

## **DIFFUSION OF THE "ANTI-GLOBALIZATION" MASTER FRAME TO LEFT-WING POLITICAL PARTIES AND SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: THE CASE OF UKRAINE**

*The article is devoted to the analysis of the master frame of the anti-globalization movement and to the investigation of the results of diffusion process on the framing of two Ukrainian cases: the youth branch of the Communist Party of Ukraine - Lenin's Communist Union of the Youth of Ukraine and Trotskyist group "Robitnychi Sprotyv" ("Workers' Resistance"), which represent two different types of incorporation of the anti-globalization master frame. I show that the outcome of its diffusion is determined by the structure of political opportunities (particularly by the presence or absence of powerful allies) and by the availability of direct ties with the activists of anti-globalization movement.*

As it is nowadays recognized by the majority of scholars, globalization is not something single or unified but it is rather a set of different processes running with different tempo, affecting different phenomena and resulting in different outcomes for different groups. Moreover, one hardly will deny that these globalizing processes may be contradictory to each other. After mass protests in Seattle in 1999 it became obvious that they also imply the globalization of resistance to neoliberal globalization. Mittelman uses the Polanyian notion of the double movement regarding globalization to underscore that fact that resistance is its indispensable part since global free

market, disembedded from society and culture, is an unrealizable and dangerous Utopia [1]. The progress of neoliberal globalization is inevitably leading to emergence and development of counter-movements.

What became known as the anti-globalization movement in the West is only the most noticeable part of globalization counter-movements. Protests in the South are comparably numerous, although they may take a different form [2]. What are the manifestations of the counter-movement in the former Second World? Consider, for example, the former parts of the Soviet Union, particularly Ukraine.

Social transformation towards market economy included industrial restructuring, privatization, increasing of the unemployment rate and actual decrease in welfare expenditures. These were the main reasons of so called "left renaissance" after the official dissolution and ban of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in 1991 [3]. In 1994 successor parties of CPSU (including Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU) and Socialist Party of Ukraine (SPU)) actually won parliamentary elections by getting 43 % of seats [4]. Besides, democratization of political regime allowed different extra-parliamentary left-radical groups and movements to emerge, including Trotskyist, Maoist, and anarchist ones. Obviously, they also negated the direction of the transformation and can be considered together with parliamentary parties as the part of the counter-movement corresponding to neoliberal globalization.

Thus, the counter-movement is not a unified whole [5]. Like the globalization itself, it is highly fragmented and may also contain some contradictory elements. Thereby the question about the interrelation between different parts of the counter-movement arises, particularly the question about the cultural exchange between movements from the North and movements from the South, including diffusion of collective action frames, symbols and ideologies. This problem is obviously under-researched as both the phenomenon of anti-globalization and the topic of diffusion in the social movements sphere are relatively new [6]. Probably the only exception is the article by Couch who investigates the diffusion of the cultural elements of Zapatista movement to anti-globalization movements of the North [7]. The diffusion between parts of the counter-movement in Western and Eastern Europe was hardly ever researched.

In this article I am going to examine the influence of the master frame of the anti-globalization movement on the left-wing movements and parties in Ukraine [8]. I will show that the outcome of its diffusion will be determined by the structure of political opportunities (particularly by the presence or absence of powerful allies) and by the availability of direct ties with the activists of anti-globalization movement.

In the first part of the article I will draw a theoretical framework based on the theories of framing and diffusion processes. The second part is devoted to examining the anti-globalization movement and its master frame. In the third part I will investigate the results of diffusion process on the framing of two Ukrainian cases using their web-sites as the sources for frame reconstruction: the youth branch of CPU - Lenin's Communist Union of the Youth of Ukraine (LKSMU) and Trotskyist group "Robitnychi Spro-

tyv" ("Workers' Resistance" (WR)), which represent two different types of incorporation of the anti-globalization master frame.

### **Theoretical framework: master frame and diffusion**

The term "collective action frame" refers to "action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of a social movement organization" [9]. Here lies the assumption that collective action (including social movement) is not a phenomenon of everyday life for the majority of people; therefore, there must exist some explanation in culturally relevant terms to justify necessity of joining a mass action or becoming a member of a social movement organization (SMO). Mobilization of people to a social movement demands description of the current situation as unjust ("diagnostic framing"), providing them with explanation how it is possible to change this situation ("prognostic framing") and motivating them to join the social movement or devote some resources for its goals ("motivational framing") [10]. The process of framing is not limited to collective action field; it is a part of our everyday interaction. It means that social movements are confronting the problem of "frame alignment", i. e. "the linkage of individual and SMO interpretive orientations, such that some set of individual interests, values and beliefs and SMO activities, goals and ideology are congruent and complementary" [11].

Master frames play the same role as single movement-specific frames but only for a larger scale [12]. It was observed long ago that protests tend to cluster in time and space. Tarrow introduced the concept of the cycles of protest by which he means aggregates of partly-autonomous and partly-interdependent episodes of collective action in which new forms of action emerge and evolve, a social movement sector grows and changes in its composition, and new political opportunities develop, in part as the result of the actions, themes and, outcomes of the early movements in the cycle [13]. Snow and Benford linked the concept of master frame to the concept of the cycle of protest arguing that the former determines the emergence and shape of the latter, i. e. "master frames affect the cyclicity and clustering of social movement activity" [14].

Diffusion was for a long time neglected process in the theory of social movements [15], but without this notion the very idea of cycles of protest is unintelligible. The cycle of protest presupposes expansion of protest collective activity beyond group and territorial boundaries. Concerning the question of

this article, it is important to specify the conditions under which the diffusion (for example, of master frame) is expected to take place. McAdam proposed the general model. First of all the experience of using a master frame by the "initiator" movement must be successful - it encourages subsequent movements to follow it. The other necessary conditions are availability of information and attribution of similarity of subsequent movements to the initiator one, which "makes the actions and ideas of innovator relevant to the adopter" [16]. These conditions can be created by mass media, but McAdam argues that direct ties with innovator movement participants are much more effective [17].

Snow and Benford made an important modification to application of diffusion theory emphasizing the constructed nature of "attribution of similarity" [18]. It is not only defined by the similar structural position of two movements between which it is expected that diffusion may take place (for example, the same structure of political opportunities as in models of Oberschall [19] or Giugni [20]). It is socially constructed or "at least influenced by constructionist processes such as framing" [21]. Moreover, the objects of diffusion rarely are transmitted without any modification; they are "framed behaviorally or linguistically so as to enhance the prospect of their resonance with the host or target culture" [22].

Below I will apply the concepts of master frame and diffusion to the anti-globalization movement on the North and expansion of its rhetoric to Ukraine.

### **"The" anti-globalization movement and its master frame**

Usually the birth of the anti-globalization movement is reckoned from the mass protests in Seattle in November-December 1999 against the meeting of the WTO, which was intended as a key moment in expanding its role [23]. Nevertheless, it is well known and recognized that numerous protests against policy of IMF, WTO and World Bank happened and social movements against neoliberal globalization emerged some time before the "Battle in Seattle". The most famous predecessors are considered to be the Zapatista uprising in Mexico in 1994 and the campaigns of protests against the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) in 1997-1998 [24].

The Battle in Seattle is regarded as the crucial point in the development of the movement because it was the first time when different anti-globalization groups of different structures (from networks to formal organizations [25]) and different ideologies (the Old Left, trade unions, environmentalists and anarchist groups) united in one protest. From this

point media and activists began to talk about *the* anti-globalization movement. However, it is necessary to move beyond labeling by media and self-identification by movement participants to identify the anti-globalization master frame, because important framing diversity may be hidden behind apparently unified label or identity. As Levi and Olson noticed, "the media, protestors, and governmental officials tout the Battle in Seattle as a turning point, but in what direction the movement is turning and who composes the movement coalition remain uncertain" [26].

There are a large variety of ideologies inside anti-globalization movements. Amory Star counts fifteen different ideological positions (including anarchism, pacifists and human rights, land reform, environmentalism, socialism, and religious nationalism) which are present in the anti-corporate struggle (quoted in [27]). The most often mentioned ideological lines cutting across "the" anti-globalization movement are the attitude towards capitalism, which relates to the goals and which separates more reform-oriented organizations from more radical anti-capitalist ones [28], and attitude towards the nation states as a tool in the struggle against neoliberal globalization, which relates to movements' strategy [29]. The latter ideological line separates Old Left political parties aiming to capture and strengthen the power of nation-states against global capital and US-"imperialism" from more anarchist movements and organization: as Hardt and Negri claimed, "it is a grave mistake to harbor any nostalgia for the powers of the nation-state or to resurrect any politics that celebrates the nation" [30]. Besides, some organizations and movements, for example ATTAC (the Association for the Taxation of Financial Transaction for the Aid of Citizens), combine seemingly contradictory "faith in grass-roots democracy and state interventionism" [31]. The divergence about the possibility of violent tactics is also often mentioned as a "dilemma" of "the" anti-globalization movement [32]. Such ideological diversity obviously leads to significant differences in the content and form of movements' activity, organization, and collective action frames.

Taking into account all this variety inside "the" anti-globalization movement, I support the refusal of some scholars to term the anti-globalization protests as an integral social movement [33]. Its apparent unity was produced partially by mass media that expanded the negative label "antiglobalist" onto all participants of the "Battle in Seattle" and subsequent mass protests against institutions of global governance. Partially it was produced by the activists who were in euphoria after the victory in Seattle won with the joint operations, but also these activists were

highly interested to show unity as a sign of their power and strength, although reluctantly accepting the "antiglobalist" label.

However, even unified identification with "the" movement is much less sustained now as it was in 1999 and 2000. The changing attitude of the radical antiglobalists towards World Social Forums (WSF) is a good illustration of this trend. The WSFs in Porto Alegre, Brazil, originally designed as an alternative to World Economic Forum in Davos, could provide the site for discussions on visions and programs, exchange of experience, supporting commitment and solidarity between anti-globalization movements and organizations from all over the world, and in the long-run perspective for elaboration of the counter-hegemonic project. Naomi Klein's comment: "thousands of groups today... [that are] all working against forces whose common thread is what might broadly be described as the privatization of every aspect of life, and the transformation of every activity and value into a commodity" [34] was very typical for that time.

However, because of ideological differences of the Forums' participants and because of certain internal problems with democracy (forums lacked transparency of decision-making, their leaders were unknown to the majority of participants and activists, the danger of new hierarchies emerged [35]), already the second WSF in 2002 was perceived as "sharply polarized" by its radical wing [36]. As a result of this a series of publications in radical anti-globalization media appeared dividing anti-globalization movement into two parts: traditional Left, which "hijacked" the Forum [37], and the majority of radical activists. For example, Michael Hardt, distinguishes anti-globalization (defending nation-state against neoliberalism) and democratic globalization (opposing national solutions and pursuing alternative globalization, alter-globalization) movements. The first one is supported by traditional, centralized organizations (parties and some NGOs) which occupied the most visible and dominant spaces at WSFs. The alter-globalization position is supported by decentralized social movements and the majority of the membership of centralized non-governmental organizations [38]. In November 2003 this divergence resulted in parallel alternative anti-globalization events in Paris: the more or less traditional European Social Forum and more radical and anarchist Libertarian Social Forum.

Thus, if it is only possible to talk about "the" anti-globalization master frame then it should be li-

imited only to the "diagnostic" part. It may sound trivial but what really unites all the diverse anti-globalization movements is just "anti-globalization" - rejection of the neoliberal turn in economic policy which began in the 1970s and in different degree touched all the countries in the world. A variety of grievances are framed as being the results of one cause. Besides, it is necessary to situate a particular movement in relation to the image of the unified anti-globalization movement as it was in significant extent created and maintained by mass media. Below I will describe the framing strategies of two Ukrainian cases referring to globalization and the anti-globalization movement.

### Diffusion to Ukraine<sup>1</sup>

In Lenin's Communist Union of the Youth of Ukraine (LKSMU) framing the concepts of "globalization" and "neoliberalism" are set into subordinate position in relation to the notion of "imperialism", which is more common in Marxism-Leninism. Moreover, neoliberal globalization is not even considered to be something qualitatively different from traditional imperialism; NW unambiguously equates these two terms [39], even blaming "globalization" for bringing confusion into terminology [40]. Contemporary Ukraine is framed as a victim of the imperialist policy of the USA, global capital and transnational financial institutions, who use the Ukrainian state elite for promoting their interests. NW draws clear parallels with the "analogous" situation in the countries on the South, for example, in Argentina [41]. The most often mentioned concrete issue of critique is the new wars in Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq, which obviously are set to be "imperialist" ones [42; 43; 44; 45]. NW also tries to frame certain specific interests of youth as threatened by US imperialism, for instance, protesting against more strict policy in relation to producers of "pirate" CDs, since its realization will substantively increase prices of software [46; 47].

The attitude towards the anti-globalization movement is more controversial. For the whole period examined NW posted 9 messages about antiglobalist protests and 2 messages on WSFs. All of them have purely informational content. The analysis of the only "analytical" article [48] can explain this neglect. The anti-globalization movement is criticized for consisting of too many anarchists and reformists. NW repeats media stereotypes about antiglobalists ascribing to

<sup>1</sup> Reconstruction of antiglobalist framing of LKSMU is based on discourse analysis of the contents of the web-version of the newspaper "Novaia Volna" ("New Wave" (NW), <http://nw.com.ua>) for the period from 2001 till 2003. Analysis of WR's framing is based on the materials of their web-sites "Antyglobalistska Initsiatyva" ("Antiglobalist Initiative" (AI), <http://www.antiglobalizm.net.ua>) and "Robitnychi Sprotyv" ("Workers' Resistance" (RS), <http://www.workres.kiev.ua>).

them the slogan "Down with globalization!" and proposing instead "For globalization!" as the necessary precondition of the world revolution.

Workers' Resistance builds its framing strategy in another way. The objects of framing process are not so much events in Ukraine and in the world as the very organization itself. The main aim of AI-site is to frame WR as an antiglobalist group. It becomes evident if one compares AI to another WR's website RS (<http://www.workres.kiev.ua>). The last one is much more ideologically strict being more apparently Trotskyist [49], and more concentrated on specific topics of party [50] and trade union building [51]. On the contrary, the content of AI is the collection of texts on very different topics and more various in ideological sense (which is very peculiar for the anti-globalization movement). The site includes general overview of the anti-globalization movement, written from the point of view inspired by pro-anarchist antiglobalist writers [52], an analysis of Iraqi war made from the point of view of imperialism theory [53], a report on participation in European Social Forum in November 2003 in Paris [54], a cycle of short materials on gender issues [55], messages about protests and state repression in Ukraine and Russia [56; 57], and a critical review of a book on Israeli-Arab conflict [58]. But the main part of the web-site is the news column describing the actions of WR as the actions of "antiglobalists" (for example [59]).

### Analysis

As I have shown there are important differences in the degree of the inclusion of anti-globalization

master frame into general framing activity of LKSMU and WR. Whereas LKSMU only incorporated new popular term "globalization" into "imperialism" ideological framework, WR tries to show its identification with "the" anti-globalization movement. There are two possible causes explaining the different results of the diffusion. First of all it is the different structure of political opportunities. WR does not have powerful allies in Ukraine, although they joined the Committee for Workers' International in 1994 and probably have some financial support from it [60]. Nevertheless, these opportunities cannot be compared to the ones of LKSMU which is obviously supported by the CPU, the most populous party in Ukraine [61] and which had the largest faction in the parliament till 2002. This fact leads to necessity of WR's members to be more entrepreneurial and flexible in construction of collective action frames to maintain existence and development of their organization. The second cause is existence of direct ties with antiglobalist groups from the North. Whereas there are two articles about participation by members of WR in Genoa protest in 2001 [62] and in European Social Forum in 2003 [63], there is no such evidence for LKSMU.

However, despite all the differences antiglobalist framing of both LKSMU and WR can be described as "keeping up with fashion". Both organizations' encountered with a problem of attracting young people under the banner of Communist ideology, which was in their eyes discredited by the CPSU. Inclusion and modification of the anti-globalization master frame is one of the tools of building modernized image for Ukrainian leftists.

1. *Mittelman J. H.* The Globalization Syndrome.- Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.- P. 170.
2. *Buttel F. H.* Some Observations on the Anti-globalization Movement // Australian Journal of Social Issues.- 2003.- V. 38.- № 1.- P. 99.
3. Українські ліві: від ленінізму до соціал-демократії / За ред. О. Гараня, О. Майборода.- К.: Видавничий дім «КМ Аскадія».- С. 28.
4. Там само.- С. 92.
5. *Mittelman J. H.* Op. cit.- P. 170.
6. *McAdam D., Rucht D.* The Cross-National Diffusion of Movement Ideas // The Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Sciences.- 1993- V. 528.- P. 58.
7. *Couch J.* Imagining Zapatismo: The Anti-globalization Movement and the Zapatistas // Communal / Plural.- 2001.- V. 9.- № 2.- P. 243-260.
8. *Snow D. A., Benford R. D.* Master Frames and Cycles of Protest // Frontiers in Social Movement Theory / Ed. by A. D. Morris, C. McClurg Mueller.- New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.- P. 133-155.
9. *Benford R. D., Snow D. A.* Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment // Annual Review of Sociology.- 2000.- V. 26.- P. 614.
10. *Ibid.*-P. 615-618.
11. *Snow D. A., Burke Rochford Jr. E., Warden S. K., Benford R. D.* Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation // American Sociological Review.- 1986.- V. 51.- № 4.- P. 464.
12. *Snow D. A., Benford R. D.* Master Frames and Cycles of Protest.- P. 138.
13. *Tarrow S.* Struggle, politics, and reform: collective action, social movements and cycles of protest.- Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.- P. 50-51.
14. *Snow D. A., Benford R. D.* Master Frames and Cycles of Protest.- P. 151.
15. *McAdam D., Rucht D.* The Cross-National Diffusion of Movement Ideas.- P. 58.
16. *McAdam D.* "Initiator" and "Spin-off" Movements: Diffusion Processes in Protest Cycles // Repertoires and Cycles of Collective Action / Ed. by M. Traugott.- Durham: Duke University Press, 1995.- P. 233.
17. *Ibid.*-P. 237.
18. *Snow D. A., Benford R. D.* Alternative Types of Cross-national Diffusion in the Social Movement Arena // Social Movements in a Globalizing World / Ed. by D. della Porta, H. Kriesi, D. Rucht.- N. Y.: St. Martin's Press, 1999.- P. 23-39.

<sup>1</sup> Orientation towards the youth is a conscious strategy of WR [64].

19. *Oberschall A.* Social Movements: Ideologies, Interests, and Identities.-New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1993.- P. 225.
20. *Giugni M. G.* The Other Side of the Coin: Explaining Crossnational Similarities between Social Movements // Mobilization: An International Journal.- 1998. - V. 3- № 1- P. 89-105.
21. *Snow D. A., Benford R. D.* Alternative Types of Cross-national Diffusion in the Social Movement Arena.- P. 39.
22. *Ibid.*- P. 38.
23. *Smith J.* Globalizing Resistance: The Battle of Seattle and the Future of Social Movements // Mobilization: An International Journal.- 2001.- V. 6.- № 1.- P. 3.
24. *Johnston J., Laxer G.* Solidarity in the Age of Globalization: Les sons from the Anti-MAI and Zapatista Struggles // Theory and Society.- 2003.- V. 32.- № 1.- P. 39-91.
25. *Smith J.* Globalizing Resistance.- P. 4-9.
26. *Levi M., Olson D.* The Battles in Seattle // Politics and Society.- 2000.- V. 28 - № 3.-P. 325.
27. *Crossley N.* Global Anti-Corporate Struggle: A Preliminary Analysis // British Journal of Sociology- 2002- V. 53- № 4- P. 673.
28. *Sader E.* Beyond Civil Society // New Left Review.- 2002.- № 17.-P. 87-99.
29. *Wallerstein I.* New Revolts against the System // New Left Review.- 2002.- № 18.- P. 29-39.
30. *Hardt M., Negri A.* Empire.- Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.- P. 336.
31. *Ancelovici M.* Organizing against Globalization: The Case of ATTAC in France // Politics and Society- 2002- V. 30- № 3.- P. 449.
32. *Bleiker R.* Activism after Seattle: Dilemmas of the Anti-globalization movement // Pacifica Review.- 2002.- V. 14.- № 3.- P. 202-205.
33. *Crossley N.* Global Anti-Corporate Struggle.- P. 674.
34. *Klein N.* Reclaiming the Commons // New Left Review.- 2001.- № 9.- P. 82.
35. *Albert M.* WSF: Where to Now? // Znet, 2003- <http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?SectionID=41&ItemID=2956>.
36. *Petras J.* Porto Alegre 2002: A Tale of Two Forums // Monthly Review.- 2002.- V. 53.- № 11- P. 58.
37. *Klein N.* More Democracy - Not More Political Strongmen // Znet, 2003.- <http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?SectionID=1&ItemID=2946>.
38. *Hardt M.* Porto Alegre: Today's Bandung? // New Left Review- 2002.- № 14.-P. 112-118.
39. Кабак «Дядя Сэм». Эволюция клиентуры // Новая волна.- № 8(43), сентябрь 2001.- <http://nw.com.ua/index.php?i=6&v=115>.
40. Антиглобализм, попытка непопулярного анализа // Новая волна.- № 12(47), декабрь 2001.- <http://nw.com.ua/index.php?i=2&n=6>.
41. Hasta la victoria siempre! // Новая волна.- № 2(50), февраль 2002.- <http://nw.com.ua/index.php?i=5&n=138>.
42. Прямое действие по-киевски // Новая волна.- № 3(38), март 2001.- <http://nw.com.ua/index.php?i=9&n=161>.
43. Терроризм. Что это? // Новая волна.- № 11(46), ноябрь 2001.- <http://nw.com.ua/index.php?i=3&n=66>.
44. Комсомол против империализма // Новая волна.- № 12(47), декабрь 2001.- <http://nw.com.ua/index.php?i=2&n=20>.
45. Мертвый сезон // Новая волна.- № 12(47), декабрь 2001.- <http://nw.com.ua/index.php?i=2&n=5>.
46. Интеллектуальная собственность // Новая волна.- № 8(43), сентябрь 2001.- <http://nw.com.ua/index.php?i=6&n=114>.
47. Microsoft - на бордаж! Билла Гейтса на рею! // Новая волна.- № 12(47), декабрь 2001.- <http://nw.com.ua/index.php?i=2&n=24>.
48. Антиглобализм, попытка непопулярного анализа // Новая волна.- № 12(47), декабрь 2001.- <http://nw.com.ua/index.php?i=2&n=6>.
49. Начомумистоімо.- <http://www.workres.kiev.ua/organization/stoimo.html>.
50. Мігаль С. Яка партія потрібна робітникам? - <http://www.workres.kiev.ua/public/party.html>.
51. Актуальні задачі профспілкового будівництва.- [http://www.workres.kiev.ua/public/tradeunion\\_u.html](http://www.workres.kiev.ua/public/tradeunion_u.html).
52. Черепанин В. Альтерглобалісти: спротив системі.- <http://www.antiglobalizm.net.ua/vasil02.html>.
53. Комітет за робітничий Інтернаціонал. Міжнародний секретаріат. Аналіз. Війна з Іраком.- <http://www.antiglobalizm.net.ua/cwil.html>.
54. Климова М. Европейский социальный форум. Париж-2003.- <http://www.antiglobalizm.net.ua/paris.html>.
55. Тендер.- <http://www.antiglobalizm.net.ua/gender.html>.
56. Гедзь О. Николаевское дело.- <http://www.antiglobalizm.net.ua/nikolaev.html>.
57. Тарасов А. Тщательно скрываемые бунты.- <http://www.antiglobalizm.net.ua/taras01.html>.
58. Черепанин В. Интеллектуальный полицейский на посту.- <http://www.antiglobalizm.net.ua/palestina.html>.
59. Антиглобалісти проти репресій.- <http://www.antiglobalizm.net.ua/sob1.html#bk1037>.
60. Нотатки до історії Робітничого Спротиву.- [http://www.workres.kiev.ua/organization/history\\_u.html](http://www.workres.kiev.ua/organization/history_u.html).
61. Українські ліві: від ленінізму до соціал-демократії.- С. 49.
62. Денисюк С. Генуя. Ще один крок до перемоги.- <http://www.workres.kiev.ua/public/publicistika.html#bk1>.
63. Климова М. Европейский социальный форум. Париж-2003.- <http://www.antiglobalizm.net.ua/paris.html>.
64. *Ishchenko V.* An Antiglobalist Movement in Ukraine: Is It Possible. Paper presented at the Regional Student Conference "The Changing Region in the Changing World: New Boundaries of Transition" held by the Civic Education Project and Ukrainian Academy of State Tax Service on April 18-20, 2003, Kyiv, Ukraine.- P. 5.

*Ищенко В. О.*

## **ДИФУЗИЯ «АНТИГЛОБАЛІСТСЬКОГО» МАСТЕР-ФРЕЙМУ НА ПОЛІТИЧНІ ПАРТІЇ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНІ РУХИ ЛІВОГО СПРЯМУВАННЯ: ВИПАДОК УКРАЇНИ**

*Статтю присвячено аналізу мастер-фрейму антиглобалістського руху та дослідженню результатів дифузії на фрейми двох українських політичних організацій: молодіжної організації Комуністичної партії України - Ленінського комуністичного союзу молоді України та троцькістської групи "Робітничий спротив", які являють собою дві різні типи використання антиглобалістського мастер-фрейму. Стаття демонструє, що на результати дифузії впливає структура політичних можливостей (а саме наявність або відсутність впливових союзників) і наявність безпосередніх зв'язків з активістами антиглобалістського руху.*