

STRATEGIES FOR CHANGE

The Evolution Of Resistance > Richard Grossman, Founder POCLAD, Program On Corporations, Law & Democracy

For my adult lifetime – the last 30 years – many, many people, large numbers of people, sometimes millions of people have been involved in efforts to stop particular harms. And, in order to do that we've had to learn an enormous amount. Just the folks around the world who were fighting against nuclear power plants over the last 30 years. I mean, people had to learn about chemistry and physics and learn the periodic table and learn about the fuel cycle and money and weapons and how the military atom and the so-called peaceful atom – how they all interact in nuclear ways. And, people have done that around climate change. They've done that over forestry, over mining, over building these giant dams, over just water use. You know, we've done it over how banks use redlining and interlocking directorates. We've studied the nature of corporations; many people have and increasingly are.

So, people are capable - often times without sophisticated official education - of figuring this stuff out and using that knowledge to resist. I think what's happening in the last couple of years is that because of all that work, and because of the resistance from the corporations and the elected governments and stuff, the sense of the work, the nature of the work of people is changing, is evolving – slowly, but it's happening. And that is... people are moving from single issues... not to say we don't care about that. But, they're understanding that what we need to be doing is to resist those symptoms (single issues) in ways that begin to educate more people about the nature of the whole and that begin to challenge the public officials fundamentally who are giving away the peoples' authority, who are enabling private capital (which is not always private because many times it's just been stolen from the people anyway), but enabling capital and property, you know, put together in these corporate entities to in fact use the law of the land, to use the coercive force of law to instruct people in what they should be doing, to instruct them in how to think, to deny their rights.

...I live in a small state of New Hampshire in a small community of a couple thousand people, you know. We're trying to stop a gravel, a granite quarry corporation coming in to a little hill in our community. They want to come in and mine this... you know, 80 trucks a day for 20 years in this community of two thousand people. And what their lawyers, when their lawyers come and appear before our zoning board - you know, the community is really rising up – and their lawyers come in and say “given the law of the state of New Hampshire and the US government and the US constitution and New Hampshire constitution you people through your elected board of supervisors have no authority here except to help determine the conditions under which we can mine. You cannot...you have no authority to prevent us from mining this granite on this corporation's private property in this hill in your community.”

And so, picture that happening all over the place. WalMart corporation wants to come in and Home Depot corporation and all these corporations, and timber companies want to clear cut and all that. When their lawyers come in and say to the community that's trying to either stop it or make it less bad and say "You have no authority, except to work with us – sort of regulate how we destroy everything and how we pull out the guts from this neighbourhood by building this, or how we mine all this stuff." They're right. They're right. That's what the law is. That's what the law says.

So, you know, most of these struggles have been in fact. I mean occasionally you slip by and you can stop it, you make it too costly for the company and you make them stop and all that. But, for the most part, again, the community ends up trying to make it 15 trucks a day and you won't go between 12 midnight and 6 am and when you pass the school you'll slow down and you'll have barriers for the water and you'll protect the deer and the frogs and all that. What's beginning to happen is that we've been through that. People in communities all over the place have been through that and they're realizing it's not enough and so they're changing how they look at the situation and what they're saying is, "Well, I don't care what you say the constitution says or the laws that you, Mr. Corporation, have enacted at the state level. We're saying we're not going to allow this to happen in our community. We're going to write the rules for our community."

Changing Relationships, Changing Language > Mary Zepernick, Coordinator, POCLAD

POCLAD is a small group of individuals across the country and one in London, not a membership organization but we have a mailing list. And we put out a publication and other information. We do workshops and talks. And we work closely with people we consider allies. Who want to work in their organizations, in their communities to try to put into action the belief, the analysis that human beings belong in charge of the decisions that affect our lives. Who want to work to create democracy which must include subordinating, putting under our control all institutions we create.

And we believe that simply working on single harms, on one toxic, or one labour exploitation, or one campaign finance issue. Standing along is not really addressing the power structure and the wrong relationship. It's a relationship issue between human beings and our institutions. So it isn't that we would ask people to stop doing that organizing. To let the toxic dump come into their neighbourhood, no. But to try to organize within the context of a people who mean to be in charge.

So how does that change your language, your demands, even the arenas you work in. You go most likely to public officials rather than corporations themselves.

Corporate social responsibility is an oxymoron. It's a contradiction in terms. Not because they're irredeemably bad across the board. It's not about behaviour. It's

about the nature of corporations. They're not set up to be responsible, they're legal fictions. They're a form; human beings are responsible. We are responsible including for the entities we create supposedly to serve us.

So that that's a term even though the effort to bring control over corporations is a worthy one, the language is not the language of a sovereign people. We do not beg or beseech or plead or ask them to do a little less harm. Or to reward them when they behave well. It's not about that, it's about the right relationship that we need to bring about.

Challenging Patriarchy > Mary Zepernick, Coordinator, POCLAD

One very, very large context for POCLAD's work in more recent years has been the idea of patriarchy. And that comes back to who we are as human beings. What forms us? What are cultures and institutions reflecting? And patriarchy is many millennia old system that has prevailed in much of the world that takes human differences and assigns to them unequal value. Dominant and subordinate. And on the basis of that hands out privileges and goodies accordingly.

It's a male word linguistically and historically it was men who set up these categories. However, as we use it and there are other terms; a woman named Rhianna Isler calls it the dominator culture to avoid it only sounding male. I for instance am conscious of the need to struggle with my own patriarchal behaviour. I was raised in this culture. I have tendencies to dominate with my strengths. So it's not about men/women, although that gender differential remains. It's about any struggle for equity. And even more than that, the notion of a hierarchy of human beings.

So that the modern corporation - and as we know it today it's different in scale and in very many ways - the modern corporation is the quintessential patriarchal institution exercising power over. That's the hallmark of patriarchy, or a dominator culture. It's exercising power over based on wealth, based on human difference whatever. So that any kind of vision of democracy, of peace, of justice must whatever terminology people use, look at this larger framework and recognize that it's completely different behaviours that we need to call forth in ourselves. Again of mutuality, cooperation, all the relational. And I'm just conscious of how important that relational relationship word is in all this work among people, with our institutions, with the earth.

Keeping Corporations In Line > Robert Weissman, Editor, Multinational Monitor

The way that society can sort of mark what's permissible would be both to set boundaries on what the companies can do, and to have a variety of enforcement mechanisms to make sure those boundaries aren't transgressed. But also to also to sort of pin the corporation down so it doesn't have the ability to reach as far as it does now. In the area of setting boundaries, we're talking about creating a set of clearly defined and distinct regulatory limitations and prohibitions on certain kinds of activities.

We want to set high markers for what constitutes violation of criminal law and we want to have strong means to enforce this. That might include things like much higher fines than currently exist, but other kinds of creative sanctions that might involve putting corporations on probation with much stiffer sanctions outside of the realm of fines for companies that are recidivist and that violate the law again.

It might involve adverse publicity requiring corporations to take out advertisements explaining what they did wrong, apologizing for it, and publicizing their wrongdoing. It might involve equity fines, different kinds of creative fines that require companies to pay, not in terms of dollars but in terms of shares, to donate, to create new shares and donate them to the government, watering down the value of the shares of all the existing shareholders, and really penalizing the shareholders who benefit from the company's wrongdoing.

There's a whole set of creative sanctions we want to talk about. We also want to think about ways to limit corporate power itself. We want to prescribe certain kinds of activities. We want to take them out of the political field so to end the possibility and the various opportunities for corporate campaign contributions. We want to put restrictions on companies' ability to threaten to move, and actually fundamentally tie them down to place in new ways by limiting the mobility that's available to them. We want to take away all kinds of rights that they have under skewed existing law including expansive rights to free speech that are very appropriate and necessary for individuals but not for corporations.

The right to avoid search and seizure. Again, appropriate for individuals but not for corporations, and on down the line like that. At the same time, it makes sense to think about whether there are different ways to organize the economy, other than corporations all together.

Now, I think the near term does not going to involve those institutions displacing corporations but in the medium term, it's possible to imagine a network of cooperatives, having a much greater say in how the economy's run, a build up of the non-profit sector, a build up of a government provision of services, so that the traditional corporate role is more and more restrained. The corporate sector becomes a smaller portion of the economy. These other sectors are built up. We've got an infusion of different kinds of values in society, different forms of doing economic transactions, becoming part of the whole mix. And we're not completely reliant on the corporate form and corporate transactions.

The Consumption Dilemma > Naomi Klein, Author, NO LOGO

I actually think that any movement that's about scolding people, making them feel guilty for needing to feed their families quickly. And for liking nice clothes is doomed to failure.

Not just here but particularly in the developing world where you've got a lot of people who are fighting for basic rights to consume and who can only dream of being able to produce, to buy the goods that they're in fact producing. And I think that's a really elitist argument.

And what this is really about is the fact that we see corporations as the most powerful political entities of our time. And we are responding to them as citizens, citizens to political organizations. And we can do it with a latte in one hand and with Nike shoes on. I believe that we can. I'm not saying we should but I think that there is a distinction between having a problem with a product and having a problem with the way a corporation is behaving in the global economy as a political entity.

Does Globalization Help The Poor? > Robert Weissman, Editor, Multinational Monitor

Well, the economic data doesn't *prove* that people are worse off under corporate globalization than they would otherwise be. In the narrowest sense, which is to say, we don't know what would have happened had they not pursued the corporate globalization agenda.

We can say well, if we look back to the previous twenty years, when they weren't doing it so much, that's a good indication, it's awfully compelling evidence, but it's true, you could say, well, it's not proof, we don't know for sure. So what can we do? Well, we can look at the underlying policies that have been part of the corporate globalization model and say, well, do they really help the poor? Have they been successful in helping the poor or have they been harmful to the poor?

And if you look at privatization in the developing world and seen how it's just led to the transfer of government and public assets primarily to foreign corporations or a narrow elite and the simultaneously involved massive lay-offs of people, you'd have to say, mostly it hasn't helped the poor. If you look at policies like charging user fees for people to access basic health care and education on the theory that they'd be able to raise a little bit of money to support those services. You'll see that what it's done is deny access to health care and education to millions of people in the developing world.

And you'd have to conclude, well, it didn't help the poor. If you look at the efforts at trade liberalization to open up markets to imports and orient economies

towards exports in the developing world, you see a record of tens of millions of people in the agricultural sector displaced. So in Mexico for example, millions have lost their hold on the land because they're unable to compete with the agri-business in the United States and to some extent in Canada. And they've been forced off the land, they've lost their livelihoods. Hard to say that that's been helpful to the poor.

If you just go down the list and look at all the particular policy prescriptions of the IMF - the International Monetary Fund - and the World Bank, the elements that are embodied in the World Trade Organization Agreements, the directives that countries receive from institutions like the Cato Institute or the Heritage Foundation, you'll see, one by one, they overwhelming are harmful to the poor. I think that kind of analysis combined with looking what the record has been for the last twenty years, makes an awfully compelling case that corporate globalization has been disaster for people in the poorest countries, not a benefit.

The Responsibility Of Activists > Noam Chomsky, Institute Professor, MIT

Corporations are indeed imposing codes of responsibility which conceivably have a certain effect. But if to the extent that they do it's because they're under constant pressure. Pressure is eliminated the codes go.

In fact there's a lot of fraud involved. There was just a major case that even hit the newspapers. I think it was the textile and sneaker manufacturers that kind of thing. Clothing corporations did have a code and they hired a big accounting firm, Price Waterhouse, to monitor their overseas factories. And big surprise Price Waterhouse put out a glowing report about how wonderful they are. But they made a mistake. They allowed a young person to come along, Dara O'Rourke who's actually a former student of mine. But he's now a professor at MIT.

He was a specialist in environmental issues, labour issues in particular in Asia where they were working. So they allowed him to tail along. And he did a very close detailed analysis of what was actually going on in the factories they looked at, and the things that Price Waterhouse wasn't investigating. Like for example do workers have the right to associate? They didn't ask about that but he did. And all sorts of other things.

And he published, put together a very critical paper which to their credit the New York Times had a pretty good story about their labour reporter. Well that's what you'd expect. They're going to be monitored by systems like Price Waterhouse which are basically inside the system. If they allow outside monitoring you're going to find something else. If they allowed the workers themselves to speak you'd get a totally different picture.

And it's the, the activists in the rich countries who have some clout. Now they have a responsibility to make sure that these codes are implemented, but a deeper responsibility to eliminate the slave system itself. So that the people

instituting the codes have no right to do it. Just like a slave, you could impose codes of responsibility on slave owners. And if you force them, threaten to take away the institution unless they act responsibility toward their slaves you might get them to do it. Which is perhaps an improvement but not wonderful.

Tactical Intelligence Acquisition > Charles Kernaghan, Director, National Labor Committee

I know when Wal-Mart had this buy American campaign you know they said that the stuff in their stores was made in United States and of course if you go into a Wal-Mart it's very patriotic.

There's flags banners, stars and stripes banners over the cashiers and everything. Made in the USA, bring it home to the USA, Support American manufacturers that support American jobs. So I called Wal-Mart and I said them how many of your goods are made in the United States? They wouldn't answer they said we don't know, of course they know.

So we went into Wal-Mart and we decided to start counting all the products and what countries they were from. And it was hilarious because we found out Wal-Mart may look out of control but they've got hidden cameras. So the minute you take out a notebook all of a sudden your arms go up and you're led out of the store. You cannot write in Wal-Mart. They think you're a competitor I guess, I don't know what.

But then we tried to take some pictures. You can't take pictures in Wal-Mart they throw you out. It's against company rules. So we found out though that you can act really weird in Wal-Mart and no one would say a single word. So we put hidden tape recorders in our pocket and just spent months talking out loud to ourselves in Wal-Mart stores. Not one single person ever said anything.

So I'd walk over to the Kathy Lee Gifford rack of clothing and I'd say oh look at this blouse is from Malaysia. Look 30, 1, 2, 38 blouses from Malaysia \$18.00. Oh look at these sweaters from China. We did that for months on end. Going to Wal-Mart stores and to all different states and did our survey and found out of course that only 17% of the goods were made in United States and 83% were made off shore.

We found a statement that Wal-Mart had, Wal-Mart has an unprecedented commitment to purchase American made goods. And I wanted to sue them for false advertising until we looked at the small print. Wal-Mart has unprecedented commitment to purchase American made goods whenever they can meet the pricing available off shore. So if you work for nine cents an hour in the United States Wal-Mart will purchase your goods.

But just the lies, the hypocrisy. And I just see, when I see the corporations I see organizations that have lost their moral compass. Who don't care and who can only be reached through, through massive social pressure.

Sweatshops Will Not End Unless... > Charles Kernaghan, Director, National Labor Committee

If we're doing whales and penguins we would be taking money in right and left. If you're talking about worker rights of young women - forget it, everybody runs away. So given the lack of resources and given the small scale you have to focus your work. And you have to, but the challenge becomes a successful campaign will generalize. You know you run a good campaign and it's Coles, Gap, you know Nike, everybody is watching. Nobody wants themselves to be the target of a campaign.

... So many different facets come into any decent campaign. And you can't rely upon the media that's one avenue. You have to, you know, rely upon good corporate campaigning out on the streets, the leafleting, the research. I feel very strongly that campaigns are research driven.

And I would never enter a campaign unless the research was solid. And you have to put a human face on this issue so you have to have the picture, the photographs, the clothing, the wage slips, where the workers live. You have to go through all of that.

... So now say looking at a campaign for worker rights, enforceable worker rights standards and global trade that the 16 year old is going to have every bit the same protections as the label does. I think you just keep that campaign as simple as that and you bring it out to the American people and as this wave starts to grow, as hundreds of thousands as millions of people sign these petitions that the rights of the 16 year old are going to be protected.

You're going to see the administration, 'cause the petitions will be directed towards the administration or towards congress. But I don't think you're going to get anything out of this congress or this administration without enormous popular pressure. And so you do your job and you keep an eye on Washington.

But, but the long range, in the long range you will not end the sweatshop economy. The global sweatshop economy will not be ended without enforceable human rights and worker right standards. It can't be done. It will never be done on the back of voluntary codes and privatization and monitoring never. It has to be laws.

But in the past we weren't strong enough to move for those laws. You had to build the movement first so it's, it's starting. I mean now it's time to move for the enforceable laws absolutely.

DON'T Boycott Sweatshops > Charles Kernaghan, Director, National Labor Committee

No worker we have ever met anywhere in the developing world has asked us to boycott their jobs. No not once. And this will even sound harsher: every single

worker in the developing world will tell you it's better to be exploited than to have no job at all. But they stop there. No worker has ever said we need more sweatshops.

They've never said that ever. They wouldn't even dream of saying that. But the part that moves, moves me the most is that the demands of these workers around the world are so modest so reasonable. Like workers would tell us in Bangladesh just like in El Salvador they would say to us look if you could double our wages we could climb out of misery and into poverty.

So the wage would go from maybe 17 cents an hour to 34 cents an hour. The labour costs of the cap would go from 1.6 cents to 3.2 cents. It's nothing, 3.2 cents of labour in a seventeen dollar and fifty cent baseball cap. It's less than 2/10ths of 1% of the retail price. So what I find most moving is that the demands are so reasonable. And workers will sell you, tell you they'll say look we're a poor country you know, we need these jobs.

We'll work hard. We'll work ten hours a day. We'll work we'll give our blood for these, these companies but we wanted to be treated like human beings. And we don't want to be forced to work twenty hours, or twenty-four hours we need to go home to our kids. You know what they asked for in Bangladesh they said do you think the American people would help us get one day a week off because they're working seven days a week.

And they said to you our families are collapsing. We're not home with our kids. Our kids are alone they're sick. The mother is exhausted too, working seven days a week you know, fourteen hours a day. So they said do you think the American people will help us win one day a week off.

... After she tells us her story about working you know, seven days straight, 120 hours, this kid bounds over, this beautiful child comes bounding over because a crowd started to gather around us. And she says I work making clothing for the US companies also, for the US she says. So I said to her how old are you? She says I'm eleven or twelve. And I said how do they treat you in the factory?

And this little kid looks up and she says, sir I cannot possibly put into words to express how they treat us. And I had chills up and down my spine. A little eleven year old kid talking like this and they, they afterwards she told us that they were hit in the factory with sticks. The supervisors took their shoes off and hit the kids with it, screamed at them.

Then her mother comes over and her mother says, yes my daughter comes home at midnight every single night, seven days a week. This eleven year old kid or twelve year old kid was working seven days a week until ten or eleven o'clock at night then traveling through these dangerous slum areas back to her home. We can do better than that. We can demand our corporations do better than this.

And at one point I turned to take a picture of this hut, just to document these 8 by 10 foot thatched huts. And this kid leapt to get into the picture cause she was still a child. Like a deer she leapt from where she was standing right in front of the

hut so she'd be in the picture. And it was, there was such life in this kid but her life is being stolen from her.

And you know when American people see these things I think the reaction is going to be quite strong. But we do have to find other ways than boycotts because boycotts are not, not what are necessary. It's not going to help.

... I have a sort of a, a good feeling about the American people. That if they're given the information, if they actually see the human face of the global economy, they see these young kids. They see the living conditions they will never accept it never, never not in a million years.

And so our job is not to beat up on the corporations we don't have to do that. What we have to do is bring the reality together the brand, the swish we'll bring it together with the young women who make, who make these garments and these sneakers in the conditions under which they live and work.

Humor, Ridicule, Pressure, And Jail > Michael Moore, Author, Filmmaker

So, I've seen the power of this lens and the power of humor. See, a lot of people, a lot of political people, especially people on the left, have forgotten the importance of humor as an incredible weapon, and a vehicle through which to affect change. They think humor sometimes trivializes or makes the serious subject less serious, when in fact, you know, I think it was Mark Twain who said against an assault of laughter nothing can stand. These people cannot, cannot debate ridicule,

Corporations will respond to ridicule. They do not like being made to look like jackasses. They will respond to an incredible amount of public pressure. They will respond to going to jail. If there's a chance that they or their executives may have to go to jail, or lose all the money that they've been hoarding, they tend to jump in pretty quickly and turn things around. So they will respond to the people if the people make their feelings known because you see, they know, they know the math. The math is, is that in a democracy, they've got the same number of votes as you or I do. One. The corporate honchos, they just get one vote. And they know, there's a hell of a lot more of us than there are of them. And should we choose to use that power, they are in deep trouble.

Unions And Protest > Michael Moore, Author, Filmmaker

Forming a union at your workplace works. That just scares the be-jesus out of them. That's the last thing they want to have happen, because you are going to have some power then. You are going to have some say over what's going on at your workplace. That can have a big impact. Seattle. Seattle was a watershed moment for corporate America. They, I think that just rocked their world, and

followed up by Quebec City and these other places where all kinds of people took to the streets to say we're getting kind of sick and tired of this corporate dominance over our lives, over the rest of the world, things being done in our name to the poor in this world.

I see a lot of good happening. I see a real political shift happening. Even a magazine like Business Week took a poll asking Americans how they feel about big business and the vast majority said they didn't trust them. That they were essentially anti-big business, and it was a stunning poll to the business community. So they know that they had better find, sort of, the kinder, gentler way of putting forth their agenda and fooling the people. The sort of friendly face of fascism as one author put it.

Using The Activists' Tools > Chris Komisarjevsky, CEO, Burson Marsteller Worldwide

Whenever you have demonstrations like that, whether it's in Seattle, whether it's in Genoa, whether it's in Washington, I think one of the most striking things is when you're dealing with some of these activist organizations how sophisticated they are. And in many cases corporations how naïve they are. And what they have to do to be able to deal with this kind of pressure.

Now it's a very, these are a lot of very serious issues that organizations are talking about. But the fact is that these activist organizations use every tool that anybody could ever think of. They're very strong and they are very, very conscious of what the camera is going to pick up, what the sound bite is going to be and their point of view. And finding a way to get it across in the most dramatic way. It could be any, it could be demonstrations. It could be putting pies in people's faces in a public environment. It could be outside the courtroom steps. It could be any number of things. But they know where to go to get the attention. They're very good at it.

And I think in many ways it's a signal to corporations that if you feel strongly about an issue, if you don't want to be maligned incorrectly then you have to speak out. And you have to do it very smart and you have to do it by using all of the tools that a NGO, or an activist organization might be using as well.

It's Up To Consumers And Employees > Ira Jackson, Director, Center for Business & Government, Kennedy School at Harvard

What we need is not more intrusive government, we need more demanding consumers. And employees who develop a market like mechanism which weeds out and differentiates the good guys from the poor performers. And part of what I'm calling for is the principle for a more principled consumer. And a more

principled and demanding employee. So that a market develops that rewards best practice. And that begins to weed out the ethical violators from the ethical pioneers.

So I think that's, and that's something that even we capitalists can understand. It's so simple. It's driven by markets. And what we have the luxury of forming for the first time in the history of civilization because of the ubiquity of the Internet. The availability of information and the surplus of commodity goods and services. We have now the ability to choose.

The customer and the consumer and the employee are the kings and the queens of the new capitalism. And we have to start exercising our authority and opportunity responsibly.

What's It Going To Take? > Joe Badaracco, Prof. Of Business Ethics, Harvard Business School

Well I think the protests against the World Trade Organization, other groups have not yet resonated in my judgment with middle America. I think they're more likely to resonate if unemployment goes up. If there's scandals involving politicians and companies, I think what will aggravate and maybe mobilize the middle classes if they sense that they've listened to too many menus when they've telephoned their bank for service. When they've had too many flights canceled. When they've had too many experiences of being consumers ready to spend money and being treated by complete indifference by a large corporation.

Stakeholder Participation > Sam Gibara, Former CEO, Goodyear Tire

Different systems have been tried in different countries. For example, the German model. German model calls for a management council that's made up of representatives of the workers of the shareholders and of management. That's an attempt to really share decision making and to render the organization more democratic. It doesn't make it fully democratic, it makes it better represented.

The downside of that is that it does slow down the decision making process. So there's no perfect answer to that. But there's certainly different models being tried in different places and I think the involvement of parties that have a stake in the organization, in the decision making process, should be encouraged to the extent that it doesn't slow down the decision making process.

I don't think we'll ever see a CEO elected by the people of the company, nor do I think that would be desirable, because the people of the company are only one of many stakeholders. The employees are just one stakeholder. So, it is not possible to have a completely democratic structure.

Shareholder Activism > Robert Monks, Corporate Governance Advisor & Shareholder Activist

You have to advise the average shareholder who finds himself affronted by corporate conduct to ask himself very, very hard: How much pain can you endure? Because he's never going to get paid for what he does. Because if he manages to affect a recovery in the stock price his stock will go up a little bit but everybody else's does too, everybody gets a free ride off of him.

If he has to spend any money, if he has to take any time off work. If he has to do any of these things it all comes out of his pocket. No one is going to pay him back. So you want to be very, very sure before you undertake a cause like this that you're prepared to pay the price and you're not going to be discouraged. And that you have the ability to stay in there and bear the pain.

Remember the corporation all this time can spend your money hiring lawyers to obstruct you. And if you don't, if you don't want to play don't put on this track suit because this is not a game for people who are motivated in the usual way. The usual way of acting only in immediate self interest you wouldn't do it.

... Individual shareholders can find shareholder resolutions that the company must put in to its annual proxy report. And a shareholder can then solicit support from other large institutions and over time build up a very good basis of support.

I mean I started along with some partners a company called Institutional Shareholder Services some 15, 20 years ago. And we started with nothing. And we started to provide proxy advice to people as to how they should vote. It took us about five years but after about five years we were able to get 40% of the vote at almost every corporation we wanted to.

And it is possible to have that kind of impact. And the amount of money that we were involved in wasn't gigantic in the world's terms. But it was not something that you could do in your spare time and with your spare cash.

The Lessons Of Cochabamba > Oscar Olivera, Leader, Coalition in Defense of Water and Life

(Translated)

So people don't want this model
but they don't want to return to the past,
a situation where few people make
decisions in the name of the people
in the name of the country.

They confused the well being of a nation
with the well being of just a few people.
And the war over water demonstrates
that people are willing to build

a new alternative
where the people themselves
are in charge of solving their own problems
without closing their eyes
to an alternative to a globalized world
with a globalized economy.
But where the relationships of exchange
and investments are fairer
not like now.

I believe that people are
giving that message
and in the case of water
we have decided
to implement a solution
where the people are the main protagonist
not politicians
not foreign investors
not those interests.

Of course we're going to need investment
we're going to need the money
it's a poor country without the resources
to find solutions to its problems.
But it needs to be an investment
that is transparent like water
so we can see who has the costs
and who has the benefits
and how it benefits and costs
both groups.

We have inherited a company
like all public corporations
with technical problems
with financial problems
with legal problems
and with administrative problems
and we are facing these problems.

This new societal project
is not just a social or economic project
but a political one.

It has to do with people making decisions
about their own problems
and finding solutions.

If we show that simple working people
are capable of solving
their problems
we can be at the point
of asking, that everything

that was privatized
everything that was sold
everything in the hands of the corporations
be returned to the hands of the people.

Lose The Fear > Oscar Olivera, Leader, Coalition in Defense of Water and Life

(Translated)

I believe we live in a world of fear
people are afraid of everything
they're afraid of the dark
they're afraid of losing their jobs
afraid to speak
afraid to give their opinion
afraid to act.

I think that it's important
for us to lose our fear.
we're going to lose that fear
once we have the capacity
to be united, to be organized
once we regain the confidence
in ourselves and in other people
then we can open our hearts
to those feelings of solidarity
of brotherhood to all
thinking that globalization
is uniting everyone
we all have the same problems
but we all have the same dreams
it's important to lose the fear.

Culture First > Jeremy Rifkin, President, Foundation on Economic Trends

What is culture? It's all the activities you and I engage in that are not commercial and not government. Church, secular, paternal, sports, arts, civic. It's where we have play. It's where we have reciprocal relationships. It's where we explore our humanity. It's where we revel in each other for the sheer joy of being a human being, and where we explore our relationship to our fellow creatures in the earth we live in. Culture is where we explore play. And create intrinsic value. The human story. Commerce is where we create deep work and utility. In the real world, we live by play and work. We live by intrinsic and utility values. The key question is which comes first? The community or the corporation and commerce?

What I would argue, and it's common sense, is that communities precede commerce, and therefore corporations are not the central organizing principle of our life, but they're an augment. And should only be an essential augment but not sufficient to define who we are. So, what we need to do is bring back the culture. The problem is that civil society, the culture, the community, has been marginalized and colonized by either corporations or governments. In fact, we call the culture the third sector in public policy. As if commerce is the first sector, government's the second sector and then where we live our lives and create our stories is the third sector. And think of the language we use. This is a total colonized institution. In Canada and Europe, you call organizations in the civil society, non-governmental organizations. Meaning, not government, but dependant on. Totally colonized.

In the U.S., we call these organizations in the culture non-profit. Not corporate, but dependant on the commercial arena. We need to decolonize the civil society, re-embolden it, bring back cultural diversity, understand that the human story is the center of our identity. Then, we can put the corporation in its proper role. We can put the market and the networks in their proper role. Their role is to create utility. But utility is not the end of human existence, it's simply an augment to human culture. And if we can begin to reestablish culture as the center where people's power is, then there's a role for corporations. And there's a role for government. But those roles are to be attended to, not dominant over the place where people have their story told and where they live out their community values.

Redefine Our Relationship To Nature > Maude Barlow, Chairperson, Council of Canadians

Right now the, we, we exist to serve the global economy. And that is, that is just so wrong. It's wrong in every conceivable way. We need to have a redefinition of economics whereby the economy serves communities and people. We need a total redefinition and reconfiguration of our relationship to the world around us because the thing I know in my soul is that we are killing this planet. We are killing this planet.

We're taking down other species at an enormous rate. The world cannot survive what we're doing to it. Economical globalization in the end will destroy itself because there will be nowhere left to go to get the fish. When you've taken the fish off the east coast of Newfoundland and you say, well what the hell the cod are gone but there are Chilean sea bass, you know.

And then they're gone well we'll go a level deeper. We will run out. It is finite. Water is finite, air is finite, energy is finite. We will run out. The question is will we know it in time to stop it. And until we redefine our relationship to nature, the power that we have given to these transnational corporations, the international

institutions that serve them and the non-democratic governments that we have we will not be able to stop this destruction.

And so I think we have, I'm actually quite hopeful. I want to say that. I feel that the movement that has taken foot around the world is based on a truly and deeply revolutionary or radical notion of, of radical in the sense of root. What needs to be changed at the root? And I think the young people who are part of this movement will teach us. I think they'll lead the way.

I think those who haven't had a voice, the first nations, indigenous peoples, the poor, young people I think these are the voices that are going to come to the fore now. And they are going to tell us how it has to be. They won't compromise. They're not going to work with reforms.

They have a fundamentally different vision of the world. And we will listen to them because we will have no alternative. And the corporation will fall. The corporation in its current powerful state will fall, it must.

Real World Strategies > Ray Anderson, CEO, Interface

In nature there's no waste, so let's model a company after nature, a waste free company, where emissions are harmless, so that whatever we do emit, is not going to harm any creature, any part of the biosphere. Let's drive our processes with a renewable energy, but let's first reduce that energy usage to its irreducible minimum through efficiencies, relentless pursuit of efficiency, so we can begin to afford the investments in the renewable sources of energy, affordable tags win biomass fuel cells someday.

...So that someday, instead of sending carpet to a landfill, we can mine the landfill and bring those old carpets back and salvage the petrochemical molecules and give them life, a true resurrection, if you will. We've planted 30 thousand trees at this point in time, offsetting lots of miles in commercial jets. We can see the day, when we will no longer sell our products, but we will sell the service that our product provides. In carpet that means colour, and texture and ambience, comfort underfoot, acoustical value, cleanliness, functionality, all the reasons people want carpet. They can buy that service instead of owning the product itself. We retain ownership in the means of delivering the service. And why is that good for the environment? You can bet that we own that product, we will make it to last, we will maintain it to last, so that those molecules through their first life, have a maximum life, and then we will also at the end of that life, bring those products back, and give them life after life, and to take it a step further, we will design them in the first place, so that they easily disassemble into their components to make it even easier to bring those materials back and close the loop on the individual material components

Radar Up! > Jane Akre, Whistle-blowing Fox Reporter

What scares me is that we know that Monsanto monitors the traffic that goes on on the internet. They have hired out companies that will do that, and when a certain topic comes up, they can hone in on it, on the internet. So, this is being tracked. That makes me very, very nervous. The internet is of course a free marketplace for things to go back and forth, but it's also sort of a school room for Monsanto to learn about what's going on and they are learning, you know they're learning about what's going on.

... We're going to see more corporate spies out there. More people who are alleged to be part of a grassroots movement that are actually monitoring what's going on on behalf of a corporation. I think we're going to see more of that. It's, people just need to have their radar up and their eyes open and be very, very savvy, I think.

Choose Organic > Jane Akre, Whistle-blowing Fox Reporter

You shouldn't have to wage war before you go to the grocery store. It shouldn't be an unpleasant experience. How am I going to wade through this? How am I going to keep the crap out of my grocery cart? How am I going to feed something to my kid that is wholesome and close to natural? And doesn't have a lot of added ingredients, and doesn't have trans-fats, and doesn't have genetically modified ingredients in it, and doesn't have hormones in it. I mean, going to the grocery store, you know, for me is like angst, I just, I hate it. It shouldn't be that tough for the average consumer to buy wholesome nutritious food made by mother nature that you feed your kids to sustain them and nurture them and help them grow. It should be a very easy process.

And people vote every time they make a purchase in the grocery store, they are voting what they want their food to be. And they're sending a very clear message, if I buy something organic then the non-organic producer is hearing about that. They're hearing about it at the grocery store, which tracks my purchases. It's getting back to the grocery store. More people buy it, they will stock it. You build it, they will come.

Curing The Cancer Epidemic > Dr. Samuel Epstein, Prof. emeritus, Occupational & Environmental Medicine, U of Illinois

What do we need to do to turn this whole situation round? The answers are really very simple, extremely simple and they are more in the realm of public policy than they are of science. The first is basically the precautionary principle. Do not

allow any corporation to introduce into commerce any product, process or technology which has not been thoroughly and independently tested and independently validated. Insist that this evidence be validated by non-governmental organizations and insist on the principle of risk avoidance and risk prevention rather than accepting risk and attempting to so-called to manage risk. That's the first. That's an absolute ban on any new or poorly tested or untested technologies.

The next is Toxics Use Reduction. By that I mean, phase out the current use of toxic and cancer causing chemicals. Now is this pie in the sky? Not at all, not one bit. In 1988 the Commonwealth of Massachusetts working, the ground having been prepared by a coalition of people from the university of lower Massachusetts, environmental groups and some responsible industry in Massachusetts, passed a Toxic Use Reduction Act, which stated that - we will in collaboration with engineers and industrial hygienists develop methodologies for phasing out toxics and they have been extraordinarily successful in regard to the reduction of hazardous waste disposal and with relation to phasing out the use of chlorinated organic solvents.

And this can be bolstered by a series of tax incentives, and disincentives. You offer the incentives to the companies who are phasing out hazardous products, and disincentives to those who know about the hazardous products, but refuse to act on this.

... In this country and all great democracies, we believe every citizen has the right to have access to all information except validated trade secrets, which there are very, very few, and defence and security. However US and German, and citizens all over democracies, are denied the right to have information which lies buried in Government and industry files or relatively inaccessible in the scientific literature. Once you give this information to the public, you have a grassroots revolution demanding safety. Dying from cancer ain't a very pleasant business and seeing your wife or your children dying from cancer, isn't a very pleasant business. Given that opportunity, I'll give you a hundred to one, you'll see an international grassroots, democratic revolution in which people demand the right to know. That's a winner, nobody can argue against that.

The next is transparency of decision making. So much decision making, is made behind closed door, as it was with Enron, without any safeguards. The FAOWHO committees in Geneva, that's the Food and Agricultural Organization World Health Organization, they meet in private, they have industry consultants, no representatives of nongovernmental organizations. So balanced decision making and transparent decision making in the National Cancer Institute and the American Cancer Society, lead committees, there are no representatives of individuals and scientists who are knowledgeable and vocal in their demand for prevention.

Members of corporations that knowingly refuse to divulge information on hazards of their products or processes, or their managements or their R & D staff, should be subject to criminal penalties, and both Senator Kennedy in 1978 and

Congressman Conyers attempted to pass white collar crime legislation, and I testified in Conyers legislation and provided a detailed listing of companies, major corporations with examples of how they manipulated, suppressed or destroyed information. What you need is an agency which is responsive to citizens and which has rights of investigations, like anti-cartel activities and which reports directly to Congress.

... With this package of legislative proposals, we could within one decade help move and help reverse the cancer epidemic to the relatively low rates of the 1940s, and at the same time ensure corporate responsibility. The way in which this is going to be done, is by a mixture of white collar crime legislation, and also arousing the public to what democracy really means.

Fighting GMOs > Jane Akre, Whistle-blowing Fox Reporter

Labelling has met with limited success in the States although there are an awful lot of grassroots groups that are saying, once we label, that is essentially the death of genetically modified organisms. And there was an attempt in Oregon called Measure 27 to label GMOs and, it was amazing. I actually got out to Oregon and watched it. It was certainly a grassroots citizens group and they had limited budget, they had somewhat of a budget. They did some advertising, they did a lot of public speaking. A lot of grassroots folks were very organized and did a really good job to inform the public.

Then a consortium of biotech companies came in and there was just no limit on the amount of money they spent on advertising. The scare tactics that they used, scaring people that they were going to have to pay 30 per cent more on the grocery store shelves if labelling goes into effect. Scaring people about the grassroots folk who were trying to keep consumers informed. Ultimately, that multimillion dollar campaign won out against the grassroots campaign, and that's the way it's done.

Other than that, that's as far as the labelling issue has gone, but that was the seed, that was the genesis and it's not going to stop. And we now have areas of the country where they're not allowing genetically modified organisms in. This has just got to be done on the grassroots because that's the only way it's going to be effective. Citizens are going to make it happen. It's not going to happen on the part of the biotech companies and it's not going to happen from our government.

... You know, people are easily scared and a lot of people are on very tight budgets and it's tough to think that it's going to cost you more. I always, I always come back to thinking that an informed consumer is going to do the right thing. I mean, they even had Sir Paul McCartney coming out and doing an ad for them, and that's pretty powerful stuff. And, they were defeated. I wish I had some kind of words of advice. Unless you have a multimillion dollar campaign, it's very, very tough.

Circumvent Party Politics > Naomi Klein, Author, NO LOGO

I think that there's activism going on on several different fronts. Activists whether they are targeting Nike or whether they're school boards deciding that they're not going to do business with corporations who are invested in Burma. Or who use sweat shop labour. Or unions who decide that they're going to organize themselves as investors and apply pressure through their pension funds. This activism is taking place on many different fronts.

But it is doing an end run around traditional political parties. And I think the way previous generations perhaps understood how to affect political change. But I don't think it's about privatization. I think it's a fallow period where those structures have been thoroughly discredited that they need to be ignored for a little while so that new structures can emerge out of this movement. And so I'm not, I don't believe that this is about privatization. I think it's about decentralization and it's about building new structures. But we're just at the early stages and we don't even, in a sense, know what they're going to be.

But I'm encouraged that we're not sort of running into the brick wall trying to solve these problems through national electoral politics anymore. And part of the reason why this activism is happening, why so many, so many campaigners have decided that they have more luck going after corporate targets as opposed to governmental targets is because they've tried that. They've tried to affect change by electing a social democratic party for instance. And seen that that was essentially a waste of energy. And worse than that, a recipe for despair, for activists' despair. And so what we need I think, are a few solid victories and a sense of empowerment to build upon.

Evade Government > Maude Barlow, Chairperson, Council of Canadians

The most powerful political transformation of our time is the creation of an international civil society movement.

I call it the new democracy movement. That is literally taking on these institutions, bypassing the government saying you're either useless or you're worse, you're part of the problem. And we know you've bought into this and we know that you may say one thing to your citizens but you're doing something else. So we're stopping voting.

You know in country after country records lows in terms of people turning out to belong to political parties to vote. Young people are not voting. It does not mean they're not political. What it means is they're bypassing a process that they no longer consider to be democratic or in any way representative of their interests.

And they're going directly to the institutions either the global institutions like the World Bank or the World Trade Organization. Or directly to the corporation itself. And speaking their truth to its power. And it's a whole new politics. It's, it's, it's

creating a counterforce to this corporate power over here that I think is the most important political development of our time.

What, Me Protest? > Chris Barrett & Luke McCabe, First "Corporately-Sponsored" University Students

Luke

Hypothetically Chris do you think that it would void our contract with First USA if we were to go into an anti-corporation protest?

Chris

That's actually a very good question I've been thinking about that a lot.

Luke

Really.

Chris

I don't know why we'd want to join in an anti-corporation protest. But we were actually in a magazine Ad busters do you remember that? That was anti-corporate magazine.

Luke

That's true.

Chris

And we got like hundreds of emails from people. And we actually convinced some of them that what we're doing is a good idea and that we're not just selling out for the corporation.

Luke

That's true.

Chris

So would we participate in one I don't know?

Luke

I don't know.

Chris

Since we are corporately sponsored but maybe we could go there and help out other like students and let them know that maybe the corporation isn't as bad as they think it is.

Luke

Exactly.