

Summit protests 1968-2002

Tord Björk 2002

Contents:

Introduction.....	3
The history of the summit protests.....	3
Summit protests in statistical comparison 1968 - 2002	12
Comments on the statistics.....	15
Types of popular activities	15
Political content of the protests.....	15
Largest summit demonstrations	16
Top list of popular organisation meetings and NGO forums in parallel with the summits	17
Mass arrests and detention at summit protests in the West.....	18
Detainees in absolute numbers.....	18
Proportion of protesters detained in absolute terms.....	18
Convictions for protesters/activists.....	19
Total convictions for protesters/activists	19
Police shootings	19
Difficulties with demonstration statistics.....	19
Police interventions.....	19
Appendix 1: Press release from the Democracy Network on the report.....	23
Appendix 2: Statistics with calculation favoured by the police.....	25
Appendix 3: Abbreviations	27

Introduction

This report is the result of a prolonged search for knowledge within the Popular Movement Study Group.

It is primarily a statistical comparison between different summit protests. There are many ways to compare the activities of civil society organisations at summits and how they are responded to. More important than the number of demonstrators or the number of detainees are analyses of the political outcome, but this is almost entirely indirect in this report, which focuses on the form rather than the content of the summit protests. However, it is of some interest to have comparable statistics on the number of participants and how protests were handled. It may allow different interests to see the possibilities and limitations of these popular activities. The major problems in providing figures for summit protests are commented on at the end of the report. There may also be summit protests that are not included in this summary at all. However, major demonstrations and confrontations should have attracted enough attention to spread knowledge about them, even if small-scale protests may have occurred at summits for which we have no data. A first version of this report was presented at the launch of the Democracy Network in Malmö on 21 April 2002. This version has included some additional information and comments on the difficulties of obtaining comparable information on summit protests. It was finalised on 18 May 2002.

Comments and factual information on summit protests from readers are welcome.

History of summit protests

The first known summit protest was carried out by the United FNL Groups (DFFG) at Lidingö in 1968 when finance ministers from 10 industrialised countries met. In secret, groups of demonstrators had prepared to protest that the finance ministers supported economic policies that strengthened the US currency and were therefore important for the war effort in Vietnam. They stormed past the police and managed to get 50 metres from the entrance of the Foresta hotel where the ministers were meeting. The oppositional popular movement DFFG also held discussions with Prime Minister Tage Erlander before the meeting of finance ministers and at the same time marched side by side with both Education Minister Olof Palme and the North Vietnamese ambassador in demonstrations against the

Vietnam War.

In 1970, the protests became much more extensive at the World Bank meeting in Copenhagen. A major demonstration was organised by the World Bank Group, which also arranged a university meeting on the world economic order and the US war in Vietnam. Outside the demonstration there were widespread riots for many days. Police used mobile motorbike units that drove into the path of the demonstrators and chased people trying to escape. Activists threw Molotov cocktails and burned police motorcycles. On a smaller scale, there were also riots at the World Bank meeting in Gothenburg in 1971 where delegates were hit by egg throwing.

Stockholm 1972 became a model for the whole world

The first ever summit to organise popular activities with counter-conferences and demonstrations in mutual dialogue with the official meeting was the UN Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm in 1972. Stockholm established a form of popular participation that democratised international politics. This Stockholm model has since become a pattern for other summits both organised by the UN and later also other international organisations such as the World Bank, the IMF, the WTO and the EU. The largest popular participation and clear political message is supported by demonstrations, often a large joint demonstration. In Stockholm, this demonstration gathered 7,000 participants and targeted the ecocide in Vietnam.

One or more counter-conferences are also organised where many organisations come together to address various issues, often in both group discussions and larger plenary debates. In Stockholm, the demonstrating organisations Folkets Forum and FN-förbundet together with the National Council of Youth Organisations organised the Environmental Forum. A total of about a thousand people attended these counter-conferences. Both of these alternative conferences emphasised issues such as the working environment and the US use of environmental toxins in the Vietnam War. The People's Forum and the collective demonstration were the driving force behind an independent critical stance. As a result, the discussion at the much more government-financed Environment Forum was sharply focused on the issue of population control and, in particular, coercive measures to reduce population growth in the South.

Even the issue of the limits to growth, launched by representatives of experts and big business in the Club of Rome, was criticised by several representatives of the Third World environmental movement who were able to attend thanks to the contacts of the alternative movement and SIDA funding. In addition to the broader counter-conferences, several smaller seminars on various environmental issues and exhibitions on indigenous peoples and alternative technologies were also organised.

Mutual dialogue also took place between NGOs and the official meeting. NGOs were able to express their views directly to the delegates and representatives of the US delegation came to the Environment Forum for a direct confrontation on environmental issues and the Vietnam War. Friends of the Earth International, together with the Ecologist newspaper, also published a daily newspaper, ECO, which covered the official conference and popular activities, thus publicising all the events. It was the only source of news for everyone present and was read by official delegates, grassroots activists and journalists alike. Such a special newspaper has since become a tradition at many summits, sometimes in many different competing projects.

However, a proposal that later gained traction at summits was rejected. The proposal was supported by British and American interests in the UN conference secretariat, many of whom were close to big business. It involved organising a fair where various voluntary organisations could exhibit and organise seminars in the form of a market. Instead, the Swedish government and popular movements wanted a more active political involvement of popular movements, and a joint programme for the Environmental Forum emerged. In practice, this became an opportunity for the United FNL groups and the OI Committee, which consisted of some 60 environmental activists from the Third World and many others, to gain acceptance for their views by virtue of the content of the programme and not the amount of resources they had to invest, resources they had to exhibit and organise seminars with their own funds. The Environmental Forum, which arose on the government's initiative, was also radicalised, not least because there was a completely independent competing People's Forum that criticised

attempts by the UN Secretariat or the government to control the cooperation of the popular movements.

Local activities were also seen as important. Alternativ Stad organised alternative sight-seeing for journalists and delegates to show a different reality than the official image of environmentally friendly Stockholm. Internationally, the grassroots cooperation in which Alternativ Stad participated encouraged organising international activities locally at home rather than coming to the summit and participating in grassroots activities there.

On this issue, conflict arose with American activists who hoped for a mass turnout of young people from all over the world, which hardly materialised at all. The American activists from Hog Farm turned out to be closely linked to a fund used by the CIA to finance activities that would divert protests from political action. With the support of the Swedish authorities, Hog Farm was given a very free hand to distribute hashish and organise a youth camp where the Secretary-General of the UN conference, Maurice Strong, came under media coverage and emphasised how much he had in common with the young people. Activists from Hog Farm also organised actions for whales and life. They also sought to disrupt People's Forum press conferences and the final debate at the Environment Forum to prevent criticism of the ecocide in Vietnam. On one occasion, they intervened with physical force against a person seeking to make the same criticism at a public meeting on Sergels Square. These American activists were also at the forefront of the confrontations that occurred when protests by smaller groups took place at the Parliament building where the UN conference was organised.

The Stockholm model of counter-conference, demonstration, mutual dialogue, daily newspaper and, more rarely, local simultaneous actions internationally took hold. Initially only at UN meetings, but later in the 1980s also in other contexts. Hardly any new elements have been added since then with the exception of the market-oriented fair model for organising the participation of NGOs and popular movements and civil disobedience blockades. In addition, the riots that occurred before the Stockholm model was adopted at the World Bank meeting in Copenhagen have returned. The market model of a fair for popular organisations and NGOs has been given a dominant role on many occasions, with a particular impact during the 1992 Rio conference, where the Global Forum attracted 20,000 international participants and 500,000 visitors, while the largest demonstration in Rio attracted only 10,000 participants.

Provocateurs funded to manipulate the protests, as happened in 1972 in Stockholm, have not existed or been noticed for a long time. It was only recently that many witness accounts of such cases have emerged, particularly during the protests against the World Bank in June 2001 in Barcelona and against the G8 in Genoa.

Civil disobedience through blockades was successfully utilised at the Bergen Ministerial Meeting on Sustainable Development in 1990 and on an even larger scale at the WTO meeting in Seattle in 1999.

The rest of the 1970s saw no more combined demonstrations and counter-conferences. The role of oppositional popular movements faded away. Instead, we get a one-sided emphasis on NGO Forums in close cooperation with the official organisation. Participation in alternative meetings was particularly extensive in connection with the women's conference in Nairobi in 1975 and five years later in Copenhagen. There were 6,000 women in Nairobi and 9,000 in Copenhagen.

Breaking point in the 1980s

In connection with the tenth anniversary of the Stockholm Conference, several Swedish popular movements sought cooperation to organise a conference in Stockholm. Promises of SEK 1 million in support were made if the organisations could agree. The environmental and alternative movement wanted a conference that addressed how social development could be changed away from the waste of resources towards a more environmentally friendly and solidary society. They wanted to emphasise the construction of alternatives locally and how a transformation of industrial society in both capitalist Western Europe and planned economy Eastern Europe could take place at the same time as global justice and Third World environmental problems were also a central issue. Contacts with opposition movements in Eastern Europe began to emerge and groups in the West began to criticise

the rich industrialised countries of the G7 and their economic model.

The Swedish Society for Nature Conservation wanted to limit itself mainly to how aid could be more environmentally oriented. Through their contacts internationally and with the government, they were able to ensure, without consulting other organisations, that the promised resource of SEK 1 million in aid was instead transferred to a meeting in Nairobi where mainly established environmental organisations met in connection with a special session of UNEP, the UN Environment Programme, which was formed by decision at the UN conference in Stockholm. Two smaller meetings also took place in Stockholm in 1982, one on environmental aid and one on alternatives, which was part of a comprehensive Nordic alternative campaign linking opposition to nuclear weapons and nuclear power with the struggle for labour and international solidarity.

The experience of the UN anniversary in 1982 showed that the established environmental organisations had no serious interest in democratic cooperation on the renewal of environmental work. Instead, the aim was to strengthen established structures such as UNEP. Voluntary organisations had been gathering at UNEP meetings since its inception in ever smaller numbers. There were no more after the meeting in Nairobi, which replaced the planned popular movement meeting in Stockholm on the tenth anniversary, and no new political perspectives emerged apart from the establishment of environmental aid.

While the environmental movement met on a small scale in Nairobi, several special sessions of the General Assembly were held in New York. Here, mass participation reached its highest level ever at a summit with a 1 million-strong demonstration. Numerous counter-conferences and popular activities of various kinds were also organised. But these mass protests for nuclear disarmament did not actively seek to link to other issues and soon faded away.

The battle over the influence of popular movements on international politics intensified in the 1980s. After the failure of the Third World to negotiate a fair world economic order through the UN, the economic crisis for the South intensified. A growing debt burden made it increasingly difficult for Southern governments to coordinate their interests. Instead, other forces emerged. In 1983, family farmers in the United States organised an international farmers' conference that became the beginning of a popular movement alliance critical of free trade, with farmers as the main unifying force. In 1984, the Third World Network was launched, with roots in all continents of the South and strong links to both the left and emerging environmental, consumer and other popular movements. TWN combines criticism of various social and ecological issues with a critique of the economic and political world order. The counter-conference TOES, The Other Economic Summit, is organised in conjunction with each G7 meeting to demonstrate alternatives to the economic policies of the rich countries. In 1985, the rubber tappers in Brazil form the organisation CNS, which manages to ally itself with the Indians and the environmental movement and, for the first time, stops the World Bank's support for environmentally destructive projects in the third world. At the same time, the environmental movement in Sweden and Europe begins to oppose the plans of big business to build more motorways, dismantle social welfare and establish the EU's internal market with more freedom for capital than for people.

The cul-de-sac of consensus

The participation of popular movements limited to a certain specific policy at summits becomes a model for strengthening the support for government policy and excluding stronger influence from oppositional popular movements. Instead of a democratic solution where popular participation takes place according to their own conditions and political starting points, an overarching ideology is established to which popular movements must be adapted and a model for consensus dialogue. The overarching issue is that the solution to various problem areas should be sought in development according to the same model that the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation sought to compete with system-critical alternatives in connection with the Stockholm Conference's tenth anniversary in 1982. A series of UN conferences were organised on themes such as environment and development, human rights and development, population and development, social development and women and development.

This political model was launched in 1987 with a special session in New York on disarmament and development, the same year that the Brundtland Report, *Common Future*, launched the concept of sustainable development. This concept encompasses all development, whether ecological, social or other, that meets the needs of present and future generations. This idea of development shifts immediate conflicts into the future. There, consensus will solve the problems. This is where non-governmental organisations are important, together with governments and businesses, in working towards a common future. The form is that of jointly formulating the common overarching ideology arising from the consensus dialogue based on sustainable development. In this form, the role of NGOs and popular movements is limited to that of lobbyists and partners in implementing the joint action plan. Independent popular movement politics and oppositional action are undemocratically marginalised. In 1992, the climax of this development is reached at the Rio Conference. More than a hundred heads of state agree on a Rio Declaration and an action plan for the 21st century, Agenda 21. Popular movements are expected to support the implementation of the Rio Conference decisions on sustainable development. The Rio Declaration recognises the importance of free trade and self-regulation by big business for the implementation of sustainable development. To implement Agenda 21, 125 billion dollars a year are needed, which can be achieved by doubling aid according to the Rio Conference. Conflict issues are largely swept under the carpet.

The consensus conferences under UN auspices for various aspects of sustainable development lead to an ever-increasing dialogue activity, while independent popular movement work and confrontation comes into the background. Not only are demonstrations increasingly absent, but also popular movement cooperation around counter-conferences is being thinned out in favor of fragmented large market places for the voluntary organizations where the influence and implementation of a policy in agreement with the official agenda dominates. With the aid organizations as a unifying factor at UN conference after UN conference, participation grows to 30,000 at the NGO Forum at the women's summit in Beijing 1995. NGO is established as a concept without anyone being able to really explain what it is. In practice, it is defined as non-governmental organizations that are also non-profit making so that the companies are not counted there and also that the organization does not represent the interests of for-profit companies, a triple negative. The dominant group of NGOs are aid organizations, charities and foundations of various kinds, while it is also used for people's movements, even if these sometimes defend themselves against this designation. At the same time as the growing importance of NGOs, the political results are beginning to be conspicuous by their absence. After the promise at the Rio Conference in 1992 to double aid to achieve sustainable development, aid is instead drastically reduced for the first time since aid began to be measured in the middle of the 20th century. It decreases by more than a third internationally, in the USA it is starting to get closer to 0.1 percent instead of the 0.7 percent in aid that Agenda 21 saw as a goal. Friends of the Earth Sweden seeks, in alliance with the youth environmental movement and Eastern Europe's new environmental movement, to challenge the prevailing consensus policy with its participation in non-binding summits as a unifying factor. This happens with some success through the SEED Popular Forum 1990, which is a people's movement meeting in connection with a ministerial conference for the industrialized countries before the Rio conference. Parallel to the counter-conference, a local network organizes a blockade of the ministerial conference with 800 participants who, after preventing the delegates for a long time from coming to their dinner and then continuing to surround the conference hotel, are finally allowed to let in two representatives who are allowed to speak at the official meeting. Counter-conference with 500 participants from around the world inspires the formation of the youth activist network A SEED and climate action days organized in 70 countries in 500 locations in the early 1990s.

The youth network lives on, but local action days with broad participation do not last long. The interest from established environmental organizations that focus on summits is non-existent for local climate action days. Another line is being developed by the Dutch Friends of the Earth with a proposal for investigation of fair environmental space. This campaign has an impact in many countries outside of Europe as well. It is important as a method to go beyond the Rio Conference's vague consensus by putting all people's equal right to the same environmental space in the focus of the discussion on how a transition of different countries to sustainability can take place. But still, this

campaign does not become a mobilizing factor for a mass movement for global justice as technical methods to reduce the environmental burden tend to prevail over concrete demands for a policy of justice. In Europe, the emphasis on consensus with big business to achieve fair environmental space also tends to stand in the way of more radical criticism of the prevailing world order. It leads to strong conflicts internally within the International Friends of the Earth, where the groups in the third world are strongly opposed to consensus with big business, and this consensus idea also gains less influence within the European Friends of the Earth. In 2000, FOEI carries out a major action in connection with the climate conference in The Hague and a people's movement collaboration carries out several activities over several weeks with justice as the main theme. But the connection to local issues comes to the fore. It is more difficult to get a growing interest in the issue or solutions that come in conflict with the sustainable development consensus around free trade as a main solution to environmental and other social problems. When the Kyoto agreement is finally signed in Bonn in 2001, it is implemented at the price of an emphasis on trade solutions to climate problems.

Renewal of the Stockholm model's popular movement cooperation

Parallel to the consensus model of the UN conferences, the power is increasing in economic and military international organizations where the UN's democracy with one vote for each nation does not prevail. It had been relatively calm at summits here since the riots at the World Bank meeting in Copenhagen in 1970. At the World Bank meeting in Berlin in 1988, alternative people's movement activities also had a big impact alongside UN meetings. The Stockholm model most methods came into use on a large scale. The largest demonstration gathered 80,000 participants. At the counter-conference, which gathered 2,000 participants, the book tables were 2 miles long. In addition, arrangements were made an extensive local public education activity throughout Germany with common campaign material about the World Bank and the world order. Alongside the counter-conference, a less radical alternative meeting was also held with environmental organizations and the church. The state sought to split the two arrangements by only supporting the alternative meeting. This led to major protests from the environmental organizations and the church, which did not accept that only one but not the other activity would receive support, which led to both arrangements being able to be carried out on a large scale. A kind of solidarity that has since rarely been seen when popular movements and voluntary organizations prefer to adapt to the conditions set by the state or other contributors rather than acting collectively and avoiding division. The 1988 counter-conference marked the beginning of a new era of summit protests. The counter-conference's declarations were translated and spread throughout the world, where they contributed not least in the third world to a new start to the economic criticism of the Western world's dominance. Third world people's movements that constantly put environment, peace, women's oppression and other problems in connection with economic and social issues got better impact for their ideas. At the same time that the NGO Forum of the UN conferences, dominated by Northern European and North American voluntary organisations, established a policy of consensus, the farmers, Southern Europe and the Third World managed to open up to popular movement cooperation that broke with the consensus. At the 50th anniversary of Bretton Woods in Madrid, where the World Bank and the IMF met, a counter-conference was organized where a thousand people gathered every night in plenary debates with panels, half of the participants coming from the third world for a whole week. It ended with a confrontational debate between two representatives of the people's movements and two of the World Bank and the IMF in front of a mass audience. A demonstration gathered 10,000 participants and an action on the street 300 tents protesting Spain's aid policy. The common demand was debt cancellation and that they had had enough of 50 years of economic world order determined by the rich countries.

The Spanish popular movements then took their model for summits and similarly protested at the EU summit in Madrid. It was the first time that both the counter-conference and the protest demonstration at an EU summit gained great breadth and radicality. 10,000 environmental activists, farmers, union activists, unemployed and the left demonstrating together against the EU. Three marches came from all corners of Spain in protest against unemployment. In Southern Europe, where it was claimed there was no protest against the EU except possibly from the right, it turned out that on the contra-

ry there was a broad protest from environmentalists, farmers and the left. The nascent EU-critical movement, which until then had organized smaller activities in connection with summits, received a push forward through the people's movement cooperation in Madrid. The Spanish model spread. In Lyon, the G7 met in 1996 and protests were organized in the same way as in Madrid with 40,000 in demonstration marches and several counter-conferences. The mass movements of the Third World and trade unions, the unemployed and people without homes or citizenship were put at the center of the southern European settlement with consensus politics during summits.

This development reached its peak in Europe with the European March and counter-conference during the EU summit in Amsterdam in 1997. The demonstration brought together 50,000 participants who came via 14 different marches from all corners of Europe, sometimes marching for two months. The counter-conference gathered 2,000 participants. Side activities in Amsterdam also included a street party with 2,000 participants in which the police did not intervene and no violence occurred and a riot with a few hundred participants organized by punk rioters that led to broken windows at the French consulate and some arrests. The police also made preventive mass arrests of 700 people. The environmental association Friends of the Earth initiated international protests against the mass arrests, which were responded to in 8 countries. The Dutch organization Autonomo Centrum managed to carry out documentation work and, together with lawyers, pursue the case of the arrested in the courts. This led to everyone who reported illegal mass arrests to the police receiving 1000 euros in damages, which amounted to a total of 270,000 euros for both the suffering they had to endure and because they were deprived of their democratic rights to protest during the EU summit. Parallel to protests in connection with EU summits, criticism also grew at economic summits. Driving the development in both the 1980s and 1990s were the mass movements of the third world. For example, they organized demonstrations against the GATT agreement with half a million participants in Bangalore in 1994 or started the Zapatista rebellion in Chiapas the same year. In North America, the development reached a climax with the protests at the WTO meeting in Seattle in 1999. Globally, the farmers were the unifying factor where smallholder interests could more easily than all other popular movements find common interests in both the South and the North. The farmers therefore became the driving force in the alliance building and, in parallel with the UN conferences on sustainable development based on free trade, succeeded in questioning the free trade policy. 10,000 demonstrated at the GATT meeting in Brussels in 1990.

The summit protests were constantly linked to protests against national policies and mobilization on local issues where the connections between global free trade policies and the local were made clear. An alliance was also built by the small farmers with the environmental movement against patents on life and for the transition to organic agriculture and with third world mass movements among the landless, fishermen, trade unions and popular movements for economic justice against neoliberalism. When the neoliberal policy sought to gain full freedom also by treating investments as goods and disputes being decided through mechanisms similar to the WTO, it came to a halt. The Third World and the farmers' view that you have to say no and not just demand reforms on the margins of the policies that are being carried won the majority of both popular movements and voluntary organisations. The MAI agreement could be stopped. The next step was to oppose the extension of the WTO agreement.

At the beginning of 1998, people's movements from all over the world gathered in Geneva and formed the People's Global Action against "Free" Trade and WTO (PGA). On the same days that anti-WTO demonstrations were held in Geneva in 1998, youth riots also occurred. When the UN Secretary General came to Geneva to form a body for dialogue between the UN and big business, Nestlé's director urged the police to act against the system-critical movement protests. Soon after, the police stormed a PGA seminar and detained all 150 participants, which created protests mainly among popular movements in India. 8 of the organizers' hard drives were also seized. The various initiatives led to a peak of summit protests also gaining traction in North America. At the WTO meeting in Seattle in 1999, counter-conferences and demonstrations could gather 50,000 participants, but mainly large civil disobedience blockades. Shop window vandalism was minimized by the radicality of the civil disobedience blockades being more attractive and non-violent activists preventing the vandalism from spreading so that it was limited to what a small group of 50-100 people did.

This marginalization of the vandalism led to growing support from the local population and various popular movements that were primarily outraged by police abuses of peaceful protesters. Seattle was also much more than actions on site. The PGA called for local simultaneous actions throughout the world which were well attended. Seattle became a success because of the people's movement cooperation that united 1,500 organizations worldwide behind common demands, the farmers' 18-year-long alliance building between different people's movements in the South and the North, and that the union and other people's movements united. It was expressed through the slogan "Teamsters and turtles unite." This alludes to the truck drivers known for their union militancy and turtles that many environmentalists were dressed as in Seattle. The environmental movement protested the WTO threat against the US import ban on tuna fishing with gear that harms turtles.

The dead end of confrontation and consensual dialogue

After Amsterdam and Seattle, instead of a popular movement model with an emphasis on alliance building, one's own knowledge seeking and local mobilization at home, there grew an emphasis on confrontation or dialogue. In Amsterdam, the EU had invested in the counter-conference, which already 8 months in advance received full funding not only from the EU but also from the Dutch state, and in good time also received support from the municipality with accommodation and other issues.

After Amsterdam, the EU stepped in to marginalize independent popular movement cooperation and instead emphasize only voluntary organizations willing to dialogue, on the condition that they cooperated on the premises of the EU-friendly European movement. In this way, contact with the citizens would be strengthened. The NGO Forum, where voluntary organizations with different, sometimes conflicting interests, would present their views received increasing support from both the EU and the government of the country holding the presidency.

The one-sided commitment to consensual dialogue with organizations that were already an opinion-based support in general for the pursued EU policy meant that those who sought confrontation gained more influence. This was most clearly noticed where the conflict was at its greatest, in the Schengen issue. The EU supported anti-racist campaigns where it was only allowed to criticize everyday racism and thus forbidden to raise political criticism of the EU or the state for racist consequences of the Schengen Agreement. Those who were prepared to confront this EU policy saw how they were completely left without resources, which made it easier for such groups who did not trust the state or the EU and built their business without being guided by state grants. These organizations, such as Antifascist Action, did extensive popular movement work to create an opinion through seminars, book publishing and demonstrations in collaboration with other popular movements, despite the government's lack of interest in supporting this form of anti-racist political work. At the same time as it became more difficult to get support for political anti-racist work, it also became more difficult to get support for the long-term critical search for knowledge and its dissemination regarding refugee policy and police cooperation. Circular Letter Fortress Europe? which throughout the 1990s provided the popular movements in Sweden and Europe with this critical knowledge had to cancel its publication due to lack of support.

In other areas, the same tendency was noticed. Support for independent popular movement work decreased from the EU and governments. Instead, increasing support was given to "multistakeholder" dialogues where individual representatives of various interests among e.g. business, environmental or humanitarian organizations and politicians came together and exchanged views, often with the aim of finding consensus win-win solutions, and avoid clarifying where contradictions existed. Professional lobbying and mass media adaptation gained increasing influence. The space for independent popular movement cooperation and public education linked to demands that are pursued jointly in forms where many can actively participate, such as in demonstrations, shrunk.

The Consensus Dialogue, with its lack of political results, split popular movement cooperation and increased support for the proponents of confrontation. At the EU summit in Cologne in 1999, no unifying counter-conference was held linked to a joint demonstration.

The European march did gather 25,000 participants, but the difficulties in uniting a wider movement behind common demands were palpable. During the Finnish presidency, a major investment

was made in dialogue through cooperation with the European movement, aid organizations and voluntary organizations with headquarters in Brussels. This NGO Forum called Citizen 2000 was carried out shortly after the Seattle protests but did not carry this spirit of protest to the EU where a Western European WTO policy is being designed. The NGO meeting was held a week before the EU summit and moreover in Tampere and not Helsingfors where the politicians met. In Helsinki, the protests were fragmented and the demonstrations were small except for the farmers. A smaller counter-conference could be held with very broad participation from Eastern Europe and a very small budget. Here, for the first time, a dialogue between a minister and popular movements took place in connection with an EU summit at a counter-conference, which was a success.

During the year 2000, the EU-adapted NGO dialogue grew into a campaign for the EU to adopt a catalog of rights that would become the basis for the EU's constitution. This campaign was run jointly by NGOs in Brussels and the European Union. It culminated in a demonstration during the Nice Summit with 70,000 participants. It is difficult to assess whether the participants were primarily behind the demand for a catalog of rights that hardly included anything in practice that is not already in existing rights guaranteed by national legislation or the declarations of the Council of Europe and the UN. Judging from interviews with participants, the demonstration was more about a protest against privatizations and company closures.

In parallel with the conversion of support for independent people's movement work to EU-adapted NGO messages, there has also been an increase in the EU's dialogue with large companies. This has already been well developed both through employers' organizations such as UNICE and special organizations to increase the power of large companies such as the European Roundtable of Industrialists, ERT. In 2000, they also invested heavily in collaboration on mass meetings with business through the European Business Summit with 9 EU commissioners present among 2,000 directors. ERT and UNICE make the cooperation between the EU and large companies increasingly intimate. This pattern also includes initiatives such as the Trans Atlantic Business Dialogue, TABD, where directors and politicians from EU countries and the US meet to discuss and find consensus on political issues surrounding the economy.

The consensual dialogue between EU politicians, the trade union, NGOs and the companies has opened up for movements that seek more confrontation with the prevailing system. In connection with the World Bank meeting in Prague in 2000 and the EU summit in Nice, this was similarly expressed. Instead of organizing themselves according to the issues they want to bring forward, participants are divided into actions according to how much they are willing to take confrontational action to stop the meeting. This working method is claimed to be inspired by Seattle. But it differs radically from Seattle in that the non-violent radicalism in the form of mass participation in civil disobedience that existed in Seattle was directed both at the WTO meeting and at those who committed the damage. Moreover, the actions in Seattle were blockades to prevent delegates from getting from one place to another, not incursions to stop a meeting. Divided into yellow, red and blue blocks, around ten thousand activists took action in both cities.

The majority of the demonstrators were completely peaceful, although several were prepared to carry out blockades or attempted incursions without violently attacking the police or even defending themselves. But especially around the blue bloc, confrontations arose. Molotov cocktails were thrown at the police and the police committed several assaults against both completely pacifist and more militant protesters. Shop windows were smashed and in Nice a bank premises was burnt. In Nice in particular, there was no unifying counter-conference, only a few meetings and less fragmented arrangements, no speeches were given during the demonstrations and the municipality under the leadership of the far-right mayor had done everything to make it difficult for popular movements to stay overnight and rent premises for meetings. The confrontational model had also reached an impasse.

Summit protests in statistical comparison 1968 - 2002

Number of participants and type of popular activity at summits since 1968.

Year	Type of summit	Place	Popular activities	participants
1968	Finance ministers	Lidingö, Sweden	Assault	100+
1970	World Bank	København, Denmark	Demonstration	10.000
			Riots	100+
			Counter conference	
1971	World Bank	Göteborg, Sweden	Riots	100+
1972	UN Environment	Stockholm, Sweden	Demonstration	7.000
			Counter conference	500
			Alternative conference	1.000
			Daily alternative newspaper	
			Mutual dialogue	
			Local action day	
1974	UN Population	Bucuresti, Romania	NGO Forum	
1975	UN Women	Mexico DF	NGO Forum	6.000
			Daily alternative newspaper	
1980	UN Women	København, Denmark	NGO Forum	9.000
1982	UN Disarmament	New York, USA	Demonstration	1.000.000
1982	UN Environment	Nairobi, Kenya	NGO Forum	
1985	UN Women	Nairobi, Kenya	NGO Forum	14.000
1988	World Bank	West Berlin, BRD	Demonstration	80.000
			Counter conference	2.000
1990	Gatt	Brussels, Belgium	Demonstration	30.000
1990	UN Environment	Bergen, Norway	Blockade	800
			Counter conference	500
			NGO Forum	100
1991	World Bank	Bangkok, Thailand		
1992	UN Environment	Rio de Janeiro, Brazil	Demonstration	10.000
			Anti-Bush demonstration	5.000
			Alternative conference	2.000
			NGO exhibition	20.000
			Local exhibition	500.000
1994	Washington inst	Madrid, Spain	Demonstration	10.000
			Counter conference	2.000
1995	EU	Madrid, Spain	Demonstration	10.000
			Counter conference	500
1995	UN Social	København, Denmark	Demonstration	2.000
			NGO exhibition	
1995	UN Women	Beijing, China	NGO Forum	30.000
1996	G7	Lyon, France	Demonstration	40.000
			Counter conferences	1.000
1996	UN Habitat	Istanbul, Turkey	Demonstration, mass arrests	
			Counter conference	
			NGO Forum	
1997	EU	Amsterdam, NL	Demonstration	50.000
			Street party	2.000
			Riot	100+
			Mass arrests	700
			Counter conference	2.000

1997	EU Employment	Luxembourg	Demonstration	30.000
1998	WTO	Genève, Switzerland	Demonstration	
			Riots	
			Counter conference	
1998	EU	Cardiff, Wales	Demonstration social	2.000
			Demonstration agriculture	10.000
			Counter conference	
1998	G7	Birmingham, England	Demonstration debts	70.000
			Street party	2.000
1998	IMF/World Bank	Washington, USA	Demonstration	3.000
1998	EU	Wien, Austria	Demonstration social	5.000
1999	EU	Köln, Germany	Demonstration social	25.000
1999	G7	Köln, Germany	Demonstration, debt	50.000
			Local action day	
1999	WTO	Seattle USA	Demonstration	50.000
			Blockade	1.000+
			Riot	100+
			Counter conferences	
			Local action day	
1999	EU	Helsinki, Finland	Demonstration	500
			Counter conference with dialogue	200
			NGO Forum	2.000
			Local action day	
2000	IMF/World Bank	Washington, USA	Demonstration	30.000
2000	EU	Lisboa, Portugal	Demonstration social	50.000
2000	G7	Okinawa, Japan	Demonstration	5.000
2000	WEF Asia/Pacific	Melbourne, Australia	Demonstration/blockade	20.000
2000	IMF/World Bank	Praha, Czech Rep	Demonstration/blockade	12.000
			Counter conferences	
			Local action day	
			Mass arrests	900
2000	Asia/EU	Seoul, S Korea	Demonstration	10.000
2000	UN Climate	Haag, Netherlands	Demonstration/action	8.000
2000	EU	Nice, France	Demonstration, social	100.000
			Blockade	5.000
			Arrests	100
2001	WEF	Davos, Switzerland	Demonstration	300
			Counter conference	100
2001	WSF	Porto Alegre, Brazil	Conference	15.000
2001	G8 Environment	Trieste, Italy	Demonstration	10.000
2001	OECD IT	Napoli, Italy	Demonstration	20.000
			Arrests	100
2001	FTAA prep	Buenos Aires, Arg	Demonstration	10.000
2001	FTAA	Quebec, Canada	Demonstration/blockade	50.000
			Mass arrests	500
2001	EU	Stockholm, Sweden	Demonstration	2.000
			Counter conferences	
2001	EU Finance	Malmö, Sweden	Demonstration	2.000
			Mass arrests	300
2001	EU-USA	Göteborg, Seden	Demonstration	15.000

2001	EU	Göteborg, Sweden	Anti EU demonstration	20.000
			EU critical demonstration	20.000
			Anti-capitalist demonstration	2.000
			Street party	1.000
			Riot	200+
			Mass arrests	900
			Counter conference	1.000
			NGO exhibition	20.000
			NGO Forum	
2001	World Bank	Barcelona, Spain	Demonstration	20.000
2001	WEF	Salzburg, Austria	Demonstration	2.000
2001	G8	Genova, Italy	Demonstration	150.000
			Anti-racist pre-demonstration	50.000
			Blockades	20.000
			Counter conference	
			Arrests	500
2001	UN Racism	urban, South Africa	Demonstration land reform	20.000
2001	EU Finance	Liège, Belgium	Demonstration social	15.000
2001	EU	Gent, Belgium	EU critical demonstration	20.000
			Demonstration social	8.000
	EU	Laeken, Belgium	Demonstration social	80.000
			EU critical demonstration	25.000
			Demonstration peace	5.000
			Street party	2.000
2002	WEF	New York, USA	Demonstration	15.000
			Mass arrests	200
			Counter conference	
2002	WSF	Porto Alegre, Brazil	Conference	60.000
2002	NATO	München, Germany	Prohibited demonstration	7.000
			Mass arrests	700
2002	EU Domestic	Santiago de C, Spain	Demonstration	5.000
2002	UN Finance/Aid	Monterrey, Mexico	Demonstration	10.000
2002	EU	Barcelona, Spain	EU-critical demonstration	300.000
			Demonstration, social	100.000
			Demonstration water	200.000
			Blockades, actions	8.000
			Mass arrests	100
			Counter conference	6.000
2002	EU Culture	Salamanca, Spain	Demonstration against privatized educ.	2.000
			Counter conference	
2002	EU Defence	Zaragoza, Spain	Demonstration	10.000
2002	EU Mediterranean	Valencia, Spain	Demonstration against NATO/globaliz.	50.000

Sources: My own archives (everything before 1999 except Europe march), website of the Europe march, indymedia.org, indymedia UK, Indymedia Belgium, Corporate Europe Observatory on the Spanish EU presidency in 2002. The figures are mostly based on the organizers' information. In many cases there are several sources. I have then included the lowest figure stated by the organizers or related media. When information on the number of participants is missing, in some cases the type of public activity that took place is still indicated.

Comments about the statistics

Demonstrations are what, together with riots, usually receive the most attention in reports or the mass media. Counter-conferences, NGO forums, local action days at the same time as the international summit are sometimes considerably more difficult to get information about. Here, primarily summits where demonstrations took place or larger NGO forums have been included. However, there is a very large amount of different types of meetings in connection with summits of a more or less popular and open character. At G-7 meetings, alternative economic public meetings have been held since the mid-1980s, which also applies to most UN, EU and other international organization meetings, often with a small number of participants.

Different types of folk activities

In the description, different types of activities are specified in different ways. Demonstration means an ordinary walking demonstration, blockade means that you actively shut down around the conference building by sitting down or similar, storming that you break through police chains at the conference building, riot that it is a fight between police and demonstrators, street party that it is a street party with music and often a vague political message. Demonstration/blockade/storming indicates a mixture of forms of action, if it goes into each other, where it is a bit difficult to know how many are involved in what. Demonstration is the form of participation that I most systematically involve. Other forms of street action are not as systematically included.

The number of participants in riots is very difficult to calculate. Sometimes I enter with a plus sign after a number to show that there are more but it is unclear how many. It is particularly difficult during the first chaotic summit riot in 1970, when it lasted for several days and the lack of organization on both sides escalated the situation. Oddly enough, 1970 is reminiscent of Gothenburg with the big difference that both the police and demonstrators at that time were significantly better organized. There is scattered information about mass arrests, I indicate the nearest hundred. There is even more scattered information about those who were rejected.

When it comes to popular meetings, it is sometimes difficult to categorize what kind of meeting it is. I am talking here about at least four varieties. Counter-conferences are people's movement meetings with a political message where demands can be made and connection is almost always made to street actions/demonstrations, Alternative conferences are people's movement meetings that are not clearly in opposition to the official meeting, but for clearly independent people's movement work. NGO forums are more difficult to define, often with organizations with widely differing political messages that nevertheless sometimes agree on a platform but without wanting to mobilize mass participatory forms of politics such as demonstration. The NGO fair completely lacks the ambition to convey any collective message that has been agreed upon, but is a professionally organized arena where everyone can make their exhibition and convey their message as in a market (read Fritt Forum, Global Forum in Rio, on proposal in 1972 but was rejected by the Swedish government). Counter-conferences and the like are not at all systematically included, especially towards the end when demonstrations have become increasingly common. It is also difficult to find more complete information.

Mutual dialogue means that delegates for the activities of the popular movements appear at the official meeting and, conversely, official delegates meet participants in the popular activities. Dialogue means that official parties come out and critically review the conference and that the conference is open to this review. Local action day means that at the same time as the official conference, popular protest actions are taking place locally in other countries.

The political content of the protests

In terms of content, it is most complicated for EU summits. Other summit protests are consistently in opposition either more generally to the overall policy of the summit or concentrate on some limited issue relevant to the summit. As far as the EU is concerned, the situation is completely different. Here are various chattering. The ones that have succeeded best are the campaign against capital's Europe which gathered 300,000 or half a million in Barcelona with MRG grassroots mobilization at the

head which corresponds most closely to Globalization from below. Social Forum with trade unions and waiting organizations as well as regional movements were more marginal in this big demo. This tradition was founded by the environmental organization Aedenat in Madrid in 1995 at the EU Summit at a similar demonstration. Then, for the first time, a motley alliance including leftists marched against the EU in southern Europe, 7 years later half a million are on the march. The Gothenburg action also worked in this tradition. I call it EU-critical. The second most successful form is mobilization around a single issue, also the one in Barcelona where a pre-demonstration in protest against the privatization of water and other things gathered 200-400,000, so these are single-issue demonstrations. Here I also count, perhaps a little arbitrarily, the European marches against unemployment and social exclusion, which I describe as social. (It is also the form that succeeded best in all summits including 1,000,000 against nuclear weapons in New York in 1982). The third most successful in terms of numbers are demonstrations for the EU as a social project with the European union as the main engine in the mobilization as in Nice and Barcelona (again Barcelona but interestingly much smaller than the two other mass demonstrations at this summit). Finally, the anti-EU demonstration also exists with Gothenburg as a successful and solitary example.

Largest summit demonstrations

1.	1.000.000	1982	FN Disarmament, Against nuclear arms, New York, USA
2.	300.000	2002	EU, spring meeting, EU-critique, Barcelona, Spain
3.	200.000	2002	EU, spring meeting, Against water exploitation, Barcelona, Spain
4.	150.000	2001	G-8, Against G-8 Genova, Italy
5.	100.000	2000	EU, For a social EU, Nice, France
6.	100.000	2002	EUspring meeting, For a social EU, Barcelona, Spain
7.	80.000	1988	World Bank, Critique of the World Bank, Berlin, BRD
8.	80.000	2001	EU, For a social EU, EU Brussels, Belgium
9.	70.000	1999	G-7, Debt reduction, Birmingham, England
10.	50.000	1997	EU, Social, against unemployment, Amsterdam, Netherlands
11.	50.000	1999	G-7, Debt reduction, Köln, Germany
12.	50.000	1999	WTO, Against WTO/practices, Seattle, USA
13.	50.000	2000	EU, Social, Lisboa, Portugal
14.	50.000	2001	FTAA, against FTAA/practices, Quebec, Canada
15.	50.000	2001	G-8, Anti-racism, pre-demo Genova, Italy
16.	50.000	2002	EU-Mediterranean, Valencia, Spain
17.	40.000	1996	G-7, Against G-7, Lyon, France
18.	30.000	1990	GATT, Against GATT in agriculture, Brussels, Belgium
19.	30.000	1997	EU, social, against unemployment, Luxembourg
20.	30.000	2000	IMF/World Bank Against IMF/World Bank/practices, Washington, USA
21.	25.000	1999	EU, social, against unemployment, Köln, Germany
22.	20.000	2000	WEF Asia-Pacific, Against big business, Melbourne, Australia
23.	20.000	2001	OECD IT, Against neoliberalism, Napoli, Italy
24.	20.000	2001	EU, Against EU and EMU, Göteborg, Sweden
25.	20.000	2001	EU, EU-critical Göteborg, Sweden
26.	20.000	2001	World Bank, against neoliberalism, Barcelona, Spain
27.	15.000	2001	EU-USA, AntiBush, Göteborg, Sweden
28.	15.000	2002	WEF, Against big business, New York, USA
29.	12.000	2000	IMF/World Bank, IMF/World Bank-critical, Praha, Czech Rep
30.	10.000	1970	World Bank, World Bank/USA-critical, København, Denmark
31.	10.000	1992	UN Environment, For environment, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
32.	10.000	1994	Washington institutions, Against IMF/World Bank, Madrid, Spain
33.	10.000	1995	EU, EU-critical, Madrid, Spain
34.	10.000	1997	EU Agriculture, Cardiff, UK
35.	10.000	2000	Asia-EU, against neo-liberalism, Seoul, S Korea

36.	10.000	2001	G-8, environment, Trieste, Italy
37.	10.000	2001	FTAA prep, against FTAA, Buenos Aires, Argentina
38.	10.000	2002	EU defense, Zaragoza, Spain
39.	7.000	1972	UN Environment, Against environmental war, Vietnam, Stockholm, Sweden
39.	6.000	2000	UN Climate, For climate protection, Haag, Netherlands
40.	5.000	1998	EU Socialt, Wien, Austria
41.	5.000	1992	FN Environment, Anti Bush, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
42.	5.000	2000	G-8, Against G-8/USA Okinawa, Japan
43.	5.000	2002	EU Domestic, Santiago de Compostela, Spain

Sources: For the period up to 1999, own archive except for demonstrations at EU summits 1997-2000 where information comes from the Euromarches website, pre-summit protests after Seattle Indymedia, for the Spanish Presidency Corporate Europe Observatory in addition to Indymedia, for summit protests outside Europe and North America People's Global Action.

General about these statistics see above in the chronological compilation.

One should be careful with this comparison. The summit protests are to varying degrees woven into the domestic political struggle and can sometimes be a platform for this more than a protest against international politics. In addition, there are often domestic demonstrations with greater participation. An example is the trade union and socially broad demonstration against the Berlusconi government recently with between two and three million participants or the protest against the WTO in Bangalore in 1994 with 500,000 participants.

In the past, there was a tendency not to count international mobilization at summits as essential. Therefore, summit protests were not included in studies of the movement of a country where the summit was held, even though summit protests almost without exception are primarily based on participation from the country where the summit is held. Today there is perhaps a tendency in the opposite direction. Only summit protests count and the domestic struggle is rendered invisible.

The book Anticapitalism - a guide to the movement, Bookmarks publications, 2001 is good in the way that it addresses domestic battles directed against the global institutions' corporate-friendly policies as much as the summit protests since 1999. However, the book's participant data from summit protests is consistently over the top, so one should watch out for this point.

Top list for people's movement meetings and NGO forums parallel to summits

1.	2002	World Social Forum, Porto Alegre, Brasilien, alternative to World Economic Forum, New York, USA	60.000
2.	1995	UN Women and development, NGO-Forum, Beijing, China	30.000
3.	1992	UN Environment and development, NGO-Forum, Rio, Brazil	20.000
4.	2001	World Social Forum, Porto Alegre, Brazil, alternative to World Economic Forum, Davos, Schweiz	15.000
5.	1985	UN Women, NGO-Forum, Nairobi, Kenya	14.000
6.	1980	FN Women, NGO-Forum, København, Denmark	9.000
7.	2002	EU Economy, conter conference, Barcelona, Spain	6.000
8.	1975	FN Women, NGO-Forum, Mexico DF, Mexico	6.000
9.	1988	World Bank, counter conference, Berlin, BRD	2.000
10.	1997	EU, counter conference, Amsterdam, Netherlands	2.000
11.	1999	EU, NGO-Forum, Tampere, Finland	2.000

Information is missing here for a number of lesser-known alternative meetings.

Mass arrests and detention at summit protests in the West

The data from countries outside the Western world are too scarce, so these are not included in the state statistics on mass arrests and detentions. Two smaller demonstrations in Bhopal and Santiago de Chile are said to have had 150-200 arrested.

Summits have often been held in rich countries. Demonstrations against the policies advocated by the WTO, IMF and others have, however, primarily occurred in the third world, sometimes with very large participation and confrontations.

Deprived of liberty in absolute numbers

1. 900 (929) av 20.000 Demonstrations and riots, counter conference, EU, Göteborg 2001
2. 900 (850+) av 12.000 Demonstration and blockade IMF/World Bank, Praha 2000
3. 700 av 50.000 Preventive detentions, EU, Amsterdam 1997
4. 700 av 7.000 Prohibited demonstration, NATO, München 2002
5. 500 (508) av 150.000 Demonstration and riots, G-8, Genova 2001
6. 500 av 50.000 Demonstration and blockade, FTAA, Quebec 2001
7. 300 (266) av 2.000 Permitted demonstration, EU Ecofin, Malmö 2001
8. 200 av 15.000 Demonstration, WEF, New York 2002
9. 100 (109) av 300.000 Demonstrationer and actions, EU, Barcelona 2002
10. 100 av 20.000 Demonstration, OECD IT-meeting, Napoli 2001
11. 100 (103) av 10.000 Demonstration and riots, World Bank, København 1970
12. 100 (60) av 100.000 Demonstration and riots, EU, Nice 2000

Rounded to the nearest hundred, more exact numbers in parentheses when available.

Sources: 1. Police in Västra Götaland, 2. Amnesty about detentions, 3. Black Book, Autonoom Centrum, Amsterdam 1997, 4. Indymedia, 5. La Repubblica 24.7 2001 and Indymedia, 6. Indymedia, 8. Indymedia, 9. Indymedia, 10. Indymedia, 11. Sydsvenska Dagbladet Snällposten 25.9 1970, 12. Euromarches.

Proportion of protesters deprived of liberty

The percentage is calculated on the largest demonstration that occurred on the same days as the mass arrests and detentions took place, not an amalgamation of the number of participants in several demonstrations as there can be quite a large overlap between protest participants on different days.

The percentage of people deprived of liberty at summits is of interest because it shows how far the police or those who set the framework for the police's actions are willing to curtail protests or whether the protests are of such a nature that they can be seen as so disruptive that mass arrests are justified. Mass crackdowns against a large proportion of the protesters may make it difficult to meaningfully continue the protests. In Bhopal, it is stated that all 150 demonstrators were arrested at a meeting with the Asian Development Bank, but information on how the demonstrators behaved is missing. In many cases such information is available. It is the combination of what type of popular activity that the police intervene against and the proportion and the total number that is most interesting.

1. 13,3% 266 of 2.000 Permitted demonstration, EU Ecofin, Malmö 2001
2. 10,0% 700 of 7.000 Prohibited demonstration, NATO, München 2002
3. 7,5% 900 of 12.000 Demonstration and blockade, IMF/World Bank, Praha 2000
4. 4,5% 900 of 20.000 Majority at counterconference, EU, Göteborg 2001
5. 1,4% 700 of 50.000 Preventive detentions, EU, Amsterdam 1997
6. 1,3% 200 of 15.000 Demonstration, WEF, New York 2002
7. 1,0% 100 of 10.000 Riots, World Bank, København 1970
8. 1,0% 500 of 50.000 Demonstration and blockade, FTAA, Quebec 2001
9. 0,5% 100 of 20.000 Demonstration, OECD IT-meeting, Neapel 2001
10. 0,3% 500 of 150.000 Demonstrations and blockades, G-8 Genua 2001
11. 0,1% 100 of 100.000 Demonstration and blockade, EU Nice 2000
12. 0,03% 100 of 300.000 Demonstrations and actions, EU, Barcelona 2002

Sources: 1., 2. Indymedia, 3. Amnesty for the ripand. 4. Police in Västra Götaland, 5. Black Book, Autonoom Centrum, Amsterdam 1997, 6. Indymedia, 7. Sydsvenska Dagbladet Snällposten 25.9 1970, 8. Indymedia, 9. Indymedia, 10. La Repubblica 24.7 2001 and Indymedia, 11. Euromarches , 12. Indymedia.

Especially when the percentage is below 1%, the probability is high that there are other summit protests with a higher percentage but where information is missing. Those with a very low percentage are included in the table mostly to show how even summit protests noted for extensive confrontations have a low percentage of detainees.

At the same time, this shows the limitation of only looking at the proportion of people deprived of liberty, the total number is also significant.

Sentences for protesters/activists

1. 30 months the maximum sentence EU, Göteborg 2001
2. 1 month maximum penalty EU, Nice 2000
3. 9 days maximum sentence WTO, Seattle 1999
4. Conditional sentence and deportation maximum penalty IMF/World Bank, Praha 2001
5. Compensation to protesters EU, Amsterdam 1997

Sources: The information about Amsterdam is based on the law firm Jansen&Jansen, about Nice, Seattle and Praha on the radio program Studio 1 and about Göteborg on material for Erik Wijk's book *Göteborgskravallerna och Göteborgsprocesserna*. What is stated here as the maximum penalty can also be the average penalty when, as in the case of Nice, only two sentences have been imposed. See otherwise extensive comments.

Verdicts total for protestors/activists

1. 476 months EU, Göteborg 2001 (51 charges remain, 20.5 2002)
2. 2 months EU, Nice 2000
3. A number of weeks WTO, Seattle 1999
4. Conditional IMF/World Bank, Praha 2000
5. Approx. 2.7 million total in damages to 270 protesters for illegal mass arrests EU Amsterdam 1997

The lists of judgments are based solely on a comparison between the summits that the government in the directives to the Göteborgskommittén (appointed by government to elucidate the case) designated as relevant to compare with, Seattle, Prague and Nice. In addition, Amsterdam was added, which in many ways resembled the EU summit in Gothenburg with preventive mass arrests and riots with the difference that the police prepared but did not storm accommodation and meeting premises because the prosecutor opposed this form of police intervention.

Police shot

1. 1 person killed G-8 Genoa 2001
2. 3 people injured EU Göteborg 2001

Difficulties with demonstration statistics

There are many reasons to be wary of comparisons in numbers between the number of participants in different demonstrations or how many are affected by various forms of police or legal measures. The problems are already many when you only stick to counting the number of participants in a demonstration. It becomes even more difficult when trying to compare different data on police interventions and legal consequences and different forms of violence.

Police interventions

Data on police interventions and the judicial system are possible along a whole scale of events. From the way in which a certain number of protesters come into confrontation or are passively exposed to various police measures, to how the police intervention itself takes place in terms of violence,

on what sustainable or untenable legal grounds, how the treatment is during the deprivation of liberty and upon release, and how the accused have access to defense lawyers, the presentation of evidence in trials takes place and what the penalties will be. The conditions in the prisons or detention centers during summits have e.g. been significantly worse in Genoa 2001 and worse in Amsterdam 1997 than in Gothenburg 2001, while the intervention itself has been worse in Gothenburg compared to Amsterdam.

Conversely, the time in custody during the police preliminary investigation before the threat of future charges is recognized worse in Sweden than in most other countries with extreme isolation which is very stressful and for many after Gothenburg lasted for several months. But figures on how rough the treatment has been during the deprivation of liberty are difficult to make, even though attempts were made at the EU summit in Amsterdam when various forms of rights violations were systematically mapped. However, comparable data from other summits is not available.

On the other hand, there are various testimonies that together give sufficient impressions to enable a more general assessment of whether the treatment in the prisons was more or less cruel. Problems also exist around the nature of detentions. All of the mass arrests in Amsterdam turned out to have taken place illegally, while in Sweden the judicial system so far sees several mass arrests and also fatal shootings in Gothenburg as legal. What then a critical review concludes that there are reasonable grounds for assessing whether a police intervention was justified, whether the judiciary considered it to have been legal or not, is another relevant task.

The most common form of data on police action in connection with a summit is the total number of detentions during the time the police intervened against protests. There may sometimes also be information about deprivation of liberty on each individual occasion during the summit. These can vary from large demonstrations to smaller demonstrations or street actions. It can also be on a mass scale by residents of a school or participants in seminars. Finally, there may be deprivations of liberty that occur by individuals or small groups that are taken care of outside of some larger collective context. Sometimes it is also stated how many were of different nationalities.

The difficulty here comes already when it comes to determining the number. The police's information can be questioned on various grounds based on own information that more people have been taken care of by the police.

A more decisive difficulty lies in the legislation of different countries. Deprivations of liberty can take different legal forms. Arrest means that a person is detained for a period of time, in Amsterdam that period was a maximum of three days. After Amsterdam, the Dutch politicians thought that the laws should be changed so that the illegal mass arrests carried out by the police would become legal. Because an amendment to the law on custody was adopted, which Sweden also adopted at the same time.

Custody makes it easier to detain people because the police largely have a free hand to judge whether they want to take people into custody or not, while arrest means detention with significantly stricter rules for the grounds that the arrest must have and significantly more expensive to implement on a mass scale. In Sweden, the time that one can be deprived of liberty through custody, which today is a maximum of six hours, is also shorter than in the case of an arrest, which can be extended over a significantly longer period of time. Many reports only state in English the number of arrests. On the other hand, there are no names for "omhändertagande" because it is hardly in use anywhere except Sweden. In addition to detention, terms such as arrested or reported may appear.

In addition to what the police describe as detention, there can also be detention in practice that the authorities do not register. In Gothenburg, 500 people were called both on Hvitfeldtska high school and Järntorget for several hours without being able to get out. Many of these were eventually released in both locations while others were taken into custody or arrested. In practice, therefore, many hundreds have been de facto detained for two hours or more, even if they are not included in the police statistics. In Amsterdam, an entire train with about 1,000 people was taken while investigating the alleged vandalism of a carriage, people who can also be seen as being in practice deprived of their liberty for a shorter period of about two hours and then released.

In addition, all approx. 130 people in the carriage where the vandalism was alleged to have taken place were taken and identified, after which these people were expelled from the country and had to go back to Italy without having seen anything other than the police in Amsterdam. When they returned to Italy, they were not charged with any crime. Legally, detention did not exist in Amsterdam but it is similar to this form of action, at the same time it is similar to rejection which hardly happened at all at the Amsterdam meeting and only became very common after it happened in Quebec and Prague in 2000. 500-4,000 people have been rejected at the border or shortly before they emerge in recent years at summits in e.g. Nice, Gothenburg, Genoa and Barcelona.

A common measure of how serious the violence has been is the number of injured. But here the figures from the same occasion can vary significantly. A common figure is based on how many police officers and protesters admitted to hospital for treatment during the protests. In Genoa, the police beat people in the hospitals. The suspicions against the authorities made an extensive own healthcare apparatus built up that took care of many. Therefore, the figures here vary considerably, while in other cases hospital reports can be a reasonable comparable criterion.

In Sweden, the police also count occupational injuries in the form of e.g. mental strain reported in several cases through identical descriptions and produces extremely high figures. Corresponding figures for protesters are completely missing. It is reasonable to report hospital figures for the most part, but in exceptional cases also count on data from volunteer healthcare workers. Of interest here are both the total number but also the proportions between the number of injured police officers and protesters. In Gothenburg, there were three injured protesters for each police officer.

Legal or other disciplinary consequences

These may vary. Often the police are not affected at all. If it is affected, it is usually disciplinary measures against police chiefs, such as in Seattle and Genoa, where several were dismissed after summit protests, or judgments directed against the police leadership's illegal mass arrests in Amsterdam, which led to millions of kroner in damages for protesters. Instead, putting the main focus on individual subordinate police officers has been a Swedish method with requirements for marking helmets as a measure to create confidence that even the police's actions can be legally tested. Despite clear evidence, this has so far not led to a conviction after the summits in Sweden, but commanders and others may be prosecuted in cases in Gothenburg that have not yet been fully investigated.

Protesters can face fines, community service or suspended sentences. However, the most common measure of punishment that is compared is time in prison. There are different ways to retrieve data here. You can state what the maximum sentence was, you can state the total sentence and the number of convicts or the average sentence, which is the same thing but stated in a different way.

There are several problems even with this seemingly simple type of numbers. Firstly, one can ask whether the average value of the sentence should be calculated on everyone who received a conviction or everyone who received a prison sentence. In Gothenburg, 41 people have so far received convictions for violent riot and the average was low before the Supreme Court reduced one of the sentences to exactly 12 months. But only 32 of these have received prison sentences. The rest have received community service and other forms of lighter punishment. The average of the 32 is after the Supreme Court reduced one of the sentences from 20 months to 4 months in 15 months.

Another problem is whether people have been convicted of crimes during summit days and it is unclear whether there is any connection between the other protesters or not. In Gothenburg, two people are convicted of crimes other than violent riot in the form of interfering with the police radio and assault that did not occur in a collective violent riot. No political reasons are given for the crimes either, which resulted in up to a year in prison. How should these crimes be counted?

One can also ask how prison time is calculated. In Seattle, people who had been in custody for a few days were sentenced to jail for the number of days they were in custody and then released as the sentences were handed down. In other countries such as the Czech Republic, all were given suspended sentences after serving in several cases considerably longer than in Seattle. But formally speaking, the punishment in Prague was no time in prison and in Seattle a maximum of 9 days and for others a few days. If one then counts the time that those taken into care or arrested were deprived

of their liberty in buses or special storage places, the figures for time that people were forcibly kept in a form of prison are long overall. In Gothenburg, where almost a thousand people were detained, it could be anywhere between six months and a year, in Amsterdam, where the time protesters were kept varied between a few hours and three days, a couple of years.

In addition to this, there are problems regarding which crimes were actually committed. In many countries, the very archaic collective violent riot section that exists in Sweden does not exist which may be the reason why after Prague all received suspended sentences. In Nice, two Spaniards were each sentenced to a month in prison for possessing a knife. In Sweden, there are penalties for things that have never been punished before, sending SMS messages from an information center. In different countries and in different times, crime classifications have varied and so has the severity of the punishment.

What then is reasonable to measure? The number of people who received a prison sentence is, together with the total sentence, an interesting measure. Another is the maximum penalty. The most recent information is the most frequently occurring information in historical reports, while the total number of convicts and their sentences also appears. The mean value can be calculated from these data but is almost never done. At summits, it has been irrelevant before Gothenburg because so few have been sentenced and then to the same or almost the same prison sentence, so the basis for more detailed calculations has not been available.

For the maximum penalty, what the person was convicted of is usually stated, for lower penalties the information is usually more unclear. There is reason to believe that punishments are sometimes meted out in riots for symbolic reasons rather than fundamentally correct ones. The ones you happen to get hold of and the reasons you think you find like in Nice with two people who carried knives are punished because others threw Molotov cocktails and some punishment must be given.

The maximum penalty is of particular interest because it indicates how much the state wishes to inflict on what are considered leading people at different times. Therefore, this information returns, which in Sweden previously for violent riots has been about two and a half years of penal servitude for a person for inciting riots in which abusive assault and kidnapping were included. The only time the maximum penalty for political unrest has been higher than in Gothenburg since the royal autocracy was abolished is during the March riots in Stockholm in 1848 when many people were killed. Then they only managed to convict a single person, but he got five years in prison. Sentences in Sweden have been low for violent riots before Gothenburg. When e.g. the police chief in Stockholm demanded the maximum sentence of ten years in prison for violent rioting after riots in the early 20th century, the court instead sentenced to a fine. The world's first known summit protest by storming past the police almost all the way to the conference centers on Lidingö in Sweden in 1968 led to no penalties at all. The violent riots when a park in Stockholm was saved in 1971 did not lead to any penalties either.

Appendix 1

Press release from Democrat Network about the summit report

238 times longer total sentence for summit protests in Sweden

Sweden is the worst in the Western world when it comes to criminalizing and depriving summit protesters. Both in terms of percentage and absolute numbers for deprivation of liberty at summit demonstrations, Sweden ranks highest in the Western world. This is the result of a survey carried out by the environmental association Friends of the Earth's People's Movement Study Group, which was presented to the newly formed Democrat Network. The proportion of protesters arrested or taken into custody in Sweden is a third higher than at all other summit demonstrations since these began in 1968. This is also compared to countries that have banned demonstrations at summits where the police then intervened against the illegal demonstration. Even more extreme is the difference in the legal aftermath. Here, Sweden is on a maximum sentence that is 30 times higher than the longest previous case at an EU summit and 238* times higher in the total sentence that the courts have so far sentenced after the Gothenburg events.

Sweden has implemented a system shift in relation to oppositional popular movements that have had international catastrophic consequences, says Tord Björk, member of the Democrat Network's coordination group and responsible for the Friends of the Earth summit study. Before Gothenburg, it was not possible to shoot protesters at summits. The courts ruled reasonable punishments and preventive mass arrests by the police led to damages for the protesters. After Sweden introduced a new police strategy to deal with summit protests, police in Genoa shot dead a protester and schools were stormed with great brutality in a way not seen at summits before.

In terms of the proportion of demonstrators who were detained by the police, the authorized demonstration at the EU finance minister's meeting in Malmö on April 21, 2001 is above all others. The demonstration was led into a back street away from the authorized road by the police there then 266 protesters out of 2,000 were taken into preventive custody. Even the police-banned demonstration at the NATO meeting in Munich this year was not affected on the same scale deprivation of liberty such as the Malmö demonstration. In the banned anti-NATO demonstration 10% were detained, in the permitted Malmö anti-EU demonstration 13.3%. In the protest demonstrations at the EU summit in Barcelona this year involved hundreds of thousands of people for three days and only 0.03%, numbering 100 out of 300,000, were arrested by the police. In absolute numbers also lies Sweden at the top with 929 arrested and taken into custody at the EU summit in Gothenburg, roughly the same level as the World Bank meeting in Prague in 2000. Most of the deprivations of liberty in Gothenburg took place by surrounding and storming the counter-conference of the popular movements. It is striking that Sweden is not only the country where the police have deprived protesters of their freedom to the greatest extent, it is also the country where police interventions on a mass scale took place before any riots arose.

These figures show that the Swedish police's strategy in Malmö and Gothenburg is the most democratically and policingly unsuccessful in the entire Western world, says Maria Dahl, a member of the Democratic Party's coordination group and active in the group NOG in Malmö. Protesters are not more non-violent in Spain than in Sweden, it is the preventive and provocative actions of the police in Sweden that are drastically different.

If you look at the maximum penalty and compare the summits in Seattle, Prague and Nice that the government commissioned the Gothenburg Committee to investigate, the differences become even more extreme. Here, Sweden is 30 times or even higher in terms of penalties compared to other countries. The total sentenced time in Sweden is so far 250 times higher. After Seattle, a handful of people were sentenced to a few days in prison, after Prague, all sentences became conditional, and after the EU summit in Nice, two people were sentenced to 1 month in prison each. After the EU summit in Gothenburg, 41 people have so far been sentenced for violent riot to an average of 12 months in addition to two prison sentences for other crimes, which gives a total of more than 500 months in prison.

After the High Court ruling that reduced the sentence in one of the cases for violent riot by 16 months, this means that the total sentence for sentences for violent riot in Gothenburg alone has been

reduced from 246 times longer to 238 times longer. However, the violence has on several occasions been more serious in other places. Both in Nice and Prague Molotov cocktails were used, which did not happen in Gothenburg.

However, Sweden was the first in the world to have police shoot against summit demonstrators, which was directly followed by the shooting death at the G-8 meeting in Genoa. At least one major preventive mass arrest has taken place at a summit before. At the EU summit in Amsterdam in 1997, 380 people were arrested for membership of a criminal organization in a demonstration in a permitted place.

This police intervention was later ruled illegal in court and millions of kroner were paid out in damages to protesters who were deprived of their freedom. In Sweden, the police in Malmö and Gothenburg have so far been able to carry out preventive mass arrests and have inflicted three times more damage on demonstrators than they themselves have received with complete impunity.

No protester can trust the Swedish police, judiciary, mass media or responsible politicians anymore, says Mårten Björk, member of the Democracy Network's statement group and active in the group NOG in Malmö. The Gothenburg generation with tens of thousands of Swedes, 1,500 from Norway, 1,000 from Denmark, 500 from Finland and hundreds from other countries that appeared during the EU summit and faced with the West's most repressive criminalization must now seek international support to get justice. The support of thousands of Italians who protested against one of the judicial abandonments after Gothenburg together with five trade union leaders in Norway and a Norwegian collection of 200,000 kroner to support the accused shows that it is possible to get international support. The Democrat Network will now go out with information to other countries and call for opinion formation and international scrutiny.

The investigation is based on a review of demonstration participants at more than 60 summit protests since the first known action was carried out at a meeting of finance ministers on Lidingö in 1968. 1,000,000 participants in New York in 1982 at the UN special session on disarmament is the largest summit protest to date followed by 300,000 demonstrators at the EU summit in Barcelona in the spring of 2002. Information about confrontations and deprivation of liberty does not appear often because it was unusual, even though extensive riots took place already at the World Bank meeting in Copenhagen in 1970.

Tord Björk

The Democracy Network's statement group

The Democracy Network was formed with the support of 101 co-founders from all over the Nordics in Malmö on April 21, the anniversary of the demonstration against the EU's meeting of finance ministers in 2001. The Democrat Network urges

to protests throughout the country against the EU's terror legislation and organizes a large meeting and demonstration for democracy and justice in Gothenburg on June 15. The network wants to promote non-violent conflict solutions and protect equality before the law, which requires re-examination of the Gothenburg judges after the EU summit, which politicizes and multiplies the punishment.

Appendix 2

Statistics with calculation as prescribed by the police

Representatives of the Gothenburg Police have criticized the calculation methods for this report. They believe that the starting point should be the total number of participants in the demonstrations at a summit and not just the number in the largest demonstration. In Gothenburg, the police state 20,000 participants in the largest demonstration and 50,000 participants in total. This may mean that summits where there have been several large demonstrations may have a smaller proportion of people deprived of their liberty. Such a method of calculation should also mean that the total number of people deprived of their liberty is counted in the same way, which means that if the same person goes in several demonstration marches or is taken into custody several times, each time counts towards the total number.

Proportion of persons deprived of liberty

Merger of all demonstrations at a summit without taking into account that people often participate several times during a summit. In the same way, the total number of people deprived of liberty increases when such information is available because some people have been taken into custody several times. In addition, this table is based on higher estimates given by the number of participating protesters.

1.	12.6%	266 of 2,100	Permitted demonstration + pre-demo, EU Ecofin, Malmö 2001
2.	10.0%	700 out of 7,000	Prohibited demonstration, NATO, München 2002
3.	4.5%	900 of 20,000	Demonstration and blockade, IMF/World Bank, Praha 2000
4.	2.3%	1,200 out of 50,000	Most at counter-conference EU, Göteborg 2001
5.	1.3%	200 out of 15,000	Demonstration WEF, New York 2002
6.	1.3%	700 out of 55,000	Preventive detentions EU, Amsterdam 1997
7.	1.0%	100 out of 10,000	Riots, World Bank, København, Denmark 1970
8.	0.6%	500 of 80,000	Demonstration and blockade, FTAA, Quebec 2001
9.	0.16%	500 out of 300,000	Demonstrations and blockades, G-8 Genova 2001
10.	0.09%	100 out of 105,000	Demonstration and blockade, EU, Nice 2000
11.	0.008%	100 of 1,200,000	Demonstrations and actions, EU, Barcelona 2002

Deprived of liberty in absolute numbers

1.	1,200 (1,155) out of 20,000	Demonstrations and riots, counter-conference, EU, Göteborg 2001
2.	900 (850+) out of 12,000	Demonstration and blockade IMF/World Bank, Praha 2000
3.	700 out of 50,000	Preventive detentions EU, Amsterdam 1997
4.	700 of 7,000	Prohibited demonstration, NATO, München 2002
5.	500 (508) of 150,000	Demonstration and Riots, G-8, Genova 2001
6.	500 of 50,000	Demonstration and Blockade FTAA, Quebec 2001
7.	300 (266) out of 2,000	Licensed demonstration EU Ecofin, Malmö 2001
8.	200 of 15,000	Demonstration WEF, New York 2002
9.	100 (109) out of 300,000	Demonstrations and actions, EU, Barcelona 2002
10.	100 of 20,000	Demonstration, OECD IT meeting, Napoli 2001
11.	100 (103) out of 10,000	Demonstration and riots, World Bank, København 1970
12.	100 (60) out of 100,000	Demonstration and riots, EU, Nice 2000

A calculation according to this method does not change Sweden's position at the top of the list both in terms of the proportion of protesters deprived of their liberty and the total number. Rather, the picture is further worsened by the fact that the total number of people deprived of liberty during the EU summit in Göteborg with this calculation method will be even more significantly higher than in all other countries. It has to do with the fact that a large number of people were detained in Göteborg several times, including the kitchen staff in the mass catering kitchen Rampenplan, who for twenty years cooked for protesters all over Europe without ever either in communist Eastern Europe or elsewhere keep being deprived of their freedom. The special storming of schools that took place in Göteborg

on two occasions led to many being deprived of their freedom. The reports from other summits lack information about the detention of the same person several times.

It may have to do with the fact that deprivation of liberty took place by arresting people or putting them in prison for the duration of the summit. But on several occasions, detention is said to have only been about a number of hours, which applied to approximately half of those arrested in Amsterdam in 1997 and all those arrested during the riots in København in 1970.

Appendix 3

Abbreviations:

ADB	Asia Development Bank
BWI	Bretton Woods Institutions
ECE	Economic Commission for Europe,
EU	European Union
FTAA	Free Trade Agreement for Americas
UN	United Nations
G-7	The seven richest industrial countries
G-8	G-7 plus Russia
GATT	General Agreements on Trade and Tariffs
IMF	International Monetary Fund
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
OAS	Organisation of American States
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
WEF	World Economic Forum
WSF	World Social Forum
WTO	World Trade Organisation

