In this paper the classical diffusion theory and some of its elaborations within the field of collective action studies are briefly delineated. Next the dynamics of diffusion process are illustrated by case studies of two social movements. First is explored the international Third World Solidarity movement at the end of the 1960s, its diffusion to Finland, and the consequential formation of a movement called Tricont. After that the paper proceeds to examine an analogous process taking place at the turn of the millennium: the emergence of the Global Justice Movement and the establishment of Attac movement in Finland. Also the diffusion of ideas from Tricont to Attac is investigated. Based on the empirical cases, the paper assesses the applicability of the concepts used in the cross-national diffusion studies in a situation where the diffusion does not take place only between countries but between two different points in time. It is argued that the current theorization fails to take into account the process of historical diffusion.

The Classical Diffusion Theory

The classical studies of diffusion have investigated the spread and adaptation of various innovations, such as medical techniques, boiled drinking water, church attendance, national sovereignty, consumer products, language, and hybrid corn (Strang and Meyer 1993; Rogers 1983). One of the well-known theoretical models is by Rogers (1983) who states that diffusion proceeds in a form of an S-shaped curve: after an initial slow phase
the innovation starts to spread apace until the mass of the potential adaptors is reached. This is followed by rapid deceleration.

The classical approach has been criticized of concentrating mostly on the rate of diffusion rather than the social conditions under which diffusion is likely to appear. According to the critics, it has regarded diffusion more mechanical and linearistic a process than it actually is. (e.g. Chabot 2002, 99; Giugni 2002, 18-19; Roggeband 2004; Strang and Meyer 1993; Strang and Soule 1998.)

Globalization and the Cross-national Diffusion of Social Movements

The process of globalization has entailed the growing internationalization and transnationalization of political action, including the civil society actors such as social movements. On the one hand, these actors are affected by transnational political issues and agendas, on the other hand by the national contexts that they operate in. These elements are interconnected: the global streams of political ideas are interpreted differently within different national contexts and traditions of political culture. (e.g. Ayres 2001; della Porta & Kriesi, 1999; Held & McGrew 2002; Miller 2004; Mittelman 2000) With regard to social movements, this development stimulates cross-national diffusion of ideas and practices, engendering parallel processes of mobilization.

Since the early theories of collective action that viewed diffusion processes within and between social movements as irrational, hazardous impulses, bearing resemblance to a contagion of a disease (e.g. Le Bon [1897], Tarde [1903], and Blumer [1939], the subject has regained academic attention only in the recent years. (Soule 2004; Snow & Benford 2000 ; Giugni 2002, 18-19.) However, the recent theorizing on social movement diffusion does not consider it as a social pathology (Soule 2004). In what follows, some of the central concepts of this new approach are presented.

Most studies on diffusion operate with following four categories: a transmitter (or: previous adopter), an adopter (or: potential adopter), an innovation, and a channel (through which the innovation spreads). (Soule and Zylan 1997, cited in Soule 2004).

The channels of diffusion can be divided to direct and indirect ones. Direct (or relational) diffusion takes place between organizations, groups or individuals interacting in direct contact with each other. The more intense and frequent this contact is, the higher the rate of diffusion. Networks of actors are one of the central facilitating factors in this type of diffusion. Indirect (or non-relational) diffusion takes place between organizations, groups or individuals that are not in direct interaction or contact with each other. In this case the ideas and practices diffuse through 1) a shared identification 2) cultural linkages or mass media that spread information about the actions of the transmitter to the adopter. (della Porta and Kriesi 1999; McAdam and Rucht 1993; Soule 2004.)
McAdam and Rucht (1993) observe that there has to be some sort of common identity between the transmitter and adopter also in the case of indirect diffusion. However, this identification can be rather narrow, for example that of being an activist. Tactics can be borrowed from other activist groups even though their agenda is not supported. Diffusion is even more likely to happen when there is an institutional equivalence between groups, i.e. both the transmitter and adopter are for example college students or trade union members.

Strang and Meyer (1993) note that indirect diffusion can be catalyzed by theorization, i.e. “the self-conscious development and specification of abstract categories and the formulation of patterned relationships such as chains of cause and effect”.

The concept of protest cycles introduced by Sidney Tarrow (1998) and elaborated by Ruud Koopmans (2004) is relevant to the discussion on diffusion, as it includes the assumption of the spread of movement frames and tactics within a cycle or, for Koopmans, wave of protest. The international waves of protests tend to develop as responses to major triggering events, such as the Chernobyl accident or the Vietnam War (della Porta and Kriesi 1999). McAdam (1995, cit. in Soule 2004) points out that the waves of protest are usually launched by initiator movements that set an example for spin-off movements at the national as well the cross-national level.

Reframing as a Part of the Diffusion Process

Snow and Benford (2000) use the concept of frame, originally introduced by Goffman (1974), as the groundwork for their idea of collective action frames. Both of these concepts refer to the process of interpretation in which meaning is constructed. However, collective action frames are designed not only to organize experience in a meaningful way, but to “mobilize potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystander support, and to demobilize antagonists” (Ibid., 614). According to Snow and Benford (2000, 615-617, 623; 2004, 400-404), collective action frames are created in discursive processes in which the frames are articulated and elaborated. They consist of core framing tasks, such as 1) diagnostic framing, i.e. the problem identification and the attributions, causality, and adversarial framing (the construction of the categories of proponents and opponents), and 2) prognostic: the proposed solutions for the identified problems and the plans for implementing them.

Drawing on their framework [sic], Snow and Benford (1999, 38) have incorporated the framing perspective into the diffusion theory. They note that “very little is likely to be diffused, especially across different socio-cultural contexts, without either alteration of the object of diffusion or alignment of aspects of the transmitting and adopting units” . . . “the object of diffusion is likely to be strategically modified and adapted to the host culture in the case of cross-cultural borrowing, and strategically tailored or fitted to the target culture in the case-of cross-cultural promotion.”
Also, Roggeband (2004, 161-162) emphasizes the significance of interpretation in diffusion processes. Borrowing a concept of strategic framing effort developed by Benford and Snow (2000, 624, 627), she observes that the current discussion underestimates the fact that “diffusion is not a simple process of receiving and adopting, but rather of interpreting, translating and adapting”.

The Third World Solidarity Movement of the 1960s

The mobilization for Third World Solidarity emerged in the context of the Cold War. In the latter half of the 1960s, the social and political conditions in the First World were relatively stable. The Second World was controlled by the Soviet Union, imposing a threat of military intervention to its satellite states. In the Third World, the social circumstances were extremely volatile. During the 1950s and 1960s, a revolution or an attempted revolution, a coup d'état by the military, or other kind of violent conflict took place. In most cases, the revolutionary efforts were manifested in guerrilla warfare in almost all the former colonies. In consequence, considerable number of these countries gained independence before the end of the 1960s. The United States strove to counteract the revolutionary movements by economic aid, propaganda and even military intervention. The best-known of these enterprises was the war in Vietnam in 1965-1975: a crusade that provoked extensive protests in the US as well as elsewhere in the world. (Hobsbawm 1999.)

The independence struggles of the former colonies were of great interest and inspiration to the left-wing radicalism that boomed in the First World. However, these guerrilla movements were not imitated, nor were the developed countries in a political situation verging on a coup d'état (France perhaps being an exception). The leftist radicalism surged in 1968 - a year of simultaneous protest in the United States, Japan and several Western European countries, as well as in Prague and Mexico City. The protest emanated from student movements, triggering also wide-ranging strikes among the workers. (Ibid.) Various issues such as apartheid, university policies, gender equality, environmental problems, the Vietnam War, and the North - South relations were addressed within this wave of protest.

Many of the protest movements were inspired by neo-Marxist theorization - an academic stream of discussion that kept its distance from the interpretation of Marxism practiced by the Soviet Union government. One of the central themes for this theorizing was the economic and political relationships between the North and South. The dependency theories, building on the Marxist tradition and the theory of imperialism by Lenin, argued that the poverty of the Third World countries is caused by their
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2 The concept of Third World is characterized by the context of the Cold War. In the current discussions the developing countries are usually referred to as the South or the Global South.
subordinate position in the system of international capitalism. The developed countries (the centre) set the terms for the international trade, creating a condition of structural exploitation and preventing the Third World (the periphery) from developing. (Kegley and Wittkopf 2001, 145-146.)

A common feature for the different variants of dependency theory is that they are critical towards modernization theories. However, the variants differ in their understanding of the definition of periphery, the mechanism of dependency and some other central concepts. What they share is the idea of asymmetrical structural dependency, that shapes the economic exchange between the First and the Third World. When the peripheries integrate into the world economy, the center redefines its socio-economic structure. Dependency theories are neo-Marxist in the sense that they take a revisionist approach to the classical concepts of Marxism. However, the Marxist idea that the mechanism of unjust dependency can be disestablished only by socialist revolution is preserved. (Østerud 1978, 74-96, 234.)

The protest wave of the of the late 1960s diffused also to Finland. The political counterculture was strong particularly within the student movement and various single-issue movements. The Finnish society was undergoing structural and cultural change, in which the homogenous national culture disintegrated, transforming into a more pluralist society. (Alapuro 1997.)

Sadankomitea (Committee of 100), a peace organization established in 1963 set an example for the various movements that emerged around it on the latter half of the 1960s. These movements brought forth novel issues such as gender roles, sexual politics, control politics, the Vietnam War, and the North-South question. (Siisiäinen 1990, 64-65.) This was the context of emergence for a Third World solidarity movement called Tricont, founded in Helsinki in September 1968.

In what follows the diffusion of the Third World Solidarity movement ideas from other countries to Finland are analyzed by exploring the Tricont movement. Then the diagnostic and prognostic dimensions of the collective action frame developed within Tricont are analyzed.

Tricont

The central goal of Tricont was to gather, publish and diffuse information about the Third World, addressing particularly the issue of structural mechanisms behind the problems of the developing countries.

The movement was divided into smaller groups with special interests, such as South America, the United States, China, the rest of Asia, Africa, Palestine, Afro-American solidarity, and imperialism and the interests of Finland. (Tricont’s annual report 1968-69; Tricont magazine 1/1969, 38.)

Tricont was active in publishing a magazine, brochures of various Third World countries, articles, and books. In addition, several presentations, briefings, seminars and
major events were organized. Also a service for subscription of foreign literature was established. The demand for the information produced by Tricont was intensive particularly in 1969. (Annual report 1968-69.) After the turn of the decade the movement started to wither and by the summer 1973 it was finished.

**Tricont's Direct Contacts to Foreign Movements**

In terms of formal organization, Tricont was not linked to other Finnish or foreign movements. However, there were contacts and co-operation. One of the important inspirations for Tricont was Unga filosofer, a Third World oriented group of students and researchers at the University of Stockholm. In 1968, the group started two journals, Häften för Kritiska Studier and Kommentar. The former one was a New Left-minded theoretical publication, the latter one less theoretical and more oriented towards the Third World issues. Both of these journals were actively read within Tricont. Moreover, Kommentar became a model for the Tricont magazine that was established in the beginning of the year 1969. (von Bonsdorff 1986, 254-255.) Members of the group also visited Helsinki in December 1968. One of the important links between the two groups was Jan Otto Andersson, a Finnish economist living in Stockholm. The interaction between Tricont and Unga filosofer was facilitated by the fact that many of the most central people in Tricont, such as Johan von Bonsdorff, Viveca Hedengren, and Peter Lodenius, were Finnish Swedes. (Interview with Jan Otto Andersson, 24 May, 2005.)

Tricont was influenced also by various foreign visitors who took part in the various events that the movement organized. Here only a few examples can be mentioned. In October 1968 John Gerassi, an editor of the American Ramparts magazine, visited Helsinki. Gerassi informed Tricont about the tactics of SDS in the United States and advised them to purchase a printing machine for producing publications, as the SDS in Boston had done. This idea was soon implemented. (von Bonsdorff 1986, 247.)

In November 1968 Tricont organized an event on Third World issues. The list of speakers included representatives of Third World liberation movements, as well as the editor of New Left Review, Perry Anderson, and the Belgian economist Ernest Mandel, one of the leaders of the Trotskyist international and an activist of May 1968 in Paris. (Mt., 247-251.)

In summer 1969 Tricont organized an event in which for example Andre Gunder Frank, one of the main developers of dependency theory, and the English sociologist Robin Blackburn (of the New Left Review) were invited as guest speakers (mt., 302-304).
Indirect contacts

Tricont considered itself a part of what was called “the anti-imperialist front”: an international alliance of socialist countries, workers' movement, Third World liberation movements, and the Western left-wing radicals. While the two first-mentioned were criticized for various reasons, the liberation movements (as well as the Western left-wing movements) were strongly identified with. (Tricont 12: Imperialismi ja opiskelijaliikehdinnät; Tricont 12: Uusi vallankumouksellinen internationaali.)

The people in Tricont followed the development of world politics with great interest. The movement had its own library to which the members as well as many outsiders donated books, dealing mostly with Third World issues. A large variety of journals, newspapers, and magazines were regularly subscribed—out of which 35 titles were of foreign. Furthermore, Tricont collected an archive of newspaper clippings. (Mäki 1998, 58.) Against this background it is clear that most of the members were well aware of both the events in world politics and the different protest movements at the time.

In addition, theoretical texts by, for example, Paul Baran, Paul Sweezy, Leo Huberman, and Harry Magdoff (who were central figures within the Monthly Review journal), and those of Perry Anderson and Robin Blackburn (in New Left Review) were actively studied, as well as the writings of André Gunder Frank, Franz Fanon, Che Guevara and Regis Debray. (Bonsdorff 1986, 254-255.)

These theoretical influences were adapted to the Finnish context, characterized by integrative and tolerant state policies. While the dependency theories implicated an idea of concrete and even violent revolutionary action, the left-wing radicalism in Finland, including Tricont, was peaceful. Compared to its West European counterparts, the Finnish radicalism was, particularly in the 1970s, characterized also by “Finlandization”. This was obviously related to the geopolitical position of the country. However, Tricont was an exception among these movements in that it adopted a rather critical stance towards the Soviet Union. This was possibly due to the strong influence from Western Europe and the focus on the Third World issues. (Interview with Jan Otto Andersson, 24.5. 2005.)

Diagnostic Framing

The diagnostic framing of Tricont was based on the problem identification articulated by dependency theories: the troubles of the Third World were attributed to an asymmetrical dependency in which the developed countries profit from the subordinate
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3 For an account on Third World Solidarity movements in Germany, see Rucht 2000.
position of the developing countries. This way of “keeping the Third World underdeveloped” was seen as an inherent feature of the capitalist world economy. Therefore, according to Tricont, “only the anti-capitalist, revolutionary and socialist solutions have in the long run been progressive”. (Johdatusta kolmannen maailman ongelmien; Uusi vallankumouksellinen internationaali; Imperialismi ja opiskelijalikehinnät; Tricont magazine 1/1969 editorial Mitä nyt, TRICONT.)

Albeit the focus of interest was decidedly in the Third World issues, the dependency theories were applied also in the Finnish context: the industrialized Southern part of Finland was seen to exploit the less developed Eastern and Northern part of the country (see e.g. Tricont magazine (2/69, 31-34).

Prognostic Framing

The prognostic framing of Tricont was focused on producing information about the Third World issues, especially the structural mechanisms behind the poverty problem. This goal must be understood in relation with the strong enlightenment optimism within the movement: an idea that the perceived injustice was fundamentally due to lack of knowledge and could be straightened by producing and spreading information. (Tricont’s declaration of agenda.)

Tricont campaigned against the development aid provided by the government, as well as the development loans that were regarded as being motivated by the Western commercial interests. The aid was considered useless or even harmful, enforcing the prevailing structures of dependency. (Ibid; Johdatusta kolmannen maailman ongelmien.) Instead of granting development aid and loans, the Third World was supposed to be helped by supporting the revolutionary liberation movements, such as the FNL in Vietnam (Tricont Magazine 2/1971, 30).

Tricont was highly sceptical also towards the international projects of economic and political integration, such as the EEC, IMF, GATT, OECD and EFTA, because they were regarded as fortifying the harmful tendencies included in the capitalist system. (see e.g. Tricont magazine 5-6/1971.)

Globalization and the Rise of the Global Justice movement

The Global Justice Movement became known to the general public at the time of the massive protests in Seattle, where nearly 50 000 people gathered to criticize the World Trade Organization (WTO) policies in November 1999. However, earlier mobilization, particularly the Zapatista movement in Mexico (since 1994), and the international campaign against the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (1997 onwards) can be regarded as a prelude to the world-wide wave of protest that emerged at the turn of the millennium. (Johnston and Laxer 2003; Klein 2001; Seoane and Taddei 2002.)
The protests in Seattle were followed by demonstrations taking place in Washington D.C., April 2000, in the context of the meeting of the IMF and the World Bank. The same institutions were targeted next September in Prague, coinciding with the protests against the World Economic Forum in Melbourne, Australia. In the summer 2001 the wave of protest continued in Genoa and Gothenburg.

After the extensive street demonstrations the protest found a new form in the World Social Forum, an annual meeting that was organized for the first time in January 2001 in Porto Alegre, Brazil. The WSF is a forum of discussion and a global network for the various organizations active in the Global Justice Movement, striving to innovate alternatives for the neo-liberal policies. (for a more detailed account of the genealogy of the GJM, see e.g. Johnston and Laxer 2003; Klein 2001; Seoane and Taddei 2002.)

The problems addressed by the Global Justice Movement have been subject also to academic theorizing, as well as various journalistic accounts. One of the most renowned academic writers is Pierre Bourdieu, who in his book Contre-feux (1998) tries to articulate the problems inherent in the global neo-liberal economy, as well as possible solutions. A similar type of effort has been made also by Ulrich Beck in his book Was ist Globalisierung? (1997) and Zygmunt Bauman in Globalization. The Human Consequences (1998). Important journalistic contributions are for example No Logo: Taking Aim at the Brand Bullies (2000) by Naomi Klein, When Corporations Rule the World by David C. Korten (1996, 1996, 2001), and Die Globalisierungsfall. Der Angriff auf Demokratie und Wohlstand by Hans-Peter Martin and Harald Schumann (1998).

Also the writings by activists and politically active academics like Walden Bello, Subcomandante Marcos, José Bové, Arundhati Roy, Vandana Shiva, Bernard Cassen, Susan George, Michael Hardt & Antonio Negri, Joseph Stiglitz, Lori Wallach, and Noam Chomsky have been of great inspiration to the various branches of the Global Justice Movement. (see e.g. a collection of these activist writings in Mertes 2004).

The Emergence of Attac

The Attac movement was founded in France in 1998 as a response to an editorial Désarmer les marchés by Ignacio Ramonet in Le Monde Diplomatique (12/1997). According to Ramonet, the globalization of finance capital has been implemented in a way that has created a severe democracy deficit:

---

4 Due to the deregulation of the financial markets and the new instruments provided by the information technology, the international monetary system has integrated strongly since the latter half of the 1970s. In the beginning of the 1980s the scale and pace of liberalization started to increase in an unparalleled way. This "neo-liberal turn" originated when Margaret Thatcher, Ronald Reagan, Helmut Kohl, and the Liberal Democratic Party in Japan started to collaborate, implementing a vast array of neo-liberal policies, launching a trend that soon diffused to various other countries, including Finland. (Naefiger 1997, 110-111.)
The hurricane that has hit the money markets in Asia poses a threat to the rest of the world. The globalization of investment capital is causing universal insecurity. It makes a mockery of national boundaries and diminishes the power of states to uphold democracy and guarantee the wealth and prosperity of their peoples. Financial globalization is a law unto itself and it has established a separate supranational state with its own administrative apparatus, its own spheres of influence, its own means of action. That is to say the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the World Trade Organization (WTO). These four powerful institutions are unanimous in singing the praises of "market values", a view faithfully echoed by most of the major organs of the media. This artificial world state is a power with no base in society. It is answerable instead to the financial markets and the mammoth business undertakings that are its masters. The result is that the real states in the real world are becoming societies with no power base. And it is getting worse all the time. (Ramonet, Ignacio: Désarmer les marchés. [Disarm the Markets]. Le Monde diplomatique. 12/1997.)

In order to counteract these tendencies, Ramonet suggested that an international tax on currency transactions, an idea developed by Nobel-winning economist James Tobin, should be implemented. Other useful reforms should be the disestablishing of tax havens, increasing the taxation of capital income and democratizing the international economic institutions such as the WTO. (Ibid.) Finally, Ramonet proposed that an international non-governmental organisation, "Association pour une taxation des transactions financières pour l'aide aux citoyens" (ATTAC) should be established.

Attac France was officially founded June 3, 1998 (Cassen 2003). The founding members consisted mostly of organizations, such as trade unions, civic associations, newspapers and magazines. The individual members were mainly public intellectuals, e.g. René Dumont, Ignacio Ramonet, Viviane Forrester, Susan George, Gisèle Halimi, René Passet, and musician Manu Chao. (Ancelovici 2002, 440; Waters 2004, 859.) By October 1998, the amount of members had added up to 3,500, now including also large numbers of individual citizens. By 2003 Attac France had 30,000 members. (Cassen 2003.)

The movement diffused rapidly. By the beginning of the year 2003, the movement was active in 50 countries in Europe, Canada, South America, Africa, Australia, Asia, and Canada with altogether 80,000 members. Attac has diffused particularly strongly to the French and Spanish speaking former colonies. The different branches share the agenda of their French parent organization. However, there are differences in the emphasis between countries (Ronkainen 2003, 86-87.)

Attac's Diffusion to Finland: Direct contacts

The idea for Attac Finland was born when Johan von Bonsdorff and Mikael Böök attended the founding meeting of Attac Sweden in January 2001. Both of them had been politically active already in the 1960s, Bonsdorff for example being the ideological and theoretical dynamo of Tricont, and Böök the contact person in Finland for the
Häften för Kritiska Studier, one of the journals established by the Unga filosofer group. (Interview with Mikael Böök, May 26, 2005.)

The first preparatory meeting in which Attac Finland was planned was held in Helsinki on January 24, 2001. The organization was officially established a few months later in Helsinki, on May 19-20, 2001. By the year 2002 the movement had approximately 2,000 members. Unlike in France, where considerable part of the Attac members (particularly the founding ones) are organizations, such as trade unions or civic associations, Attac Finland consists entirely of individual members.

Since Attac Finland is part of an international organization, the direct influence from the parent organization, is extremely strong in terms of both agenda and practices. Attac Finland maintains contacts to its sister organizations by taking part in the international meetings of the movement, such as Attac Europe meetings, the European Social Forum and the World Social Forum. (Strategy statement of the Attac Finland board 2002.)

Indirect contacts

The development of information technologies and the considerable growth of the mass media have scaled up the potential for diffusion by indirect contacts. This is the case also with Attac: the internet as a means of diffusing ideas and knowledge is central in this movement. (Waters 2004, 866).

In Attac Finland, many of the initial core group members were interested in the French political scene and readers of Le Monde Diplomatique. Thus, by the year of 2001, the establishment of the international Attac and the discussion about the Tobin tax as well as the other goals of the movement were familiar to the Finnish activists. This prepared ground for Attac Finland. (Interview with Mikael Böök, May 26, 2005.)

In his article about the development of Attac in Germany, Felix Kolb argues that the rapid and massive growth of the movement in the latter half of 2001 (after eighteen months of initial non-popularity) was caused by the extensive media attention that was related to the demonstrations against the EU summit in Gothenburg and the G7 summit in Genoa in summer 2001. (Kolb 2005.)

Attac Finland was subject to corresponding circumstances in terms of media attention that covered both the demonstrations abroad as well the activities of Attac Finland. Also the amount of members increased in a way comparable to the German case. This suggests that a process congruent with Kolb’s findings in Germany probably took place also in Finland.

The academic, journalistic and pamphlet writings concerning the Global Justice Movement (described above) form a vast body of literature. However, it seems that only a very limited part of this discussion is of relevance to Attac Finland. Looking at the
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5 In March 2005 the number of members was little more than 1,000 members (www.attac.fi).
publications of the movement, the references to theoretical writings are quite rare. The authors cited are mostly restricted to James Tobin, the inventor of the Tobin tax, and a duo of Attac France intellectuals: Susan George and Bernard Cassen. This is a striking difference compared to Tricont, whose publications were full of references to a large set of theoretical influences. In addition, not only the quantity, but also the type of references is different. While Tricont applied the type of theories that for the most part could be described as grand theory (neo-Marxist macrostructural explanations of large social processes), the references in Attac Finland materials are to middle-range theory, such as the theory concerning the implementation of the Tobin tax.

Furthermore, it should be noted that compared to Attac France, the role of theory within Attac Finland is clearly more exiguous. This is probably related to the tradition of ‘Finlandization’ in the 1970s: due to the geopolitical position of Finland, the interpretation of Marxism took forms that conformed to the agenda of the Soviet government, and, unlike their counterparts in many other West European countries, did not develop Marxist thinking critical to the Soviet interpretation. Thus, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, attitudes towards leftist social theorizing turned very sceptical, expressing a counter-reaction to the unreflectiveness of the Finlandization era. (Alapuro 1997.)

Diagnostic framing

According Marcos Ancelovici’s study on Attac France (2002), the debate over the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, and particularly the 1995 public sector strikes in France were an important contextual factor regarding the emergence of Attac. These preceding events contributed to the development a framework that Ancelovici calls the politics against global markets frame, adopted also by Attac France. This frame contradicts the democratic state structures and civil society actors with the market forces that are regarded as undemocratic. (Ancelovici 2002, 431-436, 446.)

The diagnostic frame of Attac Finland is congruent with the politics against global markets frame. However, the contextual factors that have increased the resonance potential for this frame are partly different than those in France. The deregulation of economy that has taken place in Finland since the 1980s in the wake of the neo-liberal trend in Europe has opened the country for flows of foreign capital, free trade, and competition. In the latter half of the 1980s Finland was experiencing an extremely strong economic boom. The decade ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union, which for Finland meant a decrease in the Eastern trade and a significant change in the geopolitical position of the country. In the first half of the 1990s Finland suffered a severe depression, which led the major political parties, acting somewhat by general consent, to start cutting down the public services. (Siisäinen 2003, 52-53, 55.) In the latter half of the 1990s the national economy recovered. However, the downsizing of the
public services continued. This development was one of the contextual factors that made the politics against the global markets frame resonant in Finland.

The declaration of agenda of Attac Finland is almost exactly similar to that of the parent organization. The declaration states that Attac Finland opposes the neoliberal conception according to which the social development should be left to be guided by the “invisible hand” of the market. According to Attac, this sort of policy corrodes the principles of democracy and equality, causing increasing poverty and inequality at the local as well as the global level. The liberalization of economy without adequate political regulation has created a situation in which the power that should be used by citizens in a democratic system is now used by market forces. (Platform of Attac Finland, 2001.)

Attac Finland strongly stresses that it does not oppose globalization as such, but aims at creating alternatives for the present neo-liberal form of economic globalization. (www.attac.fi)

Prognostic framing

The main goals of Attac Finland are the implementation of the Tobin tax, closing down the tax havens, and the annulment of the debts of the developing countries. In addition, the movement has campaigned for instance against the US wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, for the democratization of the global economic institutions such as the WTO, and against the implementation of GATS (General Agreement on Trade in Services). Lately, it has commented the EU constitution proposal, stating that some parts of it are in contradiction with Attac’s goals, and suggesting that a referendum should be organized. (www.attac.fi.)

Concerning the domestic issues, Attac has campaigned against the cutting of public services and social security, and privatization of the state-owned companies. (Mikä Attac [What Attac] brochure.)

The prognostic framing of Attac emphasizes the interconnectedness between the global economic processes the local/national level problems. The common denominator of the movement’s main goals is the idea that the global economy should be regulated by implementation of inter-governmental treaties and strong parliamentary democracy within the nation-states, completed with active civic participation.

In her study on Attac France, Sarah W aters (2004) concludes that the political success of the movement is largely due the intellectual elite that has mobilized its expertise and influence for political ends. Intellectuals have had a central role in Attac France both as leaders of the movement as well as members of a scientific council that was established to produce research and publications. A considerable part of the original members of the council were economists who were opposed to the prevailing neo-liberal
paradigm. Bernard Cassen, one of the movement’s leaders, has characterized Attac as “action-oriented movement of popular education”, emphasizing the movement’s aim to produce counter-expertise that is then diffused to the general public (Cassen 2003, 3). Attac Finland has adopted Cassen’s description. Similarly with its parent organization, it pursues to produce, popularize and diffuse information. The role of intellectuals and other highly educated members is central, but perhaps in a less pronounced than in France. Attac Finland has not established a scientific council, nor has produced scientific publications of its own. (www.attac.fi) This difference is probably related also to the differences in size and volume between the countries, as well as to the special status that the intellectuals traditionally have in the French political culture—a phenomenon that has no direct counterpart in other European countries (Waters 2004, 862).

Probably the most important academic figure within Attac Finland is Heikki Patomäki, an active member of the board and former chair of the movement, Professor of International Relations at the University of Helsinki, and the Research Director of NIGD, the Network Institute for Global Democratisation. Patomäki has published extensively on several issues closely related to the goals of Attac, such as the implementation of the Tobin Tax and democratic transformation of the global institutions (see. e.g. Patomäki 2001; 2004).

The Cross-temporal Diffusion

In the preceding sections Tricont and Attac movements were examined as parts of international waves of protest, with special emphasis on direct and indirect processes of diffusion. It was showed that Attac Finland can be regarded as a spin-off movement, initiator movement being Attac France (or, in the large scale, the Global Justice Movement). However, it seems that there are elements in Attac Finland’s framing that were articulated already by Tricont. In what follows the relationship between the two Finnish movements is examined, concluding that both direct and indirect diffusion has taken place between them. It is argued that diffusion between movements that operate in one geographical place but are temporally distant can be analyzed applying the concepts that have hitherto been limited to the study of cross-national diffusion.

---

6 In addition to the web materials and brochures, Attac Finland has published (in collaboration with various publishing companies) a few books. First of these was a Attac. Ruohonjuuritason kapina markkinavoimia vastaan [Attac. A Grassroot Revolt against the Market], a translation of a text by Swedish journalist Birg Clini (2001) with a preface by Eeva Luhtakallio. After that a collection of articles under the title M ikä on A ttac? [W hat is A ttac?] (2002) by Finnish Attac activists was published (edited by Rosa Meriläinen). Also a book by Attac France leader Susan George have been translated and published: M aailman kauppajärjestö kuriin (2003) [Remette l’OMC à sa place, 2001].
Direct contacts

The most important direct contact between Tricont and Attac was journalist Johan von Bonsdorff, the founding member and ideological primus motor for both movements. Jan Otto Andersson, an important link between Unga filosofer group and and Tricont is also a founding member and former chair of Attac. Mikael Böök, a founding and probably one of the most active members in Attac Finland, was not an actual member of Tricont, but nevertheless the contact person of Häften för Kritiska Studier in Finland, and a close friend of Bonsdorff’s.

According to a survey data on members of Attac Finland, nine of the 1096 respondents said that they were members of Tricont as well. As 46 per cent of the total of members (2546) took part in the survey, it can be estimated that the number of people active in both movements is probably close to twenty. (Järvelä and Luhtakallio 2002, 21).

Indirect contacts

Both Tricont and Attac focus on the relationship between global economic processes and local/national conditions, with special emphasis on the North–South issues. Both concern themselves with the problems of poverty and inequality, particularly of developing countries. While Tricont regarded those problems as inherent features of capitalism, and therefore solvable only by fundamental change in the system (i.e. through revolution), Attac Finland supports democratically regulated market economy.

Both movements share the conception that poverty in developing countries is related to the structure of the world economy. This system is beneficial to the developed countries and global elites. However, it produces increasing poverty and inequality both between (the affluent North vs. the poor South) and within countries.

Attac Finland calls for democratization of international economic institutions and opposes their current neo-liberal policies. Also Tricont was critical of the GATT (presently called the WTO) and the IMF, because their policies were considered harmful to the developing countries. Both movements have also campaigned against US military interventions: Tricont the one in Vietnam, Attac the ones in Afghanistan and Iraq.

To some extent there is institutional equivalence between the movements. Tricont had approximately 200 active members, out of which 120 were students. (Mäki 1998, 53.) While only 25 percent of Attac members are full-time students, 44 percent

---

7 von Bonsdorff passed away in March 2003.
8 Andersson is a Professor of Economics at the Åbo Akademi in Turku, Finland.
have academic degree and 65 percent have studied at a university (Järvelä & Luhtakallio 2002, 7, 10-11). This suggests that the average level of education is quite high in both movements. This is presumably related to the rather academic nature of the issues addressed.

In short, both Tricont and Attac are globally oriented left-wing civic movements concerned with economic issues. Their base of members is highly educated and urban. Both sexes are quite evenly represented. (Järvelä & Luhtakallio 2002)

As has already been noted, the innovations rarely diffuse cross-nationally without being reframed to fit the adopter's context (Snow and Benford 1999, 38). The same principle applies to the process of cross-temporal diffusion: the influence from the past is interpreted according to the present context. In the case of diffusion from Tricont to Attac Finland, several major changes regarding the context have to be taken into account.

The social and political experiment of socialism strongly characterized the 20th century creating a geopolitical and ideological divide. The collapse of socialism meant, besides major changes in the international relations and economy, a radical reconstitution of the political imagery. While Tricont operated in the context of the Cold War, in which the tension between the two camps created the frames of political thought, Attac emerged in a situation in which the liberal democracy and market economy do not seem to have legitimate alternatives. (Castells 2000, 61; Hirst & Thompson 1996; 6; see also Olesen 2004.)

Despite the similarities in their orientation, the different historical contexts shape the diagnostic and prognostic framing of Tricont and Attac. This is reflected at various levels. For instance, producing information and counter-expertise is a central tactic for both, but Attac lacks the strong enlightenment optimism that Tricont had. On the other hand, Attac is able to utilise technological resources, such as the internet, that did not exist in the 1960s. To pick another example, both movements address the issue of development aid. Albeit they share the conviction that the developing countries should be helped, they arrive at opposite conclusions about whether aid should be granted.

Probably the most important reframing effect concerns the role and content of social theory within the movements. While Tricont was influenced by the kind of theories that could be described as grand theory, Attac Finland utilizes predominantly middle-range theory contributions, such as the theory concerning the implementation of the Tobin tax.

While dependency theories implicate the idea of socialist revolution, Attac Finland's theories deal only with limited practical issues, embracing the prevailing system of parliamentary democracy and market economy, suggesting only rather minor reforms. At the same time, Attac Finland is conscious of the legacy of the movements of the 1960s and 1970s. To this legacy it wants to keep a reflective distance:
Those who possibly think that they are mobilizing people towards a political revolution are wrong. They are captivated by the ideologies of the 20th century. Attac does not aim to abolish parliamentary democracy and replace it with some other polity (what could that polity be?) On the contrary, the political goal of Attac is to defend, strengthen and further development of democracy. (Mikael Böök in Hiekanjyväät 12.10.2001.)

This change in orientation is related to the fact that Marxist ideology and theorization experienced a severe inflation along with the collapse of the Soviet Union. The academic critique of capitalism is still somewhat influenced by the tradition, but the socialist system currently prevails only in a handful of countries. (Gilpin 2001, 13.) In his book End of Millennium (2000) Manuel Castells (a former Marxist himself) states that the most important lesson that has been learned (of the collapse of the socialist camp) is that the theoretical writings and the implementations of political projects should be kept separate. According to Castells, theories can be useful tools for understanding that may, when necessary, be switched or redesigned. When theories are regarded as schemata that should be executed verbatim, political fundamentalism and dictatorships emerge.(ibid., 63.) It seems that this kind of reframing has taken place between Tricont and Attac as well, and is one of the central factors explaining the change in the role of social theory within the two movements.

Conclusion

In this paper the diffusion of two global waves of protest to Finland has been examined. Tricont, being part of the international Third World Solidarity Movement of the 1960s, was strongly affected by dependency theories. However, this foreign theoretical influence was adapted to the Finnish context: despite the revolutionary ideas inherent in the theory, Tricont (similarly with other Finnish movements of its time) was completely peaceful and non-violent in its practices.

Attac movement, one of the actors of the present Global Justice Movement, originated in France in 1998 and diffused to Finland in 2001. While Attac Finland is intensely affected by its parent organization, the movement has its national characteristics, such as the lesser role of social theory in the construction of political agenda.

It has been showed that both direct and indirect diffusion has taken place, not only between the studied Finnish movements and their foreign counterparts, but also from Tricont to Attac Finland. Consequently, it has been argued that diffusion between movements that act in one geographical place but are temporally distant can be examined by utilizing the concepts that have so far been applied only when studying cross-national diffusion.

The significance of taking the process of cross-temporal or historical diffusion into account is related to the purpose of understanding the complex nature of politics of our
globalizing era. Despite the emergence of political issues that are increasingly transnational - and the fact that the current global political system is defined by intricate relationships between various different actors, such as the nation-states, economic institutions, social movements, inter-governmental organizations, quasi-supranational institutions like the European Union, and multinational corporations (Held et al. 1999, 50-58), it is essential not to forget the importance of the antecedent forms of political action and tradition that still shape the characteristics of the present contentions. Thus, in order to fully comprehend the formation of political ideas, practices, and relations in the current situation, both the cross-national and the cross-temporal processes of diffusion should be explored.
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