and body posture to show perhaps his shocked astonishment and disbelief ("so you're really in Texas?").

However, if the respondents all had an interest in my personal life, none of them asked my opinion, my thoughts or perception on the topic at hand, globalization, and no one asked me if I was myself a member of ATTAC (which I am not). In my introduction statement to them, although I explained what my research covers, I never presented them with my personal beliefs or positions on globalization, I only raised my research questions. So the assumption on their part then has to be that I was completely sympathetic to their cause. It did not really occur to me during the interview process, but

while listening to the tapes after my fieldwork. Since the interview process is a “spiritual exercise” (Bourdieu, 1996), which Clifford (1988) refers to as “hermeneutic engagement”, I indeed had empathy for the respondents: attempting to understand them meant to put myself in their shoes to some extent, or to see things from their standpoint. As Geertz (1988) wrote, the field researcher only wants “an understanding of and an appreciation for the texture” of people’s lives. This posture of empathy also meant that people could give me their trust, and in return I gave them the opportunity or possibility to ‘testify’ or make themselves heard, to transfer their experience from the private to the public sphere and to construct their own point of view both on themselves and on the world (Bourdieu, 1996). So, far from being instruments in the hands of the ethnographer, the respondents are as much social actors with agency as the interviewer is: they are both ‘conducting’ the interview at their own level.

Of course, I did not have the same sense of interaction with everybody. In some cases, (with James and Bryan in GreatVille) I felt a stronger social proximity than with the others: James is a Ph.D. student (younger than I) and Bryan is exactly my age, which gave a sense of ‘social’ equality standpoint to the tone of the interaction. For example, with James, we spent the time of informal chatting talking about graduate student life, dissertation issues and so forth, which created an atmosphere of mutual understanding: particularly, his way of expressing himself (making arguments, defending a thesis or critiquing) sounded like a very familiar language that only graduate students would be exposed to and use. In that regard, it made to conversational mode easier for both of us, which I haven’t found with any of the other respondents except Bryan. Although Bryan

is not a student anymore, he is a young employee who shares some of the issues that my generation has gone through, for example in terms of politics, political and social issues. Therefore, his frame of (political and cultural) references resonated with mine and made the discussion easier to get acquainted with and follow for the interview to flow. However, this does not mean that I did not have proximity with the other respondents, quite the opposite. Particularly with the women (Carol of BelleVille, Liz and Lorena of BelleVille, Cristina of GreatVille), we engaged in the conversation with connivance, sharing experiences, laughter and passion in addressing the issues of globalization. The empathy or sympathy was easier with them as I felt they included me in the conversation on an equal standpoint. On a couple of occasions, with Carol of BelleVille and Liz of BelleVille or Adriana of PleasantVille in particular, the conversation took a turn where I felt like a confidante to whom details and secrets could be revealed (“Me, I tell you everything huh?” –laughter-; “oh, you didn’t know that? Well, let me tell you what’s really going on...” –laughter-; “maybe I’m telling too much...” –laughter-). Whether this complicity between us came from our shared gendered experiences, or the sympathy and respect we mutually showed each other, it did help the interview process and progress where answers led to more questions without it being forced.

Whereas with others (Leglatin, Marcus of GreatVille), the mode of conversation was not nearly as inviting or welcoming: as a matter of fact, in both cases, I felt as if I was disturbing their day, and they wanted to spend as little time as possible for the interview. They were also both very didactic in their attitude towards me, with a tone of superiority over the ‘young student’ that I was to whom everything had to be explained.

Even though they went through with the interview, they made it shorter (giving short answers, or sometimes closed answers with yes/no so that not to expand their thoughts further): they looked at best blasé, and more annoyed by the questions and the topic than anything else. By their answers, it is as if they had already said all this to someone else and did not find it useful to have to repeat it. As explained in the part on difficulty and obstacles, this moment of the interview was a challenging disturbance for me, as I had to work on my impression management in order not to look frustrated or upset by their attitude. And then there were the cases of interviewees who were referred to by others as “pillars” of the movement at the local level who have been with the movement for a long time, or “informants” in the sense that they knew the history of the movement with its ups and downs. From them I learned the official history of the local chapter as well as the backstage stories, the conflicts and the fights. For example, Mark of NiceVille gave me quite a different version of the history of the local chapter from that of Matt I had heard a couple of days before: from Mark’s answers I got a very different feel about what happened to the chapter as far as leadership goes. In BelleVille, Bill was the pillar character and knew the particulars of the local chapter beginning and creation, while Carol and Liz had details about the internal disputes and discords that are part of a movement’s life. Finally, Marcus of GreatVille was the only one in this local chapter to go into specifics about the politics of ATTAC, with which he openly admitted he disagreed (especially the new line of ATTAC GreatVille).

Nevertheless, most of the people were receptive and welcoming to my questions and the idea of a study of ATTAC, some more lively and cheerful, more conversational

or passionate than others. But they all opened up to share with me their experiences as ATTAC members, as citizens, as social actors participating in the political life of their country.

IV.3.ii. Participant observation account

As Copans (1996) notes, despite all his/her qualities, the researcher cannot erase his/her primary identification: he/she is and will remain a stranger to the group. Indeed, people knew I was an outsider but because I participated in regular activities, because of my symbolic as well as physical proximity to the group, I became a sort of familiar stranger whom they could trust enough to have debates, discussions, and other less formal activities in front of. In other words, people got used to me. However, it didn't mean that I was invisible: instead of pretending not be there, I on the contrary embraced the fact that I was there as a familiar stranger or sympathetic stranger paying attention to the perturbations I might have provoked just by my presence, as Devereux (1980) has suggested researchers do.

In this part, I will describe the meetings/gatherings I attended in the course of my fieldwork, as they are indicators of the organizational structure of the local chapters and their functioning. It also allows us to witness and situate in context, through the daily routine activities of ATTAC's local chapters, what the people are about, what their activities are about and what kind of interaction they have, depending on each chapter. In turn, we will have a better understanding of the debates and discussions that are taking place within the movement. In fact, Geertz (1988) argues that fieldwork account, and especially participant observation account, is about showing how we, as

ethnographers, actually have “penetrated –or have been penetrated by- another form of life”, and how we have “one way or another truly ‘been there’.”

I have participated in five different gatherings in BelleVille, GreatVille and NiceVille (because of time restriction, I did not have the opportunity to attend gatherings in PleasantVille). I will first present each meeting I attended in their particularity, and then I will describe the features common to all.

The first meeting I went to was a general assembly of ATTAC BelleVille in December of 2003: it means that it was open to all public. The reason they had this assembly was the presence of national ATTAC President, Jacques Nikonoff who is a charismatic and media personality. The assembly took place in a cultural and education center in down-town BelleVille. The room looked like a class room: we were sitting like students at students’ desks, and there was a blackboard which the speakers were going to use during the meeting. There were three speakers: Lorena (the moderator whom I will interview), Jacques Nikonoff (ATTAC President), somebody else who was also a moderator and discussant. The meeting started at 7:15 pm and ended around 10pm: the set up was, first an introduction by Lorena, then a speech by Nikonoff reporting on the past year’s action (2002) action of ATTAC at the national level, and then questions from the audience. There were about one hundred people in the room, 40 to 45 years old on average, with a mix of men/women participants, and very few minorities and/or immigrants. The way people expressed themselves, their level of language, the historical, philosophical or literary references they used, made me think that they were not working class: they might either have been professors, retired professors, teachers,

some nurses, public service employees. In other words, it looked like a middle-class crowd with some college education. At the same time, from the vocabulary they were using (references to “class struggle”, “comrades”), some people were apparently from Left or extreme Left parties or political groups (one of them mentioned out loud he was LCR, Revolutionary Communist League).

The second meeting I attended was an executive committee meeting in GreatVille in December of 2003, it was an officers’ meeting of ATTAC GreatVille. This meeting was part of their regular meetings’ activities. It took place in a residential ‘building’ that also has rooms for meetings as such. It is located in one of the oldest parts of the city (still paved with original roman pavement), the building itself is also a nice typical French medieval architecture building. Incidentally, it is a part of town where all the nice restaurants are, as well as antique shops, theatres, old churches. In other words, this is the favorite place for intellectuals, artists, students and the like to interact for social life. The room was rather small and could barely fit everyone: there were twenty participants, with five women, about forty years old on average, with mostly ‘Whites’, except for AB (a highschool student, French-Algerian) the only presence of a minority. As far as political membership, there was one man who decided to “come out” as LCR (Revolutionary Communist League), and some of the members referred to politically marked terms such as “exploitation of the workers”, “alienation”, which is a typical rhetoric on social classes. The meeting started with an introduction of Vice-President James (calling for order, then introducing me to the group) who set the agenda for the night, but who was rapidly overwhelmed by the debates that will follow. The meeting

started at 8:45pm and was still running at 11:15pm when I left accompanied by the Vice-President James on the way out, whom I will interview later.

The third and fourth meetings I participated to were general assemblies in NiceVille on January 8th of 2004 and on July 1st of 2004, and were open to the public. Both meetings were held at the Bourse du Travail, situated in the center of the city, a building that is the official location for workers unions' meetings. The room was wide and large, and there was a stage with a platform. On the walls, two posters (CGT and CFDT, the two unions as it is a meeting place for them) consisted of the decoration. Actually, I found out that, before I got there for the January meeting, they had an informal gathering during which they ate a "Galette des Rois" (the Cake of the Kings), a tradition for the Epiphany. Incidentally, they offered me some leftovers. In both meetings, there were about twenty five members, among which fourteen women. I did not see any immigrants or minorities. The average age was 40-45 years old (with perhaps four or five people in their 20s or late 20s). From the vocabulary used and the informal talks about people's jobs and lives, I gathered that they were mostly teachers or professors, or in the medical field (doctor, nurse), as well as some university students. In the January meeting, the President Mark (whom I will interview later) had set up the agenda, and he was accompanied by a moderator and a secretary keeping tracks of the meeting's agenda; then an officer presented a report on the European institutions during which time he handed out documents supporting the presentation to the members present. After this presentation, the floor was opened to questions and comments from the audience. The January meeting ended with the financial report of the local chapter.

For the July meeting, a video documentary dealing with the effects of globalization at the local and global level, was showed and commented by Matt. Then it was followed by a debate about the video's content. The January meeting started at about 8:30pm. By the time I got out at 10:30pm, a man approached me to find out who I was and wanted to know more about me and why I was there; eventually he will be one of my interviewee (Matt). Indeed at the first meeting, I never got a chance to introduce myself as they had already started.

The common features of all these different assemblies have to do with the atmosphere in the meetings. Indeed, I observed that, even though meetings organizers or officers had an agenda prepared to conduct the meetings, people did not always follow the order. It is actually something that Henry of NiceVille criticized ("I am not here to talk like that in the void...", "I don't have time to waste, discuss like that, it doesn't interest me..."), and in fact, I have noticed that NiceVille is probably the chapter that was the most organized as far as following the order of the meeting. The moderator in NiceVille January meeting was taking her role very seriously and made sure to keep the meeting in order for people's interventions and on track for the agenda. In all the other cases, even if there was an agenda, the meetings were more a place for exchange of ideas and viewpoints, and then also a way to remind of the current actions to pursue or the future projects to take place. In GreatVille meeting (December 2003), James, who is Vice-President of GreatVille's ATTAC chapter, wasn't very experienced in running meetings (as he admitted it during the meeting), and he was also less vocal than others: as a result, the meeting was a bit disorganized and James did not intervene so much

during the discussions and arguments. Finally, in BelleVille's general assembly meeting, there were quite a few altercations, heated debates and direct questioning to ATTAC's President Nikonoff. So each meeting wasn't necessarily oriented towards decision making. However, it was about education or educating: as ATTAC claims itself to be a movement of "popular education", the way that meetings were set up showed me a direct application of what it meant. In NiceVille (January meeting) a member had prepared a presentation on the role and functioning of the European institutions: he gave us a 'lecture' on how the decisions are made at the European level, and what the power of lobbies can do, for example. In NiceVille (July meeting), one of the members showed a video to the group about the effects of globalization on Mexican workers (the Maquiladora industry), and then animated a debate afterwards. In GreatVille, someone made a report on actions taken in a particular area of town (Los Marcos), and what could be learned from that. In BelleVille, there was a presentation by the speakers on the health care system, the unemployment in France and the European constitution. In this regard, the meetings are a place for 'teachings' as well as discussions: as a matter of fact, all meetings had a convivial atmosphere, where people (while taking turn to speak) could discuss, digress into scattered and multiple ways, joke in a friendly way, or debate seriously. While I was an unfamiliar face for the members present, they were never reticent to engage in lively conversations in front of me. There were in fact some strong arguments and disagreements clearly exchanged by some discussants, and it sometimes gave the impression of verbal altercations looking like settling of scores. In fact, most of the time, the exchanges were quite forthrightly crude and direct.

Finally, there was a special visit of national ATTAC President, Nikonoff at a company in GreatVille on June 9th of 2004. The company is called RISK and is located on the outskirts of GreatVille in what is called a “technopole” zone. RISK is a branch of Irony⁵ and mainly produces fused cast materials for glass furnaces. I was accompanying Nikonoff for the day, basically following him for the day. First there was a meeting between Nikonoff and a small group of the company’s employees at 3pm. The meeting occurred in the CGT meeting room (the main workers’ union of the company, close to the Communist Party) within the company’s building. There were posters of the CGT on every wall, and pictures of people at protests and probably strikes. Jack, a CGT member and representative, began the meeting. He was very outspoken, very vocal and had a typical CGT discourse rhetorical about capitalism (using terminology such as “comrades”, “exploitation of the workers”, “alienation of the workers”, “loss of control over the means of production”). Nikonoff seemed to connect well with him (he also talked about the “working class” and other unions’ themes), and invited him to come to a national meeting of ATTAC in Paris (to which, I find out later, he will go).

Then a public forum was planned and organized by the CE (Comité d’Entreprise) at 5pm where Nikonoff was expected to talk about the globalization of firms and companies, and more specifically explain what the effects of globalization on local production companies were going to be. The public forum took place in a different

⁵ French company, producer, processor and distributor of materials such as glass, ceramics, plastics, cast iron, etc...It operates through 49 countries and employs 180,000.00 people. Irony was created in 1665 as part of the plan devised by Louis XIV and Colbert to restore the French economy. Entrusted to private entrepreneurs, the company broke with the factory tradition by organizing glass production on an industrial basis.

building from the 3 o'clock meeting; it actually was held in an old renovated barn or stables. About 20 to 25 people were in attendance. The executives and management (about six of them) were sitting together on the same row, a bit separated from the rest of the crowd. There were about seven women out of the entire group attending (none executive or higher management). Participants' average age was 40-45 years old and there were very few minorities (two or three at most). After Nikonoff's speech, at 6:15pm, there was a question-and-answer session: people were a bit shy with questions at first. Then almost all executives and management were gone when Nikonoff initiated a discussion on pension funds. Then people opened up more and started asking questions or making comments on the role of the French government, the role of education and the media, but mostly about the outsourcing of the company that is threatening jobs here locally. The conference ended with Nikonoff's words at about 7pm. The organizers then welcomed everyone to stay for an "aperitif". Indeed wine (from different regions of France) was served, as well as cantaloupe (from southern France), green and black olives (from southern France). I asked. Everyone was then gathered standing around a long rectangle table, socializing, drinking and exchanging ideas, 'reconstructing' the world. They were also discussing politics as there were some elections on Sunday (June 2004) to elect European representatives.

IV.3.iii. Difficulties and obstacles

As Stoller (1989) writes, we must be able to admit that fieldwork is sometimes difficult: it is a question of epistemological humility. Moreover, the fact that researchers reveal (instead of suppress) and explain the difficulties they went through actually contributes to the conditions of ethnographic validity, as proposed by Sanjek (1991). Indeed, Sanjek (1991) recommends that the reader be informed of the “ethnographer’s path in conducting fieldwork.” Precisely, the path of fieldwork is far from being linear and already planned up: it is actually relatively unpredictable at the beginning, and then proceeds through back and forth processes between the researcher, the subjects and the “information” (Olivier de Sardan, 1995). Fieldwork experience will modify the initial problematic which in turn modifies the way the researcher is doing fieldwork, and so on and so forth. This dynamic process of the fieldwork corresponds and adds to the complexity of the field studied by the researcher.

So in this part, I will share some of the main difficulties encountered during the fieldwork process (especially during the interviews) that are relevant to my overall problematic. I will also show how I dealt with those difficulties as I confronted them along the way. I identified several difficulties or problems as follows: the problem of double bind; the problem of defamiliarization/estrangement; the issue of my social position/status; the gender issue; the issue of interview location; the issue of length of time of the study.

The first difficulty resides in the dilemma of the interviewer’s position: Olivier de Sardan (1995) describes it as a “double bind”, because the interviewer wants

simultaneously to keep control of the interview (because he/she to progress in his/her fieldwork research) while letting the interviewee express him/herself the way he/she wants (because it is probably a condition for the success of the interview itself). During the interviews at the beginning, I kept wondering if I should guide the interview more or if I should let go. It is probably, as Olivier de Sardan (1995) says, a question of finding the right distance, an association of “empathy and distance, respect and wariness.” Actually, Bourdieu (1996) considers the interview process as a “spiritual exercise.”

Although I was concerned with the possibility of my “imposition” on the people I interviewed, I had no rejection of an interview and no one refused to be recorded: quite the contrary, they were the ones who put me at ease about the whole interview process, and defused the potential tension created by my anxiety. Additionally, they were mostly happy that a “young student” (as a few of them said to me) was interested in such matters as globalization and a movement like ATTAC. So despite the imposed character of the situation, and without pretending to eliminate the social distance, it is still possible to put oneself in a position of listening. I was in fact amazed by the trust, the kindness and the willingness of the people I interviewed. This was showed for example in how some people went out of their way to accommodate my meeting with them: they knew I did not have any means of transportation other than the train, as I had explained it to them, so they suggested to meet where I was staying (my family’s place), or they proposed to meet in the center of town knowing that I would have access to public transportation to get there. They would also often ask if I needed help traveling to places, and a woman even offered to accompany me back to where I was staying, which she did,

even though it was really out of her way. These heartfelt gestures showed me that if the epistemological distance between my position as researcher and their position as interviewees could not be erased, at least there were ways through empathy, or even sympathy, to alleviate the pressure of imposition. Then finally, I realized that I could only accept the detours, the repetitions, the digressions, the silences, the hesitations and other contradictions during the interviews: they are part of the interview process, of the conversation, of the exchange that is happening during the interview. In fact, far from preventing progress of the interview, all these moments opened up ways of better understanding, even new ways. They also allowed me to unravel (for myself) the complexity of the discourses and narratives on the issues I am studying. I would not have been able to do so, had I been more “controlling” on the interview process in terms of its timing and progression (for example, through a more structured survey questionnaire). As Olivier de Sardan (1995) notes: “one must have wasted some time, in the field, a lot of time, a great deal of time, in order to understand that these ‘dead times’ were necessary.”

However, this did not prevent me from feeling anxious about another issue: my “social status” as a “young” French female Ph.D. student who studies sociology in the United States. As McCorkel and Myers (2003) show, the “data” and analysis we, researchers, produce in the course of ethnographic fieldwork are “shaped by our relationship with the subjects of our research” and, by the positions we occupy relative to them and within wider society.

So my second anxiety or fear was that even though I am French, people would not look at me as just a regular French student because I was actually coming from the U.S., and that I had been living in the United States for over five years. George Marcus (1998) refers to the notion of “estrangement” or “defamiliarization” necessary steps to any ethnographic works. Even before starting the fieldwork, the interviews, I have felt “defamiliarized” or “estranged” somewhat while living my daily life back in France: it felt as if I had to re-enculturate, get reacquainted with my own culture, my own roots. Back to French, back to thinking in French, speaking in French, behaving French was not as “natural” as I thought it would be. It is as if I had lost it a bit, and I had to re-learn it: how to interact, how to approach people in situations. Therefore, when I introduced myself for the first times in meetings of ATTAC’s local chapters, I had to make a conscious effort not just verbally but in non-verbal communication too, to be identified and recognized as French, and not as American. My assumption was that, because of the general discourse of ATTAC blaming American neo-liberal capitalism for the wrongs of globalization, members of ATTAC might not be so welcoming with an American student trying to study them. Therefore, I wanted to strongly assert my citizenship, thinking it would help ease the tension and the pressure of my presence as a researcher among the group, as I would be considered “one of them” on the citizenship (and hence cultural identity) level. At the same time, it seemed a bit ridiculous to have to state my citizenship per se, when no one else did at the roundtable during the introductions. But they had to be reassured, so my strategy was to introduce myself stating my full first

name and last name, which to me sounds undeniably French, then explaining what I do and where I study at the moment.

Apparently, this precaution was not enough, as in GreatVille, BelleVille or PleasantVille, people in the chapters kept asking me anyway about my origin either directly to me, or indirectly to the people I later interviewed. In one particular occasion, the meeting even started with a seemingly joke about this situation: the presiding officer of the meeting that night in GreatVille stated in front of everyone that after “investigation” he could “vouch” for my citizenship, that I was indeed really French and not an American “spying” on them. Laughter came after this statement as well as relief on the faces of people; however, a woman in the group stood out and said out loud “and so what, if she had been American? What’s the big deal? Were we going to discriminate her because of it?” This is when I knew they must have been talking about it long after I had left, in previous meetings. I, also, felt relief, but with mixed-feelings for two reasons: I realized at that moment that just this fact (that people questioned my citizenship) might jeopardize my access or entry into ATTAC local chapters or my interviewing people. Then, I also realized there was something unsettling about the comment made by that woman: people in these circles are about popular education, educating themselves, not pre-judging situations, and yet, they negatively judged me based on citizenship, when at the same time their action goes to constructing criticism against the French government for its policies towards minorities, immigrants and racism in general. I wondered at this point if beginning my fieldwork this way, with such tension, was a good promise for future interactions.

Related to the citizenship issue, my third anxiety or difficulty concerned my social status, i.e. in the case of my fieldwork, the fact that I am a Ph.D. student. In my mind, I was the one in the field who was in a posture of learning from the people I was going to interview. In other words, I was the one with questions, and they had some answers. But, as I soon found out during some interviews, I was looked “up” by some of the interviewees as some kind of an expert on the question of globalization. In my introduction at local chapters’ meetings, and in email exchanges, I did present my research and had emphasized quite a bit the globalization issue, as well as the anti-globalization resistance. It was about epistemological and ethical honesty and truthfulness, I had to tell them what interested me in coming to see them (in turn, it was part of gaining their trust as well). However, in a lot of the cases, at the moment of the interview, when the first questions came up about their perceptions of globalization, a lot of the interviewees sort of froze on the question, and apologized in advance for not giving me a “good” answer. I thought it was a wording issue, and that I did not ask the question right, or that they misunderstood me. But then I heard them say multiple times throughout the interview how they were no “experts” on the question, and how they were not “economists” or “social scientists”, like I was. Some of them also half-joked about it, to most probably defuse the tension (and their fear): they said that I would probably make fun of them, laugh at them for their “simple minded” response, they used the word “basic intellectual” (“intellectual de base”, which in French is a negative or derogatory adjective to talk about someone who does not know much) to tell me in an apologetic way that it is what they were, nothing more. Then, I actually had to make

clear to them, repeatedly, that I didn't not want the dictionary's definition or explanation, that I did not want an expert's answer, but that instead I wanted their standpoint only, their perspective on globalization as they saw it. When that didn't work, I had to assert how I was no expert myself on the question of globalization, that I had not read all the documents published by ATTAC that they on the other hand had read, and that even though I was a scholar, I didn't have any economic expertise on the question of globalization. I actually had to be very assertive about this on several occasions and repeated times during the interviews to be 'believed', and to relieve the tension. I also had to come back to the same question about perceptions of globalization, but under different forms, later on in the interview, because their answers helped me formulate my questions better or differently anyway, and provoked new questioning on my part. This is what Olivier de Sardan (1995) calls the "recursivity" of the interview: "it is about relying on what has been said to produce new questions, (...), questions we are asking ourselves, and questions we are asking to others."

At the same time, on a couple of occasions, the fact that I was a student put me in a position of 'inferiority': the interviewees treated me or interacted with me as if, I am guessing because of their assumptions concerning my age and my status as a student, I did not know much at all about what I was asking. So, in those cases, the interviews turned into lectures where I was explained with great detail what it was that I was trying to study, how I should study it, how I should look at it and how some of my questions or questioning were wrong. This definitely created tension and anxiety on my part, for

which I could not pinpoint the reasons until afterwards only. They are actually related to the next difficulty I experienced while in the field.

This fourth difficulty was indeed connected to a gender issue. From the start, as for any fieldwork, I knew that my gender (as for my social class or race in some instances) could affect the interaction I was going to have with people during participant observation or interviews. However, as McCorkel and Myers (2003) note, “in situating ourselves as agents of knowledge, researchers refer to abstract categories like race, class, and gender.” Thus, it is far more difficult to see the effect of these identities at play during an interaction in which we are involved. Going to my first meetings at ATTAC’s local chapters, I knew I would be somehow “scrutinized” –and at least observed- by the members. I hence prepared myself in terms of presentation: presentation of my own discourse (my research, my problematic) as mentioned earlier, and presentation of my dress manner. Because I was a student, because I was a woman, I thought I needed to look “professional” and dressed up accordingly (in what I thought of French standards of professionalism, i.e. black pants, white blouse, dark suit, low-heeled shoes). I guess I wanted to “make a good impression” so they would take me seriously, as I also wanted to show that I took them seriously and show them my respect. I was also always prepared with a notepad and pens, ready to write. Right away at the meetings, I noticed how either at the beginning of the meeting or the end, women came to me to introduce themselves, politely making contact. On the other hand, when men would come to me and do the same, they almost automatically started by an emphasis on my gender, age and status: “so you’re a young student” (“alors tu es une jeune étudiante”, with a

feminine mark for the word 'student'), and they would smile or laugh. Needless to say it did not help my confidence nor my fear of not being taken seriously. Then during interviews, this was confirmed: women usually had respect (and/or admiration, not that I wanted to be 'admired' in any way) for what I was doing, and told me directly so in several occasions; in other words, they treated me as their equal or at least not as inferior in terms of standpoint. Whereas, men did so by lecturing me, giving me a lot of basic definitions of terms that I perfectly knew, using expressions such as "let me explain to you" or "let me tell you what is going on". They first and foremost saw me as probably a "young inexperienced student who is taking classes to learn about things", and assumed that their mission was to teach me. Experiencing this attitude during the interviews was a bit nerve-wracking for me, and I had to make a self-conscious effort to refrain myself from replying back at them or picking an argument, or in one occasion just stop the conversation and plainly leave. Then in the middle of the interviews, I realized whom I was dealing with, namely retired or active schoolteachers, retired or active university professors, 'mentors' or 'supervisors'. So really, their perhaps sexist attitude of looking down on me was coming from the fact that they felt in a position of tutors or educators and thus had to educate me on everything during the conversation because their assumption was that a woman my age (relatively young compared to them) who is a student could not possibly understand unless she was explained things extensively. By then, instead of fighting this attitude in my mind, I decided to play the game, in other words, I looked probably more candid and naïve than I was, certainly less knowledgeable than I was, so that they would just continue talking. After all, this was an

interview, I wanted them to talk, and in one particular occasion I realized that the interviewee was talkative on the question of globalization and culture, hence I let him go on. This experience helped me realize that the demographics of ATTAC, at the local level, reflected what I had read in Cassen (2003), i.e. a strong presence within ATTAC of 40-45 years old teachers, professors or other intellectual groups.

The fifth difficulty encountered in the field concerns the location of the interviews. As previously mentioned, interviews occurred in public places (cafés, bars) or private places (home, office). My apprehension with public spaces, such as cafés and bars is first a practical one and has to do with the noise: indeed, the problem with public spaces, especially cafés or bars, is that they are not favorable to interpersonal interactions, particularly involving an interview; in most cases, there were a lot of people in the room, the radio was on and sometimes a TV set was also on, adding to the noise and discomfort for listening. These were stressful moments because I feared I would not be able to record the interview properly to be able to transcribe it later. Also a public space like this does not allow for any “intimacy”, any sense of ease for a conversation involving very personal questions (such as their biographies). I dreaded the moment where they would stop talking because it was too loud, or there were too many people around us, and they would either be “distracted” or be afraid to talk in public like this. Then I realized something: they were the ones to suggest such places, places they obviously were familiar with (as previously observed and noted in the part on the relationships with the interviewees). Hence, they were used to coming here to relax, enjoy coffee or beer, meet with friends and so forth. They looked perfectly at ease in

such environments, that is, they were in their comfort zone. I was the stranger, the one who did not feel at ease, out of “my” environment. Once I realized this, I just had to adapt to the situation to be able to be in empathy with the interviewee.

The issue of private places was different: the noise and distraction were not a problem anymore. However it was a whole new kind of anxiety. For example, when interviewing people in my family members’ home⁶, I felt concerned that the interviewees would not feel comfortable in “my” space / “my” field, and I was self-conscious at the beginning of the interviews that there was a potential for unease, and that it could prevent them from comfortably talking to me, as if they were in ‘my’ interrogation room. But I realized in the course of the informal chat at the beginning of the conversation, and then during the proper interview, that I was projecting my own discomfort, and that they looked perfectly at ease. They were drinking the coffee and/or water that I had offered them, and answering my questions as they would do in a conversation, taking their time to answer, relaxing back in their chair. So despite what might have been a strange location to them, they seemed, through body language observation, perfectly fine with the process, or at least as much as the other interviewees did in other locations. The other type of private space was either the home or the office of interviewees. Then the situation was reverse for me: I felt again like a stranger, a foreigner in their space, but this time they felt right “at home” and could relax, and to some extent be in charge of the interview process. However, despite the personal

⁶ I interviewed participants in my family members’ home on two occasions (one in NiceVille, one in PleasantVille).

environment where they looked in control (of the space anyway), they let me know when it was time for me to take charge again and start the interview process per se. In the case of the office environment, it was a bit more awkward (or at least more problematic) than the home space for me because I felt I was interrupting their work, as if I was not expected, or expected but as a work appointment (a client, a customer, someone to deal with). Therefore, in these cases, it was a bit more difficult for both of us to relax, especially considering the organization of the space: me being on side of the office, the person being behind their desk or on a different side of the room. There was a sense of unease on my part where I felt I was the one being interviewed, even though I was conducting the interview. I made an effort not to let this show but it was difficult as we were interrupted by phone calls, or people knocking at the door.

Finally, the last difficulty with which I came across was the length of time spent on this particular case-study. Because of funding availability (or lack thereof), as well as personal status limitations (administrative), I could not conduct a fieldwork on more than one to two consecutive months at a time, and could not do this over more than two years. Therefore, I did not have the opportunity to (1) interview more people while in the field, and (2) access more regions in France, i.e. local chapters ATTAC from the West region of France which could have given us different discourses and narratives. However, these were limitations beyond my immediate control. Additionally, I still managed to get a diversity of sites by going to urban centers as well as smaller places in semi-rural areas, so this study will still offer us with a multiplicity of discourses on globalization. Olivier de Sardan (1995) argues that the interview process is made of “invisible negotiations”.

IV.4 Analysis method

As previously stated in explaining the ethnographic methodology, the second moment in the dialectic fieldwork/interpretation, is then the work of interpreting. In this part, I will therefore describe and explain the different models and methods used for the analytical part of the study.

We must acknowledge however, as Jack Goody (1979, 1986, 1994) did in his relevant analyses of the question, that by writing down spoken words, interviews and other oral interactions, the sociologist transcribes what was just a series of individual or collective statements into an “ensemble” of more or less homogenized texts likely to be cut and re-cut. Or as J. Bazin and A. Bensa (1979) recall, we begin by “a work of transcription of heard and spoken words” or by “a real ‘staging’ of the text from the culture being studied.” This means that the researcher must temporarily turn away from the dialogue and from the observation, in order to write a “thick description”, as Clifford Geertz (1973) claims. This rhetorical reconstruction of fieldwork observations is somehow a “realist, empiricist, reconstruction of the social reality that mixes perceptions and information of the anthropologist and ‘his people’.” (Jean Copans, 1998) According to Copans, this plausible homogenization of the discourses is then a “synthetic and reflexive process.” (Copans, 1998) This means that the writing part is an active process, it is not a simple receptacle of reality, it records and constructs at the same time. Copans compares this process to a “textual cuisine.” (Copans, 1998)

Following James Clifford (1988), my interpretation will then be based, among other models, on a philological model of ‘textual’ reading, since –as previously

explained- culture or society (the objects of my research) are viewed as an assemblage of texts to be interpreted. This comparison of a comprehension of cultural ‘forms’ with the reading of ‘texts’ was initiated by Dilthey who proposed a “interpretive rationality” with the idea of “*verstehen*”, as explained previously. This implies a re-historicization of the description and the comprehension at work. We must have in mind, advocates Geertz (1988), the situated nature of any ethnographic description, that is, the fact that researchers are situated in a particular time frame, a particular space, with particular informants and questioning. In any case, Clifford (1988) argues, the analysis indeed consists of a “textualization” as a prerequisite to the discursive practice of interpretation. In effect, at this point, it is time for the “scriptural transformation” (or linguistic elaboration) of my experience, my fieldwork, to take place (Laplantine, 1996).

This writing procedure then goes through a work of representation called ‘translation’: according to Stoller (1989), the “representation of” corresponds itself to the act of describing, which is fundamentally creating. Indeed, Stoller (1989) compares the work and gaze of the ethnographer to the painter’s, finding the nature of signification of things in indirect language, i.e. in the representation of things themselves. Precisely, one of the difficulty for me was to have to translate, and in the case of my study, it was a work of double translation: translating the thoughts, conceptions, representations of the discourses, of the narratives on the one hand; and translating from French to English, going back and forth from the nuances of one language to the nuances of the other, making it fit into one frame of thought, of interpretation, on the other hand. The reader will see that understandably it is sometimes difficult to make the nuances of the original

language appear, but most importantly the work of language translation must avoid any confusion for the reader to grasp the meanings of the words or expressions. Then also, as interpreters, ethnographers have a responsibility of translation, because the discourses, the narratives, don't 'talk' for themselves: the meaning is not in itself 'obvious' or 'natural' –as the positivist approach would like us to believe, with the illusion of 'spontaneity' of discourse as an absolute and pure mirror of the mind-. Ethnography is a work of construction: however it does not mean that the ethnographer invents significations, but he can only attempt to perceive “through” (and make the readers perceive), so that he helps us see the connections. In this sense, as Laplantine (1996) writes, the description made by the ethnographer is a work of “transformation of the visible”.

As far as discourse analysis/interpretation is concerned, I will follow the principles and tools of ethnolinguistics or linguistics anthropology. I will pay a particular attention to the signifiers and its denotations or connotations (Schott-Bourget, 1994), i.e. what the words denote (what the words convey in the general social acceptance of the sense) or connote (what the words bring about and suggest, with what they are associated) according to the context. I will also compare the plurality of meanings in the discourses: for example, I will look at the meaning given by each interviewee to the word “globalization” and how it denotes and connotes different things for each of them. I will as well examine the connections of sense and ideas as they are made by the interviewees, the pre-established notions, the innuendos, implications or insinuations of the discourses, in brief, all the ‘games’ of language, between the explicit and the implicit

sometimes source of misunderstandings. At the same time, I will explore the enunciation itself, how the discourses are produced, in what context, what situation: this examination requires the underlining of the subjective markers in the discourses, i.e. how the interviewees leave their personal marks in the discourse (social, spatial, temporal), that connect the discourse to the context and circumstance of enunciation or production of that discourse.

In the end, Schwartz (1993) contends, there are at least three levels of analysis in interviews: some information on the world (on the “facts), some information on the point of view of the interviewee on the world, and finally some information about the communication structure of the interview itself. Additionally, Marcus (1998) argues, there is no possibility of a fixed, final or monologically authoritative meaning. According to the postmodern notion of heterotopia (Foucault), juxtapositions have served the practice of comparison in anthropology but in altered ways. Therefore, the postmodern object of study is ultimately mobile and situated in multiple standpoints. All this means that, as Marcus (1998) suggests, we must recognize that an analysis, no matter how totalistic its rhetoric, is partial. Instead we can try for a comprehensive display of levels of analysis, of epistemological angles. So it is very possible to juxtapose structuralist analysis, political analysis and the hermeneutic/dialogic mode as different takes on a common object of study.

CHAPTER V

CASE STUDY PRESENTATION

In this chapter I will present the different local chapters of ATTAC I visited, their organizational structure and process. I will also portray the interviewees according to their socio-economic status, as well as other relevant information, and I will finally explain how the texts from the narratives/interviews will be incorporated into the analysis later on.

As previously mentioned, for the purpose of protecting the identity and anonymity of the members interviewed I will use fictitious names through the entire analysis for both the cities and the individuals, except in two cases for which I obtained the consent to publish names as is: Nikonoff, the President of ATTAC national, whose headquarters are located in Paris; and Leglatin, Culture Committee chair, who lives in Paris.

V.1 Introduction of ATTAC local chapters

In this part I will introduce the cities in France, as well as the local chapters where I performed interviews with members, as well as participant observation or simple visits. I will particularly focus on the organizational structure and life of the local chapters, giving accounts of meetings I attended.

V.1.i. General geographic context

Even though I cannot completely reveal the identity of the individuals, and therefore identify the cities and other places with real names due to research ethics requirements, I will now situate the local chapters I visited.

Due to time constraints, I visited four cities in France where I participated in meetings and forums, observed actions led by groups and interviewed individuals: GreatVille, BelleVille, NiceVille and PleasantVille. In order to preserve the anonymity of the members' identity I will only briefly describe the cities in their geographical location.

- GreatVille is a town situated in southeast France and has an approximate population of a bit less than 100,000. It is an urban center located in the main south/north train axis that crosses France. However, it is part of a region that is mostly agricultural where wine, fruits and vegetables hold an important place in the local economy. Additionally, some research and some specialty industries also participate in the city and regional economy.
- BelleVille is a city also located in southeast France and the population approaches 1 million. The major part of its local economy is still related to the port activities although it has greatly declined over the past 20 years. The regional economy also relies on refinery plants, as well as on research, the tourism industry and other services.
- NiceVille is a town of less than 40,000 inhabitants, and although it is a town, its location makes it more of a rural area. It is situated in center-east of France, also

on the south-north European train axis, close to another major city of France. Although the city is located in a wine area, the local economy heavily relies on the textile industry, the food industry, as well as agro-chemical plants and electro-mechanical plants.

- PleasantVille is a town (outside of a major city) in the center-north of France with a population of approximately 60,000 and rapidly growing. Its economy is mostly connected to the service industry.

V.1.ii. Current organizational status of the chapters

The Charter of Local Chapters (or Committees) was adopted in November 2002 at a General Assembly of ATTAC and defines the status, functioning and mission of the local chapters of ATTAC. The Charter however affirms that the definitions should remain flexible.

First, ATTAC's Charter states that only ATTAC is the owner of the logo and the name ATTAC, and consequently only it can attribute or take away the logo and name to local chapters. The attribution of the name to a local chapter requires verification and validation of its statuses by the members of the National Bureau of ATTAC. For a local chapter to acquire the name and label it must conform to three points: conformity to the constitution and the mission of the association; conformity to the relationship with the National organization as defined by it; conformity to the rules concerning members and membership. Additionally, ATTAC's local chapters must apply the principle of participative democracy so central to the movement. ATTAC recommends that the local chapters not be too numerous on the French national ground, therefore that they should

be reflecting France's geographical zones (regions and departments), and should work together in order to avoid overcrowding.

Furthermore, according to the Chart, each local chapter has a double "political mission": "to stimulate and coordinate the actions realizing ATTAC's objectives", as well as "to see to the plurality of viewpoints and to the respect of the founding platform of ATTAC." Each local chapter must also equally promote the expression and initiatives of all members in the movement, but also improve the efficiency and the range of actions performed in the region where the chapter is located. At the same time, if the local chapters must render popular ATTAC's mission and actions, they are free to define their own priorities and topics of discussion and projects, while respecting the identity of the movement, notably through the idea of popular education turned towards action.

- GreatVille local chapter was created in September 1998 and from there expanded to connect to smaller areas around GreatVille where sub-chapters were founded. They meet about twice a month, more in case of planning of forums or other actions. They have about 100 to 150 members, but some told me that by the beginning of 2004, with the addition of new members, the count came to 237 members. Not all members are active: according to the people I talked to, about 20 to 30 members are actively involved and regularly come to meetings.
- NiceVille chapter was created in 1999 (beginning) and now has about 75 members (in 2003). The chapter meets several times a month (whether it is the Board or public forum), and during my visits I saw about 15 members present at both meetings, and these were the same individuals.

- BelleVille chapter was founded in September 1998. The Board meets once a month and then the bureau meets once a week, and they also have regular forums or debates open to the public. Since the beginning there are about 1,300 members registered, and 432 paid their dues in 2003.
- PleasantVille chapter (which I did not actually visit due to time constraints) has by April 2005 about 400 members and seems to have officially been created in 2001 (although the member interviewed was not entirely positive on this information and the website did not give more data to confirm).

Finally, all chapters are organized following a semi-formal structure: President, Vice-President, Secretary (meetings minutes), and a Treasurer. They also are composed of committees working on specific topics: for example, the “Europe Committee”, “Culture and Globalization Committee”, “Women and Globalization”, and “Living in BelleVille Committee”, in BelleVille; also the “Farmers’ Committee”, “Health Committee”, or the “GMOs Committee” in NiceVille. Finally, they all possess a website that can be found through the general ATTAC website or individually.

The meetings I attended were usually run at night, starting around 7:30pm or even later, ending around 11pm or later. The meeting process was formal in the sense that the President (or Vice-President) called to order and officially started the meeting, while a designated officer (secretary) took the meeting’s minutes. Then, depending on the agenda, people discussed action items, such as the planning of future events: Operation Freeway in GreatVille; theater play in GreatVille; 60th Anniversary of the CNR Program (National Council of the Resistance) in BelleVille; 60th Anniversary of

the Bretton Woods Agreements in BelleVille; the night of August 4th, celebration of the end of privileges in BelleVille; 9th of May the Day for Another Europe in NiceVille; radio talk show special edition on Europe in NiceVille. Members in each chapter also engaged in debates amongst themselves over a particular topic on which they wished to write a report. The debates usually concerned local or national issues: legislative elections; the role of ATTAC during GreatVille cultural Festival; the European Constitution; health care system; alternatives to the free-market system; issue of GMOs; unemployment; point on the functioning of European institutions. The debates actually took most of the meeting time and were more or less moderated by the President or another officer. They were also more or less informed: sometimes the person who launched the debate had prepared a preliminary report on the topic based on scholarly or other type of information materials; sometimes people brought materials (mainly newspapers) on which they built the discussion; mostly people reacted to the debate with arguments based on personal readings or experiences. The agendas for the meetings (including action items, debates, etc...) are set by the local chapter and are not imposed in any way by the national bureau of ATTAC.

However, among the topics at hand directly related to globalization issues or actions to plan, I noticed recurrent subjects or issues that related to the internal life of each chapter, particularly over semantics or internal politics: the first frequent theme I noted was that members were disagreeing over the use of the expression “masses populaires” (popular masses) when referring to the working class. In BelleVille’s general assembly, I could hear comments from people around me or sitting next to me,

engaging me to give my opinion also. Although they were just talking amongst themselves without addressing the crowd, they really seemed to disapprove Nikonoff's (National ATTAC President) label of the working class. At one particular moment, in his plan of action, Nikonoff mentioned the necessary presence of ATTAC during the Tour de France, because he said, mostly working class people watched this event, therefore, ATTAC could get easy publicity by organizing rallies and protests along the road during the Tour. This very comment started an "upheaval" from the crowd who got rather upset and everybody started talking all at once. One man in particular stood up and addressed Nikonoff: "what does that mean 'masses populaires'?" he said, "Who is the 'masses populaires'? Am I a 'masses populaires'?" Other people thought the use of the expression was insulting and asserted their disapproval: at this point, through his answers, Nikonoff was on a defensive mode as if he was under attack. The same phenomenon happened in GreatVille and NiceVille, where people started arguing among themselves about the definition and the labels "working class" and "masses". People seemed to be divided as to what label should be used on the one hand; and on the other hand, other people manifested their concern that ATTAC had so far been unsuccessful (at the local or national level) precisely at recruiting members from the working class or 'popular classes'. For example, a comment from one man in GreatVille dealt with how the expression 'social class' had now become 'the masses', and how according to him, 'the masses' were not necessarily a 'social class'; he thought of the 'masses' as consumers, because we went from a society of production (with the 'working class') to a society of consumption (with the 'masses'). Another example is a member in NiceVille

recognizing the fact that their local chapter had no contact with workers and the ‘proletariat’ in general: hence, the question people raised at the meeting was how ATTAC could reach out to the workers.

Directly related to this discussion was a dissent in all chapters as to whether ATTAC should assert a political alliance (with the Left parties that is), and whether ATTAC should also support candidates in local elections –although the statutes of ATTAC, as previously explained, specifically mention that there can be no official support of ATTAC to any candidate in an election.- Someone in BelleVille’s general assembly bluntly asked “ATTAC is not a union or a political party, so what do we do?” and most people shared their disappointment in the fact that ATTAC national seems to have forgotten the idea of a Tobin Tax. In the same vein, somewhat indirectly related, people in all chapters mentioned how no effort had been done so far to recruit members among minorities: in GreatVille, AB, a French high school student of Algerian origins (not an ATTAC member yet, but sympathetic to the cause, he said) commented on how Arabs in France did not feel taken into account or included by anti-globalization groups, and how they did not see the point of fighting when French people were giving up. For example, he said, “racism, we see it everyday. So if we hear people like you say they don’t know who to vote for, you can imagine what’s going on in our minds.” He was then referring to the Extreme Right party voters (led by Le Pen). The same kind of remark was made in BelleVille during the general assembly by a woman (whom I recognized afterwards to be Liz of BelleVille) who, addressing Nikonoff, criticized the fact that ATTAC was not using the voices available among its members, for example she

said, “how about the experiences of immigrant women? They know a lot, they have a lot to bring to the table.”

This last remark can actually be linked to a second recurring theme I identified in all the meetings: the issue of how ATTAC may sometimes appear as a movement made by the elites, for the elites. This is what Liz in BelleVille was questioning, beyond the question of immigrant women’s participation in the movement: indeed, Liz disapproved the fact that only certain people had access to public expression, and that ATTAC should listen to voices other than the ones of their own experts. In GreatVille, some members expressed their disappointment in that even within ATTAC, some say, “it is a France of experts” or “a France of elites”. For example, AB in GreatVille said: “You are all intellectuals, you all talk well and all that. But what’s the concrete action?” Indeed, through the questioning of the role of ‘experts’ within the movement, most criticisms in all meetings had to do with the democratization process in the movement. People questioned whether the notion of ‘participative democracy’ was a marketing label or an illusion. This in turn can be linked to the debate members of all chapters have been having about action vs. reflection. Some of the comments or complaints in meetings have all revolved around the idea that ATTAC locally has done too much thinking and not enough acting. In GreatVille’s meeting, there were remarks by women and men who said “we cannot just win with ideas”, “this is what the exercise of democracy is about”, or “we must practice a ‘radicalism’ of reflection and action.” Some others like AB in GreatVille bluntly asked “well, you talk, you talk, but what is ATTAC doing?” Following this challenge, people started an argument over thoughts, exchange of

discourses with references to historical, philosophical and political French thinkers, without really addressing AB's question. In BelleVille, some participants to the general assembly question whether ATTAC has anything to show for what they call "concrete victories" and argue that they "can't just win the ideological battle" and that society needs "to make the laws change."

V.2 Introduction of the interviewees

In this part I will introduce the individuals I interviewed by presenting their socio-economic status, their different affiliations to organizations (religious, political or otherwise), their media habits and finally their involvement level within their respective ATTAC chapters. I will also discuss how the texts or narratives from the interviews will be incorporated and displayed in the analysis.

V.2.i. Presentation of interviewees' demographics

Socio-economic status of the members interviewed here:

- Are French citizens except one person who has dual citizenship Swiss/French.
- Do not identify with a particular ethnicity, and when they do (Corsica, Provence), the majority of them do not make it an essential component of their identity.
- Are either married or living with a partner in cohabitation (after divorce), some are single. The majority of them have grown up children.
- Live in the city of their ATTAC chapter city or close (suburbs or village) to it.
- Have degrees above a Bachelor's Degree (11/17).

- Are still active, with a couple of them retired, with most of them with public sector occupations (10/17).
- Are over 40 years old (4 over 60; 11 between 40 and 59).

Religious affiliation and other affiliations of the members interviewed here:

- Do not affiliate with a particular religion (although some do) but state their atheism.
- Are or have been a union member (10/17), mostly connected to the CGT.
- Are not currently affiliated with a political party (13/17): some have in the past been members of parties mostly on the Left (whether Communist or related or the Greens) but are not anymore. However, some have been actively involved for a long period of time (Bill of BelleVille and Nikonoff).
- Are members of other organizations, mostly political or human rights related, although most of the members are not active but only paying dues.
- They more or less all have a militant past where they participated in actions and protests through their party membership or other affiliations (15/17).

Media consumption of most of the members interviewed here:

- Read printed press (17/17): mostly daily newspapers with an Extreme-Left, Left or Center-Left political orientation. They also read weekly magazines and other specialty magazine with a usual Left political orientation.

- Listen to the radio (11/17), mostly public radio for the news, with a tendency for the ‘elite’ radio shows on France Culture.
- Do not watch TV (9/17); some of them don’t even possess a TV.

Connection to ATTAC of most of the members interviewed here:

- Joined ATTAC in and after 2000 (9/17), although almost half joined the movement at its creation or shortly after, and even sometimes before.
- Are members with no particular function within their chapter (9/17), although they are all active members (see below). However there are a couple of members who hold a specific function (President, Vice-President; 6/17), and some members are part of the board of officers (2/17).
- Are active members in the sense that they participate in regular meetings and debates held by their local chapter (15/17).
- Participate in protests and other actions (Forums, Summer University) whether at the local, regional, national or international levels (15/17).
- Some of the members are also involved in actions at the local level somewhat related to their membership at ATTAC (9/17).

As Sommier (2003) has previously argued, among the traits that are distinctive of new social movements such as anti-globalization movements, one element is the particular social composition of the movements: middle-classes, strong cultural capital and more women. Indeed, among the interviewees, we find a majority (11/17) with

degrees above a Bachelor's (some even have Ph.D.s) which confirms the rise of intellectual middle-classes and by the same token shows their availability/capacity to build a social critique based on their expertise in their respective fields. This in turn reinforces the legitimacy and authority (as well as its visibility through publications) of ATTAC as a movement that is constructing a counter-expertise on globalization issues: this new model of engagement that is 'professional' and expert is thus made possible by the elevation of the cultural capital of the militants (which also shows in the type of newspapers they read and radio broadcast to which they listen, all geared towards a certain intellectual class). At the same time, while there is an overrepresentation of people with university degrees (high levels), we must also note a large number of members are actually in situations of over-qualification considering their degree compared with their occupation (teaching jobs, temporary research positions), which is consistent with the observation by Sommier (2003) on other anti-globalization movements. Also noteworthy is the fact that most members are over 40 years old: as scholars of social movements have observed (Sommier, 2003), most of the leaders in new social movements are between the ages of 45 and 60 as their militant past from the 1970s helps them hold such leadership positions (and we see here that 15 interviewees have had a rich militant experience in the past whether at the local or national level). However, if some members have been affiliated with Left political parties, the majority of them do not belong to any party which shows a disillusion or a "disenchantment", vis à vis the institutional political sphere (as noticed by Sommier, 2003). Additionally, it seems that most of the interviewees belong to (working or having worked for)

occupations connected to the state, i.e. the public sector or public service: this is also consistent with observations by scholars (Sommier, 2003; Kriesi, 1989) who argue that new social movements mobilize “socio-cultural specialists” who have the capacity to denounce social control and who have been influenced by Foucault’s critiques of the 1970s against the “managers” and technocrats of society. Finally, and most importantly, we will see later in the discourse analysis part how the status of public sector employees of ATTAC’s members is relevant and connected to their critique of globalization, particularly regarding the effects of globalization on collective rights in France.

V.2.ii. Presentation of the interviews/texts

In this part, I would like to explain how the interviews will be presented in this study. One of the questions when analyzing discourses is to know how to treat these texts in a rigorous and systematic manner, while preserving their richness and their diversity (Nonna Mayer, 1995): first, a transcription (in a translated version) of the interviews will be offered, as I recorded them, for better readability and as pledge of faithfulness, two constraints that are often times difficult to reconcile in the analysis work (Bourdieu, 1996). However, for this particular study, I decided to cut the texts and incorporate into my analysis specific parts of the interviews (instead of their totality) that were directly or indirectly related to my problematic in order to ease the reading. I also included in the analysis some comments made by individuals met during meetings and at other occasions during my visit to local chapters of ATTAC whom I did not personally interview later. The transcription includes the repetitions, hesitations, and other linguistic ties that punctuate oral communication. Also, I will indicate the moments of

silence, pause, laughs and other non-verbal communication elements in between brackets. I have recorded the silences when equating with or going over a minute. Finally I have underlined the words on which interviewees insisted. This mode of transcription was my way of acknowledging the entirety of the discourses in their verbal and non verbal expressions. Indeed, Bourdieu (1996) argues that the readability of the texts goes through this restoration of what was lost throughout the passage from oral to written conversation. Eventually, most of the time I have put the discourse of interviewees in direct style, between quotes.

Second, I cannot neglect the problem of translation: if Geertz (1988) compares the notion of understanding in ethnography to translating, it is in reference to the idea of a bridge that allows for translation of perceptions of the world of the Other and his/her ethos (Blu, 1980). In my case-study it was a double translation process since not only did I have to put in words individuals' perceptions and representations, but I also had to decipher or interpret at another level: indeed, I had to translate into English (my second language) what was said and explained to me in French (my native language). This has not been a effortless or neutral process as I had to transpose ideas, images, emotions and concepts in a language that was not original to the interviewees. However, I remained as close as it is possible to be in a translation to the spirit of the interviews and comments that were communicated to me.

Therefore, we recognize in the text the presence of a sociologist engaging dialogue with the subjects: in fact, using ethnographical methods, I consider that every ethnography must be fundamentally "collaborative and reflexive" (Marcus and Fischer,

1996). In that regard, Marcus and Fischer (1996) argue, as in novels, the ethnographer himself as an author is staging the different discourses and events of a credible world in order to represent cultural and linguistic systems. However, the two experiences of writing (novel and ethnography) are not entirely similar: ethnographic discourse never represents the words of invented characters, as the interviewees are specific individuals with actual names and lived experiences of their reality.

CHAPTER VI

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS / DISCUSSION

In this chapter, I will proceed to the analysis of ATTAC's members' discourses, particularly through the lens of new social movement theories, as well as post-modern and feminist theories. Additionally to the interviews' content, I will as well make use of my participant observation field notes when necessary and relevant to the themes presented.

VI.1 Presentation of themes and contents

As proposed by new social movement theory and post-modern theories, attention and focus need to be put on the production of meanings and symbols in social movements, and not solely on actions. As explained in previous chapters, new social movement theory in particular contends that anti-globalization movements, such as ATTAC, are dealing with post-materialist or post-industrial issues which have to do less with class struggle (and for example the control over the means of production) and more with identity processes (for example, identity revival), as well as a civic conception of political action. Furthermore, post-modern theories claim that scholars need to concentrate their analysis on the different narratives produced by individuals that is, to bring their standpoint, localized, contextualized and fragmented back into the picture, if we are to understand the issues at stake in such movements.

My analysis/translation therefore concentrates on ATTAC's members' discourses and the particular themes from the interviews that concern ATTAC members' grievances and perceptions on globalization. Two themes seem to stand out in the interviews: first,

the relationship between globalization and French culture, whether it concerns the food industry (or French cuisine), the entertainment/cultural sector or the cultural goods; second, the relationship between globalization and the French idea of “les acquis sociaux”, which difficultly translates into “social gains or benefits”, as well as the actions (or lack thereof) of the French government. We will see how the two themes are actually interconnected, and how they represent parts of the French cultural identity in the eyes of ATTAC members. Before the main themes, however, I will introduce the members’ definition(s) or representation(s) of the notion of globalization today, which will give basis to their further claims and criticisms of the effects of globalization.

VI.2 Local discourses on globalization

VI.2.i. So, what’s globalization anyway?

First, when asked to define the notion of globalization in their own terms from a general standpoint, some members had difficulties to express themselves. Partly the reason for their hesitation was their assumption that as a scholar, I expected an academic definition (so I had to clear this misunderstanding) and that I was less interested in their personal view; and partly, members assumed that I would focus on the economic perspective of globalization, therefore, they tried to emphasize the economic aspect of their definition.

Second, some members insisted on making a distinction in their struggle against globalization: to them, it is not a fight against the idea of globalization, or “going global”:

Mark of NiceVille: “First, globalization, me I have nothing against globalization, I am one of the people who doesn’t like that, say that we are against globalization.”

Matt of NiceVille: “so first we must say something very clearly, it’s that ATTAC, we are for globalization, but globalization of humans, that is euh, for the, euh, we have a certain quality of life, euh, that technology is capable of offering to everyone is we wanted, well, it’s, it’s an organization problem of society.”

Carol of BelleVille: “well first it’s true that people have blamed us for being anti-globalization but euh it is an unfair trial because we know it exists and it’s normal, so before they said anti-globalization and it’s not honest.”

James of GreatVille: “for me globalization is really an empty shell euh well it is a word that, euh, it is a word that is trapped huh (...).”

As we see in these quotes, members make a preliminary distinction before they even go further in their definition. Indeed, as noted by feminist theorist Janet Conway (Henderson and Singh, 2004), the term anti-globalization is problematic because it doesn’t say anything about what the movement (and its members) really stands for. So even though not all of them did so in a formal way during the interview, most of them reacted when I explained that my research was on ‘anti-globalization’ movement, and they in fact corrected me by claiming that this is a ‘other-globalization movement’. Some of the members even consider themselves “internationalists” or “globalists”. That is why the label anti-globalization has largely been rejected by most groups and members in those groups, and ATTAC (and its members) prefers the term “other-globalization” movement.

Consequently, members also usually separated their definition of globalization under the positive and negative effects of globalization, and they usually began with a positive outlook, as in the following quotes:

James of GreatVille: “So sure, in my work it’s fantastic because if I have a problem, I have a question that I cannot resolve euh in France (...) well I contact an American colleague euh who in the middle of the night, while I am sleeping, he is at work and he replies to me the next day euh, I go to work, he goes to bed and, and me I have the answer to my question. So this is fantastic, the, the, the euh the exchange of knowledge, I think it’s great.”

Bryan of GreatVille: “so in general I would say that euh it is the fact that transports being faster, communication faster and faster especially with the internet, well globalization is the fact that we are all (silence) that distance is not the criteria of selection for discussions and for exchanges whatever they are any more. (...)So it’s the first thing that I want to say.”

Jane of NiceVille: “there is the globalization of ideas euh, euh, of cultural euh exchanges, and all, all that follows, so there is all this let’s say positive aspect of euh globalization.”

Bill of BelleVille: “euh yes, well, the positive aspects euh despite the fact that euh (silence) we are more informed on what’s happening elsewhere euh (...).”

Lorena of BelleVille: “globalization has this aspect euh not neo-liberal, but positive, I’m thinking about an internationalization of people euh you see, about human being at the level of the planet, so you see, all this positive aspect (...).”

Liz of BelleVille: “Me I think there is a very positive aspect of globalization, it’s the globalization of information, huh, and of network connections, and that, euh, it’s, it will bring the globalization of solidarity, it will bring the fact that you will not be able to do just anything you want somewhere without anyone knowing about it. (...) That’s the positive aspect.”

Carmen of BelleVille: “globalization it means euh that, if you will, with the the the (silence) the amelioration of technology that is absolutely incredible huh, and especially the internet I mean that it has allowed for the total elimination of boundaries even, even if they still exist.”

Most of the members then see globalization, or the positive effects of globalization, more as a physical and technical phenomenon that breaks the barriers between humans and facilitates communication and networking between individuals. To

them at this point, globalization is equivalent with an increased “interconnectedness of individuals, groups, companies and countries” (Green and Griffith, 2002). They insisted on starting with the positive aspects of the definition in order to corroborate their assertion that ATTAC (and therefore its members) is a supporter of the idea globalization, even it is another kind of globalization.

This distinction enables them to follow their comment with a more critical definition, this time attacking the negative aspects of it.

Cristina of GreatVille: “what’s disturbing to me is the globalization that’s being made for us in the structures, which I became aware of thanks to ATTAC that they were absolutely illegal, and they didn’t have any democratic roots, huh, euh, like the FMI, and so on huh. These are people that auto-declared themselves that they were the managers of the world, and this, I cannot tolerate. Especially since, we know that, euh, they, they manage it according to their own interests. So globalization it is euh (silence) euh it is, it is not something that /if, if you want, that’s where the problem is. Euh, us citizens, we live it like something natural, normal. For me this is clear. (...) So there are people who want to dominate and people who want to get all the wealth for themselves. It is the globalization of people who want euh a people that doesn’t think euh a people that doesn’t create etc....you see, simply a people that euh has four pennies to consume/buy products euh that’s it. That’s why the danger, it is, it comes from that.”

Marcus of GreatVille: “globalization it’s the neo-liberal globalization, but neo-liberalism is not globalization. Yes, yes, it is the religion of materialism.”

James of GreatVille: “the way we hear it is neo-liberal globalization and that is euh well the weakening of the nation states, euh the financialization of economy but that it’s not easy to see (...).if you take the economic globalization, neo-liberal, as a fact, natural fact, euh that’s imposing itself like something falling from above here and that’s the way it is, then sure it’s euh revolting because, because we know it’s not true.”

Henry of NiceVille: “Well, it is certain that the investors of the world will make a lot of money with China for example thanks to the WTO (...).So on an economic standpoint, there is going to be euh I think a euh an acceleration of the disappearance of industrial production (pause) well to the profit of perhaps nothing. What are we going to export? Communication?”

Mark of NiceVille: “I think that political decisions have been taken to euh free some financial transactions that’s all, and this liberalization of financial transactions has catastrophic consequences (...).”

Matt of NiceVille: “So now, globalization or financial globalization, it’s what’s governing us now, and what’s destroying everything because euh (pause) in economy we talk about giving the technical means, to think about an organization of society, about a distribution of products, that’s economy, even if there’s intervention of the state (...). But euh, financial globalization, its main problem is that it produces nothing, it makes money with nothing, it’s a betting game, and euh betting it can bring money, sure, but it can take it away, and so these people who bet, we come to believe that they are useful to society because they make money, because they develop, they make money for others, I mean euh, they manage pension funds, they’re like companies, euh banks etc... And so as long as they invent something that makes money and that they redistribute this money to their shareholders, they euh, they think it’s positive that they are people getting rich but they get rich on what? Nobody is asking the question.”

Bill of BelleVille: “on everything else euh, well, it’s systematically, euh, there is, there is an attack euh against systems that work, euh, well, the pensions, social security [health care in France], education etc... Me what I see the most is what I was saying, it’s, it’s the weakening, it’s the transfer of collective risk to the individual (...) It has important consequences for people, euh who withdraw on themselves, who, it’s everyone their own thing, there’s less solidarity between people euh, so euh, (...).”

Carol of BelleVille: “For me the current globalization well it’s euh, an uncontrolled capitalism that’s it (laughs) euh, maybe we call it differently, for me, it’s simply a capitalism euh, yes euh, without (pause) without limits, without, yes, that’s it, unbridled. So after that, we can explain euh, it has 36 different ways of manifesting itself but generally, it’s what it is.”

Lorena of BelleVille: “but unfortunately globalization huh, euh neo-liberal, economic, as it’s happening well of course it’s more like euh we are living in one single system which means that wherever you are you find euh the same Nike hat, the same hotel chains, you see, always the same, so some kind of ‘deculturation’, an exploitation, a redistribution of wealth that’s not happening.”

Liz of BelleVille: “The negative aspect, it’s that globalization has only meant the freedom for financial capital circulation, to the detriment of freedom for the movement of populations, of individuals, and that individuals have only become tools, or, or, instruments to the service of capital, to the service of transnational corporations, and not

at all the opposite. So that's the extremely negative aspect, the extremely negative aspect it's precisely been the, the rising of commercial laws against euh humanist laws. So for me, neo-liberal globalization for me it's essentially a financial and commercial globalization. So the person that you hire, it's only, it's only either a merchandize, or a consumer or a buyer, but he has no other function, we are trained as consumers, we are formatted to become consumers, we are formatted to be a flexible and docile worker."

First, the focus here is on neo-liberal policies and ideology: it is actually the moment during the interview when I see appearing the notion of "neo-liberalism" attached to globalization which clarifies their anti-globalization position. Words such as "financialization", "liberalization", "unbridled capitalism", "religion of materialism" reflect a concern for (and a resistance to) a mercantile conception of the world that is at the heart of ATTAC's main critique (Matthieu, 2001). Second, members are also questioning the policies of globalization as promoted by international institutions (such as the FMI, the WTO or the World Bank, which they named sometimes) and by multinational corporations. These criticisms are about the legitimacy of the transnational institutions and whom they represent, as seen through references made to the "structures", the fact that they are "illegal" and have "no democratic roots". Indeed, the words used to designate the institutions are varied and range from "auto-declared managers of the world" who wish to "dominate the world", "investors of the world" to "something falling from above" or simply "they", hence suggesting that these institutions seem to have no real physical existence, i.e. no legitimacy, even though they seem to possess power.

However, although members' discourses relate the financial aspect of globalization, they are already connected to the idea that globalization (economic or financial) affects society as a whole, or parts of it, in its cultural roots, as showed by

expressions such as: “weakening of the states”, “disappearance of industrial production”, “destroying everything”, “produces nothing”, “attack against a system that works, the pension funds, social security”, “same Nike, same hotel chains”, “deculturation”, and “trained, docile, flexible consumers”. These expressions reflect the fear of a general deregulation that would ‘merchandize’ all sectors of social life, making them uniformed products of mass consumption (Poupeau, 2002). Thus, these words already prefigure the actual themes of the interviews having to do with French identity and culture possibly threatened by globalization.

So as we see, the problem of terminology is real in consequences: the struggle, the fight from members’ standpoint does not happen against just any globalization but against certain policies or institutions (Poupeau, 2002). Or as Sommier (2003) explains, militants of anti-globalization movements are really opposed to the forms in which economic and financial globalization is operated, not to globalization in itself.

V.2.ii. Globalization and French culture

According to Warnier (2004), all “culture-traditions”, hence all cultures, are socially contextualized and situated. That is how cultures can be identified as singular and diverse: they are localized, geographically and/or socio-historically. They are, Hall (1997) notes, located in a place, in a specific history, that is what make them peculiar. A culture is also located in relation to a whole set of notions about territory, about where is home and where is overseas, what is close to us and what is far away. It is therefore about who constructs, develops, and perhaps changes the definition of that location. So culture is not a varnish that allows people to shine in society, it is the capacity

individuals possess to act with references, models of action and communication. It is a capital of habits that are incorporated and that structure the activities of those who possess and practice it, Warnier (2004) further explains. Culture is, in summary, a complex totality made of norms, habits, repertoires of action and representation, acquired by man as member of a community/society, for whom it is a factor of identification with respect to the others. Eventually, those habits, practices and repertoires construct society and give to its members their identity, or their “compass” as Warnier (2004) characterizes it.

VI.2.ii.a French cuisine

Whether viewed from archeological-historical, socio-cultural or biomedical perspectives, food is not only a basic concern for all human societies, it is also a cultural practice. As Ellen Messer (1984) shows, the old proverbs, ‘tell me what you eat and I’ll tell you who you are’ (from the French), and ‘you are what you eat’ (from the German), point to more general anthropological issues such as the relationships of human populations or social groups to their environment, the symbolic construction of cultures and the social relations and social structures of societies. Early British social anthropologists noted how the search for, the preparation and consumption of food provided the primary focus rather than an interval in the day’s activities, and how in such contexts, symbolic and emotional values of foods were often used ritually to mark social status, intervals in time and culturally important environmental resources. Subsequent ethnographies emphasized the centrality of the social cooperation in the food

quest and food sharing to the structure and change of human social organization and culture.

Food has been also analyzed as material and symbol, which marks the prevailing sexual division of labor, social class or ethnic identity. Barthes dealt with food symbolism and its relationships to social classifications in modern state societies. He considered the various cultural meanings attributed to substances like sugar and coffee by different national groups, such as the French Vs the Americans. He also tried to identify certain 'tastes' with particular classes [e.g. lower class preferences generally for extremely sweet or strong flavors.] Thus food is a marker of ethnic identity via ethnic cuisine, which is characterized by items of particular flavor and type, recipes that combine food elements in particular ways, meal formats that aggregate the dishes in predictable manners, and meal cycles that alternate meal formats into ordinary and festival meals as well as particular types of festive eating events. For Penaloza (1994) as well, food is more than a means of nourishment and sustenance: it is also a key cultural expression. In effect, she observed that for her informants –Mexican immigrants-, eating the foods they ate in Mexico in the U.S. provided them with a taste of home and served to reaffirm ties to their culture of origin.

Indeed, food is one of the themes recurring in my interviews with ATTAC's members.

Adriana of PleasantVille: "Me I tell myself I cannot buy my chocolate-bread because it's not the little pieces of chocolate it used to be, now it's all frozen, I know this through a young guy who is intern in a company, an industry of, of, of bakery precisely, and now everything is done so that the bakeries only buy frozen products, and I can always look at it me euh it's, it's the aspect that makes me buy my little chocolate-bread

and my croissant, so then sometimes I buy one and I tell myself “well, it’s not so bad”, but it’s still not what it used to be. Well, now everything is euh big production, big production, big production, the craft, the work, the real work, well it’s not that at all.”

Carmen of BelleVille: “the world is like a merchandise huh, we are in this, that’s why by the way I think we need to react it’s that (...) a system that consists of making everything a merchandise including art, cinema, out of a hundred of movies that come out there are 96 that you can throw to trash at least for me, at least that are really out just for the cash so, it’s, it’s like food, it’s neither very bad, neither very good, it’s like that, without taste, we don’t really know what we eat at McDonald’s it’s not really bad, it’s not really good, it has some kind of a neutrality of taste like that yeah, and culture becomes the same thing. So but of course it has [globalization has an effect on French cuisine], but I mean wait a minute [talks to me shocked as if I didn’t know and she giving me the news], but my son it’s really difficult to make him eat traditional dishes, he only wants to eat grilled chicken wings and euh steaks euh some McDonald’s and euh some pizza. But me no, huh, me I still cook very traditionally, I never buy frozen stuff, never anything ready-made. But at the restaurant yes somehow but somehow me I think that now there is a certain come back to the desire if you will to preserve taste, the good one, to preserve, because there is somehow a great culinary tradition in France so there are somewhat a lot of people who are conscious, me I listen to Jean-Pierre Coffe on Saturday, huh, there are plenty of people who are conscious that you can’t let the traditions disappear huh, unfortunately it, it becomes luxury products, and I hear it’s the case in the U.S.”

Carol of BelleVille: “I think we are going to a culture called mass-culture where indeed, there will be Pizza Hut or Pizza Hot I don’t know how you say it, and then McDo and this and that, and there will be on the other hand, an elite cuisine for a small part of the population. (...) But me I am a little bit more optimistic (...). And maybe there will be a certain way of eating McDo that won’t be the same. And anyway, they’ve started because now at McDo they’re making salads, in BelleVille (laughs), they adapt, they’re making ‘salade niçoise’ (laughs). But it’s true that it’s a danger anyway.”

Bill of BelleVille: “Well in Belleville, we eat, euh, couscous, aioli, paella, euh, well, it’s part of euh the Mediterranean root now, but it’s been done over generations, there had to be people to bring it, settle down, make connections, get married, everything, etc...some exchanges for it to happen. Now it’s TV that imposes a way of life, we see that, we see the same (...).When I went to work in SmallVille years ago, I was surprised in the stores I couldn’t find, they had a really small pasta shelf, because I mean here, pasta it’s big, but there, it’s true that I realized that well actually they don’t eat like us, because I mean sure, when you go in restaurants, we take the local

specialties, well that's it. But I mean, no, in the store shelf either they don't eat the same, it's interesting, you find something else. And that's going to be reduced more and more.”

Jane of NiceVille: “I mean all these people who have the power to manage the planet (laughs), at one point indeed we can all drink coke in the middle of Africa, Canada, all eat euh well McDo euh, and euh, (...) and we could indeed align our cultural system on their [interests], our traditions. (...) So yes it's all legalized so that products disappear, we are going to legalize with health laws that are extremely hard, and nobody will be able to follow them, so that products are going to disappear and [industrial] food industry is going to dominate the market. So one of the solutions for example would be for the apple producer not to follow the regulations. It's the same thing for the cheese, well so you need a minimum of regulations of course, but we've reached that minimum a long time ago, and I mean there are health services that are controlling things, so it's very well regulated for the interest of the consumer, but now it's regulated in the interest of the industry that produces big quantity of euh, euh, tasteless cheese, and so now we regulate not to protect the consumer but to protect euh let's say, the big company so that it makes a lot of money. And that, in that regard, those who make the laws, they make the laws to defend a system that is managed by the WTO that imposes its regulations. (...) I mean it's what's happening right now [uniformization]. There is a conditioning through advertisement, and it's where the cultural aspect is serious.”

Cristina of GreatVille: “Well, there's the culture, there's everyone's personal life experience. And I think that it's, the products are from the place where you are supposed to consume them. I have an example, it's cider, we have ties since years, well, we have specific ties with some Lower-Town region people, when I go to Lower-Town region, my first wish is to drink cider, when I drink cider here, well, it has nothing to do with the other, and when I get to their place, they bring out their cider, so in addition it's not even the same because they do it themselves, but over there, it has its own *raison d'être*, and this we must be able to keep, the Camembert, all that, it's true, it's the same, there are things to be consumed where they are produced. That's why I give cooking lessons (laughs) to the women in my company, let's keep this, let's keep this, let's keep our olive oil, let's keep euh, this is culture, that's why I am learning GreatVille region dialect, because this language is a richness, I mean it doesn't exist anywhere else. I am very concerned because for the GreatVille region dialect, there are arguments because some people would like to unify, there are some people who would like to unify the language, but because it's a language that was, that kept being a spoken language and all that, well euh there differences everywhere I mean, and I think it is rich (...). We must keep everything you see. (...) So it's very dangerous euh because for example for the wine, there are some appellations, well GrapeVine appellation that has something real interesting for the wine, well there are some people who want to standardize the GrapeVine, so that we all do the same (laughs). It's crazy, there's no *raison d'être* for

that, what's interesting is that the neighbor doesn't do the same wine as yours, that's great. What a pity."

James of GreatVille: "So I tell myself, what's left of local or transnational specificity, euh, national culture, aren't we in the process of blending everything in some sort of abominable mix? (...) In this mix, we mostly see a dominant model that's imposed, but you're free to reject it I mean, we are free to go see movies to the Pathé movie theater, euh to go eat McDo. (...) I think it's kind of interesting to think about that [the food issue]. It might seem like French nationalism, but to think about globalization from the angle of food. (...) Euh, in fact me, I, I mean, it's pleasant to eat, it's pleasant for the palate to eat something strange/foreign, but I find it terrible tasteless to go to a Chinese restaurant in GreatVille, but I mean it's terribly sad. Euh I mean, I have a lot of pleasure to cook here in France, dishes that have been cooked a long time ago before in France, by people in France. But (...) I mean we must be careful because it can be interpreted almost like being racist, but I think it's actually tasteless to each euh to eat Mexican food in France, and it must be so much more tasteful to go eat a couscous euh I mean in Rabat, euh it's completely different."

Bryan of GreatVille: "What's threatening is what's hegemonic so (...) when uniformization, euh, it's true that if everyone starts drinking Coke, well, it's not because it's American that I say that, but we're going to lose other products like lemonade or other from here [France], so at the cultural level euh...(...). We had everything [in France], the social security, the food and we're going to lose everything. (...) Yes in French culture what we are going to lose indeed and yes me, euh, all that we eat that's not sanitized or that's not euh I don't know euh (...)."

According to Jean-Pierre Warnier (2004), culinary habits are made of tastes and distastes that have been learned, that are acquired. They structure the relationships between individuals and with the "magical" and religious life-worlds. As a matter of fact, food is one of the areas in which the French government has stepped in to attempt to contravene market forces in the name of the preservation of cultural diversity. Jean-Michel Normand wrote in *Le Monde*: "McDonald's...commercial hegemony threatens our agriculture and its cultural hegemony insidiously ruins alimentary behavior, both sacred reflections of French identity." (Normand, 1999). Alain Rollat's also wrote in *Le Monde* (1999): "Resistance to the hegemonic pretenses of hamburgers is above all a

cultural imperative.” The huge success of Jean-Pierre Coffe (a radio talk show host) who has made a career through books and radio talk shows and popular television appearances, of defending French culinary traditions against the “malbouffe” (bad eating) is another indication of how seriously the French public takes the issue¹.

These concerns for the effects of globalization on French cuisine are mirrored in ATTAC’s members’ interviews. First, expressions such as “neither very bad, neither very good”, “without taste”, “neutrality of taste”, “uniformization”, becomes the same thing”, “tasteless cheese”, “dominant industrial food industry on the market”, “standardize”, “we all do the same”, “blend in abominable mix”, “everyone drinking coke”, “tasteless” and “sanitized” translate this fear of a loss of what constitutes the expression of French cultural identity and a fear of having to ingest a tasteless cuisine, a cuisine without soul. In most interviews, references are made to fast food production and consumption (whether McDonald’s, Pizza Hut, Coca Cola). Critics of fast food argue that it embodies globalization in its culinary dimension. It is a one-size-fits-all approach to food, encouraging uniformity and playing on the lowest common denominator of tastes. It is the direct opposite of French culinary traditions, which is what one of the members argues when she claims that there is a “great culinary tradition in France” and that we “can’t let the tradition disappear.” Fast food has indeed become a symbolic target of antiglobalization protesters because of its American origins. In fact, French sociologist Michel Crozier notes that to some extent, “there is an association that good food is French and that fast food is American, foreign and bad.” (in Rick Fantasia,

¹ See for example, Jean-Pierre Coffe. 1991. *Le Bon Vivre, le Vrai Vivre*. Paris: Best Pocket.

1995). As some quotes suggest –“merchandization of the world” or “alignment of our traditions”-, the perception is that pure market forces have a homogenizing effect and tend to limit variety. So the widespread belief among ATTAC’s members is that this same homogenization should not happen in the area of French gastronomy, whose diversity is itself an essential component of French culture.

Second, adversaries of globalization also argue that it represents a threat to French “gastronomical sovereignty”, not only because it homogenizes tastes, but also because it puts consumer health at risk, as it has been argued by some members during the visit of ATTAC’s President at a local company: we can think of food crises (mad cow disease) that have gone public through the media, as well as a sense of food insecurity. Globalization is blamed for these food scares for several reasons: France doesn’t seem to have control over what comes across its borders, meaning that without protection this could include hormones and GMOs. Indeed, critics such as José Bové and his farming organization (Confédération Paysanne who is one of the collective entities founders of ATTAC) argue that the new food safety crises result from the industrialization of agriculture. As a result of industrialization, the process of food production is now dominated by a race for profit, which can explain some of the unorthodox methods being used by today’s farmers. Because of globalization, it is argued by the Confédération Paysanne, food production is no longer local. In fact, ATTAC members believe that the development of agronomic dietary multinational industries and the globalization of meat, fish, drinks, or wheat trade will have a deep impact on local identities. Several members gave specific examples of regional

particularities: “camembert”, “cider”, olive oil”, “GrapeVine Appellation”, “tasteless Chinese in GreatVille” or “tasteless Mexican in GreatVille”, particularities created over generations “reduced more and more”. These expressions of discontent are not to be confused with closure of identity as a defense of individual specificity by denying that of others, which is the case of associations of the extreme right or populist associations (Farro, 2004). Actually, according to Leglatin (VP Culture Group of ATTAC Paris), whom I interviewed in Paris while also visiting with ATTAC national chapter and its President Nikonoff, the problem is that there might be the temptation, like a reflex, to withdraw within oneself, within a traditional culture, as a “folklore that becomes frozen”. Therefore, for Leglatin, this is not the antidote ATTAC is looking for: in fact, Leglatin says, this kind of identity withdrawal fits perfectly the neo liberal world because the goal is to avoid the creation of a real opposition, hence the re-emergence of the traditionalist movements who only oppose, in a racist manner, the supposed ‘invasion’ of migratory groups (Farro, 2004). For Leglatin, these extremist groups are only showing the powerful domination relationships and it is a logic that ATTAC, in Leglatin’s words, wishes “to expose and denounce”. Consequently, some members even take formal precaution to distance themselves from a possible amalgamation with racist ideologies. Quite the contrary to a withdrawal into a “frozen folklore”, members’ comments indicate that individuals wish to embrace and get recognition for their own subjectivity, as French citizens, and further as local/regional citizens: so the emphasis here is on resisting impositions seemingly seeking to deny cultural and other forms of particularity, it does not indicate a desire to defend archaisms (Farro, 2004). Members of

ATTAC, in other words, are individuals who strive to define themselves by emphasizing their particularity in terms of food and cuisine in this case, without closing themselves off from the concerns of other groups.

Additionally, some of the critics during the interviews approach the role of external regulations: “laws defend a system managed by the WTO that imposes its regulations”, “alignment of our cultural system on their interests”, “loose other productions from here”, “disappearance of products”. Again, as in their criticism of the very notion neo-liberal globalization, members attack the institutions (economic and political), at the local, national or transnational level, challenging the legitimacy of their actions and regulations. In fact, faced with this apparent attack on the national culinary identity, the French government has taken steps to ensure the defense of the country’s gastronomical patrimony. In 1989 the Ministry of Culture created the National Council of the Culinary Arts (Conseil National des Arts Culinaires) with a mission to protect French gastronomy. French consumers (even though they buy these products) share these views for the large part and would rather have their government apply the principle of precaution whenever possible. In 1999 for the first time since the introduction of fast food in France, fast food “*à la française*” (baguette sandwiches from food chains) outnumbered burger chains, including McDonald’s and European brands such as Quick.

At the same time, considering (as seen in the demographic description of the interviewees, Chapter V.2.i. Pp. 151) the middle-class or more specifically the “intellectual middle-class” status of the interviewees, the conception of what represents the ‘good’ taste of French cuisine can be connected to French sociologist Bourdieu’s

notions of “distinction”, “cultural capital” and “habitus”. The latter are in turn interrelated with the idea of social class. Indeed, Bourdieu (Gronow, 1997: 13) argues that what is considered “good or legitimate taste” in fact “conceals its real class origins”, in this case behind the claims of ‘authenticity’ and ‘diversity’ of French cuisine. Through his sociology of social distinction, for example, Bourdieu (1984) shows how lower classes consider that food must be ‘nourishing’ first and foremost, whereas bourgeois milieu, as well as middle classes now, will tend to deny the immediate satisfaction of food consumption to privilege ethical and aesthetic imperatives. We can observe in ATTAC’s members’ discourses that the emphasis is on a ‘ideal’ of what makes the unique quality of French food, and not so much, for example, on the inequality of access to food for under-privileged classes: “I cannot buy my chocolate-bread because it’s not the little pieces of chocolate it used to be, now it’s all frozen”; “we are going to legalize with health laws that are extremely hard, and nobody will be able to follow them, so that products are going to disappear”; “me I still cook very traditionally, I never buy frozen stuff, never anything ready-made”; “I have a lot of pleasure to cook here in France, dishes that have been cooked a long time ago before in France, by people in France”. In Bourdieu’s terminology (Gronow, 1997), this classification of tastes (in more ‘refined’ and ‘subtle’ levels) operates as a possible mechanism of distinction, where a certain kind of food (as defined by the intellectual middle-class) is worth more than other kinds of food (as introduced by the fast food chains for the ‘masses’ for example). These remarks from members also illustrate the notion of cultural or symbolic capital, as conceived by Bourdieu (1990; 1992). Indeed,

breaking with the economism of marxism which reduces the social field to the economic field, Bourdieu's (1990; 1992) definition of capital extends to all the goods that present themselves as rare and worthy of being sought after in a particular social formation. This includes material things (that can also have symbolic value), as well as untouchable but culturally significant attributes (e.g. prestige, status, authority...). The latter are referred to by Bourdieu as symbolic or cultural capital (1984; 1990): it is a transformed and disguised form of physical economic capital, and is defined as culturally valued taste and consumption patterns; it can include a broad range of goods such as art, education, forms of language or accents, dress codes, body posture, and food. This concept can be completed by integrating Bourdieu's (1990; 1992) notion of habitus. Habitus can be defined as a system of taste (or preferences) and dispositions acquired over time and common to a group of agents who give the same signification to their practice of consumption. According to Bourdieu (1990), there are three types of habitus: one of the dominant class, defined by a sense of distinction; one of the middle-class defined as a "good cultural desire", or more precisely a desire to imitate to dominant group; and finally one of the popular class defined by the taste of necessity. Of course, habits of consumption acquired through socialization, values and norms, are also interiorized through this socialization process and the social status (position) too. Indeed, A. Muxel (1996) argues, food is an object of pleasure, as well as an object of training, learning the family rules and taste, and the ways/practices of a given culture. That is why culinary transmission takes such a primordial place in ethnic groups. At the same time, as Bourdieu shows, food, as any other field in society, is a place where

different classes engage in a symbolic struggle, “one aimed at imposing the definition of the social world that is best suited to their interests.” (May, 1996: 131)

Finally, the question generally asked by ATTAC members is: “are we going towards a coca-colonization of the planet and a Disneyland type of culture?” ATTAC members consider that culture in general is too vital to be “given” to the business world, to the merchants. This is because food, as any other cultural goods, is considered to be “sacred” somehow, or part of the inalienable goods, in the words of Jean-Pierre Warnier (2004), inherited from generation to generation. These goods define the identity of a group, and that is why they are considered sacred and apart from the other types of “profane” goods. That is why they all agree with French farmer José Bové and François Dufour’s slogan “the world is not for sale” or that “the world is not a merchandize.” They call upon something that is sacred and that cannot be “given” to business trade without selling one’s soul. When I attended a meeting in GreatVille, where ATTAC’s President Jacques Nikonoff was making a visit, at the end of the conference/forum, we all gathered around a table set up by the organizers (the employees of the company) to share a drink and more: at this moment I realized how the debate over globalization and its negative effect on French culture was translated into action. Indeed, as detailed in the participant observation account (Chapter IV.3.ii. Pp.118), all the food and wine (after a short questioning/investigation on my part) revealed to be from the GreatVille region, all local productions: we were ‘eating’ French culture, everything around us was about French culture and identity. So, even though we weren’t primarily talking about French identity, we were surrounded by it, we were ingesting it, appreciating out loud the taste

of it: “this is the real cantaloupe from LittleVille, you can’t find that anywhere else”, as Cristina of GreatVille explained to me. Cantaloupes from LittleVille are indeed renowned not only in the region but all over France: they are in fact marketed as such (i.e. “cantaloupes of LittleVille”) as a guarantee for authentic taste from this southern region and for excellent quality. This is exactly what Flynn (1995) is referring to when he explains that the essence of French identity can be considered to embody those qualities that make an individual identify with France (i.e. what it takes for someone to feel French as opposed to German). That is why someone like Cristina of GreatVille cannot imagine the production and consumption of regional products (cider, Camembert cheese or cantaloupes) being delocalized from their original place: “it has its own *raison d’être*, and this we must be able to keep, the Camembert, all that, it’s true, it’s the same, there are things to be consumed where they are produced.” The notion of power and control through a process of disciplinarization and normalization of the body as articulated by Foucault proves relevant here: ingesting food that is normalized exactly creates that, a normalization of the taste into a minimum common denominator that eventually could eventually, in ATTAC’s members’ fear, destroy the taste of French cuisine, the taste of French identity.

VI.2.ii.b French entertainment and art sectors

According to Jean-Pierre Warnier (2004), a new historical situation appeared when the Industrial Revolution allowed the “developed” (soon to be industrialized) countries to fabricate cultural products and to diffuse them in mass and everywhere. One of the consequences of the industrial development is the globalization of culture, and

furthermore the development of industries of culture that can produce and trade cultural goods on a large scale. The expression of globalization of culture hence can be found in the circulation of cultural productions at the global scale. One of the questions, Warnier (2004) notes, raised by the globalization of culture is how much will world cultures weigh facing the “attack” of cultural industries? Frankfurt School thinkers and theorists (especially Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer) coined the expression “cultural industries” for the first time in 1947: they intended to stigmatize the mass production of cultural goods that, according to them, would endanger the artistic creation. And generally, they meant to underline the negative aspects of industrial modernity doomed to produce a “pastiche” culture, unauthentic, superficial and standardized, without any depth.

Precisely, one debate that recurs throughout the interviews about the cultural influences of globalization on French society focuses the entertainment and art sectors (cinema and television in particular). This again was expressed in the members’ interviews when addressing the issue of culture and globalization.

Carmen of BelleVille: “ah yes, ah but the world is like a merchandise huh, we are in this, that’s why by the way I think we need to react it’s that (...) a system that consists of making everything a merchandise including art, cinema, out of a hundred of movies that come out there are 96 that you can throw to trash at least for me, at least that are really out just for the cash so (...).”

Liz of BelleVille: “well, culture we call that the world common good. The world common good, you have material things, water, forest, air, that doesn’t belong to anyone, and that belongs to everyone, and culture is part of that, so this good is a whole that we need to protect to transmit to future generations. And this is new within ATTAC, that is, we are six, at the national level to work on this to make this idea go through and precisely we are becoming more and more aware that because of the merchandization

that's trying to get everything, like culture, and to get standardization, it means we create, we create a clothing brand, and this clothing brand prevents others from creating different clothes so that we standardize the taste of people all over the planet. So yes it is one of the dangers, yes, it is one of the big dangers. This uniformization is not representative of the differences that exist between people. It is the differences that make our cohesion. But unfortunately the dominant model through advertisement it's what we are imposing (...)."

Lorena of BelleVille: "There is a concept, you know, this principle of flux of thought, cloned to consume the same, to, to think the same, to speak the same, to laugh about the same things, well, euh, you can imagine TV series like Dallas that are watched, even seasons in advance, in North Africa, so we thought, well, as you see, you can imagine how the Mediterranean region, European and American watched the same things euh. And so at this moment, indeed you have a sort of shaping of the architecture of thought huh, this is what's terrible. (...) There was the director of a movie theater in BelleVille who explained the problem of [cinema] distribution really well, he said "you see, during Christmas, there were three movies that had 90% of the movie theaters", you see, there. So it participates, it participates of the same principle we said earlier, we only have one or two products (laughs), no, I exaggerate (laughs), I exaggerate but that's it, one or two products, there are only one third of the artists that can live. In every sector we come to uniformization, some sort of funnel like that where there are only a few products euh, owned by the big families, the big monopolies and that's it, and that take 3/4th of the market and of the wealth."

Mark of NiceVille: "It begins to be the case already [homogenization of cultures], it seems to me, because you find the same things in Italy, in France, euh, the same kids in general consume the same things, the same products, so yes certainly, euh well, maybe not like the "one-dimensional man" of Marcus but yes I think that there is something going on. (...) And I mean, it seems to me that people are, how would you say euh, they don't have any other choice in order to exist than consumption, so in fact we find refuge in consumption, we consume."

Henry of NiceVille: "Yes, yes it [globalization] can reduce things, but not fundamental things. I don't think globalization is going to touch culture very much. (...) I don't know [uniformization of cultures], it's been happening, from the prehistoric times (...), so culture has changed. It's not a problem. (...) Yes perhaps, it's true that there are some things that are imposed in the, by the intense communication, by the fact that new industrial products spread fast. But it's not new. (...) They have adopted the fridge compare to the old cave or the well, it's, it's, it's what's called progress. So I think that in what's being developed there are so rejects, some trash, there are things we adopt because it's trendy and then it goes to trash real fast. (...) So the houses have changed,

and all that is new, so there was an uniformization of housing right? So maybe we shouldn't fear it. (...) Me I don't care about that. Me I really don't care about that."

James of GreatVille: "Euh so that's clear, that's obvious, we must, we must, we must be careful, we must reject euh, we must choose our books, choose our movies, choose euh what we eat. (...) And if we talk about French cinema for example, that we have protected through a pseudo French-exception rule, euh I mean the famous French cultural exception, yeah, I remember that Bourdieu in 2000 in Millau, he has said something about that, euh by developing a model, I mean, a generic cultural model, I mean that's what they want us to believe when really there's a dominant model behind it, it's classic. It can be scary. (...) So it's true there is a risk of mixing, and of disappearance of [French] cinema, and by the way I think that the French directors say it, at least they have the same idea as I have, that is we cannot make movies the way we used to before, but I mean, you must be careful not to fall in the other extreme. But it's true that I have a tendency to believe that it's a dominant model that euh that could crush everything on its path. (...) And if we don't have the French exception, I mean euh I don't know, the famous French cultural exception I don't know if Utopia [alternative movie theater] would still exist. So there is a risk, euh, there is a risk of cultural uniformization."

First, among the recurring expressions we find "merchandize" or "merchandization", "cloned to consume the same", "consumption", "world like a merchandize" and "making everything a merchandize". One of the issues raised by members is therefore connected to the idea that neo-liberal globalization transforms everything, hence including cultural components such as art, into a commodity to be sold and bought by consumers, not social actors. In this regard, Warnier (2004) argues that indeed, all the systems of mass production do convey and "merchandize" culture in the sense that they reduce it to a product to be traded in an economic exchange, rather than symbolic. In this sense, Warnier (2004) claims, cultural industries are intruding the culture-traditions, transform them and sometimes destroy them. What is problematic for the members in the idea of commodification of the arts and entertainment sectors is precisely the fact that culture (food, as well as other elements) should be set apart from

any trade: as one member put it, culture is part of the “world common good” and as such cannot be exchanged and traded as a commodity. In fact, then French Foreign minister Hubert Védrine has defended the widespread view that cultural goals cannot be “treated, produced, exchanged, and sold like any other” and points to the “vast internal market” and “huge resources” that enable Hollywood to “flood markets abroad.” So the main argument to protect French audiovisual industry for example is not economic or commercial but cultural. French cinema should be defended in order to preserve what is unique about French identity and culture, and to preserve cultural diversity in France and for the world. Védrine says that “the desire to preserve cultural diversity in the world is in no way a sign of anti-Americanism but of anti-hegemonism, a refusal of impoverishment. American cinema has been enchanting viewers around the world for nearly a century and that will continue. This is no reason for others to disappear.”

Second, and consequently to the first point, one of the main fears in interviewees’ standpoint is the idea that market forces tend to result in a homogenization of offerings and eventually tastes, as well as being a threat to some elements of French national culture. This fear is reflected in expressions such as “standardization”, “uniformization”, “dominant model we are imposing”, “cloned to think the same, speak the same, laugh the same”, “shaping the architecture of thought”, “TV watching the same thing”, “homogenization”, “one-dimensional man of Marcus”, “generic cultural model”, “could crush everything on its path” and “risk of cultural uniformization”. We should note here that one member particularly mentions the “one-dimensional man of Marcus”: this remark from Mark of NiceVille (a public middle-school teacher and director) refers to

Herbert Marcuse, one of the main theorists of the Frankfurt School, and its critical theory of society, founded in the 1920s in Germany. The Frankfurt School built a critical analysis of the economic and political problems of modern capitalism, but it also critiqued culture and more particularly the cultural domination of culture industry. It was thought that culture industry would manipulate and control the arts, and that with consumerism and advertising combined, we would end up with standardized commodity production replacing critical and creative cultural expression. In particular, Herbert Marcuse predicted that this dehumanizing logic of commodification would happen in contemporary societies from which emerges a 'one-dimensionality' of life. Marcuse especially focused on cultural superstructure: he argued in his critique of culture ("One-Dimensional Man") that an external world of mass production, mass distribution and mass technology claims the whole person. This is a rather pessimistic vision of society, and it is, why whether talking about food or the arts, members (besides Mark of NiceVille) express their fearful concern: expressions such as "very dangerous", "crazy", "what a pity", "terribly sad", and "we're going to loose everything" show the sense of urgency and seriousness of members' claims and criticisms. At the same time, members refuse to believe it could actually be happening: "there are plenty of people who are conscious that you can't let the traditions disappear", "we are becoming more and more aware", "I'm a little bit more optimistic", and "that's why I give cooking lessons". As a matter of fact, when mentioning French cinema or other cultural creations, interviewees and other members at meetings often brought up the notion of "cultural patrimony" (*patrimoine culturel*), which Warnier (2004) refers to as the "inalienable goods" (very

much the same way French cuisine is considered) that are regarded as sacred, and that define the identity of a group, hence an exception. It is for this reason that the idea of “merchandizing” of the French culture or French cultural patrimony is so scandalous and ‘unbelievable’ to ATTAC members. The notion of “cultural patrimony” itself comes from the 18th century French Revolution, when members of the newly elected French National Assembly debated on what monuments (some of them symbols of the former rejected monarchy) should be kept and what should be destroyed. The modern concept of cultural patrimony is directly born of this debate, and everywhere in Europe it has imposed itself on policies led by public institutions. In France for example, these policies directly depend on the Direction of Patrimony, itself related to the Minister of Culture. Another element that interviewees mention in their discourse is the fight against the MAI (Multilateral Agreement on Investment) and how for some of them it has been their first active participation in a protest. In 1998, France was supposed to sign the MAI: one of the consequences of the draft agreement would have been to render illegal regulations protecting cultural investments in Europe. The French entertainment sector mobilized against the MAI (under the impulse of Jack Lang, former Minister of Culture, and “inventor” of the concept of “cultural exception” mentioned before). Famous French directors, actors, and other artists, as well as ATTAC in its early beginnings, raised public awareness about the dangers of subjecting culture to the imperatives of global capital. The result of this mobilization is that politicians pulled France out of the negotiations, triggering their collapse. ATTAC was at the forefront of the battle. Thus the defeat of the MAI was the first real victory of the antiglobalization camp and the first

successful alliance between the cultural sector and other segments of the French society, in the name of defending France's culture from globalization. In other words, as Gordon and Meunier (2001) put it, "a movie by Eric Rohmer is no more a defining component of French cultural identity than foie gras or Parisian cafés, and all seem threatened by globalization."

Additionally, this hegemony of a few multinational corporations is considered a danger not only because only a few corporations own the 'networks', but because they therefore have absolute control over the content of the messages offered on those networks. Indeed, for Leglatin (the VP Culture Group of ATTAC Paris), the entertainment industry is dangerous because "it's conditioning the minds of the people." According to Leglatin, the entertainment industry is "a means of control of the consciences; it has a very strategic role." For him, the problem with mass culture having a business/commercial orientation is that "everything is about emotions, strong sensations, speed, and danger, so there is an instrumentalization of urges/drives, look at reality TV". So, the content and the form are (re)possessed by the dominant societies, or the dominant powers in societies, which consequently means that, according to Leglatin "some society will not have the power to tell themselves, to say their history, their culture." Therefore, the urgency for Leglatin is for ATTAC (and eventually government policies) to find cultural politics that value something else than a dominant model, that value local practices and that leads to participation. So for Leglatin, since we are dealing with cultural symbols and meanings, the question is: "what type of civilization do we want?" Therefore for him, the most important issue regarding the effect of neo-liberal

globalization on French society is not the economy, it is “a moral question, a question of definition in a symbolic, moral and cultural sense.” This discourse actually resonates with the Gramscian’s analysis of social movements which contends that counter-hegemony (such as the anti-globalization project) challenges globalization at “the more subtle, but also significant, level of culture and ideology.” (Worth and Kuhling, 2004: 36) In fact, Sklair (1995) and Bauman (1998) have argued that the challenges to globalization at the level of cultural ideology are as significant as movements challenging the structural political and economy of globalization. This is the case with ATTAC through its mission of popular education aimed at questioning the dominant neo-liberal ideology: it is what Kebede (2005) calls a critique of the intellectual order. Particularly, movements like ATTAC are interested in the reassertion of an expert knowledge (hence the presence of many university professors and other academics members of ATTAC) as “an intellectual endeavor that is public oriented” because knowledge is power (Kebede, 2005: 96). Indeed, the hegemonic economic power is seen by ATTAC members as sustained by a neo-liberal ideology that in turn has to rely on a set of intellectual constructions to legitimize its policies. In other words, in the case of ATTAC’s members’ discourses, uniformization –through neo-liberal globalization– seems to be threatening not just the diversity of content broadcasted but also the diversity of who will be able to define the content (Benhamou and Saint Pulgent, 2000), and in the case of France, who will define what part or role France can play in representing itself. This cultural hegemony is thus not limited within discursive practices but is also manifest in the production (and consumption) of cultural goods (as seen

above for French cinema). Therefore, following a Gramscian argument, ATTAC can be interpreted as a counter-hegemony that aims to challenge cultural practices (leading to the uniformization and merchandization of French culture) by contesting the intellectual order through augmenting public awareness, with the presence of experts who give legitimacy and authority to the movement.

VI.2.iii. Globalization “les acquis sociaux” and the actions of the government

The concerns for what French call “les acquis sociaux” or social benefits (social acquired advantages or acquired benefits would be the exact translation) is reflected throughout the interviews, as well as the criticisms towards the French government, which is precisely connected to the concerns members have regarding those social benefits.

Bryan of GreatVille: “[what is threatened is] all that is necessary to live that should be free so euh healthcare, even housing, I mean minimum housing. (...) So well we lost it [the social gains from the CNR, National Council of Resistance]. Last year, for the pensions issue we’ve succeeded and made them [the government’s reform] stop, and for the social security we were ten times less people at the protests. (...) It makes me sick, this, I will never let go (...). I tell myself, well, there’s no one, no politician that talks about stuff like that correctly [homelessness, unemployment]. But ATTAC well, they talk about it a bit more, and it’s not even a political party dogmatic or something, because I mean, when Mitterrand was elected, we had a little hope, and I mean it’s him who personified, I mean, when he did his turn-around after 83 or 82, I don’t know anymore so that’s it. I mean, the first one who said “there’s nothing we can do” for me it’s Mitterrand. And the only one who said something a little bit different it’s Le Pen, that’s the problem. (...) And today I mean if we take, so it’s all politics, theoretically, and politics tells us that finance is governing us [silence, sigh and smile], in fact it’s not true because it’s still politics that govern us except they decided to sell themselves out somehow. (...) [So what do you think of the current government’s actions regarding globalization?] Which one the current one? Well, the current one, it’s applying the roadmap of the “small liberalism illustrated”, “how to break whatever’s public service”, there, that’s it huh, anyway Raffarin, he was, he was part of the extreme right sphere,

huh, and what's his name, Madelin, and Madelin was, after he had been a guy from the extreme right, he became a liberal, so that's it I mean. They apply everything."

James of GreatVille: "I see how the research system in France is being reorganized and aligned on a very "liberal" [economically] model that is coming from a school of thought euh liberal in the economic sense, well for example, competition, and that comes from also a organizational model euh anglo-saxon, let's say euh more American than British euh (...).About the social security indeed, me I am euh indeed I am aware that, that it's a concept euh euh that is not very old euh, that is here since half a century euh, it's an idea that has 50 years and so euh, it could easily disappear, and in fact, I was going to say, it's going to disappear. I surprise myself saying that but euh, considering the government we have euh, it's clear that it's going to put the social security through the blender [and crush it]. But I tell myself, it's so impossible, it's so impossible [sigh of despair], it's so impossible to eliminate the social security² that if the government destroys it, it's impossible. (...)But I mean I don't think that really all the people in France have wished the destruction of public service, we've been made [sigh], it's so stupid really that it's to fall on the floor, we have this right wing government that was elected, following the election of a President of, of a Right Wing Republic (...). I mean French people don't wish for the destruction of public service, for example (...) nobody wishes the privatization of EDF [French utilities], euh nobody wishes the destruction of, of our system of social security. (...)So now we have a right wing government and euh this right wing government can't stop beating up euh public services, euh. So I don't think that, I think that the government and the people that are behind it, actually wish for a health care system that's profitable to the private sector and euh catastrophic for the public but euh but these people, it's what, 5% of the population, not even. You think I'm naïve huh? But I tell myself that it's so impossible."

Cristina of GreatVille: "The problem is what means do we have facing the imposing wave that's destroying all this system of solidarity, regarding the merchandization? (...) So I'm not afraid of globalization, I am afraid of people who are armed, I am afraid of people who have a strong economic power, it's what scares me. (...) We feel depossessed sometimes. (...) [so what do you think of the actions of the government regarding globalization?] Me, I think that it is at the service of globalization that they want to impose on us huh, I mean, it's loud and clear. Euh, me I think that they're really good [laughs] and they made at the communication level euh at the tactical level euh and all that euh to let us believe I mean that they are trying to save euh everything we care for and that for example, social security I mean, and even the temporary workers, it's crazy to say "we're going to save all that" when they're

² Social security for French citizens refers to the idea of general social protection of the workers (public or private sectors) offered by the state including health care, family allocations, retirement funds, and mandatory social contributions from the employer for all of the above.

destroying everything I mean. So they [the governments] make it [globalization], they nurture it huh. That's why we don't need to change Raffarin, I mean, anyway the policy will not change, huh, so we can always change the men I mean."

Marcus of GreatVille: "This elaboration [nationalization of services and organizations] takes more than 50 years, so euh 60 years, where we create a concept, well today we're wasting it, but we are wasting it, this effort of reflection, we don't even think about that, I mean that's, that's, that creates a lot of problems. (...) But I mean you can see it [the destruction of public service], absolutely yes, well it's an antinomy [the merchandization of public service]. I mean public service, it exists only because the individuals, because the private is incapable of protecting the common good or to insure the common good."

Henry of NiceVille: "Well for example, I don't think France Telecom [French Phone Company that has been privatized recently] is an example of wealthy company, euh and secured, which was the case before, with the PTT [French Public Post Office, used to be combined with French Telecom]. So I mean we are selling the state property, it means we're privatizing, for the moment euh they survive by redistributing but it's only increasing the debt of our descendants, and at the same time we are selling off cheap our patrimony, by consuming, by making people consume, so it's a policy absolutely euh, euh irresponsible, bad. (...) There is a resignation of the politics, of the politicians. What's really negative in this thing, it's that the politicians let themselves get abused, we've found out with forums like Davos, somehow they were completely flattered, red carpet, jet, but they assimilated, they thought they were members of the jet-set huh, that's, these people are frivolous, I mean, they have money to spend, well, they bite huh, and our politicians, they have a lot, the desire to be recognized, to be appreciated, to be listen by those people. They live in their world. So well, they got assimilated huh, it's my opinion, huh. There's no doubt huh."

Mark of NiceVille: "Well, now, what I would like, me, well it's that the countries that have succeeded in getting public services, precisely what we were talking about with the "common good", could be used as a model for other countries, like the third world countries, etc...I mean. (...) Well at the social level, it [globalization] is destroying French society. (...) And I mean since we've absolutely destroyed every collective structures, every community centers, everything, well... (...) [so Nikonoff said that the states, the governments are promoting globalization...] yes, yes of course. Well, with Europe it's very clear for example, we see a lot of people say that's it's Europe that decides this or that but the states leaders they agree with one another before they make decisions, and the European Commission, it's only executing what they've decided prior to that first, huh, it's not a phantasm huh, you only need to read the texts, euh, the meetings' minutes of the states leaders to understand that they decide to liberalize such

and such sector, and then well the Commission obeys huh, so euh, me, it's what I don't like with Matt and others huh, it's that he has the same discourse as the enemy somehow, like "there is a market that created itself that is auto-powerful, all powerful", me I'm not sure there's so much difference [between this discourse and the neo-liberal discourse]. So for the liberalization of the financial transactions there were some political decisions that were made regarding the transfer of capital, the indexation system on gold, so well, these are political decisions, so political decisions doesn't mean we can do everything, but there are other political decisions that still can be taken into consideration. And euh for people it's an abstract entity. (...)For example, nobody asked for the privatization of EDF, nobody, it's the governments who decided to privatize EDF, the European Commission never asked the privatization of EDF, it asked something else, so in this area yes of course the governments can do a lot of things, if it's not everything at least a lot of things huh. There's an exploitation of the political model of the French Revolution."

Bill of BelleVille: "there's all the public service, so euh the issue of finding new markets for the capital euh (pause) and about this, of course we're afraid because, well, concerning health care, if the care basket gets reduced, euh (...).So already it's forgotten by a lot of people [the National Council of the Resistance gains], I mean, it's forgotten, it's forgotten and there are a lot of people who don't know it (pause). (...) [what about the position of the government regarding globalization?] It has one? [laughs]. Well, it's clear that about Europe, I mean, it's, it's really easy to say "ah, it's Europe, it's Europe's fault", etc... "they impose stuff, they impose directives", so this, this is the big thing for de Villiers, "Europe imposes us directives", and we are supposedly obliged to transpose them into national law. Well, but all these directives, they were taken with the agreement of the government, since it's the European Council that really has power, so the ministers, euh, the governments' leaders who are represented who are there and who say yes, no, etc... and who decide. So, when people tell me "yeah but to preserve the European unitary frame we have to do this or that", euh, perhaps why not, but somehow they have said yes to all these directives at some point, euh on the essentials I mean."

Lorena of BelleVille: "Within public service, so euh, it's true according to me, there's a tendency to privatize, with attempts on the education system, so we really feel it at the level of work organization, of the management style (...). You can imagine the public sector close to politics, so there are some people who help politically speaking as long as we destabilize the status, the organization, etc...(...) So all this disorganizes because of course at that point (...) people, euh, the values of public service, they impose temporary workers so euh...ah yes completely. (...) It's true that if you defend the euh republican values of solidarity, of the rights of public service, of the importance of equality, euh, to have taxes that allow to have a national plan (...).Like Cassen would say, we should eradicate this neo-liberal virus that's in us since 25 years. And you see, even in our sector it is in process. (...) [the government and globalization?] It's in

agreement with its values. And so what's, what's terrible, I think for euh, people like us who are opposed is euh, this lack of power relations somehow, because we well see that it aligns well huh with Raffarin who's gonna, who's gonna say of course that well he continues huh, elections are in three years (...)."

Liz of BelleVille: "yes, me I think it's, it is one of the things for which ATTAC is the most important, it's the notion of public service (...). So euh you see where the state is disengaging itself of all the collective, and that the collective now relying on associations (...) we are going to be backwards on equality I mean, it means that inequalities are going to increase. (...)[the actions of the government?] absent [pause] invisible [silence]. Yes, yes of course [the states are promoting globalization more than they are submitted to it]. We must follow, but in fact they are the ones to apply it, and whatever party it is, for the moment unfortunately, it was the case with the socialist party, it's the case, it's the same thing at the level of globalization, nothing has changed, whether it is a left party or a right party, and, and it's where it's the most terrible thing, I think that the, the socialist party started being conscious of what happened with the big slap in the face they got at the last presidential elections, and of what they let happen, of what they contributed to let happen."

Carmen of BelleVille: "But it's already [talking about globalization, insisting tone as if I didn't know] influencing, you now have a lot of workers in the ANPE [National Employment Agency] statistics that tell you that they find some jobs for two days, fifteen days. There was a specific interdiction in the Work Code on contracts with fixed time but it's gonna progressively disappear, and me I am in the jurisprudence business that's a reflection of society, the interpretation of the law at a moment, it's very clear that more and more we nibble things and we allow the the fixed time work, so that is an example (...). And look we are supposedly modernizing the public service of EDF [French National Utilities] and EDF euh is becoming independent despite the bad experiences that we've had, euh yes look at the breakdown there was because the installations were really old because we can't invest in it but we continue to do that anyway. (...) Yes, me I think that what's changed enormously euh at the political level is that the governments don't / cannot have the power that they had when the borders were closed huh, they are not free of their decisions, and that's what's posing a lot of problems huh, for example at the economic level, the economy is global so euh Chirac or Berlusconi he cannot take the decisions he wants because he had to take account of the owners of transnational corporations huh since they have the power in the sense that they own the jobs etc...(...) Well, me I think that on the economic level well they [the government] are in submission like everyone huh, they can't do euh much. (...) so from his point [Chirac's] what he does is extremely *démagogique* huh he realize that it was an idea [globalization and to master globalization] that was going further than anticipated and he thought that he could use it a bit so euh just to flatter people like that by saying

“you see me I am very preoccupied euh by the negative effects of globalization”, well but this, this is just a big speech.”

Adriana of PleasantVille: “They [the governments] are not victims, they want it, they are in the same, they are in the same [they accompany/support globalization] yes, yes, yes, absolutely, yes, yes of course, ah no, here with the Medef [Union/association composed of the CEOs of companies], they are completely, the Medef and the government they go in the same direction.”

First, members’ grievances over the “acquis sociaux” cover several elements of the French social system: mostly the education and research system, social security, health care, EDF (National Utilities Company), the French Telecom, the PTT (Postal Services), the ANPE (National Unemployment Agency), or the CNR (National Council of Resistance). These are part of a larger structure called the “public service”, to which members also refer. According to Brender (2004), there is in France something that is particular and not so common in other nations: collective rights that benefit (in principle anyway) everyone in France, which is represented by the idea of public service. This is richness, as much as culture is, in France, and belongs to the patrimony of France: it took two centuries to go from the Declaration of Human Rights to a society where individual lives indeed have an invaluable price. Hence, without maintenance, this wealth that was accumulated throughout generations is threatened to vanish. ATTAC is precisely fighting to maintain this patrimony, part of the historical identity of France. As a matter of fact, members connect the notion of public service to a larger conception of society in their description of what it represents to them: “values of public service”, “republican values of solidarity”, “the rights of public service”, “common good”, “collective structures”, “state property” and “patrimony”. As Krishnan (1996) argues, the system of

strong public services and social solidarity has deep roots in French history. The idea behind the notion of public service (or *les acquis sociaux*) is France's republicanism which has constructed French national identity around a new conception of citizenship symbolized in the triptych of the Revolution, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity (Lovecy, 1999): indeed, this understanding of a republican citizenship legitimized an activist role for the state in managing not only the economy but also the culture, and by developing appropriate elements of social protection (of which the famous social gains members are referring to are a part). In fact, in the mid-1990s, a discourse offered the French exemplary character residing in a series of particularistic "French models" (Lovecy, 1999), very much in the same way that we read about the French cultural exception previously. By 1994, the newspaper *Le Monde* in a publication entitled "Le Modèle Français en question" could identify a set of such models: social welfare, national champion firms, and state activism on the cultural front of francophonie. The construction and popularization of this discourse can be read, according to Lovecy (1999), as a resistance to the processes of Europeanization and globalization which both came much more sharply into focus in the 1980s and the 1990s. Hence the outcry and sometimes disbelief of members when asked about the influence of globalization on *les acquis sociaux*: "we lost it", "it makes me sick, I will never let go", "it could easily disappear, it's going to disappear", "I tell myself it's impossible [repeated several times]", "so stupid really that it's to fall on the floor", "wasting it", "selling state property", "selling off cheap our patrimony", and "destroying French society" are all expressions of discontent as well as resistant spirit of individuals facing the potential

disappearance of the French social model. Considering that most ATTAC members interviewed here are or were employed in the public service (see Chapter V.2.i., Pp. 151), we need to acknowledge the materialist character of their grievances: using a Gramscian approach, we can argue that members of ATTAC engage in a critique of the political and economic hegemonic order imposed by neo-liberal policies. However, if defending those *acquis sociaux* is related to materialist issues, it is not just about a social model, and is not a corporatist fight, it is also about French identity: in effect, Flynn (1995) argues that some of the most obvious examples of the essence of French identity concern specific political institutions or economic approaches, and certain social and cultural patterns. Some of these social patterns (such as social security, pension funds and health care in particular) have to do with the heritage of the Second World War and more specifically of the CNR (Conseil National de la Résistance, National Council of the Resistance) to which most members refer several times as a keystone to the French social system. The CNR (or National Council of Resistance) was an association created during the second World War in 1943 under the presidency of famous French resistant Jean Moulin (who was then a delegate for the CNF, the French National Committee, presided by Charles de Gaulle). The CNR was composed of the main movements of French resistance, the two main unions (CFDT and CGT), and the major political parties (including the Communist Party, the Socialist Party, the Radical Republican Party, and the Popular Christian-Democratic Party). The program of the CNR was elaborated clandestinely and adopted in March of 1944: the program was meant to define new politics in France after the Liberation, because members of the CNR were conscious of

the events that had shaped French politics for over a decade. The program primarily focused on social rights, on the principle of equality for all French citizens, on the idea of general interest or common good when managing national resources and social rights. In other words, they wished to define a new republic of France. Current France's social rights and workers' rights policies are partly the heritage of the CNR program, this is why members react with vigor ("CNR already forgotten, forgotten", "feel depossessed", "we lost it [the CNR program]").

Second, the comments by members regarding French government's actions (or inaction) on globalization express issues of boundaries and borders: "the governments cannot have the power that they had when the borders were closed", "they are not free of their decisions", "he has to take account of the owners of transnational corporations", "they are in submission like everyone, they can't do much" remark the members. Indeed, globalization provokes a refocus of political attention on the role of the state and on the boundaries of national territory. Here are some of the criticisms concerning the role played by the state: "the government is going to put the social security through the blender [and crush it]", "right wing government, right wing republic", "irresponsible policy", "state disengaging", "selling state property." The defense of French social gains is therefore more about the defense of the nation as a whole, even humankind. According to ATTAC's propaganda literature "to challenge the domination of finance in world where everything progressively becomes of commodity, where everything is sold and bought, is to challenge the organization of economic, human, social, and political relations." (ATTAC, 2000). Flynn (1995) has showed that some important examples of

the essence of French identity may in fact concern elements such as basic expectations of what the state is to provide the individual in terms of security, welfare and preservation of basic values. And the fear as one member puts it is that throughout the dismantlement of the social benefits, globalization is “destroying French society”, hence French identity. As Flynn (1995) has argued, the distinction of the “French case” concerns the idea French citizens have of the power and prestige of their national state, as well as the expectations that the state should be able to the new conditions “imposed” by globalization. Until recently, capitalism was believed to be largely contained within national boundaries, although some members accuse the socialist government (socialist) to have sold its soul as well: “Mitterrand, the first one who said ‘there’s nothing we can do’”, “whatever party it is, the socialist, left or right”. But mostly, they think that governments could still stand on their frontiers of their national economies and regulated the flow of labor, capital, goods and services between their societies and the outside international economy. What globalization does then is to threaten this status quo or compromise (Berger, 2003). Governments could buffer the impact of the market and was therefore able to affect the distribution of wealth and power in society: even though imperfect, it was a symbol of the exercise of popular sovereignty. With globalization there is a general growing sense of the loss of control over the basic foundations of societal well-being. But contrary to what most authors (Berger in particular) argue, ATTAC’s members do not see the state as helpless but as an accomplice or an actor in the globalization process. This is actually a debate among members: namely, the disagreement deals with whether the French government is a victim, a perpetrator or an

accomplice in the globalization process of France as showed in this comment by some members: “it’s what I don’t like with Matt and others, it that he has the same discourse as the enemy somehow, like ‘there is market that created itself that is auto-powerful, all powerful’, me I’m not sure there’s so much difference [between Matt’s discourse and the neo-liberal discourse]”; “they don’t actually wish for a health care system that’s profitable to the private sector, you think I’m naïve huh? But I tell myself it’s so impossible”; “there is a resignation of the politics, of the politicians, they let themselves get abused, they’re completely flattered, red carpet, jet, but they assimilated”.

However, most members overwhelmingly believe that the French government not only is complicit of the globalization process but promotes it and uses it to its own benefit (the dominant power) and to the benefit of the dominant ideology (neo-liberalism) as expressed in the following quotes: “politics tell us that finance is governing us, in fact it’s not true”, “they decided to sell themselves out”, “the current government it’s applying the road map of the ‘little liberalism illustrated’ [liberalism for dummies]”, “the right wing government can’t stop beating up public service”, “it’s really easy to say ‘ah it’s Europe’s fault, they impose stuff, they impose directives’ but they were taken with the agreement of the government”, “we see a lot of people say that it’s Europe that decides this or that but the state leaders they agree with one another before they make a decision, they decide to liberalize such and such sector”, “the government is in agreement of the values of globalization”, “they are not victims they want it [globalization]”, “it’s at the service of globalization that they want to impose on us”, and “they make it, they nurture it” are some of the comments from members reflecting the

disapproval and disappointment towards the (in)action of the French government. Nikonoff (ATTAC's President at national level) also claimed on several occasions during forums and meetings that "the states promote globalization, they are not victims of it. They want us to believe that they can't do anything against it but really they are the ones pushing for it." So the members of ATTAC, through the variety of their discourses, agree in their reassertion of the role of the state and of individuals as citizens rather than simply consumers. Hence the state appears as the resort of civilization against anarchy. The state stands as the guarantor of rights and equality against the inequality inevitably stemming from the logic of the market and as the rampart of national cultures against homogenization. Many believe that globalization necessarily undermines the state's capacity to shape distributional outcomes or to cushion the effects of economic dislocations, or more generally to regulate markets. Therefore in summary, we can argue that the profound crisis of identity that France is going through has to do with the nature and role of the French state and government (Flynn, 1995).

Furthermore, ATTAC's members in their criticism of the government are really denouncing the lack of political action/involvement of the government, the resignation of the state. In fact, Sommier (2003) argues, besides the disenchantment vis-à-vis the institutional political sphere, we can see, through this massive mobilization of individuals against globalization, the expression of a desire for re-enchantment of politics. Therefore, on the one hand we observe, from ATTAC's members' standpoint, a rediscovery of the benefit of personal involvement and engagement in politics, and on the other hand an expectation to see political power recover its power of arbitration and

regulation under citizens' control. It is precisely because they see the lack of action from their government/state that ATTAC's members appeal to it. They want their state back in the political sphere. And ATTAC has precisely succeeded in attracting members and participants to re-politicize, providing them with some general guiding values and "allowing agents to reappropriate their role as active subjects." (Ruggiero, 2002)

VI.3 Conclusion

New social movement theory's premises state that scholars of social movements need to look at the meanings and symbols produced by members (and not just their actions in terms of organization, structure and success), and that claims and grievances in post-industrial societies (such as France), within globalization movement in particular, are not attached to specific class issues but to non-materialist concerns such as identity. Post-modern theories (including feminist theories) suggest taking a closer look at the different, multiple narratives and standpoints of members in movements.

I have, in this chapter, explained that identity can be defined as all the repertoires of action, language, culture that allow someone to recognize his/her membership to a particular social group and to identify with it (Warnier, 2004). Identification to a particular social group then also means difference with other groups: to be French is thus to know yourself in relation to the British, the Russians, etc...All of this, the food, the cinema, the culture, is therefore where the French identity is grounded: as Hall (1997) wrote, national identity is grounded not only in economic relations or history, but also in a "whole set of cultural discourses". It is located nationally but also locally which is exactly what members of ATTAC say they try to defend against globalization.

In conclusion of this chapter, we observe that first, in ATTAC's members' perspective, globalization has a peculiar form of homogenization: it is a homogenizing form of cultural representation, enormously absorptive of things. Globalization, in this vision, is wanting to recognize and absorb the cultural differences within a larger overarching framework. So the danger is that globalization, through corporations, seek to commodify and therefore denature the practices of cultural resistance (Wallerstein, 1997); indeed, corporations are thought to create high market demand for the forms of exotic artistic/cultural production. And even the local gets to be assimilated in the global postmodern (Hall, 1997) through, for example, the consumption of exotic cuisine at home (e.g. eating Indian cuisine in Manhattan, not in India). Corporations are also seen as creating high-tech market networks for the distribution of previously artisanal production of the means of everyday life (see for example, exotic/ethnic products sold in French stores all made in China). Weber calls this the "routinization of drama": it is more than cultural corruption because by routinizing the cultural resistance, it is reducing the difference of substance to a difference of form. Hence with mass consumption of the same "exotic" products everywhere, we become uniformed through commodities. Globalization is problematic because, according to post-modern thinker Baudrillard (Sassatelli, 2002), a globalized culture then becomes a kind of universal language, a common denominator precisely because the particularities have eroded under the pressure of globalization. Baudrillard (Sassatelli, 2002) actually points to the subtle and devastating violence of the contrary of culture, of hyperculture, of indifference, which means there is no difference any more, thus the same service can be

found everywhere, the same hamburger everywhere. Therefore, globalization is about standardization, whether in the workplace or in the area of cuisine or cinema. In France, this very idea of standardization of services is unthinkable, as much as eating the same hamburgers from one place in the U.S. to the next. The reason is that this standardization does not guarantee the quality of the service offered. It only guarantees the regularity of it. And so, as a result some of those standardized services have reached, as for a lot of mass consumption products, the zero degree of quality.

Second, through the lens of post-modern theories, we can argue that the fights against globalization in the arenas of cuisine and cinema are symptomatic of a new culture of contention: it blurs the boundaries between public space and private sphere, with a displacement of the struggle into the territory of everyday life, because this is where the post-materialist values are 'located' (Inglehart, 1977; 1990; 1997). So to the question, why are the French willing to go to such extremes in order to defend their national food and cultural industries, as well as their "acquis sociaux", Gordon and Meunier (2001) answer that there is the perception of an uneven playing field, that France, and French identity is under threat, and the view that market failure needs to be corrected. As seen in some quotes, the emblems of globalization for ATTAC's members can be found in McDonald's, Coca-Cola, Hollywood (and probably Microsoft and Wall Street). As Geschiere (1998) claim, we see that there is a tension between globalization and identity, between homogenizing trends and a reinforcement of cultural heterogeneity, with a production of locality. For Baudrillard (Sassatelli, 2002) globalization implies a global hyperculture in which the erasing of differences, up to and

including that between the real and the imaginary, annuls also the distance necessary for a relation of identification/distinction. This is what corrodes cultural identity, as there is no more alterity, difference, distance. Hence, globalization means the disappearance of alterity and difference, therefore the disappearance of cultural identity because there cannot be identity if there isn't alterity and difference.

Third, members' discourses, grievances and criticisms of neo-liberal globalization is not just based on what ATTAC national as an organization asserts and propagates, but mostly on contextualized experiences at the local level. For example, there was one common pattern in all interviews: whether talking about food, the arts, the *acquis sociaux*, members spoke from their standpoint, from their personal experience with globalization at the local level, the local terrain. It was usually related to their work environment or family life: Carmen of BelleVille mentions her son and his food habits, (as well as her relationship with food), what he eats and what she cooks; she also indicates the influence globalization has on her work as a lawyer (references to the Work Code and her job, "jurisprudence business"). Cristina GreatVille also refers to her personal life when talking about cider production, and her involvement at work giving cooking lessons. Bill of BelleVille indicates his experience working and living in a region different from his native city, especially regarding cuisine and food differences. Jane of NiceVille introduces the notion of merchandizing, uniformization and marketing through her experience at work as a psychotherapist dealing with children and families with difficulties. James of GreatVille relates globalization to his experience at work as a researcher (regarding both the positive and negative effects of globalization, then

generalizing about government policy for research in France). This is the kind of knowledge feminists argue we should be looking for and at: as feminist theorist Janet Conway (2004) explains, post-modern theories encourage us to listen to all perspectives and be suspicious of attempts to impose one narrative over enormously diverse political activity. Indeed, through this analysis we have demonstrated that all knowledge is “socially situated and therefore partial limited, and positional” (Conway in Henderson, and Singh, 2004). By doing so, we have also showed that the so-called anti-globalization movement is made up of this incredible diversity of movements, standpoints and views within one movement such as ATTAC: these are indeed local resistances on a global terrain.

Finally, we must acknowledge that while not our primary source of analysis, the Gramscian perspective about hegemony and counter-hegemony has proven relevant in the study of anti-globalization movements. First, it has helped us conceptualize the battle of ATTAC as a counter-hegemony engaging with the ideology of neo-liberalism, as a resistance against global capitalism. Indeed, in a Gramscian approach, the internationalization of economy and capital flows (or globalization) is conceived as a hegemonic project that is built on neo-liberal ideology. Simultaneously and consequently, strategies of resistance (or counter-hegemony) emerged explicitly contesting policy development and application by organizations such as the IMF or the World Bank (Worth and Kuhling, 2004). In this regard, ATTAC can be viewed as counter-hegemony, a creative reaction to a dominant ideology. Second, Gramsci’s notion of hegemony has allowed us to underline that hegemony is legitimized among other

things by the social, political and cultural capital that, in this case, global capitalist ideologies possess. Hence, very much like new social movement theories, a Gramscian approach argues that a counter-hegemonic project (such as ATTAC) challenges the intrusion of political and economic institutions into the restricted domain of the life world, using a cultural and intellectual critique to contest the domination exercised by in-establishment groups.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The rise of anti-globalization movements represents one of the most significant illustrations of social conflict and contentious political behavior of the past several decades (Ayres, 2004). Such movements formed in a phase of deregulation of financial markets, and of a decline of the nation-states' power to regulate capital flows. This sphere of opposition to neo-liberal globalization has undoubtedly been dominated by a French organization called ATTAC (Action for a Tobin Tax for the Aid of Citizens) founded in 1998 that has succeeded in attracting an increasing number of members and participants throughout the world.

One of the main question scholars of such social movement have been asking is, what is at stake? Why are the French members of ATTAC, for example, willing to go to such involvement and such passion in the movement acting to resist against globalization? Is it just an opposition to economic domination? For new social movement theorists, as well as post-modern theorists, the dramatic growth of such a movement demands further analytical efforts than only emphasis on networks, repertoires of contention, relationship with institutional political actors, or means of impact on the political system.

Using new social movement and post-modern (also feminist) theories on social movements, and partly a Gramscian approach, the goal of this research has been to show

(1) how members of ATTAC actually resist at the local level against what they identify as an oppression from dominant cultural models that work to negate the subjective dimension of cultural diversity in general, and of French identity in particular; and (2) that there is a plurality of discourses on globalization and an affirmation of subjectivity by the actors within the movement, despite a commitment to common action.

My research was based on ethnographic data: during fieldwork, I gathered 17 in-depth interviews of ATTAC's members from different local chapters in France (GreatVille, BelleVille, NiceVille and PleasantVille), and I also collected participant observation data.

My focus was on the narratives, hence the meanings and symbols, produced by members of ATTAC, for which I performed a discourse analysis.

First, this research has showed that the crucial issue at stake creating a deep anxiety among ATTAC's members is the possibilities of preserving French identity in a society without borders. In fact, according to Suzanne Berger (2002), borders might be conceived as cultural institutions i.e. representations of space that are tightly connected to ideas, norms and institutions that regulate who is French and who is not. Then in this case, the disappearance of borders under globalization would appear to be primarily fears about the defense of culture and identity. Actually, according to Gregory Flynn (1995), national borders have had a particular symbolic value in France that goes beyond most countries: France may well be the only country to have adopted a geometric figure—the hexagon—as an expression of the nation and its identity. No other nation refers to itself in terms of the shape of its borders. Indeed, as Gregory Fynn (1995) underlines,

most of the authors studying anti-globalization movements in France came around to the same underlying theme: to understand the problems they were discussing, it was necessary to understand that they were dealing with challenges to French identity. The core problem involves concern about how domestic and international changes have called into question what it means to be French.

This was in fact translated throughout the interviews with concerns and grievances over French cultural identity. Three themes appeared throughout members' narratives all related to what is perceived as French cultural identity: French cuisine, the French arts or entertainments, and finally the French "acquis sociaux" (or social benefits) acquired through a history of struggles. If the concern for the erosion of the French public service system corresponds to materialist issues very much in line with neo-Marxist, as well as a Gramscian analysis of counter-hegemony, it is not the only, or perhaps the main issue. To ATTAC's members then, the real threat to France from globalization is not just economic but also cultural: it is about the disappearance of France itself, the fear that there will be no substance to French culture. For example, as one of the interviewee put it: "now you can buy a \$1 hamburger at McDonald's but does it have substance? I think not." Actually, as Gordon and Meunier (2001) argue, what is new in the concern over globalization is the way in which, in the eyes of individuals, French identity and culture today seem increasingly threatened by globalization. The perception is that uncontrolled globalization will oblige France to abandon some of the most distinctive and considered sacred aspects of its culture (as mentioned above, all those things that make France identifiable as France). Therefore what shows through the

interviews is the realization that the threat to French culture comes not only from trade in cultural goods, but more broadly from trade in general. They all feel that globalization is going to break down both the natural barriers to external cultural influence via technology but that it also opens the artificial barriers via increasingly liberalized trade. Additionally, my research shows that members of ATTAC are not fighting a corporatist fight, and that it is not a class struggle either. Indeed, following a new social movement Tourainian perspective, ATTAC's resistance can be seen as more than (as in a Marxist view) a reaction to economic strains. There is something far more threatening than loosing a job in their minds, and it is loosing the power to define what it means to be French, to define oneself. I have also showed throughout the interviews analysis, that the French reaction of ATTAC's members against globalization reflects more than just nostalgia for a disappearing way of life. It reflects a feeling of powerlessness in the face of global forces, even though they still believe that the state should offer cultural protection against this homogenization of offerings and tastes. Resistance to liberalism is not the defense of archaisms, but the desire to find alternatives for the valorization of subjectivity (Farro, 2004). In other words, the cultural and identity frame provides a critique of the free markets and capitalism without having to rely on a Marxist vocabulary and framework. It thus allows actors to avoid the stigmata of being archaic (Marxism) and corporatist (or nationalistic).

Second, this research has demonstrated that the opposition from members to neo-liberal globalization is also a question of accountability towards the state, also related to the idea of cultural identity. The question members ask through their comments is: how

can we hold accountable transnational / global institutions that have not been “elected” and/or chosen by the citizens but “selected” by members of different powerful international institutions and corporations? The state, especially the French state, because of its strong role in French politics, has traditionally been the target of protest movements because it is the one that can be held accountable. Now with the globalization process, transnational institutions such as WTO, IMF and the G8 group are the only visible target but are not really held accountable either, because according to ATTAC, they don’t represent anyone. As Berger (2002) argues, the problem is that no one can be held accountable for basic choices about society’s use of resources and allocations of reward and risk. Indeed, in ATTAC’s members’ perspectives, the problem with globalization, and the transnational institutions, is that precisely no one can identify where the power is, there is no locus of power anymore, it is spread, unidentifiable, with no context, no history, making itself out of the political hence reality arena. It is hence becoming surreal in (post-modern thinker) Baudrillard’s sense. Globalization breathes and breeds of simulations and simulacras: fluxes and flows of money are traded at a virtual level, and cannot be exchanged for ‘real’ work or production. The only symbols we have are initials (WTO, WB, G8) that don’t cover any one in particular or any place in particular. We cannot translate those symbols in anything tangible, we cannot name them. When there is a location of power, as for the G8 summits, the organizers/leaders of such meetings are in fact trying to keep it secret, to make it inaccessible to protesters and the world so no one can see what is actually taking place, everything behind closed doors in remote locations. Globalization in this sense is essentially an invisible process.

So what ATTAC as an organization is trying to do, is precisely to put the subjects (i.e. the social actors, the citizens), and the subjectivity of power back into the picture, to put a context, a name, a location on the face of globalization by naming it, explaining it, explaining the mechanisms through popular education, which is the main mission of ATTAC. Through popular education, ATTAC intends to give knowledge to people about the “reality” of globalization, about its structure, its organization, and its actors. It is making globalization visible to social actors and it is bringing back the actors (the social actors and the actors of globalization), it is giving them an identity again. To give an identity to globalization is to be able to identify the locus of power in order to oppose it, and eventually to change it perhaps. Therefore facing the appearance or illusion of abstract objectivity of power, ATTAC unravels its subjectivity by all the different local discourses on a global terrain. That is the reason why members of ATTAC are so afraid of globalization: to them, if we loose context, history, culture, then we loose identity, identification and the possibility to be a subject. Consequently, we would become objectified, consumers as well as an objects of consumption. In France, this subjectivity-identity goes through what we have identified and showed through the interviews as culture and *acquis sociaux*. The fear for ATTAC’s members is that their own government is complicit of the disappearance of identity and is actually promoting globalization (either under the pretense of powerlessness to stop or prevent it, or under the premise that it can use and master it).

Third, my research has illustrated that there exist different, localized and fragmented discourses within ATTAC, even though there is a centralized Parisian

discourse from ATTAC's headquarters on globalization. The multiplicity of voices is a reflection of this desire for subjectivity and this is probably the strength of ATTAC that governments and states fear the most: the re-politicization of people that goes through an acknowledgement of individuals and their subjectivities, their multiple different, complex identities. Members succeed in defending their specificity and singularity as individuals, even if they define themselves simultaneously as an integral part of the common initiative. No political party structure has succeeded in doing that, hence the alleged de-politicization of French society. ATTAC has managed to bring different perspectives, different standpoints and make them heard as possible alternatives. It is about putting conflict back into the political arena, and not following the "pensée unique" (or single/master thought). Therefore we can argue that internal conflicts at ATTAC, as witnessed during fieldwork, do not reflect a crisis of the movement, but on the contrary that conflict (or debate and complexity) is part of the success of ATTAC. People do not want to be imposed on one mode (whether PC, LCR, PS or other), and they reject the social class Marxist discourse also for that reason. Hence their slogan that says "the world is not a commodity" or "not for sale": indeed, if neo-liberal globalization converts the world, including people, into a commodity, then we all become into uniformed objects, thus without subjective identity, without history, without power. Therefore, as post-modern theories would argue (as well as new social movement theories), anti-globalization movement such as ATTAC is at the level of symbolic change, changing the meanings, bringing in new meanings, new questions, deconstructing the dominant ideology, the dominant discourse (neo-liberal globalization)

to bring in alternatives to this “pensée unique”. Political process theory as well as resource mobilization theory would have overlooked this component of ATTAC: anti-globalization social movements are not just about bringing direct successful political changes in the structures, but by their existence, their mission (popular education for ATTAC), they are enabling the construction of critical thoughts and plural knowledges. We are in the arena of symbols, meanings and representations, which is what the movement is working with (hence the symbolic manifestations and protests, more inventive than the usual strikes). In fact, ATTAC believes in social change through discourse: and it is exactly what ATTAC is offering, an abundance of discourses, local discourses on a global terrain, and a deconstruction of globalization.

In summary, ATTAC’s members are not against globalization. But they are against a neo-liberal globalization and its consequent ideological domination. They resist because of who they are (French citizens) and affirm their specificity in opposition to economic and social domination and cultural homogenization (Farro, 2004). Indeed, globalization (and the disappearance of borders) means that the essence of France’s collective identity could be altered, which is precisely what members of ATTAC fear of losing control. They wish to affirm their own unique subjectivity through resisting predominant forms of cultural organization within social life, whether these are transnational corporations or institutions. It is about re-conquering the local to better apprehend the global: i.e. for people to be able to define French cultural identity without being imposed a unique (neo-liberal) thought. It is also about embracing the diversity of localities at all levels: on the planet, within each society, within each culture, and within

the anti-globalization movement itself, within ATTAC. There is from ATTAC's members' part a need for recognition of all standpoints, of the multiplicity of perspectives, and the plurality and subjectivity of actors, as opposed to the predominant neo-liberal ideology that stands as a seemingly inevitable destiny for all cultures. In fact, through ATTAC's resistance, the discourses of power in our society, the discourses of the dominant regimes (the *pensée unique*) are being challenged by this de-centered/relocalized cultural empowerment of the marginal and the local (Hall, 1997).

In the end, the contention is between the global (a kind of abstract global power, a simulacra of power) and the particularities that revive but in an uncontrolled state (whether through social movements like ATTAC or through terrorism). It all comes back to the notion of identity. In effect, there cannot be identity without alterity: if there is no other, there is no self. Today, one does not know where the other is because with globalization there is no other (Baudrillard, 2002). The anti-globalization struggle to which ATTAC belongs is, in a Tourainian perspective, symptomatic of postindustrial society's conflicts: in such society, decisive conflict is no longer limited to the productive enterprise but concerns the struggle for control of the cultural norms which influence the overall orientation of society. That is why members of ATTAC are fighting on the cultural terrain: the issues at stake are more than a simplistic "protectionist" reaction to globalization, it has to do with the future definition of culture at the global and local levels, therefore, in our present study, of French cultural identity.

However, what remains to be investigated concerns the internal life of ATTAC, and more specifically the disagreements or conflicts among the members, and between

the base (the members) and the leadership of the movement. In other words, future research should take a closer look at the notion of direct democracy that has made ATTAC so successful in recruiting active members. Through this research fieldwork, I have showed two dimensions of ATTAC: one is the image ATTAC as a national organization is projecting to their members, to the world (through the media) and to themselves; the other is the local perceptions from members in local chapters. Therefore, one issue to explore has to do with how the conversations in which members engage regarding the democracy at ATTAC shape their representations of ATTAC's mission, of ATTAC's discourse as well as their own discourse on globalization and resistance to globalization. Indeed, scholars have noted that ATTAC faces some challenges: internal disagreements and questioning from the membership, whether regarding its president (and his agenda) or the organizational structure of the movement (particularly the hierarchy), have grown loud and cannot be ignored by its leaders, nationally or locally. As Nikonoff said, "ATTAC is a movement of popular education. But the articulation between education and action is unsatisfactory. What is action? What does that mean?" Indeed, Sommier (2003) argues, the originality and the strength of an anti-globalization movement like ATTAC certainly is the heterogeneity and subjectivity of its members, at the same time this could be the source of paralysis as a common strategy is trying to emerge from all this diversity. If the claims are assembled like a patchwork, they might, Sommier (2003) contends, prove impossible to connect one another and this risk of fragmentation might translate into a split of the movement if not atomization.

Additionally, political implications of this research concern France's current position within the European Union. Indeed, France is at a crossroads: between the rejection of the European Constitution by its people through a referendum in May 2005, to which ATTAC seems to have contributed through a strong and active campaign, and the ever growing popularity of anti-globalization movements such as ATTAC, the European Union project faces a very uncertain future. As Flynn (1995) argues, there is an intimate link between French identity and the European order: however, scholars have largely ignored the relationship between national identity and the international context. This could have important repercussions and France's political leaders should probably be looking for an entirely new structure of political communication of symbols and political legitimation to replace that of Gaullism. There is currently no new consensus as to how to foster a new content of French identity without altering too much of the essence of French identity. Many challenges faced by contemporary France are challenges to French identity because they call into question both key dimensions of what it has meant to be French, and the specific compact relationship that the French people have had with their state. France must adjust the essence of its identity in order to give new content to that identity in the new Europe. A failure to do so would create a continuing problem, weakening Europe and France in the process. The challenge today for France is not only that there is a need for new policies but also for something much deeper (Flynn, 1995): a new expression of what it means to be French in today's Europe. For this reason, ATTAC and the anti-globalization movement in general cannot be ignored in the political landscape anymore, whether at the national or international levels

(Mathieu, 2001). The fact that, in a decade, an active organization such as ATTAC has started and grown so fast is noteworthy because it contradicts the previsions of the intellectuals and the media who had prematurely announced the death of social conflict. By taking the floor in every way (and every sense of the word), such an anti-globalization movement is disrupting the institutions it is trying to attack, whether the national government or the transnational organizations. ATTAC is in fact a testimony that another resistance (and why not, “Another Future for Europe”) is possible: we just need to look at the local terrains.

REFERENCES

- Alberoni, Francesco. 1992. *Genesis, Mouvements et Institutions*. Paris: Ramsay.
- Almeida, Paul and Mark Lichbach. 2003. "To the Internet From the Internet: Comparative Media Coverage of Transnational Protests." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 8(3): 249-272.
- Ancelovici, Marcos. 2002. "Organizing against Globalization: The Case of ATTAC in France." *Politics and Society* 30(3): 427-463.
- Andretta, Massimiliano, Donatella Della Porta, Lorenzo Mosca and Herbert Reiter. 2002. *Global, No Global, New Global*. Rome-Bari: Laterza.
- ATTAC. 2000. *Tout sur ATTAC*. Paris: Mille et une nuits.
- Ayres, Jeffrey M. 2002. "Transnational Political Processes and Contention against the Global Economy." Pp. 191-205 in *Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movement*, edited by Jackie Smith and Hank Johnston. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- . 2004. "Framing Collective Action Against Neoliberalism: The Case of the Anti-Globalization Movement." *Journal of World Systems Research, X (1)* Winter 2004: 11-34.
- Barker, Colin and Gareth Dale. 1998. "Protest Waves in Western Europe: A Critique of "New Social Movement" Theory." *Critical Sociology* 24 (1/2): 65-104.
- Barlow, Maud and Tony Clarke. 2000. *La Bataille de Seattle. Sociétés Civiles contre Mondialisation Marchande*. Paris: Fayard.
- Baudrillard, Jean. 2002. "An Interview with Jean Baudrillard: Europe, Globalization and the Destiny of Culture." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5(4): 521-530.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1994. "Is there a postmodern sociology?" Pp. 187-204 in *The Postmodern Turn. New Perspectives on Social Theory*, edited by Steven Seidman. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1998. *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bazin, J. and Alban Bensa. 1979. "La Production d'un Récit Historique." *Cahiers d'études africaines* 19 (1-4 and 73-76): 435-483.

- Bell, Laurence. 2001. "Interpreting Collective Action: Methodology and Ideology in the Analysis of Social Movements in France." *Modern & Contemporary France* 9(2): 183-196.
- Benhamou, Françoise and Maryvonne de Saint Pulgent. 2000. "La France et la Mondialisation de la Culture." *Revue des Deux Mondes* Octobre-Novembre: 130-134.
- Berger, Suzanne. 2002. "French Democracy without Borders?" *French Politics, Culture & Society* 20 (1): 1-12.
- . 2003. "The First Globalization." Pp. 1-137 in *Notre Première Mondialisation. Leçons d'un Echec Oublié*, edited by Suzanne Berger. Paris: République des Idées, Seuil.
- Blu, Karen I. 1980. *The Lumbee Problem. The Making of an American Indian People*. New York: New York University.
- Boltanski, Luc and Eve Chiapello. 1999. *Le Nouvel Esprit du Capitalisme*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction : A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- . 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity.
- . 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1996. "Understanding." *Theory, Culture and Society* 13 (2): 17-37.
- Brender, Anton. 2004. *La France Face à la Mondialisation*. Paris: La Découverte, Repères, Thèses et Débats.
- Briggs, C. 1986. *Learning How to Ask. A Socio-Linguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cassen, Bernard. 1997. "To Save Society." Paper presented at the London School of Economics on: Is Globalization Inevitable and Desirable? May 1997.
- . 2003. "On the Attack." *New Left Review* 19: 41-60.
- Clifford, James. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- . 1988. *The Predicament of Culture. Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature and Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Copans, Jean. 1996. *Introduction à l'Ethnologie et à l'Anthropologie*. Paris: Nathan Université.
- . 1998. *L'Enquête Ethnologique de Terrain*. Paris: Nathan Université.
- Denzin, Norman K. 1989. *Interpretive Biography*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Derber, Charles. 2002. *People Before Profit. The New Globalization in an Age of Terror, Big Money, and Economic Crisis*. New York: Picador.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1972. *Positions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1976. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Deveureux, George. 1980. *De l'Angoisse à la Méthode dans les Sciences du Comportement* [1967]. Paris: Flammarion.
- Di Chiro, Giovanna. 1992. "Defining Environmental Justice: Women's Voices and Grassroots Politics." *Socialist Review* 22 (4): 93-130.
- Dilthey, Wilhelm. 1976. *Selected Writings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Downes, David and Paul Rock. 1998. *Understanding Deviance: A Guide to the Sociology of Crime and Rule-Breaking*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, Carolyn, Christine E. Kiesinger and Lisa M. Tillmann-Healy. 1997. "Interactive Interviewing. Talking about Emotional Experience." Pp. 119-149 in *Reflexivity and Voice*, edited by Rosanna Hertz. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Fantasia, Rick. 1995. "Fast Food in France." *Theory and Society* 24 (2): 201-43.
- Farro, Antimo L. 2004. "Actors, Conflicts and the Globalization Movement." *Current Sociology* 52 (4): 633-647.
- Fielding, Nigel. 1993. "Qualitative Interviewing." Pp. 135-153 in *Researching Social Life*, edited by Nigel Gilbert. London: Sage.
- Flynn, Gregory. 1995. *Remaking the Hexagon; the New France in the New Europe*. Boulder: Westview Press.

- Fougier, Eddy. 2001. "Perceptions de la Mondialisation en France et aux Etats-Unis." *Politique Etrangère* 3 (Juillet-Septembre): 569-585.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Culture*. New York: Basic Books.
- . 1986. "The Uses of Diversity." *Michigan Quarterly Review* 25 (1): 105-123.
- . 1988. *Works and Lives. The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Geschiere, Peter and Birgit Meyer. 1998. "Globalization and Identity: Dialectics of Flow and Closure." *Development and Change* 29: 601-615.
- Giugni, Marco. 1998. "Was It Worth the Effort? The Outcomes and Consequences of Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 371-393.
- Giugni, Marco, Doug McAdam and Charles Tilly (Eds.). 1999. *How Social Movements Matter*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Goodwin, Jeff and Ruth Horowitz. 2002. "Symposium on Methodology in Qualitative Methodology. Introduction: The Methodological Strengths and Dilemmas of Qualitative Sociology." *Qualitative Sociology* 25 (1): 33-47.
- Gordon, Philip H. and Sophie Meunier. 2001. "Globalization and French Cultural Identity." *French Politics, Culture & Society* 19 (1): 22-41.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1995. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* [1971]. New York: International Publishers.
- Gronow, Jukka. 1997. *The Sociology of Taste*. London: Routledge.
- Green, Duncan and Matthew Griffith. 2002. "Globalization and Its Discontents." *International Affairs* 78 (1): 49-68.
- Gusfield, Joseph. 1994. "Reflexivity of Social Movements : Collective Behavior and Mass Society Theory Revisited." Pp. 58-78 in *New Social Movements. From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston and Joseph R. Gusfield. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hall, Stuart. 1997. "The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity." Pp. 19-39 in *Culture Globalization and the World System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, edited by Anthony D. King. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hank Johnston, Enrique Laraña and Joseph R. Gusfield. 1994. *New Social Movements. From Ideology to Identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Haraway, Donna. 1996. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." Pp. 249-263 in *Feminism and Science*, edited by Evelyn Fox Keller and Helen E. Longino. New York: Oxford University Press.

Harding, Sandra. 1996. "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is 'Strong Objectivity'?" Pp. 235-248 in *Feminism and Science*, edited by Evelyn Fox Keller and Helen E. Longino. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hartsock, Nancy. 1998. *The Feminist Standpoint Revisited and Other Essays*. Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.

Hassoux, Didier. 2005. "Non et Maintenant? Parti Socialiste: Pas de Pardon pour la 'Trahison' d'ATTAC." *Libération, Samedi 4 Juin*.

Henderson, Anika and Shalvin Singh. 2004/2005. "The Global Significance of Local Resistance. A Feminist, Postmodern Look at Anti-Globalization Politics: Interview with Janet Conway." *Women and Environments* 64-65: 26-28.

Hoffman, Stanley. 1971. *Decline or Renewal: France Since the 1930s*. New York: Viking Press.

Hyman, Herbert. 1954. *Interviewing in Social Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Inglehart, Ronald. 1977. *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles among Western Publics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 1990. *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 1997. *Modernization and Postmodernization. Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Johnson, Barbara. 1980. *The Critical Difference: Essays in the Contemporary Rhetoric of Reading*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

- Kebede, AlemSeghed. 2005. "Grassroots Environmental Organizations in the United States: A Gramscian Analysis." *Sociological Inquiry* 75 (1): 81-108.
- Keller, Evelyn Fox and Helen E. Longino. 1996. *Feminism and Science*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kirk, J. and M. Miller. 1986. *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kolb, Felix. 2005. "The Impact of Transnational Protest on Social Movement Organizations: Mass Media and the Making of ATTAC Germany." Pp. 95-120 in *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*, edited by Donnatella della Porta and Sidney Tarrow. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter. 1995. *New Social Movements in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Krishnan, Raghu. 1996. "December 1995: 'The First Revolt Against Globalization'". *Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine* 48(1): 1-22.
- Laplantine, François, 1995. *L'Anthropologie*. Paris: Payot.
- . 1996. *La Description Ethnographique*. Paris: Nathan Université.
- Laslett, B. and R. Rapoport. 1975. "Collaborative Interviewing and Interactive Research." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 20: 968-977.
- Lichterman, Paul. 1998. "What Do Movements Mean? The Value of Participant-Observation." *Qualitative Sociology* 21 (4): 401-418.
- Longino, Helen E. 1996. "Subjects, Power, and Knowledge: Description and Prescription in Feminist Philosophies of Science." Pp. 264-279 in *Feminism and Science*, edited by Evelyn Fox Keller and Helen E. Longino. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lovecy, Jill. 1999. "The End of French Exceptionalism?" *West European Politics* 22 (4): 205-224.
- Lyotard, Jean-Francois. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Macdonald, Laura. 2002. "Globalization and Social Movements: Comparing Women's Movements' Responses to NAFTA in Mexico, the USA and Canada." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 4(2): 151-172.
- Marcus, George and Michael Fischer. 1986. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marcus, George E. 1995. "Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 95-117.
- . 1998. *Ethnography Through Thick and Thin*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 1964, 1991. *One-Dimensional Man*. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press.
- Martin-Barbero, Jesus. 2002. "Identities: Traditions and New Communities." *Media Culture & Society* 24(5): 621-641.
- Mathieu, Lilian. 2001. "Le Mouvement Contre la Mondialisation Libérale." *Regards Sur l'Actualité* 276: 17-27.
- May, Tim. 1996. *Situating Social Theory*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Mayer, Nonna. 1995. "L'Entretien selon Pierre Bourdieu. Analyse Critique de 'La misère du monde.'" *Revue française de Sociologie* 36 (2): 355-370.
- McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1994. "Culture and Social Movements." Pp. 36-57 in *New Social Movements. From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston and Joseph R. Gusfield. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy and Zald N. Mayer. 1996. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements. Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McLuhan, Marshall 1964. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York, NY: New American Library
- Melucci, Alberto. 1989 *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. London: Hutchinson Radius.

- . 1994. “A Strange Kind of Newness: What’s ‘New’ in New Social Movements?” Pp. 101-130 in *New Social Movements. From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston and Joseph R. Gusfield. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Messer, Ellen. 1984. “Anthropological Perspectives on Diet.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 13: 205-249.
- Mitchell, Clyde J. 1983. “Case and Situation Analysis.” *The Sociological Review* 31 (2): 187-211.
- Muxel, Anne. 1996. *Individu et Mémoire Familiale*. Paris: Nathan.
- Neveu, Erik. 2002. “Trend Report: The Contentious French.” *Mobilization: An International Journal* 7(3): 325-334.
- Normand, Jean-Michel. 1999. “McDonald’s: Critiqué mais Toujours Fréquenté.” *Le Monde*, 24 Septembre.
- Oberschall, Anthony. 1973. *Social Conflict and Social Movements*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Olivier de Sardan, Jean-Pierre. 1995. “La Politique du Terrain. Sur la Production des Données en Anthropologie.” *Enquête* 1: 71-109.
- Panayotakis, Costas. 2001. “On the Self-Understanding of the ‘Anti-Globalization’ Movement: A View from Genoa.” *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism* 4(48): 95-102.
- Penaloza, L. 1994. “Atravesando Fronteras/Border Crossings: A Critical Ethnographic Exploration of the Consumer Acculturation of Mexican Immigrants.” *Journal of Consumer Research* 21, June 1994: 32-54.
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 1979. *Poor People’s Movements*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Plummer, Ken. 2000. Symbolic Interactionism in the Twentieth Century: The Rise of Empirical Theory. Pp. 193-223 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, edited by Bryan S. Turner. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Polletta, Francesca. 1998. “Contending Stories: Narrative in Social Movements.” *Qualitative Sociology* 21 (4): 419-446.
- Poupeau, Franck. 2002. “La Contestation de la Mondialisation en France.” *L’Année Sociale* Mai 2002: 89-100.

- Perdue, William. 1986. *Sociological Theory: Explanation, Paradigm and Ideology*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Robertson, Roland. 1997. "Social Theory, Cultural Relativity and the Problem of Globality." Pp. 69-90 in *Culture Globalization and the World System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, edited by Anthony D. King. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rollat, Alain. 1999. "Vive le Roquefort Libre!" *Le Monde*, 9 Septembre.
- Rose, Margaret. 1991. *The Post-Modern and the Post-Industrial. A Critical Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruggiero, Vincenzo. 2002. "Attac: A Global Social Movement?" *Social Justice* 29 (1-2): 48-60.
- Sanjek, R. 1991. "The Ethnographic Present." *Man* 26 (4): 609-628.
- Sassatelli, Monica. 2002. "An Interview with Jean Baudrillard. Europe, Globalization and the Destiny of Culture." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5 (4): 521-530.
- Schott-Bourget, Véronique. 1994. *Approches de la Linguistique*. Paris: Nathan Université.
- Schwartz, Olivier 1993. "Postface: L'Empirisme Irréductible." Pp. 265-308 in *Le Hobo, Sociologie du sans-abri*, edited by Nels Anderson. Paris: Nathan.
- Scott, Joan W. 1988. "Deconstructing Equality-Versus-Difference: Or, the Uses of Poststructuralist Theory for Feminism." *Feminist Studies* 14 (1): 32-50.
- Seidman, Steven. 1989. *Jurgen Habermas on Society and Politics*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- . 1994. *The Postmodern Turn. New Perspectives on Social Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sklair, L. 1995. *Sociology of the Global System*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Smith, Dorothy E. 1996. Women's Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology. Pp. 17-27 in *Feminism and Science*, edited by Evelyn Fox Keller and Helen E. Longino. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Jackie and Hank Johnston (Eds.). 2002. *Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Sommier, Isabelle. 2003. *Le Renouveau des Mouvements Contestataires à l'Heure de la Mondialisation*. Paris: Champs Flammarion.
- Spradley, J. 1979. *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Steinhilber, Jochen. 2002. *Lendemain*: 27.
- Stoller, Paul. 1989. *The Taste of Ethnographic Things. The Senses in Anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Sutton, Philip W. 2000. *Explaining Environmentalism. In Search of a New Social Movement*. Aldershot, Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Swingewood, Alan. 1998. *Cultural Theory and the Problem of Modernity*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1994. *Power in Movement. Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1998. *Power in Movement. Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*. (2nd edition) Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002. "From Lumping to Splitting: Specifying Globalization and Resistance." Pp. 229-249 in *Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements*, edited by Jackie Smith and Hank Johnston. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Tartakowsky, Danielle. 2001. "Attac ou les Echelles-Temps du Libéralisme." Pp. 643-657 in *Associations et Champ Politique. La Loi de 1901 à l'Épreuve du Siècle*, edited by Claire Andrieu, Gilles Le Beguec and Danielle Tartakowsky. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.
- Taylor, Verta. 1998. "Feminist Methodology in Social Movements Research." *Qualitative Sociology* 21 (4): 357-379.
- Tilly, Charles. 1984. *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- . 2002. *Stories, Identities, and Political Change*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Touraine, Alain. 1971. *The Post-Industrial Society: Tomorrow's Social History: Classes, Conflict and Culture in the Programmed Society*. New York: Random House Inc.

———. 1981. *The Voice and the Eye: An Analysis of Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1997. "The National and the Universal: Can There Be Such a Thing as World Culture?" Pp. 91-106 in *Culture Globalization and the World System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, edited by Anthony D. King. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Warnier, Jean-Pierre. 2004. *La Mondialisation de la Culture*. Paris: La Découverte, Repères.

Waters, Sarah. 1998. "New Social Movement Politics in France: The Rise of Civic Forms of Mobilization." *West European Politics* 21 (3): 170-186.

Wood, Lesley and Kelly Moore. 2002. "Target Practice: Community Activism in a Global Era." Pp. 21-34 in *From ACT UP to the WTO: Urban Protest and Community Building in the Era of Globalization*, edited by Benjamin Shepard and Ronald Hayduk. London: Verso.

Wood, Lesley. 2004. "Breaking the Bank and Taking to the Streets: How Protesters Target Neoliberalism." *Journal of World Systems Research* X (I), Winter 2004: 11-34.

Worth, Owen and Carmen Kuhling. 2004. "Counter-Hegemony, Anti-globalization and Culture in International Political Economy." *Capital and Class* 84: 31-42.

Secondary sources consulted

Aceves, Lozano. 2001. "Biographical Experience and Collective Action in Emerging Identities." *Espiral: Estudios sobre Estado y Sociedad* 7(20): 11-37.

Armato, Michael and Neal Caren. 2002. "Mobilizing the Single-Case Study: Doug McAdam's Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970." *Qualitative Sociology* 25 (1): 93-103.

Barker, Debi and Jerry Mander. 2000. "The WTO and Invisible Government." *Peace Review* 12(2): 251-255.

Baudrillard Jean. 1999. *L'Echange Impossible*. Paris: Galilée.

Blanchard, Serge. 1995. "Histoires de Vie et Orientation. Introduction: des Evènements de Vie aux Histoires de Vie." *L'orientation Scolaire et Professionnelle* 24 (3): 219-231.

- Chioni-Moore, David. 1994. "Anthropology is Dead, Long Live Anthro(a)pology: Poststructuralism, Literary Studies, and Anthropology's 'Nervous Present'." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 50 (4) Winter 1994: 345-366.
- Diani, Mario. 1992. "Social Movements and Social Capital: A Network Perspective on Movement Outcomes." *Mobilization* 2 (2): 129-147.
- Dijkstra Steven, Karin Geuijen and Arie De Ruijter. 2001. "Multiculturalism and Social Integration in Europe." *International Political Science Review* 22 (1): 55-84.
- Fisher, Dana, Kevin Stanley, David Berman and Gina Neff. 2005. "How Do Organizations Matter? Mobilization and Support for Participants at Five Globalization Protests." *Social Problems* 52 (1): 102-121.
- Imig, Doug. 2002. "Contestation in the Streets: European Protest and the Emerging Euro-Polity." *Comparative Political Studies* 35(8): 914-933.
- Jelin, Elizabeth. 2001. "Cultural Movements and Social Actors in the New Regional Scenarios: The Case of Mercosur." *International Political Science Review* 22 (1): 85-98.
- Katz, Jack. 2004. "On the Rhetoric and Politics of Ethnographic Methodology." *Annals, AAPSS* 595.
- Kearney, M. 1995. "The Local and the Global: The Anthropology of Globalization and Transnationalism." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 547-565.
- Larson Magali Sarfatti and Silvia Sigal. 2001. "Does 'The Public' Think Politically? A Search for 'Deep Structures' in Everyday Political Thought." *Qualitative Sociology* 24 (3): 285-309.
- Long, N. and A. Long (Eds.). 1992. *Battlefields of Knowledge. The Interlocking of Theory and Practice in Social Research and Development*. London: Routledge.
- McCarthy, John D. and Mayer Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *The American Journal of Sociology* 82(6): 1212-1241.
- McCorketl, Jill A. and Kristen Myers. 2003. "What Differences Does Difference Make? Position and Privilege in the Field." *Qualitative Sociology* 26(2): 199-231.
- Nagel, Joane. 1996. *American Indian Ethnic Renewal. Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Offe, Claus. 1985. "New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics." *Social Research* 52(4): 817-868.

- Pakulski, J. 1991. *Social Movements: The Politics of Moral Protest*. Cheshire: Longman Press.
- Pendras, Mark. 2002. "From Local Consciousness to Global Change: Asserting Power at the Local Scale." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 26(4): 823-833.
- Rojecki, Andrew. 2002. "Modernism, State Sovereignty and Dissent: Media and the New Post-Cold War Movements." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 19(2): 152-171.
- Rubel, Paula and Abraham Rosman. 1994. "The Past and the Future of Anthropology." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 50 (4): 335-344.
- Scott, Alan. 1990. *Ideology and the New Social Movements*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Seoane, Jose and Emilio Taddei. 2002. "From Seattle to Porto Alegre: The Anti-Neoliberal Globalization Movement." *Current Sociology/La Sociologie Contemporaine* 50(1): 99-122.
- Turner, Ralph H. and Lewis M. Killian. 1987. *Collective Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Watson Graham. 1996. "Listening to the Native: The Non-Ironic Alternative to Dialogic Ethnography." *Canadian Review Of Sociology and Anthropology* 33(1): 73-89.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Demographics:

1. Sex: Female__ Male__
2. Age: _____
3. Status: Married__ Single__ Divorced__ Cohabitation__
Other_____
4. Origin (ethnicity):
5. Residency (city, town, village):
6. Education level:
7. Occupation:
8. Union affiliation (if any):
9. Political affiliation (if any):
10. Religious affiliation (if any):
11. Member to any other NGO, charity, association, coalition...? If so, which:
12. What newspapers or magazines are you regularly reading?

ATTAC membership:

1. How long have you been a member of ATTAC?
2. Which local chapter are you affiliated with?
3. What is your position in the movement? (are you an active member, are you on the board, are the president of the local chapter, etc...?).
4. How many members do you think are in your local chapter?
5. How have you heard about ATTAC?
6. Do you go to the regular meetings of ATTAC? If so, when are they, where are they, what is discussed?

7. To your knowledge, what is the mission of ATTAC?
8. Have you ever participated in any political demonstration organized by ATTAC and/or sponsored by ATTAC? If so, could you please list all the protests that you remember going to (when, where, what the protests were about, and what was your involvement)?
9. How do you keep informed on ATTAC's activities and other news?

Globalization:

1. For you, what does globalization represent (what does it mean)?
2. What do you like about globalization?
3. What are your concerns about globalization?
4. What kind of influence do you think globalization has on French society?
5. What kind of influence do you think globalization has on French economy?
6. What kind of influence do you think globalization has on French culture?
7. According to you, how is the life of French people affected by globalization?
8. What kind of influence do you think globalization has on your everyday life?
9. What do you think about the actions taken by ATTAC against globalization? Do you agree with them? If so how, or if not, how come?
10. What do you think about the positions and measures taken by the French government towards globalization?
11. What do you think about what happened during the Larzac event, the G8 protests in Evian, and the WTO protests in Cancun (all ATTAC organized or sponsored events)?
12. What do you think about the press coverage of the Larzac event, the G8 protests in Evian and the WTO protests in Cancun (all ATTAC organized or sponsored events)?
13. From what you know, what is the alternative to globalization proposed by ATTAC? What do you think about it?
14. What do you think would be the alternative to globalization?

APPENDIX B

ACRONYMS

- AC!: Agir Ensemble contre le chômage / Act together against unemployment (France)
- ANPE: Agence National Pour l'Emploi / National Employment Agency (France)
- CADAC: Coordination pour le droit à l'avortement et à la contraception / coordination for the right to abortion and contraception (women's rights association, France)
- CFDT: Confédération Française démocratique du travail / Confederation of workers' union (France)
- CGT: Confédération Générale du Travail / Workers General Confederation (workers union, close to Communist Party, France)
- CNR: Conseil National de la Résistance / National Council of the Resistance (Resistants group 1944, France)
- CP: Confédération Paysanne / Farmer Confederation (farmers' association, France)
- DAL: Droit au logement / Right for housing (association promoting for housing for all, France)
- Dd!: Droits devant! / Rights Forward! (Human rights, rights for the unemployed association, France)
- EDF: Electricité de France / Electricity of France (Utilities, France)
- EU: European Union
- FN: Front National / National Front (Extreme Right political party, France)
- FO: Force Ouvrière / Worker's Force (Left workers' union, close to the CGT, see above)
- FSU: Fédération syndicale unitaire
- G8 : Group of the 8th most industrialized countries
- GATT: General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
- IMF: International Monetary Fund

LCR: Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire / Revolutionary Communist League (Extreme Left political party, France)

LO: Lutte Ouvrière / Workers' Fight (Extreme Left Workers Union, France)

MAI: Treaty Multilateral Agreement on Investment

MDC (Mouvement des Citoyens): Movement of Citizens (political party founded in 1991 by former Socialist Party member Jean-Pierre Chevènement).

MNCP: Mouvement national des chômeurs et précaires

PCF or PC: Parti Communiste Français ou Parti Communiste / French Communist Party (Left political party, France)

PRG (Parti Radical de Gauche): Left Radical Party (political party founded in 1998, inheritor of one of the oldest political parties in France, the Radical Socialist Party created in 1905).

PS: Parti Socialiste / Socialist Party (Left political party, France)

PTT (Postes, Télégraphes, Téléphones): name designating the administration of the public service for the postal and telecommunication services, transformed in 1991 into two public services, the French Post Office (La Poste) and the French Telecommunication Services (France Telecom).

SUD: Solidaires, unitaires, démocratiques

WTO: World Trade Organization

APPENDIX C

FOUNDING ORGANIZATION MEMBERS OF ATTAC

AC! (Agir ensemble contre le chômage): Act together against unemployment (non-governmental organization).

Agir ici: Act here (campaign coordination for human rights and environmental rights).

AITEC (Association internationale de techniciens, experts et chercheurs): International Association of technicians, experts and researchers.

Alternatives Economiques: Economic Alternatives (magazine).

Amis de la Terre: Friends of the Earth.

APEIS (Association pour l'emploi l'information et la solidarité): Association for employment, information and solidarity.

Artisans du monde: Artisans of the World.

Association Gunter Holzman: Gunter Holzman Association (employees –journalists, editorial board members, other employees- of the Monde Diplomatique magazine).

CADAC (Coordination des associations pour le droit à l'avortement et à la contraception): Coordination of associations for abortion rights and contraceptive rights.

CEDETIM (Centre d'études et d'initiatives de solidarité internationale): Center for studies and initiatives for an international solidarity.

CFDT Fédération Banques: Bank union.

CGT Fédération Finances: Bank union.

CNAFAL (Confédération Nationale des Familles Laïques): National Confederation of "Secular" Families.

Confédération générale des SCOP (Sociétés Coopératives de Production): General Confederation of the Cooperative Societies of Production.

Confédération Paysanne: Farmers Confederation union.

CRID (Centre de la recherche et d'information pour le développement): Center for Research and Information for Development.

DAL (Droit au Logement): Right to Housing, association.

ESCOOP (Economies solidaires et coopératives): Solidary and Cooperative Economies association.

FFMJC (Fédération Française des Maisons de Jeunes et de la Culture): French Federation of the Youth and Culture Associations.

FSU (Fédération syndicale unitaire): Unitary Union Federation (union for civil servants in education, research and culture).

G10 Solidaires: G10 Solidarity, union.

Golias: French publishing house.

Le Monde Diplomatique: political magazine, France.

MNCP (Mouvement national des chômeurs et précaires): National movement of the unemployed and the precarious.

MRAP (Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples): Movement against racism and for the friendship between people.

Les Pénélopes: French association for women's rights

Politique, Revue européenne de débats: european journal/magazine created by militants, researchers and scholars offering alternative views about Europe.

Politis: political magazine, France.

Raison d'agir: French publishing house.

SNES (Syndicat National de l'enseignement secondaire): French union for high school teachers.

SNESUP (Syndicat National de l'enseignement supérieur): French union for university professors.

SNUI (Syndicat National unifié des impôts): French union for internal revenue service employees.

SNUIPP (Syndicat National unifié des instituteurs et professeurs des écoles): French union for middle-school and high school teachers.

SUD PTT (Solidaires unitaires démocratiques PTT): French union for post office employees.

SURVIE: French association for human rights (hunger, Africa and third world countries).

Syndicat de la magistrature: French attorneys' and lawyers' union.

Syndicat de la Médecine Générale: French general medicine doctors' union.

Témoignage chrétien: French Christian magazine.

Transversales Sciences Culture: French general journal on scientific and social issues.

UFAL (Union des Familles Laïques): French association of families promoting secularism.

UGICT CGT (Union générale des ingénieurs, cadres et techniciens, CGT): French union for engineering, management and technicians.

UNEF (Union national des étudiants de France): French left student union.

Union syndicale Groupe des 10: French coordination of workers' unions (Group of the 10).

VITA

Name: Marie des Neiges Leonard

Address: Sociology Department, MS 4351, Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843

Email Address: mleonard@neo.tamu.edu

Education: M.S., Social Sciences (Cultural Anthropology major), Université Lumière
Lyon2, France, 1999.
B.S., Anthropology, Université Lumière Lyon2, France, 1996.

Teaching experience: Graduate assistant lecturer. January 2002 to December 2005.
Sociology Department, Texas A&M University, College Station,
TX 77843.
Spring 2005: Introductory Sociology, 50 students.
Fall 2004: Introductory Sociology, 100 students.

Other work experience: Study Abroad Coordinator. Summers of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003
and 2005.
Political Science Department and Study Abroad Offices, Texas
A&M University, College Station, TX 77843.

Awards: 2005 Eppright Outstanding International Student Award, International
Programs, Texas A&M University.
2005 Travel to conference grant, Melbern G. Glasscock Center for Humanities
Research, Texas A&M University.
2004 College of Liberal Arts Dissertation Research Award, College of Liberal
Arts, Texas A&M University.
2003-2004 Graduate Student Fellow, Melbern G. Glasscock Center for
Humanities Research, Texas A&M University.