1. Introduction.
Just as environmentalism is one of the key issues of the Global Justice Movement (GJM), it seems that Global Justice is likewise becoming one of the values shared by environmental organizations worldwide. Nonetheless, the relationship between environmentalism and the Global Justice Movement is yet to be investigated.

World and regional social forums can be considered as new arenas where social movement activists and organizations meet each others and work together to build a transnational social movement. In such places the identity of the GJM is negotiated and Environmental Movement Organizations (EMOs), concurring and collaborating with other issues and other organizations, try to gain visibility and to present environmentalism as a core issue of the GJM. In this paper we will focus on the first European Social Forum (ESF) that took place in Florence in November 2002.

As a starting point, we will discuss the relationship between some Italian EMOs and the Global Justice Movement, stressing in particular the changing conception of alliance strategies and the links they single out between environmentalism and global justice.

In the second part of the paper we will consider the role of environmentalism in a transnational arena like the first ESF, trying to answer a series of crucial questions: which is the presence of the environmental issue within the social forum? Are EMOs involved in discussions not explicitly linked with the environmental issue? Which are the consequences of the participation in a multi-organizational setting as the ESF for EMOs?

Moving the focus of the analysis from the meso to the micro level, a third part of the paper will illustrate and comment empirical data collected during the Florence ESF. Participants were interviewed using semi-structured questionnaires. Interviews took
place in workshops, seminars and plenary sections. We selected seminars and workshops according to the type of proponent organization (environmentally-oriented, religion-based, pacifist and feminist, unions, left-wing political parties, and anticapitalist groups) and we also took into account the nationality of those organizations, focusing especially on Italian, French, Spanish, German, and English organizations. Interviewers were asked to distribute questionnaires at random. We not only interviewed Italian participants: the questionnaires were indeed translated into French, English, German and Spanish. Of the total number of interviewees, 1668 were Italian, 124 French, 77 German, 88 Spanish, 118 British, and 309 from other countries. The different sizes of the country samples are proportionate to national presence at this international event. However, for cross-national comparisons, we weighted the responses in order to compensate for having oversampled the Italian population, randomly extracting a subsample of the Italian activists.

Empirical data will be used to assess the role of environmental activism within associative experiences of ESF participants and to evaluate the presence of the green issue within the interpretative frames of participants. We will examine if and how environmental concerns are diffuse among activists of the GJM. We will then devote a

---

1 I thank Massimiliano Andretta, that established with me the rule to select seminars, workshops and conferences and that coordinated with me the administration of questionnaires. Maria Fabbri was responsible for coordinating the inputting in SPSS matrix and for cleaning it. The methodological assistance of Claudius Wagemann was of fundamental importance for data analysis.

2 Although the distribution of most socio-demographic characteristics (education, age, and social situation, such as whether student status or not) was significantly different between the Italian sample and the overall population of Italy (Likelihood ratio chi square test), the Italian sample was not stratified for these conditions, because the distributions of some other countries also differed from their respective populations. Varying the Italian sample would have meant reducing the Italian sample to a median category and foregoing variation. However, the gender distribution was equal among all the other countries; only the Italian gender distribution deviated from this (males dominating). Therefore, a stratified subsample was drawn from the Italian sample which respected the equal distribution of men and women in the population. Furthermore, the Italian sub-sample was reduced in numbers, since overrepresenting the Italians would have biased the results and made some types of statistical analysis even less applicable.
specific attention to environmental activists, analyzing how they bridge the environmental issue with other claims of the GJM.

The final part of the paper will summarize the main findings of the research, comparing and discussing the results of the micro and the meso analysis.

2. Environmentalism and global justice: some insights from the Italian case.
Mobilizations against neoliberal globalization have bridged together the fragments of diverse cultures --secular and religious, radical and reformist, young and older generations-- into a broader discourse that has taken the themes of social (and global) justice and of democratic participation as an adhesive, while still leaving broad margins for separate developments (della Porta, Andretta, Mosca and Reiter 2005). The GJM has been indeed labeled as a “movement of movements” to emphasize the fact that it is made of different families of social movements being the interactions between the “old” labour movement and new social movements one of the new features of mobilization on the issue of globalization (Sklair 1995).

Some observers have particularly underlined the presence of different social movements in mobilizations on global justice, stressing the presence of a cleavage between “old” and “new” movements within the GJM (Weibull 2003). The potential conflict and tension between materialist values and post-materialist values within the GJM has been underlined pointing at the difficulties to bridge labour movement claims with environmental movement claims in a common and coherent discourse.

Some studies have indeed pointed at the presence of conflicts between environmental organizations and workers in the case of firms criticized for destroying the environment (Farro 1991).

Nonetheless, in the past decades within labour organizations a new attention toward environmental issues seems to be emerged (della Porta 2004), while environmental organizations seem to have extended their frame considering also social issues (Rootes 2004).

This approaching seems to be one of the consequences of joint mobilization of environmentalist and other organizations on different issues, like in the case of Italian EMOs mobilized for peace in the eighties (Lodi 1984).

As Rosenbaum observed the scope of the environmental movement was already be broadened in past decades. In fact, “the movement has also become much more adept and aggressive in dealing with global issues, to the point of challenging such
international economic heavyweights as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund on the global ecological impacts on their lending policies” (Rosenbaum 1990: 24).

Notwithstanding cases of conflict between environmental movements and other movements, a new wave of mobilization in the nineties seems to have favoured relationship and exchanges between different groups. As Donatella della Porta shows (2003) in the past decade environmental organizations mobilized together with women groups, indigenous people, human rights organizations, etc. being again active on the issue of peace together with religious organizations and new left organizations opposing the wars occurred in the nineties.

At the end of the nineties, such encounter among different social movement families appeared evident during the protests of Seattle against the World Trade Organization in November 1999. Parallel summits (Pianta 2003) were important occasions to strengthen the linkages between EMOs and other social movement organizations mobilized on the social justice issue. The role of EMOs in this process is immediately evident if we consider that organizations like Greenpeace International and Friends of the Earth International gave an important contribution to the birth of social forums, being part of the World Social Forum international council.

Going from the global to the local, a similar change in environmental activism can be observed in Italy in the field of EMOs. If we consider the two Italian EMOs with the largest number of members (Legambiente and Wwf), we can notice a similar evolution. Interviews with leading roles of the two most important Italian EMOs seem to confirm such findings.

The Italian branch of WWF was created in 1966 by a group of people coming from Italia Nostra (our Italy). Beyond its conservationist orientation, since 1976 the Italian
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3 In year 2004, Legambiente declared to have 115.000 members while the Italian branch of Wwf declared to have 260.000.

4 Interviews were collected for a research project on urban movements in the city of Milan focused on “Social movements and deliberative democracy: social forums in Europe” and directed by Donatella della Porta.

5 Italia Nostra is an organization that --as it can be read in its statute-- was created in 1955 “with the object to protect and to valorize the historical, the artistical, and the natural estate of the nation” that was threatened by the process of urbanization and by the building speculation (document 2).
Wwf was a very active actor in the campaign against nuclear energy that ended with the positive result of a referendum in 1987, banding nuclear power stations in Italy. In 1998, Italian Wwf promoted with the Federtrasporti (national federation of local public transport) a common campaign against private traffic and pollution in most Italian cities.

The Italian WWF has soon recognized the meaning of the protest of Seattle stating that “focusing on international trade means not only to look after salary and work, but also to consider the food that we eat, the air that we breath, the social and cultural environment where we live” (document 1). Even before the protest of Seattle, the Italian WWF was active together with different organizations in the campaign against the Multilateral Agreement on Investments (MAI) and in the campaign to drop the dept of poor countries. Furthermore, it is worth noticing that the Italian branch of the WWF, together with other organizations, promoted the creation of Rete Lilliput (Lilliput network), a national network very active in the critic toward neoliberal globalization, paying particular attention to the issues of peace, nonviolence and environment. Lilliput network was one of the main organizational networks of the protest against the G8 summit in Genoa in July 2001 (Andretta et al. 2002; 2003).

As a representative of the Italian branch of the Wwf puts it, the alliance strategy of the organization has changed in the last years, searching for partners especially in other realms of civil society. According to the declaration of the Wwf representative “as a consequence of the very strong linkage with Wwf international, on the national level we work mostly by ourselves. We don’t have relationships with political parties and this peculiarity distinguishes our organization by comparison with other environmental organizations. In fact, lots of them are very embedded in the national context and their choices have political goals. This is the reason why we don’t follow them and we don’t share their positions. Hence there is not an ongoing alliance with such organizations but contingent coalitions on the base of common campaigns. On the contrary, in the past three years we gave a new and positive evaluation to the dialogue with other organizations of civil society, like volunteers organizations, organizations that are involved in rete Lilliput, but also NGOs and solidarity organizations active on third world countries with whom we are creating very strong relationships” (interview 1).

Linked with the evolution of alliance strategies, an evolution seems to be occurred also in the framing, conceiving environment as a complex concept strongly related to solidarity issues: “In the last ten years there was an evolution in the wideness of issues
considered by the organization: environmentalism has no longer been single-issue and then we stopped to speak about flora and fauna but we started to speak of environment in a general sense (…). We are an association that already in the sixties promoted a campaign on life styles and therefore our associative base was already aware of the fact that environment is a problem to be considered on a global level. This change happened before the rising of the anti-neoliberal movement and it is the consequence of an evolution occurred in the WWF international based on a series of scientific studies. Therefore we can state that the WWF has given a contribution to the intertwining that later occurred within civil society between environmental issues and solidarity issues” (interview 1).

Legambiente (environmental league) is another important Italian EMO, created in 1980 within the Arci (Italian cultural and recreational association), an association that was strictly linked to the Italian Communist Party. In the 1986 Legambiente splitted from the Arci and created an autonomous organization. In 1996 Legambiente signed a pact together with the three most important Italian trade union confederations with the aim to promote public policies oriented not only to create new jobs but also to improve environmental conditions (della Porta and Diani 2004: 107). Legambiente participated actively in the Genoa Social Forum coordinating the anti-G8 protest and in the Florence ESF, being present in seminars not only focused on environment but also on other issues like education, organized crime (mafia) and democracy in the third world countries.

The importance of networking with different issues and different organizations for Legambiente was particularly stressed by a representative of the organization when she declared: “we have very varied relationship… we don’t exclude contacts with any domain simply because there is no domain from which we consider ourselves excluded … perhaps there are some domains in which we are more competent but the idea is to be in a network. This is an obsession for us: we are very interested in creating relationships… relationships that could generate virtuous behaviors since environmental quality and quality of life can not be restricted to a specific sector… it is something much more wide and conceptually complex. Thus, it doesn’t make sense that you sectoralize yourself… it is simply impossible to sectoralize yourself since your goal is a common global result because every issue is linked with another one: they are all linked!” (interview 2).
Legambiente has been involved in the GJM since its rising in Italy and, even maintaining its peculiarities, it positively interacts with other organizations within the movement. In fact, “Legambiente was part of the Genoa Social Forum and it is still part of the movement. Some of our members were quite confused at the beginning because we have never participated in this type of arena before. Despite that, this choice has been seen very positively and it has also been very supported because these issues are all part of a shared concern since the statute of our association contains elements that are not far from the movement of movements. Hence there is a good identification with it even if probably we are not part of the more radical fraction [of the movement], but we share a lot of things” (interview 3).

A similar evolution pattern has been observed by Rootes (2004: 29) in the British case where “the older conservation organizations have embraced biodiversity and sustainable development (…), while FoE [Friends of the Earth] has extended its agenda to issues of social justice. (…) Thus, the broadening of EMOs’ agenda extends not only to other environmental issues, but also beyond what have conventionally been considered environmental issues”. As a consequence, a more systematic analysis of the sources of environmental ills arose among British EMOs: “all now speak the language of sustainability and biodiversity (…) all recognize, albeit in different ways, the contribution of transnational capital and markets to ecological degradation” (ibid.).

For some of these organizations the participation in the anti-neoliberal movement has favoured this consciousness. In fact, “several environmental activists mobilize in the movement against neoliberal globalization, bringing their specific contribution, but also contaminating themselves in the encounter with other movements” (della Porta and Diani 2004: 198).

If these cases seem to indicate a change in the environmental activism at the national level, which is the role played by environmentalism in transnational arenas?

3. The role of the environmental issue and EMOs within the ESF of Florence.
A first step to assess the role of environmentalism within the Global Justice Movement consists in considering transnational events, like social forums are. Social forums can be seen as public stages where the GJM negotiates its identity and its interpretation of the world and of globalization, creates loose networks between different individuals and organizations opposing neoliberal globalization and discusses about its forms of
action and communication strategies. In other words, social forums themselves are an important step in the process of formation of a (global) social movement.

The Florence ESF was an event with the formal adhesion of 426 organizations and 60,000 participants in the conferences that mobilize 1,000,000 people in the final demonstration against the war on Iraq. The huge demonstration was only the final step of three days of discussion in 18 conferences in the morning, 12 conferences in the evening, 160 seminars, 180 workshops and 75 cultural events (De Nardis 2003: 70-71). The discussion was organized around three main axes: globalization and liberalism; war and peace; rights-citizenship-democracy. What is immediately evident is the lacking of a specific interest on environment on the main axes of the discussion. If we consider the program of the following forums in Paris (2003) and London (2004), it is quite interesting to note that the number of main axes was raised from 3 in the Florence forum to five in the Paris Forum, and to six in the London forum. Both in the second and in the third social forum, environmental issue acquired more visibility becoming one of the fundamental axes of discussion.  

Although the environmental issue seems to have gained more relevance in the following editions of the ESF, it was also discussed in different sessions of the first forum. In order to assess the role of the environmental issue within the Florence ESF we tried to “weight” in some ways the presence of environmentalism in the different spaces of discussion of the forum. Albeit very impressionistic, we can consider the presence of events explicitly focused on environmental issues and the presence of environmental organizations among the promoters of an event as basic indicators of the role of environmental issue within the forum. For this reason, the final program of the forum was briefly analyzed (document 3).

As table 1 shows, the presence of environmental issues and organizations in the forum was quite limited. In particular, if we consider the more visible spaces of ESF  

\[\text{6 In Paris the name of the ‘green’ axe was “Against the logic of profit: for an ecologically sustainable society of social justice and for food sovereignty” linking sustainability with social justice. In London the name of the green axe was simply “environmental crisis and sustainable society”.

7 Visibility is related to the number of participants, to the dimension and centrality of a physical space devoted to the event, to the presence of mass-media covering the event, etc. Morning conferences took place in spaces containing around 2,000 people with interventions of representatives of different organizations but limited interactions with the public. Workshop}\]
like conferences, we immediately realize that environmentalism played a minor role. Even including in the category of environmentalism not strictly environmental organizations and issues like animal rights, GATS (General Agreement on Trade in Services), critical consumerism, transnational corporations, food sovereignty, health, responsible tourism, life styles and nuclear disarmament, the presence of the green issue is still quite limited, especially in the most visible events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visibility of the event</th>
<th>Type of event</th>
<th>Morning conferences</th>
<th>Seminars</th>
<th>Workshops (self-organized)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmentalism as issue of the event</td>
<td>1-2/18 (5.5-11.1%)</td>
<td>20-29/160 (12.5-18.1%)</td>
<td>16-32/180 (8.9-17.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental organization as promoter/speaker of the event</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16-28/160 (10.0-17.5%)</td>
<td>13-14/180 (7.2-7.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonetheless it would be naïve to ignore that being ESF a multi-organizational field, it has to cope with a complex logic of representation of different movement sectors and of national delegations of different countries. This is the reason why a percentage of presence of the environmental issue within 5 and 10% in events of high visibility and within 12 and 18% in events of medium visibility should be not considered as marginal.

What is quite surprising is instead the attitude of most environmental organizations to be present almost exclusively in events dealing with the environmental issue, with very limited cases of presence in other type of events. In fact, analyzing the program of the first ESF it is quite evident that EMOs organized their own events within the framework were self-organized and generally took place outside of the “Fortezza da Basso” (headquarter of the ESF) while seminar were in between conferences and workshops, characterising themselves for being generally hosted in the “Fortezza”, for the participation of some thousands people and also for a significant amount of time devoted to interactions with the public.

It is worth noticing the exceptions represented by Friends of the Earth International (being one of the promoters of the seminar “The Europe that finances the disaster: the case of the European Investment Bank”), Friends of the Earth Europe (being one of the speakers of the seminar “The road to Cancún: civil society strategies for the 5th WTO ministerial conference”), Les Amis de la Terre (being one of the promoters of a seminar on debt relief and structural adjustments) and by Legambiente (being one of the promoters of events dealing with education, relationship between organized crime and environmental pollution; and being one of the speakers in a seminar on democracy and development in Latin America).
of the global movement but their participation in other (discursive) events was quite limited. Even the seminars devoted to the organization of transnational campaigns were not exploited by EMOs at all to promote common environmental campaigns with a transnational scope.

This analysis seems to suggest that the possibility exists that EMOs use the ESF stage as an opportunity to gain a bigger visibility but not as an occasion to confront and contaminate themselves with diverse issues and different organizations. From another point of view it could also be argued that, being limited the resources EMOs can devote to the ESF, scarce resources forced such organizations to limit their presence to grant visibility to the green issue within the forum. In fact, the ESF is an open and inclusive process offering space to all type of antiwar and anti-neoliberal organizations but each movement sector has to commit itself to grant the presence of its issue if it wants to assure the visibility of its specific claims.

Far from adopting a pessimistic vision, we can underline the positive consequences of the first ESF, that stimulated some EMOs to promote --in partnership with other organizations-- the first “people world water forum”. The idea was launched during the Florence ESF and it was confirmed after the celebration of the world meeting on sustainable development of the United Nations in Johannesburg (January 2003). The UN meeting --that followed after eleven years the Rio summit-- received a negative evaluation from a significant part of EMOs that decided to boycott the third world summit on water in Kyoto (17-22, March 2003) and to organize in the same period an alternative forum with an alternative agenda (“The right to water for all”) in Florence. The Kyoto summit was negatively evaluated because it was considered as “the sole expression of a New World water oligarchy” (document 4). In fact, it “has proven the efficiency of transnational corporations in taking control of the political and economic sphere and of hydraulic resources throughout the planet”. In this sense, the alternative forum is presented as “a credible process capable of putting the world in perspective and of proposing solutions different from the catastrophic proposal being set forth by international decision-making bodies. (...) Thus, the forum wants to be an occasion of confrontation and research of possible alternative solutions” (ibid.).

Among the first EMOs giving their adhesion to the alternative forum, the Italian branch of the WWF, Legambiente and the Forum ambientalista (environmental forum)\(^9\)

---

\(^9\) The environmental forum (http://www.forumambientalista.it) had already been present in the Florence ESF, organizing workshop and participating in seminars and conferences. As its
were present. Interesting enough, among the main four objects of the forum there was the following one: “Contributing to the reinforcement of synergies among social movements, organizations of civil society and associations active in water issues, environmental protection, democracy and human and social rights” (document 4). Therefore, the right to water allowed to bridge the environmental protection with the fight against privatization, with the promotion of peace and with participative democracy.¹⁰

Such events following the ESF allow to advance some hypotheses on the effect of the participation in transnational events like social forums for EMOs. First of all, as it has been already mentioned, the availability of resources is a necessary pre-condition for an organization belonging to a specific social movement sector like environmentalism to engage in a multi-issue setting, as in the case of the ESF. Notwithstanding, in order that a cross-issue contamination occurs it is necessary that an organization has the real will to confront with different issues. The possibility of cross-issue contamination is neglected when an organization perceive a multi-organizational field as a conflictual setting and as a challenge threatening its own identity. This is the reason why open and tolerant identities have more possibility to enter these settings and to leave them transformed. In any case, can we say anything about the consequences of EMOs participation in the ESF? And how can we study it? Even if the analysis of the official program seems to show very little cross-contamination, the forum has probably been an occasion to create and to strengthen linkages between different social movement organizations. Furthermore, the organization of the alternative forum on water seems to prove that such linkages favored the organization of a common event on a issue like the right to water capable to bridge different sectoral frames. As this case seems to prove, unity is possible when all parts perceive the existence of a common goal and recognize that a strong enemy like neoliberalism need a strong challenger as the GJM to be stopped. If (contingent) unity statute puts it, the forum was created “to contribute to the development of a cultural, political and social movement leaded by the ecological critic of goods production and market (…) and by the awareness of the limit of resources and of the capacity of the earth” (document 5).

¹⁰ The titles of the seminar organized within the alternative forum were: “The right to water and participative democracy”, “Water and territory: the managing of the integrated cycle”, “privatization and commodification of the water and the managing of services”, “water, peace and culture”.
is possible for social movement organizations, is it also feasible for social movement activists?

4. Environmentalism and European social forum participants.

In this paragraph we will focus on individual participants in the Florence ESF. When it was possible, data were analyzed considering three different groups of participants selected on the base of geographical provenience: Southern Europe, Northern Europe and World South Delegations. The third group of participants is quite limited (only 85 cases) but the low number of cases is justified since delegations in representation of third world countries were a little number if compared with all people participating in the forum, mainly European. A distinction between Northern Europeans and Southern Europeans seems useful in order to assess if a difference exists in conceiving and (in practicing) environmentalism in Northern and in Southern Europe. In a recent comparative study on the transformation of environmental activism, a difference was underlined in framing environmental problems between Southern and Northern Europe, with Southern Europe more focused on personal concern and complaint (Rootes 2003: 8). Differences in environmental activism seem to be confirmed also by our data.

Though many participants (43.8) do not belong to organizations formally part of the Florence ESF, many of them are or have in the past been members of political or social group. The ESF data show that even those who are not present members in any movement organization have past organizational experience similar to that of the organized participants. Out of 13 types of political/social/religious groups listed, ESF participants declared they were or had been members, on average, of 5.5 types of organization (table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization type</th>
<th>Southern Europeans</th>
<th>Northern Europeans</th>
<th>World South delegations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Movement/Network</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student group</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary group (charity)</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational/sports association</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants/anti-racist association</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental association</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Union</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political party</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women association</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even if it is not the most diffuse type of associative participation, participation in environmental organizations is considerably elevated (43.5%). This type of participation seems to be quite diverse comparing different geographical areas: from 36.0% for southern Europeans to 49.6 for northern Europeans, to 55.4 for delegates coming from world south countries. As it emerges from studies of social movements using network analysis (Diani 1995), multiple participation in various organizations favours interorganizational exchanges, facilitating relations among the different groups. This means that environmental concern should be quite diffuse among ESF participants since lots of them have experiences in environmental organizations and also have multiple belongings in different organizations. At the same time, the environmental frame should be linked to other frames since, given the high number of multiple belongings, all issues should have good possibility to diffuse among ESF participants.

To evaluate main claims and concerns of ESF participants, we asked them with an open question which is their opinion on the main goals of the GJM. As table 3 shows, a quite varied blend of issues was raised by participants but in this case environmental issue was not considered among the most important object, being quoted only by 8.4% of participants. Quite surprisingly, the issue of peace was also raised by a little number of interviewed (11.8%), being the possibility of a war on Iraq a concrete possibility when Florence ESF took place.

Table 3. Main goals of the GJM according to ESF participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main goals of the GJM</th>
<th>Southern Europeans</th>
<th>Northern Europeans</th>
<th>World South delegations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic participation</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights promotion/Equality/Justice</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-capitalism</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other world/Alternatives</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-neoliberalism</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>349 (46.7)</td>
<td>334 (44.7)</td>
<td>65 (8.7)</td>
<td>748 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Table entries are the distribution of responses to the question of which is the main goal of the GJM for ESF participants. The percentages add to more than 100 percent because an open response could match different categories, being translated in a multiple response.*

It is worth noticing that participants in the social forum arena perceive the environmental issue as a minor goal of the GJM. This result seems to match in some ways with the limited visibility of the green issue within the Florence ESF underlined in paragraph 3.

If we consider only participants in the forum with previous experiences in environmental organizations the percentage of people referring to the environment as one of the main goals of the GJM rises to 12.1%. This evidence seems to demonstrate that participants in the forum perceive that environmentalism has a relative importance within the movement. What is also very interesting is the fact that only in a very limited number of cases environmentalism is quoted alone, but generally participants tend to refer and to link it to other important issues. Another interesting point to observe is how the importance of environmental issue changes according to different groups of participants. In fact (table 3), ecology has a minor role for southern Europeans (6.9%) while this percentage rises for northern Europeans (9.0%) and is even higher for people belonging to delegations of world south countries (13.8%). Third world countries are indeed the most penalized by neoliberal globalization that has moved polluting factories in the world south where labour cost is lower and were labour and environmental law is quite underdeveloped (della Porta and Mosca 2003). Furthermore, big infrastructural interventions (i.e. construction of dams) with very high environmental impact were opposed by protests of local civil societies and contributed to the raising of an environmental consciousness in the world south.

This could be a reason why world south participants consider more than others environmentalism as one of the main objects of the global movement.

If we take into account only participants that referred to environmentalism as one of the main goals of the GJM, it is interesting to note which are other issues that are quoted together with environmentalism (table 4). Almost half of participant’s claims referring to the environmental issue also mentioned human and social rights promotion, equality
and justice\textsuperscript{11} while one third refers to democratic participation\textsuperscript{12} and one fourth to solidarity.\textsuperscript{13} Anti-neoliberalism\textsuperscript{14} and the search for alternatives and for a different world\textsuperscript{15} are below 10\% of responses that also mention environment. Another interesting point is the linkage between peace and environment that reaches 14.3\%. As a matter of fact, ecology is bridged with the fight against capitalism (12.7), being this an indication that environmental concerns are also present between activists with a radical identity, as anticapitalists are.

Table 4. Issues linked to environmental concerns according to ESF participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame-bridging</th>
<th>All ESF participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rights promotion/Equality/Justice</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic participation</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-capitalism</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-neoliberalism</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other world/Alternatives</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Note}: Table entries are the distribution of responses to the question of which is the main goal of the GJM for ESF participants. The percentages add to more than 100\% percent because an open response could match different categories, being translated in a multiple response.

\textsuperscript{11} In this case respondents pointed to the social dimension of the globalization and interpreted the movement as a struggle for social rights, workers rights and social justice; particular stress was laid on the problem of unequal distribution of resources between North and South, suggesting the possible solution of cancelling poor country’s foreign debt and along with it a global diffusion and strengthening of social rights.

\textsuperscript{12} Participants express the need for a democratisation of both International Governmental Organizations and authoritarian (but also democratic) regimes; they also underline that such democratisation should be achieved from below, through information, mobilization and civil society meetings.

\textsuperscript{13} Participants stressed the need for a moral change, of values which are consistent with human relations based on solidarity; they particularly underlined the need to put human being before profit and to support poor people and poor countries.

\textsuperscript{14} In this case, participants referred either to World Bank, International Monetary Fund, multinational corporations, etc. as “agents of neoliberalism” or demanded political control of the market at global level, taxation of financial transactions, stop of privatization, etc.

\textsuperscript{15} Participants emphasized their engagement in changing the world for a better future and in searching alternative to the present model of globalization.
If the environmental issue is often linked by ESF participants to other issues, it can be interesting to consider also their degree of identification with the movement against neoliberal globalization (considered as a whole), with a specific sector of the movement and with a specific organization. In fact the degrees of identification tell us something about the willingness of participants to identify with a collective actor like the GJM, transcending a narrower identification in a specific sector or in a specific organization. In this sense, data referred to ESF participants that quote environment as a goal of the movement are quite encouraging. In fact they identify more in the movement as a whole than in a specific organization (+13.4%) and than in a specific sector of the movement (+7.8%). If we consider the data referring to all participants, we can notice that in this case identification with the movement as a whole compete with identification with a specific sector and do not transcend it at all. This means that there is a sort of tension between sector identification and movement identification and, perhaps, an obstacle to cross-issue contamination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifies a lot or enough with</th>
<th>Environmental participants</th>
<th>Non environmental participants</th>
<th>All ESF participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The movement as a whole</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A specific sector of the movement</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A specific organization of the movement</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>53-60</td>
<td>616-652</td>
<td>670-712</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Table entries are the distribution of responses to the question asking how much ESF participants identify themselves with the movement as a whole, with a specific sector of the movement and with a specific organization of the movement.*

In the case of people quoting environmental issue, we can notice a sort of hierarchy of identification that should favour the existence of an open and flexible identity, allowing a contamination. Hence, a potential is already existent within activists that should be recognized. EMOs should try to fulfill such an opportunity since the risk to innovate the framing of environmental issue and to partially transform their identity seems to be counterbalanced by the presence of activists already used to connect global and local and to link environment and social justice (among other issues).

5. Concluding remarks.

In this paper we tried to assess the relationship of environmentalism with the movement against neoliberal globalization. This attempt was developed using different strategies: a) a specific focus on the most important Italian EMOs; b) an analysis of the final
program of the first European Social forum; c) an analysis of claims and of associative experiences of activists participating in the ESF.

The results of this work in progress raise some interesting points that it is possible to summarize as follows:

1) the analysis of two important environmentalist groups in Italy, shows that some important changes have occurred in recent years in framing environment and in defining alliance strategies. In our analysis, we considered an organization like Legambiente that belongs to the area of political ecology and one organization belonging to the area of conservationism (the Italian branch of the Wwf). It should be considered that our results could be biased by the fact that both the two organizations participate in some ways to the GJM in Italy. Hence, to control if the processes we underlined are working within all the environmental movement, it would be important to consider other environmental organizations, with a particular attention to the ones that are not engaged in the mobilization on global justice. Furthermore, it should also be checked if changes in framing and in alliance strategies are a peculiar feature of EMOs or if this change is also affecting other social movements organizations.

2) our study give us some interesting elements to reflect on ESF as a deliberative arena. In fact, from a normative point of view, ESF and other similar events should work as deliberative setting. If a deliberation does not work within such arenas, than what we call GJM risks to be only a collection of diverse social movements forming contingent and volatile coalitions (Tarrow 2004). That is, a struggle for visibility with very limited exchanges between organizations and with the possibility that a logic of “intergroups” choking individual participants prevails (della Porta 2005).

3) The analysis of activists’ frames and identities shows that single participants are more prone than organized groups to fulfill the deliberative potentialities of a multi-issue and multi-organizational field like a social forum. Some organizations seem to resist this kind of process and developing open and flexible identities appear to be a crucial element in order to engage in deliberative processes. The tension between individuals and organizations is difficult to be solved but some tools can have a positive influence on this relation. The method of consensus is one of the procedure chosen by the movement in order to solve conflicts and to bridge heterogeneous actors in a coherent discourse. Consensus method represents a challenge for established organizations since it forces them to give up part of their ‘sovereignty’. Are EMOs --in some cases very vertical and very instituzionalized-- willing to adopt such method in
multi-organizational and multi-issue arenas or do they feel their identity directly challenged?

To conclude, a possibility to expand the present research consists in considering the more recent editions of the ESF in Paris and London (but also World Social Forums) and to evaluate if and how the role of environmentalism within such transnational arenas has changed.

Another interesting direction of research, not explored in this paper, concerns the role that the green issue plays in other non-environmental organizations involved in the anti-neoliberal movement. With a specific attention to the Italian configuration of the GJM, it could be quite intriguing to assess how the most important anti-neoliberal organizational networks (i.e. Attac Italy, rete Lilliput and Disobedients)\(^{16}\) frame the green issue and how much they consider it relevant.

\(^{16}\) Interestingly enough, Attac Italy and rete Lilliput were among the promoters of the people world water forum described in paragraph 3.
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