

rorist attack by, among others, the *Wall Street Journal*, has proved premature as the victory at the Doha WTO meeting on drugs and health emergencies and the 60-70,000 attendees at the World Social Forum in Porto Allegre in February suggest. A January 2002 survey shows that trust in NGOs has risen significantly from a year ago.⁸ None the less a change in strategy is under serious consideration by the major NGOs. But it's too early to forecast how this will develop. The nature of the site at Kananaskis, as at Doha, may not provide much of an answer to the question "to demonstrate or not to demonstrate?"

But it would be quite wrong to judge the impact of this movement on policy only by what one sees on CNN. The situation is far more complex and, as I have written, the "invisible" impact by technical/legal groups on, for example, the WTO via the dispute settlement mechanism, may be more significant and long-lasting.⁹ Similarly the impact of the Jubilee 2000 campaign launched at Birmingham and of its enlarged network of successor organizations which have added education and health issues to their advocacy for debt relief can be clearly seen in the Summit agendas at Genoa and probably Kananaskis. The paper released just before the Genoa Summit "Beyond Debt Relief" and the G7 finance ministers' "Debt Relief and Beyond", mirror the NGO network's concerns but not its demands for specific commitments to achieve the multiple goals. One can be certain that the outcomes of Kananaskis will be carefully monitored by the NGOs and the press. Perhaps the new message will be "put your money where your rhetoric is". Joking aside, I am convinced that the criticism of the summit will not abate if significant reform of the institution is not undertaken.

Kananaskis: the Beginning of the End or a New Beginning ?

While previous summits have been criticized in the press — most recently Okinawa, for example, for the expenditure of \$750 million on facilities — the decibel level rose significantly after Genoa. This had little to do with the protests and the violence but with the institution itself. *The Financial Times* was especially scathing with a lead editorial entitled "For slimmer and sporadic summits" (July 23, 2001). It argued that "judged on the record of Genoa, delegates from G8 governments should pack their bags knowing this was the last summit they will have to endure". The editorial concluded with a