

3

Cities in the World: Local Civil Society and Global Issues in Britain

MARIO DIANI

In the North as well as in the South, collective actions against neoliberal approaches, promoting a different model of globalization, have grown substantially over the last few years, suggesting a reemergence of social movements on a scale surely unparalleled since the 1960s. Available evidence illustrates the rise of globalization as a major contentious issue in public discourse (Andretta et al., 2002:10); the growth of voluntary and/or political organizations mobilizing on transnational issues (Smith, 1997) as well as of the density of interorganizational collaborations between them (Smith, 1997; Rohrschneider and Dalton, 2002; Schaefer Caniglia, 2001); the embeddedness of participants in major no global gatherings such as Genoa 2001 or Florence 2002 in other social movements (Andretta et al., 2002:ch. 3; della Porta and Diani, 2004b; Walgrave and Verhulst, 2003); and the consolidation of a transnational community of professional activists and campaigners (Keck and Sikkink, 1998).

While the most conspicuous displays of no global (or new global) activism taking place in the various counter-summits across the globe have attracted considerable attention (e.g., Smith, 2001; Andretta et al., 2002), less attention has been paid to how global issues and concerns affect the structure of civic and political life at the local level. Are the most visible transnational demonstrations/gatherings the products of largely occasional coalitions of actors that are mostly integrated in domestic networks, focusing on other types of issues and identities? Or can we instead identify some continuity between the two levels? In other words, can we find at the local level any evidence of global issues shaping grassroots political organizations' strategies and orientations? In this chapter, I address these questions by looking at citizens' organizations in two Brit-

ish cities, Glasgow and Bristol. In particular, I assess the extent to which globalization issues

- represent a distinctive set of policy interests for these organizations, rather than the articulation of already established interests such as those related to the environment, ethnic and minority rights, or class inequality;
- translate into a distinctive set of collective actions;
- attract organizations with a distinctive profile;
- may be associated with specific social movement dynamics, rather than being the focus of ad hoc coalitions or of organizations with little or no interest in promoting joint collective action across organizational boundaries.

Glasgow and Bristol are remarkably different in their social and political histories. In Glasgow, one must take into account the strength of the “Red Clyde” tradition of left-wing labor politics and the strong working class presence; the role of ethnic minorities—especially Pakistanis—in the Labour political machine; and, more recently, the impact of devolution and the reshaping of center–periphery relations this has prompted. Coupled with a struggling industrial economy, and despite a fairly successful conversion of the city toward a more diversified and more service-driven economy, these traits have created a context that by theoretical standards appears particularly conducive to the persistence of collective action addressing social inequality, including action from a specific class perspective. One should also take into account the persisting impact of religious sectarianism, in particular its contribution to an explicitly confrontational political style.

Despite its city politics having also been dominated by Labour in the last decades (at least until the May 2003 local elections), the overall profile of Bristol is very different. Historically, the city has switched between Labour and Tory control, yet in a context of political moderation. Since the closure of the docks in the 1960s–1970s, working class presence in the city has been increasingly modest. While areas of deprivation undoubtedly exist—and some are included in this study—Bristol is a very affluent city with a strong presence of professional bourgeoisie and highly qualified white-collar workers. Its main employers are high-tech firms like those in the aeronautic industry; firms in the service sector, especially the financial sector; and big public employers such as the Ministry of Defense. Unemployment rates are extremely low (around 2.5–3 percent), in stark contrast to Glasgow where social deprivation still represents a major issue. The ethnic scene is larger—with some neighborhoods approaching 20 percent minority residents—and more diversified than in

Glasgow, with a substantial presence of Indian, Pakistani, Asian, and Afro-Caribbean communities and a legacy of minority activism, which at times even took radical forms, most notably in the St. Paul's riots of 1981. Bristol has also been one of the main centers for cultural innovation, with a flourishing milieu of youth subcultures and alternative lifestyles addressing issues of health, alternative food, and body care. This has corresponded—if not necessarily overlapped—with a lively presence of environmental organizations and activism, including environmental direct action in the 1990s (Rootes, 2000).

This study focuses on organizations mobilizing on environmental, ethnic and minority, community, and social exclusion issues. These organizations provide a particularly interesting unit for the analysis of coalition building and interorganizational networking: they are distinct enough to work independently, yet have enough potential areas of convergence to render cross-sector alliances a feasible option (e.g., on issues such as North–South relations, peace, refugees, urban decay, and racism). Moreover, they can easily be articulated in terms consistent with a no/new global perspective, and linked into global agendas. Between 2001 and 2002, face-to-face interviews took place with 124 representatives of organizations in Glasgow and 134 in Bristol. These included both local branches of UK-wide organizations (in Glasgow, also Scotland-wide), and independent local groups with varying degrees of formalization and bureaucratization. All the organizations that played a citywide role were contacted;¹ as for community organizations, rather than taking a small sample from across the city, efforts were concentrated on two areas, both relatively deprived economically.²

ISSUES, EVENTS, AND ORGANIZATIONS

The nature of “global issues” can hardly be deduced by the contents of the specific problems on which organizations mobilize. In principle, environmental degradation, the protection of labor conditions, and the protection or expansion of migrants’ rights can all be conceived of as global issues; yet they were public issues long before the term *globalization* even appeared on the scene. They may or may not represent “global issues,” depending on the meaning attributed to them—that is, depending on their interpretation by social actors. Likewise, even topics most easily associated with globalization, such as sweatshop child labor or developing countries’ debt, may or may not be perceived as a specific set of issues. They may as well be treated as a further specification of already existing agendas, such as traditional Left internationalism, or solidarity humanitarian campaigns by well-meaning Western charities. Before exploring the

nature of the "new global movement," it is therefore appropriate to look at the structure of issues regarded as crucial by citizens' organizations (as Laumann and Knoke [1987] did in reference to policy networks), to see whether a distinctive space for "global" issues may actually be identified.

Moreover, even the presence of a distinctive set of issues need not imply that protest activities and other forms of collective action on such issues will be promoted, even less so that they will be linked into sets of activities that stand out from other episodes of collective action on cognate topics. From the point of view of protest events, social movements are best conceived of as sustained series of campaigns, where single incidents are linked into broader chains of protest activities through framing and discursive practices, but also through actors' multiple involvements in a variety of events. Analogously to what happens for issue interests, it is how such events combine that qualifies collective action. For instance, although interest in globalization issues may encourage organizations to promote actions on environmental and peace issues alike, the two may just as well be conducted independently from each other and linked to independent sets of events. Their combination into a broader, "globalization-related" protest agenda is far from granted. It is an empirical question to be explored, not a datum for the analysis.

Finally, even if distinctive, both the interest in global issues and the promotion of specific episodes of collective action are not necessarily the preserve of actors with specific profiles. They may be found among organizations and activists with very diverse orientations, resources, or political backgrounds. Although one need not expect actors associated with a specific social movement to display a very specific set of traits, analysts have often attempted to identify the defining properties of the actors engaged, if not in specific movements, at least in "movement families" (della Porta and Rucht, 1995), the most obvious example being the association between left libertarian "new social movements," high levels of formal education, and new middle-class social location (Dalton, 1996:chap.4). All else being equal, the more global issues are linked with specific actors' profiles, the more one can expect to witness a distinctive social process rather than the simple diffusion of new issues across the different sectors of a given civil society.

In this chapter, I would like to assess the impact of four different sets of organizational properties that may be correlated with interest in, and action on, mobilization issues. The first refers to *organizational traits*. Two competing hypotheses may be put forward. One posits that organizations less endowed with resources and less institutionalized will be more likely to develop an interest in less established issues like global issues. If organizations, as they develop, tend to secure control of specific issue domains and to acquire "issue ownership" (Hilgartner and Bosk, 1988; Petrocik,

1996), then the emergence of new issues such as those linked with global concerns might offer new and/or less established organizations an opportunity to secure new niches for themselves. Conversely, more established ones might be slower to adapt their agendas to accommodate new themes. An alternative hypothesis suggests that interest in global issues is most intense among organizations operating on a larger—possibly global—scale and relying on massive organizational resources. The complexity of the issues linked with globalization places greater demands on organizations: they need substantial professional expertise among their activists; the costs attached to conducting collective action on themes that well exceed the boundaries of any specific locality are substantial; and the coordination with actors interested in similar issues may be difficult. All these requirements may result in organizations with larger resources developing a distinctive interest in global issues (see e.g., Rohrschneider and Dalton, 2002). Formalization and professionalization are obviously most present among organizations promoting transnational actions on a global scene, and are often directly involved in dealings with transnational or national institutions (Keck and Sikkink, 1998). However, one could expect them to be present also at the local level, for instance through the local branches of major organizations such as the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Amnesty International, or Oxfam.

Involvement in global issues may also depend on the strength of an organization's *political identity*. Organizations regarding themselves as critical political actors, or at least as actors willing to play an explicit political role, might be more likely to develop an interest in global issues than would those who think of themselves mainly as voluntary organizations, concerned with service delivery rather than political campaigning. The rationale behind this hypothesis has once again to do with the low degree of institutionalization of global issues in comparison with other issues analyzed here. As issues become institutionalized, they also tend to be broken down into sub-issues. Their controversial element is taken out, and they become "technical" problems for specialists. This is both a reflection of, and an incentive to, growing divisions of labor among organizations, leading in turn to the specialization and issue-ownership tendencies mentioned above. In contrast, newly emerged issues tend to be more multifaceted and encompassing, and boundaries between sub-issues are not well defined—there is not even a clear, shared understanding of what belongs in a certain issue domain and what does not. Their largely undefined nature leaves more room for attempts to turn them into genuine political issues, that is, issues that can be framed within a broader political project. Accordingly, such issues may be more interesting to organizations that explicitly regard themselves as political.

Specific *action repertoires* might also characterize action on global issues.

Consistent with what has been argued with reference to the organizational model, two possible relationships with global issues could be hypothesized. On the one hand, the complexity of issues at stake, and the level of involvement of domestic and transnational agencies and institutions in globalization-related problems, might suggest that organizations inclined to adopt established techniques of pressure should be particularly involved in those issues. On the other hand, one could argue that groups prepared to engage with a more varied range of repertoires of action should feel more confident regarding their chances of attracting attention to issues that are relatively less institutionalized. In particular, action on global issues might be facilitated by a group's propensity to engage in protest activity, as well as in repertoires specifically challenging corporations and other major economic actors—such as boycotts—or actively promoting alternative economic relations—such as fair-trade practices.

Finally, the stronger their interest in *related issues*, the more one could expect organizations to be more attracted to global issues, that is, issues that may be logically associated with global ones. Taking into account the characteristics of the organizations involved in this study, we should look at three different types of issues. First, global issues might be most strongly related with themes of the new social movements tradition, such as environmental or gender issues. They might also attract greater attention from organizations interested in social inequality issues such as poverty, housing, and basic education, consistent with the renewed emphasis on both inter- and intranational deprivation processes. Finally, they might be closely associated with multiculturalism and identity issues, such as those addressed by most ethnic minority and migrants' organizations.

PARTICIPATION ON GLOBAL ISSUES OR (NO/NEW) GLOBAL MOVEMENTS?

Social movements cannot be reduced to sectors of public opinion interested in certain issues, public events, or organizations sharing distinctive traits, although they are hard to conceive of in their absence. Their specificity lies at the intersection of three elements: dense networks of informal exchanges between individuals and/or organizations, shared collective identities, and conflictual interactions with opponents (Diani, 1992, 2003; Diani and Bison, 2004). Different combinations of these elements define different collective action dynamics.³

When collective action on global issues is mainly conducted within the boundaries of specific organizations, it is difficult to speak of no/new

global movements. If organizations broadly interested in the same themes are not involved in dense collaborations, and do not share any specific identity, some of the most visible and distinctive traits of the social movement experience are missing. In such cases, *organizational processes* will prevail, as organizations focus on the strengthening of both their structures and their identities and securing control of specific issues or subsets of issues. Collaborations with other groups will be relatively rare and, most importantly, scattered across a broad range of different organizations. There will be no densely connected networks of organizations sharing similar interests, nor will strong feelings of collective identity develop between different organizations.

Other organizations will be involved in dense collaborative exchanges with groups with similar concerns, addressing specific issues. However, these linkages will not correspond to identity bonds between the organizations involved. Groups will join forces to push forward a certain agenda but will not feel linked to each other by a shared identity once the specific actions and campaigns are over. In other words, alliances and collaborations will be mostly driven by an instrumental logic. Specific events will not be linked by actors into more encompassing narratives that might assign them a broader meaning and make them part of a sustained series of collective actions. Under those circumstances, collective action will be most effectively conceptualized as a *coalitional process*.

Finally, although coalitions are clearly an important component of social movement activity, the two cannot be reduced to each other. In a *social movement process* there will be more than networks of alliances and collaborations. Of course, organizations involved in a movement dynamic will share both material and symbolic resources in order to promote more effective campaigns, and will be fairly closely linked to each other. But, most important, they will also identify each other as part of a broader collective actor, whose goals and existence cannot be constrained within the boundaries of any specific protest event or campaign. The existence of collective identity linking organizations to each other will enable them to feel part of the same collective effort even when specific actions may be over, and to develop more joint actions on that basis.

From the perspective of mobilizations on global issues, the more they were conducted by organizations with a clear division of labor between them and very little in terms of joint initiatives, the more the so-called "no/new global movement" would actually come close to a set of independent organizations, and consist mostly of organizational processes. Likewise, if alliances on global issues limited themselves to fight specific battles, with little identity and solidarity between the organizations involved, and no attempts to connect to broader frameworks, there would be little analytical gain from labeling as a "social movement" what would

ultimately be little more than sets of organizations, instrumentally pooling resources in temporary, single-issue coalitions.⁴ We can only talk of no/new global movements if dense interorganizational networks and shared collective identity may actually be found among organizations mobilizing on no/new global issues.

GLOBAL ISSUES IN GLASGOW AND BRISTOL

This being first and foremost a study of organizations focusing either on social exclusion and inequality, environmental problems, or ethnic and minority rights, identifying the space for global issues means looking at their space within issue agendas largely driven by other priorities. In order to explore the structure of issues in the two cities, respondents were asked whether they would “likely” or “possibly” promote initiatives on any of forty-nine issues. The list of those issues does not cover all the most important problems in contemporary British society. Rather, it identifies a set of themes, which could be central to at least some of the organizations we surveyed. However, some issues, which none of the respondents could be automatically linked with, such as “military installations,” “third world debt,” or “third world poverty,” are also included. It is possible to group the different issues into five broader, underlying sets of concerns.⁵ Four of them largely correspond with the main focus of our organizations, being associated with “social exclusion,” “housing,” “environment,” and “ethnic and minority rights.” However, the fifth set of concerns, which stands out as relatively independent from the others, does not match any of the main types of groups we included in our population. Instead, it can be broadly associated with “globalization.” Interest in the broad issue with the same tag is strongly correlated with interest in third world poverty and third world debt. It is also significantly correlated, if more weakly, with attention to peace issues (“military installations”), concerns regarding manipulation of living organisms (“genetically modified food”), and interest in animal rights (“hunting” and “animal welfare”).

This is, admittedly, a distinctive combination of issues that would be better tested with longer batteries of specific questions. Even as it stands, however, it is a meaningful combination. It is consistent with the integration of interest in global inequality, ecopacifist orientations, and animal rights activism that has often been found among radical grassroots activists in contemporary Britain (see e.g. Doherty, Plows, and Wall, 2001). Although the levels of interest in “global” issues are lower than those expressed in other issues—unsurprisingly so, given the way our organizations were selected—it seems possible to argue that those issues are dis-

TABLE 3.1
The Structure of Issue Interests (maximum likelihood factor analysis,
Varimax rotation)

	Percentage Interested	Social Exclusion	Environment	Ethnic & Minority	Globalization	Housing
Lone Parents	39%	.776				
Children's Services	44%	.698				
Drugs	40%	.652				
Welfare Rights	47%	.639				
Unemployment Issues	49%	.615				
Poverty	57%	.596				
Health	65%	.588				
Disability	50%	.557				
HIV-related Issues	30%	.556				
Crime in Neighborhoods	35%	.553				
Homelessness	47%	.553				
Access to Higher Education	39%	.540		.358		
Community Services	61%	.534				
Quality of Basic Education	45%	.526		.368		
Minimum Wage	24%	.510				
Gender Equality	47%	.507		.322		
Women's Issues	55%	.498				
Elderly People	43%	.467				
Community Cultural Activities	48%	.429		.393		
Community Economic Growth	48%	.355				
Pollution	37%		.803			
Nature Conservation	28%		.771			
Waste	29%		.741			
Energy	33%		.699			
Environmental Education	54%		.657			
Farming, Forestry, Fishing	20%		.652			
Science and Technology	19%		.601			
Food	35%		.593			
Transport	36%		.583			
Genetically Modified Food	21%		.558		.538	
Animal Welfare	15%		.544		.538	
Tourism	17%		.408			
Building Conservation	18%		.391			
Racial Harassment	42%			.714		
Minority Citizenship Rights	35%			.607		
Minorities' Access to Public Office	24%			.597		
Multiculturalism	42%	.321		.577		
Asylum Seekers	44%			.574		

TABLE 3.1 (continued)

	Percentage Interested	Social Exclusion	Environment	Ethnic & Minority	Globalization	Housing
Minority						
Entrepreneurship	23%			.538		
Independent Education for Minorities	23%			.462		
Third World Debt	24%				.829	
Third World Poverty	27%				.761	
Globalization	26%		.428		.689	
Military Installations	15%		.314		.427	
Hunting	8%		.322		.346	
Tenants' Rights	35%	.466				.680
Housing Quality	38%	.509				.654
Housing Privatization	21%					.629
Housing Developments	40%					.540
Explained Variance		15%	12%	8%	7%	5%

tinctive according to citizens' organizations' perceptions of their issue priority. They should not be regarded as a mere extension of more established concerns such as those with the environment or inequality.

If global issues occupy a specific location in the agendas of citizens' organizations in the two cities, is the interest in those issues accounted for by specific organizational traits? The hypotheses, outlined in the previous section, were tested with an ordinal regression analysis (table 3.2). The basic model looks at the impact of organizational consolidation (measured as an index, summarizing different organizational traits: see appendix A for details) on attention in global issues, controlling for city. No significant differences emerge between Glasgow and Bristol here, nor in any of the models, to suggest a low impact of local political cultures and opportunities on organizations' issue priorities. Instead, organizational consolidation turns out to have a negative impact on mobilization potential (table 3.2, model 1): groups with a formal bureaucratic structure, a substantial budget, and who have been in existence for a longer time are less likely to express interest in global issues than less-established groups with a looser structure. The contribution of these factors remains consistently significant even when other variables are introduced in the models (table 3.2, models 2–4). All in all, less-established organizations seem inclined to develop stronger interests in global issues.

The explanatory capacity of the model, however, increases significantly when we bring in organizational identities. The hypothesis that global issues are more appealing to political actors is tested here by means of

TABLE 3.2.
Ordinal Regression Estimates of Interest in Global Issues
(standard errors in parentheses)

<i>Model</i>	1	2	3	4
Glasgow	.153 (.253)	.227 (.259)	.195 (.281)	-8.563E-03 (.329)
Organizational Consolidation (see appendix A for details)	-.547*** (.131)	-.277* (.145)	-.332* (.155)	-.558*** (.172)
Identities				
Identity as Charity		-.469 (.315)	-.493 (.338)	-.343 (.367)
Identity as Political Organization		1.341*** (.300)	.956** (.334)	.949** (.361)
Repertoires (see appendix B for details)				
Protest			1.935E-03 (.006)	-8.39E-04 (.007)
Pressure			6.880E-03 (.006)	6.355E-03 (.006)
Consumerist			2.449E-02*** (.005)	1.294E-02** (.005)
Issue Interests				
Social Exclusion				-1.00E-02 (.006)
Housing				3.957E-03 (.005)
Ethnic & Minority				2.291E-02*** (.006)
Environment				4.153E-02*** (.005)
Nagelkerke R Square	.08	.18	.37	.57
-2 log likelihood	631384	607525	549424	463879

p < .01; * p < .001

two indicators: self-representation of organizations as charities and as political groups.⁶ Self-identification as political organizations, potentially more open to pick up salient and controversial topics and to articulate them in political projects, greatly raises the chance of being interested in global issues. The impact of political identity remains significant, even though its relative contribution decreases, when we introduce repertoires in the equation (table 3.2, model 3). Here, I differentiate between three types of repertoires, a classic *protest repertoire*, including demonstrations, sit-ins, blockades, and other forms of direct action; a *pressure repertoire*, including classic lobbying strategies; and what I call a *consumerist reper-*

toire, combining protest-oriented actions such as brand boycotts with more moderate styles of behavior such as adoption of fair-trade practices.⁷ The propensity to adopt pressure or protest repertoires does not seem to have any relation with attention to global issues: they appear to be neither the preserve of the radical direct action sectors, nor of the lobbyists. Rather, interest in global themes seems to be higher among actors with a propensity to adopt innovative styles of action, such as product boycotts and fair-trade practices, which go beyond conventional distinctions between pressure and protest. These try to address the weak spot in contemporary corporate strategies, their exposure to consumer pressure, either directly through boycotts or indirectly through the latter's support to alternative forms of production and commercialization.

Finally, the performance of the model improves dramatically when we take into account organizations' attention to interests other than global issues. In principle, as I noticed in the previous paragraph, there might be good reasons to expect a correlation between global issues and any of the other policy issues included in our dataset. In practice, global issues appear to be related to environmental issues as well as—if to a smaller extent—to ethnic and minority ones, that is, to those sets of issues that are most easily associated with the transnational dimension. No correlation is found, in contrast, between global and social inequality issues. These appear to be the preserve of organizations whose main focus may vary considerably: it can lie entirely on the specific problems of the most deprived sectors of British society (an orientation most likely to be found among institutionalized charities) or reflect an explicit attempt to connect local and global sources of discrimination (table 3.2, model 4).

PROMOTING GLOBAL ACTIONS IN LOCAL SETTINGS

How does interest in global issues translate into collective action? Similar to what we noticed in reference to issues, it is not always obvious how to tell a "global" protest event from an environmental or an ethnic one. In both cities we asked respondents to tell us about their organizations' involvement in a range public events (sometimes, campaigns), which had taken place in recent years. More precisely, we asked about organizations' involvement in twenty-six events in Glasgow and seventeen in Bristol, broadly addressing environmental, ethnic, or inequality issues with varying degrees of radicalism. In both cities we could identify three distinctive sets of events with a similar profile,⁸ although with a different relative weight (table 3.3). First, we could identify strong links between a set of actions addressing several aspects of ethnic and minority issues, ranging

TABLE 3.3
Participation in Public Events in the Two Cities (Maximum likelihood factor analysis, Varimax rotation)

	<i>Percentage Taking Part</i>	<i>Ethnic & Minority</i>	<i>Global Inequality</i>	<i>Environmental Justice</i>
Glasgow				
Chokar Family Campaign	26%	.782		.307
Imran Khan's Murder	15%	.699		
Annual Antiracist Demonstration	25%	.671		.357
Glasgow Mela	23%	.624		
Council Cultural Diversity Meeting	21%	.596		
Kick Racism Out of Football	15%	.592		
Council Police Racism Event	11%	.587		
Council Equality Policy Event	20%	.570		
Asian Youth Festival	13%	.483	.401	
Mothers Against Drugs	11%	.456		
Asylum Seekers	47%	.455		
Council Stock Transfer	16%	.331		.327
Faslane Peace Camp	18%		.916	.425
Trident Ploughshares	16%		.908	
Global Resistance Campaign	16%		.692	
May Day Parade	20%		.507	
Abolish Clause 28	18%	.306	.358	
Swimming Pool Closures	22%		.344	.321
M77 Extension	13%			.695
Mobile Phone Masts	7%			.681
M74 Extension	15%		.331	.621
Hospital Waste Incinerators	6%			.557
Gap Demonstration	9%		.437	.520
Save Our Hospitals	16%			.481
Kelvingrove Music Festival	11%	.348		.471
School Closures	11%	.381	.331	.411
Explained Variance		18%	14%	13%
Bristol				
Stop Avon Ring Road	6%			.954
Ashton Court Quarry	8%			.849
Ikea Breath Free	7%			.707
M32 Reclaim the Streets Party	5%			.548

TABLE 3.3 (continued)

	<i>Percentage Taking Part</i>	<i>Ethnic & Minority</i>	<i>Global Inequality</i>	<i>Environmental Justice</i>
Claimants' Action	3%			.538
Jubilee 2000	11%		.906	
Global Resistance	10%		.612	.323
Baby Milk	7%		.544	
Local Agenda 21	31%		.442	
Sort It Youth Festival	9%		.362	
Asylum Seekers	18%		.311	
Easton Community Festival	34%	.692		
Respect in the West Festival	31%	.651		
St Paul's Carnival	16%	.616		
Bristol Community Festival	26%	.307		
Hartcliffe & Withyood Carnival	8%			
International Women's Day	35%			
Explained Variance		10%	13%	18%

from annual multicultural festivals with a largely symbolic character to militant actions on specific instances of racial hatred or discrimination. This turned out to be the most salient set of events in Glasgow, but the least salient in Bristol. We then identified a set of actions sharing what could be called an "environmental justice" approach, linking urban ecology events, from opposition to local motorways, incinerators, or quarries, to the fight for social services in the local communities or for better working conditions. In this case the relation between the two cities reversed, with environmental justice events accounting for the highest share of variation in event attendance in Bristol, the lowest in Glasgow.

Finally, one could identify initiatives, which from different perspectives could be associated with "global inequality." In Glasgow, these events centered around peace actions such as the peace camp in Faslane or the Trident Ploughshares campaign, and antiliberal no global initiatives such as the Global Resistance campaign. However, they also included more traditional internationalist events such as the May Day parade and actions challenging local as well as global instances of social exclusion, such as the protests against well-known brands like Gap, or the high-profile campaign to save public swimming pools from closure. In Bristol, global inequality events included a combination of fairly institutional and more confrontational events: the debt-related Jubilee 2000 campaign, initiatives

linked with Local Agenda 21, and a youth festival among the former; demonstrations to support asylum seekers, Global Resistance events, and the Baby Milk Action Campaign, targeting multinational Nestlé, among the latter.

What characteristics differentiate organizations that have taken part in at least one global inequality event over the last few years, from those who have not? There are some important differences with respect to the explanations provided for interest in global issues. The impact of organizational consolidation and repertoires disappears altogether, and that of “political organizational identity” is drastically smaller: all in all, organizational traits and know-how seem to matter very little when it comes to engaging in global actions. To the contrary, issue interests matter a lot. Part of this finding is unsurprising, namely, the expected positive correlation between interest in, and action on, global issues, and the lack of correlation between global inequality events and interest in social exclusion issues (consistent with what we found in table 3.2, even though in theory a correlation was surely conceivable).

Far more interesting, and somehow puzzling, is that the sign of the relationship between ethnic and minority issues, environmental issues, and globalization is now reversed. If interest in both sets of issues predicted interest in globalization issues, it predicts poor involvement in global actions on related topics (model 4). Of course, this might depend on an inadequate choice of the episodes included in our lists. But I do not think this is the case. Rather, this finding suggests that organizations interested in issues that they perceive as close to global issues (hence the correlation when looking at issue linkages) may struggle to translate that interest into specific collective action. It is as if strong interest in cognate issues discouraged action on themes perceived as compatible in principle, but alternative in practice, when it comes to the use of scarce mobilization resources. The negative relation between ethnic, environmental, and global issues persists even if we bring into the equation involvement in the other two types of local public events (model 5). For the latter there is, however, a positive correlation with global events, to suggest that once organizations are strongly involved in local events, they tend to be so across the board. But unless such commitment exists, mere interest in cognate topics does seem alternative to action on global issues, rather than conducive to it. It is also worth noting that, when all relevant variables are introduced, location in Bristol turns out to be positively related to active mobilization on global inequality events. This suggests an independent role for local political conditions in accounting for involvement in global events.

TABLE 3.4
Binary Logistic Estimates of Actual Participation in Global Inequality
Public Events (B coefficients; standard errors in parentheses)

<i>Model</i>	1	2	3	4	5
Constant	-.878*** (.198)	-1.011*** (.282)	-1.016*** (.285)	-.929* (.400)	-2.545*** (.582)
Glasgow	.290 (.271)	.259 (.278)	.330 (.285)	.246 (.313)	-1.410** (.445)
Organizational Consolidation (see appendix A for details)	-.161 (.136)	.019 (.156)	.070 (.161)	.167 (.175)	.082 (.202)
Identities					
Identity as Charity	-.229	-.192 (.330)	-.236 (.333)	-.131 (.348)	.389 (.389)
Identity as Political Organization		.855** (.328)	.639 (.356)	.393 (.388)	.658 (.439)
Repertoires (see appendix B for details)					
Protest			.011 (.007)	.013 (.007)	.004 (.008)
Pressure			.000 (.006)	-.001 (.006)	.001 (.007)
Consumerist			-.003 (.005)	-.006 (.006)	.001 (.006)
Issue Interests					
Social Exclusion				.009 (.006)	.008 (.007)
Housing				-.003 (.005)	-.003 (.006)
Ethnic & Minority				-.013* (.007)	-.023** (.008)
Environment				-.014* (.007)	-.018* (.008)
Globalization				.024*** (.007)	.027*** (.008)
Participation in Public Events					
Ethnic & Minority Events					.893** (.359)
Environmental Justice Events					2.524*** (.467)
Nagelgerke R Square	.01	.06	.08	.14	.37
-2 log likelihood	318686	309696	306407	294797	243454

*: $p < .05$; **: $p < .01$; ***: $p < .001$

**GLOBAL ISSUES BETWEEN SOCIAL MOVEMENT,
COALITIONAL, AND ORGANIZATIONAL
LOGICS OF ACTION**

Let us now refer back to the discussion of different logics of collective action, which differentiates between social movement dynamics, coalitional dynamics, and organizational dynamics. The question I want to address is whether attention to global issues characterizes organizations involved in any specific dynamic, in particular, given the relative novelty and lack of institutionalization of those issues, in social movement dynamics. An analysis of alliance networks⁹ in the two cities (Diani and Bison, 2004) identified for each city three groups of organizations that occupied distinctive positions in the alliance network, being linked to other actors in a similar way—a position that network analysts would define as “structural equivalence.”¹⁰ I then checked whether organizations in each group were also internally connected to each other by identity bonds, in order to be able to differentiate between purely contingent alliances and alliances that might be embedded in stronger and deeper links. As a proxy for identity bonds I used the connections, originating from organizations’ past participation in the same public events (at least three out of those listed in table 3.3), and the sharing of core activists. This enabled me to identify three different collective action processes, operating in both cities.

In both Glasgow and Bristol, a number of organizations (33 percent of the total in the former, 19 percent in the latter) could be associated with *social movement processes*. They were connected through dense alliance networks and were also relatively frequently linked by shared participation in past events, or by joint activists. The relational dimension stretched beyond collaborations between organizations, which might in themselves also be purely instrumental, to suggest bonds and shared identities, which secured continuity to the network. This was not the case for another set of organizations (36 percent in Glasgow, 37 percent in Bristol), for which interorganizational networking was limited to collaboration on specific issues. *Coalitional processes* seemed to be operating there, as the gap between the density of organizational exchanges and the density of those links, measuring continuity of commitment over time and activists’ personal involvement, was pronounced. Finally, both alliance links and identity links were very sparse for 31 percent of organizations in Glasgow and 44 percent in Bristol, suggesting their involvement in *organizational processes*. The main focus for those organizations seemed to be their own organizational activities; they were not involved in distinctive sets of alliances, nor were they linked by connections implying some

level of collective identity with other groups. The relational dimension of social movement action was distinctly absent there.

The distribution of issue interests across organizations involved in different processes in the two cities shows no significant differences, but for one minor and one major exception (table 3.5): interest in environmental issues is significantly higher among organizations involved in social movement processes in Bristol, while—most important to us—globalization issues are the only ones to be consistently most popular among organizations involved in such processes in both cities. In both Glasgow and Bristol, organizations that either act on their own or only engage in instrumental coalition work seem less likely to invest in global issues. As findings reported in table 3.2 suggest, global issues may create more opportunities for less-established political players than others,

TABLE 3.5
Issue Interests (1–100 scales) by City and Type of Collective Action Process

<i>Glasgow</i>				
<i>Type of Process</i>	<i>Coalitional</i>	<i>Organizational</i>	<i>Social Movement</i>	<i>Total</i>
Social Exclusion	48	57	45	50
Environment	25	25	35	28
Ethnic & Minority	32	47	44	41
Globalization	10	15	44	23***
Housing	43	52	44	47
N	45	38	41	124
<i>Bristol</i>				
Social Exclusion	39	41	40	40
Environment	26	25	56	31***
Ethnic & Minority	25	26	25	25
Globalization	18	18	38	22*
Housing	30	23	19	26
N	50	59	25	134

Note: The scales measure the proportion of issues, correlated with one of the factors identified in table 3.2, in which organizations expressed interest. For example, on the average, Glaswegian organizations were interested in 23 percent of the issues correlated with global inequality, but this percentage equaled 44 percent for those involved in a social movement process, only 10 percent for those adopting a coalitional logic.

*** Difference significant at 0.001 level; * difference significant at 0.05 level.

where a division of labor between organizations has probably consolidated.

As for involvement in public events, the picture is partially different. In Glasgow, organizations involved in social movement processes stand out from organizations involved in other collective action processes not only for their participation in global inequality, but also in environmental justice events (table 3.6). There, over 70 percent of organizations of that type have taken part in at least one global inequality event (68 percent in an environmental justice event), whereas only 32 percent (16 percent for environmental justice events) have done so in Bristol, in both cases close to the city average. In Glasgow, participation in global events seems to be a powerful source of differentiation among civic organizations, whereas the same does not apply to Bristol. To understand why this is the case, as well as the reasons why Bristol seems to be a more conducive environment for action on global issues once other factors are controlled for, requires a thorough discussion of the logics guiding citizen politics in the two cities. Unfortunately, this cannot be addressed in the present chapter (for a very preliminary effort, see Purdue and Diani, 2003).

TABLE 3.6
Percentage of Organizations Involved in at Least One Global Inequality Event, by City and Type of Collective Action Process

<i>Glasgow</i>				
<i>Type of Process</i>	<i>Coalitional</i>	<i>Organizational</i>	<i>Social Movement</i>	<i>Total</i>
Global Inequality	9%	11%	71%	30%***
Ethnic & Minority	64%	50%	68%	61%
Environmental Justice	36%	26%	68%	43%***
N	45	38	41	124
<i>Bristol</i>				
Global Inequality	36%	39%	32%	37%
Ethnic & Minority	36%	39%	32%	37%
Ethnic & Minority	36%	51%	48%	45%
Environmental Justice	16%	5%	16%	11%
N	50	59	25	134

***Difference significant at 0.001 level

CONCLUSION

The analysis of two different local UK settings suggests that, far from being a mere addition to the new social movements milieu, or the mere revitalization of established agendas on social inequality, or ethnic and minority rights, mobilizations on global issues constitute the focal point of specific alliances, based on specific identity bonds within British civil society. We may attempt the following provisional conclusions regarding the role of global issues in local politics:

- Global issues are both pervasive and distinctive. Pervasive, as interest in them is equally present in two territorial areas, which are profoundly different in both social and political terms. Distinctive, as they are perceived by civil society organizations as an independent set of concerns, which are internally correlated and cannot be reduced to any of the other major issues around which mobilization attempts in the two cities develop. They do not overlap, even though they are linked to them, either with “new social movement” issues like the environment, nor with ethnic and minority issues. They show no correlation at all to social exclusion issues. There is the potential for a distinctive agenda there.
- Global issues are not equally appealing to the whole spectrum of civic organizations. On the contrary, they attract disproportionate attention from organizations with a distinctive profile: low levels of formalization and consolidation; a view of themselves as political groups rather than charities; a propensity to adopt a distinctive action repertoire, emphasizing consumers’ role—whether as boycotters of certain products or as promoters of fair-trade practices. Global issues are, in other words, appealing to actors structurally more prepared to experiment with new strategies of action, and to use their political orientation to secure a niche, which their uncertain formal status cannot grant them. Consistent with this picture, in both cities global issues appear particularly attractive to organizations engaged in social movement processes: in other words, involved in dense alliance networks that are also backed by relatively strong identity links.
- The picture changes substantially if we look at how interest is turned into action on specific events. None of the factors mentioned above are consistent, significant predictors of actual participation in “global inequality” actions. The latter is positively correlated to interest in global issues, and to participation on other local events on issues such as ethnic but negatively correlated to interest in cognate issues such as the environment and ethnic and minority rights. Most important, propensity to engage in other important local events on ethnic

and minority issues and environmental justice issues also predicts engagement in “glocal” actions. The inclination to cover such a broad agenda reflects what was recently found by analysts of direct action participants in the United Kingdom. (Doherty, Plows, and Wall, 2001).

- Finally, differences between cities seem to operate in an unusual way. If we look at differences in the orientations and behavior of individual organizations, they seem to matter very little. Neither organizations’ interest in global issues, nor their involvement in specific public events, is affected by their location in Glasgow or Bristol. Substantial differences can be found, in contrast, if we look at how organizations involved in specific collective action processes actually operate in the two cities. When it comes to collective action on global issues, organizations engaged in social movement processes in Glasgow differ markedly from those following different logics, whereas differences are not significant at all in Bristol. In Glasgow, where political culture still reflects drastic differences between moderatism and radicalism and inequality-based issues are still central, “global inequality” events do not seem to be an option for organizations that follow mostly coalitional or organizational logics. In Bristol, availability to act on global inequality does not shape civil society, as involvement in those actions is spread across the civic sector. These differences suggest that the embeddedness of actions conducted on global issues in specific niches of interorganizational networks is strongly mediated by the features of local civil societies and political systems.

NOTES

This chapter originates from an investigation of “Networks of civic organisations in Britain” that I conducted with Isobel Lindsay (University of Strathclyde in Glasgow) and Derrick Purdue (University of West of England, Bristol) from June 2000 to September 2003. The project was part of the *Democracy and Participation Programme*, funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (contract L215 25 2006), and directed by Paul Whiteley. I am grateful to Paul for his constant support, to Juliana Mackenzie for her assistance with data entry and data collection in Glasgow, and to Derrick Purdue’s collaborators at UWE for their work on data collection in Bristol.

1. There are strong reasons to believe that all of the most central organizations in both cities were contacted: while many other organizations that were not among those interviewed were mentioned by respondents, none received more than three nominations. On the other hand, umbrella bodies like the Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector (GCVS) or the Scottish Council for Voluntary

Organizations (SCVO) in Glasgow, or the Voluntary Organisations Standing Conference on Urban Regeneration (VOSCUR) and the Black Development Agency (BDA) in Bristol, are excluded from the present analysis. Their role as providers of services to the voluntary and community sector, rather than as direct promoters—or opponents—of change on substantive issues, renders them very different from the other organizations contacted, when it comes to alliance building.

2. These were the Southside in Glasgow, an area with massive historical presence of working class, including neighborhoods such as Govan, Govanhill, Gorbals, and Pollokshields, and the area including the neighborhoods of Easton, Knowles, Withywood, and Hartcliffe in Bristol, featuring a strong presence of ethnic minorities.

3. In contrast to what I have done elsewhere (Diani and Bison, 2004), in this chapter I will not consider the distinction between conflictual and consensual collective action. By the latter, I mean, with John Lofland (1989:163), a form of collective action conducted in the absence of specific social and/or political opponents. Consensual collective actors blame lack of information, skills, or education, rather than other social groups, for the grievances they address. In principle, we might have both consensual and conflictual organizational, coalitional, and movement dynamics (Diani and Bison, 2004). In practice, however, such differences had no impact at all on the analysis of collective action on global issues presented here.

4. Of course, nothing prevents a coalitional dynamic from evolving into a social movement dynamic, but it is still important to recognize the analytical difference between the two processes.

5. A maximum likelihood factor analysis generated ten rotated (Varimax solution) factors with *eigenvalue* above 1. The first five are reported in table 2.1 and represent the focus of my analysis (see Kim and Mueller [1978] for a basic introduction to factor analysis).

6. Although the two should be mutually exclusive by British law, their correlation is only $-.38$: significant, but far from perfect, suggesting a gap between formal criteria and subjective perceptions.

7. See appendix B for details on how these indicators of repertoires were constructed. A fourth repertoire, support to local and national candidates in elections, was not included in the models given its limited relevance.

8. A maximum likelihood factor analysis was used here too.

9. Respondents were asked to identify up to five of their most important partners in alliances. They were also invited to identify any additional important collaboration with groups belonging to any of the following categories: environmental organizations, ethnic organizations, community organizations, churches, political parties, unions and other economic interest groups, other voluntary organizations, other organizations. The resulting data on alliances should be treated not as a list of the groups with which our respondents exchanged most frequently or most intensely in objective terms, but of those they perceived as their most important allies at the time of the interview. Accordingly, the matrix of alliances, which represents the basis of our analysis, is best interpreted as an indicator of perceptions of closeness rather than objective intensity of exchange. It

reflects, in other terms, how organizations perceive their social space and identify their most relevant contacts within it.

10. In the language of network analysis, organizations are structurally equivalent when they are linked to the same actors, regardless of whether or not they are connected to each other (Diani, 2002:191–94; Wasserman and Faust, 1994:chap.9).

