

**MEDIA EDUCATION**  
FOUNDATION  
TRANSCRIPT



Challenging media

**NO LOGO**

---

BRANDS, GLOBALIZATION & RESISTANCE

# **NO LOGO**

## *Brands, Globalization & Resistance*

*Producer and Editor:* **Kelly Garner**  
*Executive Producers:* **Loretta Alper & Sut Jhally**

*Featuring an interview with* **Naomi Klein**, award-winning author of *No Logo: No Space, No Choice, No Jobs*.

Media Education Foundation © MEF 2003

## INTRODUCTION

### *[Media Montage]*

**NAOMI KLEIN:** I wrote *No Logo* based on a hunch. In around 1995 I started to notice what I thought was the beginning of a new political movement. A political movement that would specifically take aim at the growing power of multinational corporations and in many ways would do an end run around governments and go after corporations directly. We knew something big was going on; I'm talking about in the mid-nineties. We knew there were global shifts taking place around free trade, around corporate consolidation and that these shifts didn't respect national boundaries in any way and our traditional way of thinking about politics, which was to change politics nationally weren't working. And yet we didn't have the intellectual tools to even imagine this thing called globalization. And frankly there was a lot of anger directed at multinationals like Nike, Monsanto, Shell, McDonalds. What I wanted to understand was "why?" What were the conditions that created the backlash that in my opinion made the backlash inevitable? And also what liberated this generation of young people to be so bold as to go after multinationals directly?

What my research brought me to was this seemingly innocuous idea that had gripped the corporate world that had, sort of, at this point was not seen as a political phenomenon but was just seen as management babble - you would really only be paying attention to it if you read business magazines and books about how to make a million dollars. And this idea was the idea of lifestyle branding, the idea that if companies wanted to be truly successful and competitive in a global marketplace they had to understand that their true product was not their product, i.e. sneakers, movies, lattes, computers, it was an idea, a lifestyle. It was meaning itself. The idea of brands not products explains for me a few things at once. It explained the assault on the public sphere in the form of corporate sponsorship. It explained why we were seeing evermore new and creative forms of marketing particularly directed at young people. It explained why despite the promise of choice and interactivity there seemed to be less choice because of corporate consolidation. And it also explained why we were hearing more and more about sweatshop jobs, temporary jobs, McJobs - why the quality of work seemed to be diminishing in many parts of the world, not just in the developing world. And these forces taken together, which I describe as no space, no choice, and no jobs - together converge to create the conditions for what I colloquially am calling "No Logo" which is a phrase just to describe the spirit of anti-corporate resistance.

## NO SPACE – New Branded World

**NAOMI KLEIN:** The process of branding in its simplest form is just the process of marking a product with a consistent logo, image, mascot – that sends a message to the consumer, a message of consistency, a message of quality. This process became really important with the advent of mass industrialization; goods were being produced in factories, and mass transport. Because what that meant is that all kinds of products that people used to buy from a local shopkeeper or a local farmer who they had a relationship with, locally, were now coming off of trains, trucks, and out of factories – and this was quite actually scary at the turn of the century because the relationship of trust that you had with that shopkeeper or with that farmer, when it was just spooned out of the barrel or scooped out of the barrel, was now subverted by these goods coming from far away, being produced in anonymous factories.

So the original brands were comforting logos that were often people, like Quaker Oats or Aunt Jemima, that were essentially surrogate relationships, it's like, ok, you're not buying it from the local shopkeeper, you're not buying it from the local farmer, but here is this image that you can relate to – you could form a personal relationship – albeit a fake personal relationship – with this mascot, with this figure. But the message was that you can trust it as much as you would trust it if you actually had a real relationship.

How did we get from the fairly simple role of the brand, the Aunt Jemima, the Quaker Oats, to these brand tribes that we have now where we almost follow brands like we would follow rock stars – we organize ourselves into brand tribes. We are a Nike type of person or a Tommy Hilfiger type of person, how did that happen?

There are a handful of brands that understood that marketing could play a larger role than simply branding their product as a mark of quality. They understood that they could sell ideas, that they could sell lifestyles. Coca-Cola, Disney, McDonalds – these core American brands became powerful precisely because they understood that they were selling ideas instead of products, that they were selling an idea about family. Coca-Cola was selling the youth lifestyle in the sixties, they started selling peace and love – they were selling something way more profound than their fairly generic product, which was this black fizzy liquid.

Walt Disney understood that he was selling the American Dream. He was selling a nostalgic vision of the small-time American town that people felt sad about, they thought that it had disappeared.

The CEO of Nike, Phil Knight, says that he had kind of an epiphany in the mid-eighties where he realized that he didn't want to compete in a commodity marketplace anymore, that he did not want to be a sneaker company, or as he

said, a fashion company. He wanted to be a sports company and that their core image or their core idea was not about their sneakers being better than Reebok's, but was an idea about the nature of sports and that pure athletic ability and the raw ability of truly superstar athletes like Tiger Woods and Michael Jordan is a kind of metaphor for the American Dream. And so he decided to sell that idea.

When you have a culture where ideas are not treated as being connected to belief or action but are just commodity and just to be used and attach – “oh, diversity, let's use that to sell Benetton sweaters, community, let's use that for Starbucks” – the ideas themselves are devalued. The best example is Virgin.

What's significant about Virgin is that they are so clearly not selling a product – they are selling an idea. The idea that they're selling is the Virgin-type person. The Virgin-type person kind of bucks authority, sees themselves very much as an individual, they're in their late twenties, early thirties, they see themselves as a non-conformist. Richard Branson, CEO of Virgin, understood the power of that idea. What he understood is how many people see themselves as rebels and he found a way to mass-produce the desire for individuality – quite a feat.

So our most powerful ideas are treated as brand content. The environmental movement is the Body Shop's identity. Apple has used revolutionary icons like Martin Luther King and Gandhi after their deaths, long after their deaths, as pitchmen for Apple. Because allegedly the Apple brand stands for doing things differently and these men did things differently.

**[TV ad: Apple Computers]** *Because it is the people who are crazy enough to think they can change the world are the ones who do.*

**NAOMI KLEIN:** Diesel markets to a very self-conscious, ironic consumer, that's their brand identity, everything is done with a kind of nudge and a wink. Ikea's brand identity they claim is democracy because you can put together your furniture on your own, so you can really be an architect of your own destiny. So our most powerful ideas as citizens – democracy, revolution – these are now mere brand content.

There were many of these brand epiphanies where Starbucks would announce, “Starbucks is not a coffee company, it is a community company.” It is about the idea of the third place, which is not home and not work, but rather a place where people gather.

And a lot of these brand epiphanies had a kind of quasi-anthropological approach where what they were trying to identify was nothing to do with the product itself but had to do with what consumers were thinking and experiencing while they were consuming the product. Car companies realized that for a lot of young people what they love most about cars doesn't have that much to do with

whatever new feature they've got, they love the act of listening to music with their friends in the car, road trips, that was the most thrilling thing that you could do in a car. So car commercials starting saying very little about the features in any given car but would just show a group of beautiful twenty-something's in the car bopping up and down, singing like crazy. You consuming this product is being sold back to you.

And it's not just about creating associations within advertising, that's the old way of doing things – hire an advertising firm to create an association between a desirable lifestyle and your product, i.e. show footage of people consuming your product, that's the old way. The new way is to go out into the culture and find out where people actually are doing those things, where your brand idea lives independently. And then what you try to do is you try to merge with it, or you try to buy it, you try to own it. If your brand identity has to do with the spirit of rock 'n' roll in the case of Tommy Hilfiger, then what you try to do is you try through many different ways at once to merge with that spirit, through sponsoring, first by starting to sponsor concerts, then by getting musicians like the Rolling Stones or Cheryl Crow to sign deals to only wear your clothing. Then you get them in your ads, then you start buying music festivals outright, so you have the bands kind of performing in your ad. Then your ads don't even need those rock stars anymore because you are a rock star, like you are, the goal is not to sponsor them, but to grab their energy and their identity so that you exist, your brand has the same cultural role as the rock star, you have followers of your own, you are the star as opposed to sponsoring somebody else's star.

Tommy Hilfiger wasn't the first company to put the logo on the outside of the clothing as opposed to the inside of the collar. Lacoste and Polo had been doing that for a couple of decades but there was a difference in scale, because it wasn't like the little alligator in the corner, it was a human sized billboard for almost like a walking, talking Tommy Hilfiger doll.

And the measure of a successful brand more and more is not whether it's truly a mark of quality on a product, but how well it stretches. If it's a successful cola can it also be a line of clothing, if it's a line of clothing can it be a house paint, if it's a coffee chain can it be a magazine? And so more and more of what you have is a stratosphere of the super-brand where everyone is everything and these are kind of imperial powers that are constantly pushing against their own boundaries and saying, "no, we're not just a clothing company, we can be a music company and we're not just a music company, we can have our own planes." So you have this stratosphere of warring mega-brands that want to be everywhere and be everything.

Because Disney has been at this for so much longer than most companies, they have gone further. And what they have done is they have built, in a sense they've reached brand nirvana, they have built a Disney town called Celebration, Florida.

**[Celebration, Florida: Promotional Video]** *Have you been dreaming of going back to those days gone by? Well welcome to your dream come true. Welcome home to Celebration, Florida.*

**NAOMI KLEIN:** It's not about just going there on your vacation or extending a fantasy from a film just a little bit longer. You can live your whole life inside the brand and that's what thousands of families have done, they've packed up the kids and moved into the Disney brand full-time, they send their kids to the Disney school, and they elect representatives to the Disney council, so it's a fully privatized life.

What's interesting about the world's first branded town is that there are no brands there. If you go to Celebration, Florida you will see not a franchise, no McDonalds, you won't see any billboards, you'll see lots of green spaces and parks and kids riding around on bicycles. And Disney says that this is because they built Celebration, Florida as a monument to the ideal of the American town, of public space. Public space is a big part of that. Now that may be true but there's another aspect of it as well and that aspect is that when you have finally reached your absolute brand nirvana where you have built the dream world in three dimensions and you actually have people living there full-time, the first thing you want to is you want to slam the door behind you. And you want to make sure that there aren't any competing messages that are in any way interrupting with this perfect synergized, cross-promoted marketing moment. That's why what we're really talking about is monopoly.



## NO CHOICE – Brand Bombing

**NAOMI KLEIN:** People often say about advertising, “well why don’t you just turn it off?” But in many of these cases the point is that you don’t have the choice whether or not to turn it off.

### **[Media montage]**

**NAOMI KLEIN:** The point is that you don’t have the choice whether or not to turn it off because it is in the streets, it’s right in front of your face, on the subway or even in the bathroom, in a public bathroom. The point is to take choice out of the equation because choice, even when you can click with your converter, that is seen as the enemy in the world of marketing, that’s why you need to get your ad woven into the content of television shows, so choice is taken out of the equation.

### **[TV: Law and Order]**

-- *Jodie tends to get carried away.*

-- *What, I saw them at Starbucks together, didn’t I?”*

### **[TV: Friends]** *You’re out of Diet Coke?*

**[TV: Half & Half]** *I can’t believe we skipped the staff meeting this morning to go to Starbucks.*

**[TV: Dawson’s Creek]** *(Picking up Trojan condoms) Very nice.*

**[TV: Will & Grace]** *What about that cutie that you met at Banana Republic?*

### **[TV: Gilmore Girls]**

-- *This is business; it needs to be done properly and legally!*

-- *It’s a standard lease form, Taylor, I bought it at Office Depot.*

### **[TV: Dawson’s Creek]**

-- *You can do anything in a K-Mart, you can fill up on sugary snacks, you can catch up on your dental hygiene, in fact I’m starting to like this idea so much I may never leave.*

-- *Because this store is perfect just the way it is – don’t change a thing.*

**NAOMI KLEIN:** Because the power of marketing is always the power of getting someone’s attention. Let’s face it, it’s hard to get our attention, we are literally bombarded with images and with interruptions in our daily lives so the ante is constantly being raised, the advertisers constantly have to come up with new and more creative ways to get our attention.



**[CBS News]** *Patrick Dory has invented a machine that creates a beach blanket of advertising right in the sand, in this case for Skippy Peanut Butter.*

**Interview:** *Right now approximately on this one half-mile stretch are approximately five thousand impressions of Skippy Peanut Butter jars.*

**[CNN News]** *This marks the beginning of the commercial development of the Moon, and we suspect that we know where it'll end as well.*

**NAOMI KLEIN:** There is now no aspect of our lives that is not open to being used in this kind of theater of the brand.

**[NBC News]**

**Interview: Mike Miles, Pizza Hut:** *Re-launching our logo here on the side of the spaceship is the perfect metaphor for what we're really trying to accomplish with the brand.*

**Newscaster:** *Today's Pizza Hut rocket was actually the company's second choice. Their preference? Just imagine, the Moon: a nighttime billboard.*

**NAOMI KLEIN:** As companies try to feed off of meaning and feed off of space everything is a potential prop.

**[NBC News]** *Auto wraps, one California firm paying consumers \$400 a month to become driving billboards. A day at the beach brought to you by a big name sponsor. Even a town selling its own name to an Internet company for \$75,000. Welcome to Half.com, Oregon.*

**NAOMI KLEIN:** All of it, any idea, political activism, all of it gets pulled into these brands telling their story as they say. Even in capitalist cultures, there are still places where the rules of the market do not apply. We have lived with rules where there are public spaces that are cordoned off and protected because we understand that they are important for our democracies. When you lose the commons, when you lose the very idea of the public, when the schools start to look like malls, when libraries start to look like Barnes & Noble bookstores, and Barnes & Noble bookstores start to look like libraries, you lose the very idea of there being any place that is outside of the market. And I think that in terms of democracy this has drastically weakened our democracy because we have fewer and fewer places where we can relate to each other as non-consumers, as citizens.

Probably the best example of that is the shopping mall because the shopping mall is designed to mimic the town square. And often designers of malls will use this language overtly – they'll talk about creating a town square type atmosphere. You'll have fountains, you'll have benches, and you'll have pseudo-streetlights and it sort of looks like an old style town hall or town square but it isn't. And you can find that out pretty quickly if, for instance, you try to pass out a political pamphlet of any kind or if you're an employee at a clothing store, say, you and

your friends decide to form a union and you might have picket line in the mall, well you can't do that, you can do that in the street but this a privatized public sphere and the private rules around private property apply. So protestors, anyone who is exercising free speech that is seen as not being conducive to the goal of the mall, which is buying and selling. Any message that is not come to this store because we have a sale on, you'll immediately find yourself in the parking lot, escorted out by private security.

**[Mall footage]**

- Excuse me, you can't do that in the mall.
- I can't do what, what do you mean?
- There's no filming in here, turn the camera off.
- Don't worry, I'm not filming
- Who are you with? What are you filming? This is private property; I'm going to confiscate your camera.
- Chill out, I'm not even filming!
- The door's right there, I've got a man there. I'm going to have to escort you out, sir.

**NAOMI KLEIN:** We're not talking about a new idea when we talk about corporate censorship, but what has changed is the scale. Wal-Mart owns so much of the book and music market that their brand image often comes into conflict with artistic expression.

**[TV interview: Jay Allen Wal-Mart Stores Inc]** *We want products in our stores that a family would be proud to have in their home.*

**NAOMI KLEIN:** Wal-Mart, in addition to being at the top of the Fortune 500 list, the largest employer in the United States, they are also a very powerful brand and their brand identity, is, surprise, surprise, is a family brand, it's like Disney, it's a very similar kind of identity and they pride themselves on creating a family store. Now this doesn't have to do with the values of the company, it has to do with a marketing strategy where by identifying themselves as a family store they are able to attract the entire family. Dad can go buy power drills and guns, and mom can shop for clothes, and the kids can buy video games and magazines. So their strategy to be a family store obviously is what has contributed to their incredible profitability. But part of what that means is that their brand identity as a family outlet clashes over and over and over gain with artistic expression. There have been many cases where they have decided that the lyrics in a rap CD or the art on the cover or the image on the cover of a magazine doesn't fit the Wal-Mart image. Now, on one level you can say that's their right, it's a private company, they've got a right to decide what is on there shelves. But the difference is this incredible difference in scale because what that means to the record company or the magazine is that they've just written 30% of their sales and they're not going to accept that. So they reissue the CD and they also internalize Wal-Mart's aesthetic and Wal-Mart's brand values when they think

about which artists to sign and when they think about what culture they're gonna put out there in the first place. So there's kind of a preemptive censorship that we never even hear about, I mean, we'll hear about something if it gets yanked off the shelves but what we don't hear about is the censorship behind the scenes and the preemptive and second guessing censorship that takes place, that is silent censorship.

## NO JOBS – The Discarded Factory

**NAOMI KLEIN:** Brands are not new, but what's started to happen is that companies, instead of seeing their primary role as producing products, and then branding them with a corporate identity – we're not seeing their primary role as producing brands, image, meaning, which can be stretched into many different arenas. And that producing a product is almost incidental.

When you buy a pair of shoes, say a Nike pair of shoes, even though there's a Nike swoosh on it, Nike didn't make those shoes, Nike bought those shoes. And the way that they did it; probably they approached a broker in Hong Kong. And that broker in Hong Kong told them which factory it could produce those shoes for the cheapest price. So the contract to make those shoes was given to a factory in China, in Vietnam, in Indonesia. But that contractor may then decide that they can even get a cheaper price by contracting with sub-contract factories. And at every stage, the amount of money that goes to the workers shrinks. And you end up with this maze of contract and subcontract factories.

The Nike paradigm as it is now called, was held up as the future of the corporate world. Now, what makes a product cheaper – one product cheaper than the next? They can't scrimp too much on materials because obviously there needs to be a baseline level of quality in all the products, or they're going to go out of business. So where they usually manage to get the savings is how much they pay the workers.

**[CNN News]** *Human rights groups say Nike pays some workers in Asia less than a dollar a day, and employs child labor in some of its plants.*

**NAOMI KLEIN:** And part of the way you keep wages down is by tightly controlling a workforce – making sure that they don't start forming unions and making demands for things like health care benefits, job security, more control over their lives.

These goods are produced in what are called export-processing zones, they're often called *maquiladoras*. What they are, are special industrial parks that have been set up especially to produce goods for export to the United States, to Canada, to Europe. They are walled in, there are high fences and there are usually armed guards, monitoring the zones. The work force is incredibly young and almost entirely female. The dominant age is eighteen to twenty-five, and I would say that they are about 80% women. And the women who work there didn't come from the surrounding areas, they came from provinces that are six or seven hours away, this was in the Philippines and Indonesia. And the people who I met said that they felt that this was done on purpose – that they were designing a work force that was very, very easy to control. There was a feeling that women were easier to control than men, young women were easier to control than older women. And that girls, who are far from their family and their

community and their infrastructure – what makes them strong and rooted – are easier to push around, are constantly feeling scared and unstable and this is why its an easier work-force to control.

When Nike first started buying its shoes, importing its shoes from contractors, it was dealing primarily with Japanese manufacturers. But then, producing products in Japan got too expensive, so they started giving the contracts to manufacturers in Korea and Taiwan. But then, workers in Korea and Taiwan started forming unions and started getting higher wages, and Nike and Reebok and all the companies that were producing products in Korea and Taiwan weren't very pleased with this, so they cancelled those contracts. Then what happened is that the companies that owned the factories in Korea and Taiwan moved to the Philippines, Vietnam, China, and opened up factories there. The governments in these countries said ok, well we'll give you a ten-year tax holiday – you can come to our country, you can set up a factory, no tariffs, and we'll guard your factory and make sure no pesky union organizers even get in there. And then the company will say and we have a docile work force and we can give it to you for ten cents cheaper a piece. So there's kind of a global auction going on, and the pawns in this auction are the workers themselves. And that's why, even though the promise of globalization is that it will lead to development to poor countries and that wages will go up and the situation will improve, what's actually happening is we're witnessing a race to the bottom, where countries are outbidding each other for who can abuse their workers more.

But the significance for a company like Nike is that building these kind of utopian branded worlds costs much more than just advertising a product. So you often hear companies openly saying that we have made a choice – we have decided to build our brand. But that choice has consequences and one of the consequences is that when that decision is made, it is often accompanied by a decision to sell off factories. And to embrace the Nike model – the company that owns all this intellectual property but doesn't own any factories. When a company decides to embrace this model, that obviously immediately affects their work forces in North America and Europe – people who had steady, unionized jobs, were paid enough to support a family, lose those jobs.

**[CBS News]** ...cutting 6,000 jobs...

**[ABC News]** ...now unemployed...

**[CBS News]** ...lost another 42,000 jobs...

**[News]** ...cutting 11,500 jobs...

**[News]** ...they have other jobs, from factories across the South to plants overseas, where labor is cheaper...

**NAOMI KLEIN:** The communities that were built around a factory, that depended on these factories, are often gutted. And the jobs that often come to replace these manufacturing jobs are these new economy jobs that are often service sector job. They are often temporary jobs – it is significant that in the US right

now, the two largest employers are Wal-Mart and Manpower. Manpower is a company that doesn't produce anything – it supplies people. It is a temp firm, a huge temp firm. They have a roster of temporary workers that they offer to companies on short-term.

**[TV ad: Manpower]** *If you need to move it, clean it, cater it, build it up, or tear it down, then you'll get all the help you need, you can...*

**NAOMI KLEIN:** The service sector jobs are often also short-term jobs, and you'll hear the term McJob used to describe people who sell the products for these mega-brands like Wal-Mart, the Gap, Nike. And there's a feeling that somehow they are not real jobs, and by real job I mean the kind of job that would have benefits, that would have some measure of security, that an adult would have that they would be able to support kids with. In fact there's been a kind of campaign to see these jobs, these mall jobs, these service sector jobs that have largely replaced manufacturing jobs for the working class in the United States, a campaign to see those jobs as almost jobs with training wheels on, not real jobs. You often hear "well, I know its kind of lousy working at McDonalds and you don't have any control over your shift, and your manager doesn't respect you, and there are all these crazy rules about how you can't talk to your coworkers, but its good experience. Its good experience for some real job down the road."

**[TV ad: McDonalds]** *I'm Carol Martin, and this is my McDonalds.*

**NAOMI KLEIN:** And it strikes me that this is quite a feat on the part of these extraordinarily rich multinational corporations. That they have convinced us and we have largely accepted this logic, that the jobs that they create should not be held to the same standards as so-called "real jobs."



## NO LOGO – Anti-Corporate Activism & Reclaiming the Streets

**NAOMI KLEIN:** So in a sense what we're seeing is using branding that is so enmeshed in our culture and in our lives as a way back into our own societies – a way to engage with globalization, because if you pick up a shoe now, you have the story of globalization in your hand. You have leather that was maybe produced in Argentina, shipped to the Philippines, produced by a Korean sub-contractor that went through a Hong Kong broker that was dealing with a company in Oregon. So you're looking at this thing, and if you can deconstruct it, if you can trace all the components through the global economy, and not only that but find out how much that company that's selling you that shoe spent on advertising last year, and how much money they paid a super star athlete to sponsor them, then you have the disparities of the global economy – the winners and the losers.

What we've seen in the past six years is an explosion of brand-based investigative activism. Where you have campaigners that have peeled, looked behind the brand, peeled away the façade to see how the goods are produced. There are labor groups in the United States that have sponsored tours of Nike workers, of Gap workers, going to US campuses, to community centers, to tell people how their products are produced.

**[Brown University anti-sweatshop rally. Worker, speaking through translator]** *Hello, my name is Kenya, I come from the Dominican Republic, and I come here so that you may know that we are sacrificing our life so that you can wear these hats.*

**NAOMI KLEIN:** And of course this is very uncomfortable for these companies, because even though they are the engines of globalization, they don't really believe in globalization, not this kind of globalization, right? I mean, their whole system depends on the world of production and the world of consumption staying safely apart and there not being this connection at the grassroots, where we learn the secrets behind our shiny, perfect, airbrushed global world. So now these brands have become, in many ways, the most visible targets of globalization. So much so, that whenever you see a protest, there'll be a line of riot cops guarding the Starbucks, guarding the Gap, guarding the McDonalds. And this strikes me as tremendously symbolic somehow, that they're guarding the façade, the entry point into the world of globalization.

And what this activism is doing is it's putting them together. And it's going to the shiny façade of the brand, outside the mall, outside the super-store and saying, "we know how your products are produced." That's what these campaigns do,



they make globalization real, they say it's about the food that you eat, it's about the clothes that you wear, it's about the toys you buy your kids.

I'm often asked, "so what do we buy, how can we shop ethically in this context?" And the truth is that it's very, very hard to do. You can't go to the average mall and go to the Ethical section and buy products that you know are produced under ethical conditions. The truth is that there is no way to change the world through shopping but you can actually work on a few different levels at once. You can work as an individual by supporting businesses that are making an effort to produce their goods under ethical conditions. You can also buy in bulk as a school in ways that have a positive effect on an industry. But I think more importantly than that, I think that you can be part of this global movement that is really about creating more ethical conditions of trade, fair trade as opposed to simply free trade.

So if you keep following the logo still further, you end up inevitably on the doorsteps of the World Trade Organization, at the World Bank, at the International Monetary Fund – you end up on the doorsteps of the institutions that are writing the rules of global trade. What these institutions believe – people at the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization – what they honestly believe is that what's good for business, what's good for large corporations, will be good for all of us eventually. So that when we write the rules for trade, we should write rules that are in the interests of these large corporations. Because if we do that, if we make the conditions good enough for them, then eventually we will all reap the benefits, in terms of jobs, even in terms of the environment.

**[protestors]** *What do we want? –Fair Trade!  
When do we want it? –Now!*

**NAOMI KLEIN:** What you hear most forcefully on the streets is not an anti-trade message or an anti-globalization message but a rejection of the logic that what's good for corporations will be good for everyone. And that we should take a spectatorship approach to our own democracies, that we should just watch and wait.

Part of what we're starting to see at this huge protests outside of trade meetings, in Seattle, Washington, Prague, Genoa, every time world leaders get together to talk about the global economy, there are all these counter demonstrations. And what is being articulated is the beginnings of a movement that is about reclaiming the public, reclaiming the commons. Now that's a really difficult thing to do, because of course, so much of our lives have been privatized, and is now within the umbrella of the market. That even talking about the commons is like trying to talk about the Matrix while you're in the Matrix.

During these protests, one of the slogans on the street is “The world is not for sale.” And part of what’s been done is carving out spaces where we can say that the rules of the market should not apply here.

What we’re seeing is an explosion of activism that is about reclaiming the public, reclaiming the commons, and this has taken many forms. One form might be culture jamming, ad busting, or billboard liberation where you have groups of activists that are forcing a dialogue where there’s only a monologue on the streets. So that might mean climbing up on a billboard and placing your own message over a commercial message, hacking into that message, and parodying it or sending a message about how the product that’s being advertised is produced, or where its produced, and under what conditions.

*[CBS News] Somebody hijacked the sports shoe company website. Instead of the Nike logo, web surfers found a message apparently placed by hijackers – hackers that is – in Australia, protesting world trade policy.*

**NAOMI KLEIN:** So we’re seeing more and more direct action and I think that there’s a new impatience out there. People aren’t waiting to be granted rights that are already ours, that are already enshrined in law. And if the market isn’t providing in the much promised trickle-down. If it isn’t providing for people, then people have to take action in order to meet their basic needs, in fact have a right to. And even if they face repression from the police, in so doing, they are behaving ethically, and they are behaving as citizens. And that’s where the debate about globalization really is at. Its not about saying I’m for or against trade or I’m for or against this institution, its about democracy, its about people’s rights to be authors of their own destiny, to control and have a say in controlling our share of public resources.