

The Environmental Question, Employment, and Development in Italy's Left, 1945-1990¹

Wilko Graf von Hardenberg & Paolo Pelizzari

Post-war Italy's political organisations' attitude towards environmental issues is closely correlated to how the country transformed from a merely agrarian society to one of the world's richest industrial actors as well as to how its governments managed development. In view of the role of the social-Communist opposition in shaping the country's cultural and social features we are persuaded that a better understanding of that process has to pass through an analysis of how the representatives of the workers' movement approached the environmental question and the Italian model of development: an approach that was deeply influenced by a political vision favouring industrialisation, employment, and production.²

After World War II (WWII), and despite being entrenched in a framework deeply marked by the Cold War, the social-Communist left became an important political actor positing itself as a force of renewal and vouching for an alternative developmental model opposed to that outlined by *laissez-faire* capitalism. Of course, its behaviour changed over time according to the country's economic situation. For instance, since the post-war reconstruction—from the 'economic miracle' and youth contestation until the energy crisis of the 1970s and the free-trade policies of the following decade—the Italian left faced several complex environmental problems. This complexity, together with the length of the historical period considered, has not facilitated a simple historical narrative. Nevertheless, we wish to offer here a preliminary survey of the main issues at stake in the Italian left's environmentalism. It is therefore useful to clarify a few points. The first one concerns the definition of the term 'left' as it is used in this essay: even if there are some references to socialist politicians or to documents produced by the social-Communist union, Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro (CGIL), the essay is based mainly on sources referring to or produced by the Italian Communist Party (PCI). The latter is this article's main object of analysis as it is the predominant organization of the Italian workers' movement, which has enacted a sort of cultural and political hegemony over other sectors of the Italian left.

Secondly, we wish to explain the expression 'environmental question', which some may consider void of significance because of the wide spectrum of issues it is used to define today, which include pollution, nature conservation, urban sustainability, or illegal whaling. The environmental issues we address in this essay are specifically those which we believe have the greatest connections to PCI's role as the major representative of Italy's workers' movement, to employment, and

to development. In particular, we discuss the changing positions the Italian left assumed in relation to the factory environment, to a chaotic and unplanned territorial development, to the effects of polluting industries, and finally, to nuclear power. Traditionally, the Italian left seems to have simply avoided discussing nature and landscape conservation, even though various movements and organisations had, since the late nineteenth century, brought forward these issues. The left may have viewed with a certain disdain these questions, considering them primarily connected with bourgeois interests.³

We will thus take into consideration the role of the left in creating the precedents for the birth in the 1970s of what has been usually termed in Italian ‘*ecologismo politico*’. This form of environmentalism developed within the social movement of 1968 in opposition to traditional conservationism and was interested in concrete struggle against the causes of environmental damage and further interested in defeating social inequity and ecological abuses. It should not to be confused with political ecology as it is understood in the Anglo-American world—even if both may be seen as referring to a leftist, even Marxian, reconsideration of the causes of environmental degradation. The Italian version is more prone to an active role in the political struggle than its analytical and academic counterpart. It carries on this struggle through the creation of new civic associations and the organisation of public protests. It represents an approach to the environment that welds the need to preserve nature from the consequences of industrialisation and urbanisation to the desire to change the Western development model.⁴ It may be assumed that the sensibility of the Italian Communist left considered such a kind of environmental awareness, which had a strong social dimension, more concordant with the needs of the poorer social classes and with traditional leftist values.

This paper will first offer a survey of how the Communist left answered the contradictions caused by post-war reconstruction and the economic “boom” of the 1950s and 1960s. It will illustrate how the initial perceptions of the ‘environmental question’ were defined in the Communist left political family around the struggle for occupational health and for a better way of life in the urban periphery. Battles intertwined by the end of the 1960s with the ferments of student-worker protests. It will then analyze how this aspect of the Italian left wrestled with the new ‘*ecologismo politico*’ approach, which had grown increasingly important in the face of critical events such as the energy crisis of 1973. It will do so by investigating the Italian left’s reaction to some of the most important ecological crises that occurred before the fall of the Berlin Wall, such as Chernobyl. We argue that the Italian post-war Communists reluctantly, with the exception of a few figures, accepted the values of environmentalism. Although they reflected upon environmental questions—particularly those regarding the environment of industrial factories—they remained tied to an industrialist model of development and tended to be more concerned with the occupational question than the ecological one. In fact, this article will describe the inability of the Italian Communist

culture to incorporate the environmental question in a wider sense and its incapacity to fully merge its traditional values with the critical concerns of environmentalism.

The post-war reconstruction

In the ten years of post-WWII reconstruction the representatives of the working class had to manage a swiftly and radically changing reality. Marked in Italy, as in the rest of Europe, by a blind faith in the benefits of industrial development, the decade revealed a triumphant optimism about the future and an anticipated economic boom; however, attention towards the issues posed by the bourgeois conservation movement concerning natural heritage and landscapes was wholly inadequate. Relying on the experience developed in the nineteenth century in the struggles that led to the reduction of both working hours and the exploitation of the juvenile workforce, representatives of the working class nevertheless continued to demand improvements to the work environment and the protection of worker health—issues that could represent the roots of an autonomous and alternative Communist environmentalism.⁵ However, the action of the representatives of the labour movement in the post-war period was rendered less incisive by the needs of reconstruction: their priorities were “to reactivate the factories, to restore the fields, to reabsorb the unemployed, first of all to reconstruct.”⁶ Some trade-union documents of the years 1949-1952, for example, about the struggle against the sizing and dismantlement of factories (e.g., Breda, Franco Tosi, and Isotta Fraschini) include references to pollution only as far as its reduction contributed to the rationalisation of production. As historian Luigi Ganapini wrote:

The strategy of the unions in the 1940s and early 1950s was set in a framework based substantially on the aims and values of the general political struggle. Factory and workers’ conditions seemed not to be the crucial worry of militant leftists, who preferred the defence of ideological and political liberties to the preservation of jobs.⁷

The “white books” prepared between 1954 and 1958 by the unions of Milan’s great factories (e.g., Alfa, Borletti, Breda, Magneti Marelli, and OM) began to highlight instead the desire to react to the injustices suffered by the workers because of the intensification of work imposed by new Taylorist strategies adopted to increase productivity. At this stage, in fact,

a sharp increase of the problems concerning the conditions of industrial work is evident: these problems are not seen any more only as a handicap for a better deployment of the production process. Though they did not completely lose this meaning, they were now valued mainly as a—economic, physical, moral—damage for the worker.⁸

At this point in time, the left—as other political factions in Italy—was far

from having worked out its own standpoint on the conditions of the natural environment. It began, however, to give more weight to the problems of that environment in which its electorate spent most of its time: the industrial factory.⁹ In so doing, it tended to fit claims for a better work environment within a more general discontent about the incomplete enforcement of constitutional principles.¹⁰ Take for example Giuseppe Di Vittorio's speech during a meeting on the conditions of the industrial worker organised in 1954 by the *Società Umanitaria*, a Milan-based organisation devoted to aiding the working class and the disadvantaged. Citing cases of injustices in some factories (Montecatini, Marzotto, Italcementi, and Florio), Di Vittorio, the secretary-general of CGIL, insisted on the importance of the role of internal factory commissions in defending constitutional dictates since "the fundamental rights that our Constitution grants to all citizens are in practice suppressed by factory owners" and, thus,

by defending these rights the workers defend their bread, their welfare, the living conditions for them and their families, but also democratic liberties in general, because ... the whole democratic system of our country is based on the protection of liberty and of workers' democratic and union rights.¹¹

In other words, the defence of workers' welfare and thus the improvement of industrial environments was for Di Vittorio, part of a more general struggle for the defence of constitutional rights and democratic liberties, since the right to welfare and proper living conditions was asserted by constitutional law.

In the mid 1950s, there were nevertheless still strong limits to the unions' ability to understand the internal dynamics of the factories. CGIL's defeat at the elections for the Fabbrica Italiana Automobili Torino (FIAT) internal commission in 1955 led Di Vittorio to reconsider the role of the union and to theorize strategies more in line with the real exigencies of the work environment.¹² The efforts the unions and some left-wing intellectuals made to deal in a more substantial way with workplace problems clashed, however, with the wall of indifference set up by the Communist Party.¹³ In the years preceding the economic boom, while the struggle for the right to industrial safety reached an important goal with the hygiene and safety norms drafted in 1956, the desire to increase production overrode all other concerns, and unfortunately the health and safety norms were never applied.¹⁴

The representatives of traditional left-wing organisations thus had to face the ambiguous dynamics of growth that caused, together with swelling productivity levels, an increase in the number of work-related injuries and illnesses.¹⁵ Despite such ambiguities and despite the fact that new critical views were being developed—such as those by Luciano Della Mea, a socialist intellectual who wrote about nature conservation in the journal, *il Touring*¹⁶—left-wing organisations were not always able to fashion adequate tools to confront the consequences of growth

because they were still anchored to a positivist view celebrating the progressive aspects of technology.¹⁷ Thus, the attention that the traditional left gave to injustices in the workplace remained, however, strongly linked to issues of occupational healthcare issues.¹⁸ In the meantime, the first experiments of transversal political cooperation were under way. The *Inchiesta sulla condizione dei lavoratori in fabbrica*, for example, which Christian democratic deputies Alessandro Buttè and Ettore Calvi promoted and left wing parties and organisations supported, investigated the condition of factory workers. This inquiry, which took place between 1955 and 1957, highlighted the imbalances and injustices of a developmental model that was unable to correct itself and that resulted in penalties the working class had to suffer.¹⁹

The *economic miracle* and the centre-left governments

The 1960s were marked by a continued debate about the need to reform the Italian political and social system. The planned reforms aimed to modernize the country: promoting the development of the south, improving the agricultural sector, bettering the education system, instituting nation-wide welfare and health care, creating regions (as foreseen by the Constitution), strengthening local authority to better manage swelling urban areas, and nationalizing the power industry. In fact, the long economic boom had at last offered the government the funds needed to integrate all social classes in the nation-state. This reformism has found its political expression in the centre-left governments set up since 1962—comprising in the first year only Christian democrats, republicans and social-democrats, and expanding in 1963 to include socialists. The latter were former allies of the Communist Party who were now in search of an autonomous role on the political scene and dreamt of a radical and structural reform of the country. Alas, most of the planned reforms were realised only much later, and scholars have considered the experience of the centre-left governments substantially disappointing.²⁰

In parallel, more critical approaches to the Italian way of development began to flourish within the extreme left. While the ‘economic miracle’ influenced how this development would take place, favouring the birth of new actors such as the mass worker, Italian society was experiencing the creation of conditions that led to important changes in the country’s way of life and to a growth of environmental awareness. During the crucial years in which the first centre-left governments were set up, in fact, a substantial environmental movement formed. Regarding issues such as urban planning, the movement joined forces with the reforming efforts of such people as the Christian democratic Minister of Public Works, Fiorentino Sullo.²¹

This stage was also marked by a more determined, if insufficient, attempt of the broad Communist left to renew its theoretical reflection upon the new tendencies of Italian capitalism. The Communist left’s aim, stated in the proceedings of a conference organised by the Communist cultural institution Istituto Gramsci:

[was] to reach a more accurate definition of, and check the current judgments on the basic trends of Italian capitalism, to offer the information needed for a comprehensive and final re-examination of the struggles of the Italian labour and democratic movement, to locate, together with the trends in action within our economic system, the more relevant theoretical and ideological implications.²²

Within such an effort, it is difficult to detect sincerely critical approaches to a economic development model that was totally uninterested in the negative effects of industrialisation. At the beginning of the 1960s one could discern in some sectors of the Italian left greater attention to the modifications ‘neo-capitalist’ dynamics brought the work environment.²³ Already the 1960 CGIL congress showed a greater consciousness of the changes introduced in work relationships by restructuring, technical innovations, automation, and scientific management of work.²⁴ Although the social-Communist union was still deficient in its democratic practice and substantial differences were present in the way the new phase of development was interpreted, a new discursive strategy was introduced during the congress. As historian Maria Luisa Righi remarked this new discursive strategy,

made it possible to insert the aim of health preservation into the framework of a strategy directed to improve workers’ conditions not only as regards income redistribution, but in production itself, highlighting thus the topicality of issues like workers’ control and autonomy.²⁵

Activities such as courses on the work environment were organised to increase awareness, and thus attention to this problem grew and intertwined itself with the criticisms of the excessive “capitalist use of machines” and with the efforts of welfare bodies like CGIL’s Istituto nazionale confederale di assistenza (INCA).²⁶

Nonetheless, most representatives of the Italian left tackled the issues of development and reforms with an approach that cared for very different sorts of issues. Even when self-critical questions were aimed at the deficiencies of the left’s reformism, the economic boom’s limits, and the potential of an economic policy that would organise a different equilibrium, the analysis never directly involved environmental issues but remained focused on the contradictions that could put at risk the industrial model of development and, most of all, employment levels.

Instead, when efforts to investigate workers’ experiences began, the Italian left elaborated discourses that only implicitly contained messages about the environment outside of the factories. After 1964, when textile, metal, food, and chemical workers struggled to improve their life and work conditions, the prominent trade unionist Bruno Trentin affirmed the need to reconnect the political initiative of the left to the specific struggles expressed by workers, because it was only

from within these struggles that reformers could find further impulse to move forward.²⁷

During the second half of the 1960s, this leftist discourse grew to centre on the problems and unhealthiness of workplaces. It was in this period that journals like *Rassegna di Medicina dei Lavoratori*—a bimonthly publication of CGIL that subsequently became *Medicina dei Lavoratori*—were founded and that a productive co-operation between union officers and workers at the FIAT Mirafiori plant began, proposing “a first model for a system controlling environmental noxiousness, as an outcome of the comparison between the workers’ and the engineers’ model.”²⁸ Bruno Sacerdoti, secretary of FIOM (CGIL’s metalworkers union) in Brescia, designated the problem of health protection a primary issue that was not subordinate to the defence of workers’ other immediate interests. It was an issue that was in the interest of the whole union.²⁹

While the activities in the factories and the commitment of some politicians, such as the socialist minister of work and former unionist Giacomo Brodolini endured (leading to the important goal of the *Statuto dei Lavoratori*,³⁰ the charter of workers’ rights), the concern for the environment in a broad sense was awakened by a few events that demonstrated the limits underlying an unbalanced and intemperate development. In 1966 the floods in Florence and Venice as well as continued extensive illegal practices in the building sector—evident in the disaster caused by the collapse of buildings in Agrigento—could be seen as nothing less than a significant warning signal. As Paul Ginsborg has observed, these ‘natural calamities’ probably could have been avoided if only the centre-left governments had approved a structural reform of urban planning and soil preservation laws instead of passing the umpteenth transitory measure.³¹

The deficiencies of this political era however did not prevent the birth of a new sensibility in Italian society that began to produce an early, timid form of mass environmentalism. People reacted in various forms to the so-called “sacco di Napoli”³²—the building havoc visited upon the Amalfi coast. Bologna, ruled by a left-wing town council, engaged in the preservation and recovery of its historical city centre, launching a trend that other municipalities subsequently followed. Rome experienced an intense battle for the preservation of its villas and Milan grew more sensitive to environmental issues, thanks to the reporting of its main newspaper, the *Corriere della Sera*. Such activities favoured the elaboration of new regulatory norms, such as those on air and water pollution and on the biodegradability of washing liquids.³³

The new framework of values that slowly found definition was also encouraged by the initiatives of some environmentalist associations established in those years.³⁴ Of course, the efforts of those actors were aimed more at the preservation of nature than at a modification of the inadequacies of society or the reduction of abuses of the natural, and also social, environment.³⁵ Moreover, as Sergio Gentili wrote,

in a first moment environmentalism was seen as a fruit of the 'bourgeois culture' because the first Italian environmentalists, those that founded the naturalist associations during the 1950s and 1960s, were groups of intellectuals extraneous to the world of labour, more sensitive to the world of animal, plant, landscape and art preservation, than to the social needs of the popular masses or the workers' health.³⁶

This helps us to understand the difficulties labour movement representatives had in fully embracing environmentalism. It was often perceived in Italy, as elsewhere, as an anti-industrial and anti-modern movement, a reactionary trend that placed jobs at risk and in any case, did not care directly for the problems and exigencies of the weakest part of the population.³⁷

At the end of the 1960s the joint movement of students and workers made an important contribution to the developing interest in environmentalism by insisting on the problem of occupational health and rejecting the concept of risk monetisation. In that phase of active student and worker involvement, the trade-off of workers' health for wage levels and the vision of the work environment as an unchangeable element of how production was organised ceased to be acceptable. For example, between 1969 and 1971 at FIAT Mirafiori,

the *meaning* of the struggle shifted more and more in direction of the refusal of noxious environments and wage related claims got an increasingly symbolic value; the struggle became a pretext, an occasion to stop perceiving the work environment as an unavoidable fact. Criteria regarding the health impact of the factory were made explicit that deprived the Taylorist organization of work of the aura of objectivity that distinguished it. Moreover, the environmental discourse reached its zenith, as regards both internal participation and the involvement of other actors.³⁸

Political environmentalism

During the 1970s environmentalism acquired a more political quality.³⁹ The ecological problem began to directly involve the economy, touching on issues relating to the structures of the productive system and of the global model of consumption. During this transition period various left-wing intellectuals⁴⁰ opposed the passive stance the Italian Communist Party had theretofore taken in regard to ecology, opening a stimulating cultural and political debate. While reflections on scientific exploitation of the workforce and on the "myth of neutrality of science"⁴¹ took place, more acute thinking was brought to bear "on the shameful terms of the workers' condition and on the need for a more general and mass connection between the struggle for workers' management of prevention and safety within the factory and the defence of health and environment within society."⁴²

Giovanni Berlinguer, a Communist intellectual particularly aware of the

environmental issue, started to reflect upon whether capitalism posed a new internal contradiction, in some ways anticipating by about twenty years O'Connor's theory of the second contradiction.⁴³ Therefore, he proposed environmental questions be included within political programs and that they be structurally intertwined with social reforms. This revealed his understanding of the inevitable need to set in place a more extensive environmental education, one that would touch the whole of civil society. In fact, he stated,

if the issues of the factories' internal environment emerged forcefully in autumn 1969, it did not appear clear how much the capitalist factory infected with its noxiousness the surrounding environment. The workers' condition was something that concerned very ample sectors of the population, and single reforms ... (health, housing, transport) had as a common foundation the need to modify the relationship between factory and society, humanity and environment, collectivity and territory.⁴⁴

In some sectors of Italian Communism the need was perceived to direct Marxism in a new way, to work out theoretical categories involving the contradictions existing in the relationship between humanity and nature. Symptomatic of this completely new climate was the decision of the Istituto Gramsci to organise a 1971 conference on the environmental question. At this conference many thinkers attempted to link environmentalism and Marxism.⁴⁵ As Giovanni Berlinguer stated in the conference proceedings' conclusions, the conference aimed at "grafting a contemporary awareness of the risks and possibilities that exist nowadays in the circular relationship mankind-nature-society onto the path of revolutionary action (which is not at all blind, even if sometimes it has too limited an horizon in time and space)."⁴⁶

It is only in these years that Barry Commoner, who had already become the international reference point of left-wing ecology, began to co-operate with such Italian left-wing environmental scientists as Virginio Bettini. Around the same time, Commoner had his works translated into Italian.⁴⁷ Moreover, a group of scientists and technicians created networks around journals aimed at the dissemination of scientific advance, including *Sapere* and *Ecologia*. The journals became particularly effective experiments of synergy among medical doctors, union officers, and workers aiming at creating a safer work environment.⁴⁸ In 1970 Dario Paccino, a militant journalist of the extra-parliamentary left who later published the book *L'imbroglio ecologico (The Ecological Swindle)*, founded and edited another important journal of this period, *Natura e Società*, which was connected to the environmental association *Pro Natura*.⁴⁹ His book represents, according to environmentalist Andrea Poggio, the "first organic re-reading of environmentalism in the light of extreme left ideology."⁵⁰ The growth of such activities also encouraged the development of the movement of *Medicina Democratica* which promoted a profitable interaction between self-governing local groups of workers and citizens and

those groups of intellectuals, technicians, and researchers working on issues of health, security, environment, and human rights within factories.⁵¹

In 1972, the events occurring at an international meeting of Communist parties from both the Eastern and Western Blocs, in Prague, affirmed the role of workers' parties in the defence of the environment.⁵² In particular, the congress asserted that the deterioration of environmental conditions was one of the most important contradictions of capitalist development. At the same time, many socialist countries came to believe it was possible to create a social system that favoured a positive relationship between humanity and nature. This axiom became, for Communist parties, further proof of the need to realise worldwide Communism. Despite such aims and the actual existence of various forms of environmental awareness in socialist countries, progress in the area was limited to the enunciation of general laws and the foundation of committees and ministries. Certain examples reveal the problems and deceptions still concealed behind these newer goals and environmental concerns. For example, the lignite production area between Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) contained some of the highest levels of coal pollution in Europe while East Germany in particular held the world's highest sulphur dioxide emissions per capita.⁵³ In another instance, and because such a great quantity of its water was exploited for irrigation, the Aral Sea in the USSR suffered an exponential process of desiccation that has resulted, since the 1970s, in a reduction of the lake's surface and a sharp increase in its salinity.⁵⁴ The Communist world had thus, at the very least, a troubled relationship with the environment.⁵⁵ Economic and social planning was not the foreseen godsend for the environment, a fact of which the Italian Communists became only fully aware much later during the 1980s.

Another qualifying issue that marked most of the subsequent environmental debate within the Italian Communist Party, was the irritation expressed at the notion that there was an acute crisis in the very idea of progress, accompanied by the refusal of any form of neo-Malthusian, Luddite, and neo-romantic environmentalism that required a reduction in the rhythm of economic development. In the proceedings of a conference on the prevention of environmental damage, organised in Borgo San Dalmazzo by the Communist Party and held on 18 June 1972, stern criticisms were directed at any industrial and political system which in its drive for profit did not accept any trade-off of quantitative for qualitative development. Party members did however continue to prefer an idea of development that coincided with economic growth. For example, provincial councillor Borgna ignored the possibility of modifications in social behaviour in order to improve environmental conditions; his attention was focused instead on pre-emptive and pollution-reducing technologies.⁵⁶ In particular, Borgna discussed polluting exhausts and fumes produced by the quarries and glass works of the area, affirming that

Communists do not want the closure of the quarries and factories, on the

contrary they are for the development and expansion of industrial activity, they are sure that already today there are the technical and scientific means needed to get rid of the damages or reduce the negative effects.

Borgna affirmed then that it was indeed necessary to safeguard public health and the environment, “as to grant social development”, but that the way to reach these goals passed, paradoxically, through “the strengthening of industrial activities and handicraft ... and of the tourism poles of the Valdieri Park, the modernization of the road system, the reconstruction of the Cuneo-Nizza-Ventimiglia railroad, the use of waterways by ENEL.”⁵⁷

In 1972 the United Nations organized the Stockholm Conference, the first worldwide environmental congress. Commenting on the conference, important party member, Giovanni Berlinguer, violently attacked the so-called ‘neo-Malthusian’ tendencies of the MIT report and the output of the Club of Rome project on the dilemmas of mankind, *The Limits to Growth*.⁵⁸ The Communist Party refused to accept solutions that went against a classical notion of development. The zero growth perspective, that was proposed in those years as a possible solution to the problems posed by resource scarcity, was read in a distorted way as a total blockage of industrial productions, rather than as a different form of development. The Communist Party’s attention to work on environmental issues emerged only when Berlinguer mourned problems “of intensive pollution in the factories’ atmosphere and of the workers’ condition” that were excluded from the debate. Such a reading of *The Limits to Growth* is symptomatic of the difficulties the Communist Party still had in facing issues that were outside of its direct ambits of interest: it always felt that it was under attack because of its position as the greatest Communist party of the Western Bloc or that the pre-eminent role of the working class was being damaged by the attention given to such issues.

The difficulty a large part of the Party had facing environmental issues emerges from an article that appeared in the Communist Party’s weekly magazine *Rinascita* in 1972.⁵⁹ The article argued that “full employment and high wage policy are the most effective antidotes for every evil, pollution included.” Such an assertion signalled the Party’s attitude, forever favour of production, when it faced the dilemma of weighing employment against the environment. Lucio Libertini, then deputy for the extreme left socialist dissident party PSIUP and later member of the Communist Party, confirmed the need to face the deep ecological crisis, since “ecological issues, if taken seriously, are development issues.”⁶⁰ Moreover, he admitted that *The Limits to Growth* did not at all propose to create “the world in its actual form”, but that it was rather a proposal to develop “a different perspective of society that can also include lower growth levels”. As we have seen they still had serious problems relating to environmental issues. Wide sectors of the party were not able to go beyond the classic interpretation of development, fearing that the ‘new issues’ were nothing more than an attempt of the dominant classes (and

nations) to stop the development of the classes (and countries) that had reached a lower level of economic development, thereby rendering useless the efforts of Communist struggle. The reference to the experiences of socialist countries as exemplary of environmental management demonstrates the habit of handling any subject with the same vocabulary without any regard to the specific situation. Traditional industry was still seen as the only possible source of growth. The understanding of the fact that a different development of the humanity/nature relationship also needed a different organisation of work was still lacking. The defence of industrialism continued, at this stage, to be one of the Party's main features.⁶¹

Despite these limits, in the same years unions looked with more attention at environmental problems. In particular, in the crucial years of 1973 and 1974 there was a marked discontinuity in the character of union negotiations. The unions started to intervene "in the problems of ecology, seen as the relationship between internal and external environment."⁶² The interest of institutions like the Istituto di Psicologia of CNR (the Italian national scientific research agency)⁶³ and the health clinic Devoto in Milan⁶⁴ sanctioned a greater attention for the work environment and the defence of factory workers' health.⁶⁵ Wide sectors of civil society also became involved in environmental causes.⁶⁶ Thanks to the evolution of the work environment negotiation experience, which began during the 'hot autumn' of 1969, by the mid-1970s the constant growth in work related injuries and illnesses was virtually stopped.

The energy crisis

Any analysis of the 1970s must obviously consider the problems caused by the American economic crisis that led, in 1971, to President Richard Nixon's declaration of the non-convertibility of the dollar and to the consequent end of the international monetary system; moreover, it must consider the 'oil crisis' of 1973 that followed the Yom Kippur war. It is obvious that this particular context produced a new awareness of the delicacy of the energy issue. The population of the rich Western world was suddenly compelled to face a new paradigm of austerity and a reduction of its right to mobility. The amplitude of the crisis posed, moreover, the problem of the identification of new energy sources that could replace oil.

Nuclear power was a primary beneficiary and the energy question became a first-rate political issue that also influenced the choices of the Italian left. Both the representatives of the traditional workers' movement and the so-called 'new left' reflected on this issue, producing positions that did not oppose nuclear power. Even the most radical representatives of left-wing movements showed openness to the new technology.⁶⁷ A moment of change in the Italian political life of those years was thus the national energy plan (PEN) of 1975-1976. Under this plan the government began to favour the production of nuclear power.⁶⁸ Inspired

by the Christian democratic minister of industry, Carlo Donat Cattin, the plan foresaw the construction of twenty nuclear power plants by 1985—which would be added to the three nuclear plants already in existence.⁶⁹ The greatest European nuclear power plant was to be built in Montalto di Castro. A debate began within the left, thanks to the effort of intellectuals coming from its most radical fringes. The debate was enriched by the links—which historians have yet to explore—between the anti-nuclear movement and the student movement of 1977. While these issues conquered the attention of public opinion, the physicists Marcello Cini, Gianni Mattioli, and Massimo Scalia asked the radical left-wing party *Democrazia Proletaria* and the most radical sectors of unionism to adopt a critical position on nuclear power.⁷⁰

Another episode in the second part of the 1970s drew the attention of both civil society and workers organisations to environmental problems and to the tight link between the work and natural environments. In 1976 there was an explosion at Swiss multinational Hoffman-La Roche's ICMESA chemical plant in Seveso.⁷¹ Occupational physician, Francesco Carnevale and epidemiologist, Alberto Baldasseroni, write that

the cloud of dioxin emitted by ICMESA in Seveso on 10 July 1976 marks, almost symbolically, the watershed between a period in which the central problem was the health of those who work in the factory, and a new period in which the attention went progressively to a wider and more complex scenario shared by all citizens, that of environmental pollution, bringing to the forefront contradictions concerning on the one side the sustainability of development and on the other the defence of employment in factories that pose an environmental risk.⁷²

The ICMESA disaster represents the point of no return in the history of the increase of the Italian public's awareness of environmental issues. This event urged a popular reaction, a reaction in which some people on the Italian left played an active part; difficulties with the occupational debate notwithstanding.

In the urgent state created in the explosion's wake, the so-called political ecology collectives proposed closing the factory, to the discomfort of the traditional organisations of the workers' movement that privileged the conservation of employment levels.⁷³ As Giovanni Berlinguer wrote, "if environmental preservation is brusquely confronted with the needs of employment, it is easy to end in isolation, utopia or despair."⁷⁴ The closure of the factory as a solution to lessen future risks was nevertheless the request of only a minority of the population, even if expressed by locally very active groups. In the absence, however, of wide support for the proposal to close the factory, it was rather easy for the Communist Party to transfer attention away from the inherent dangers of locating a chemical industry in a heavily populated area and onto the national and local state's errors and delays in facing up to such a momentous question. The lack of wide support

for closing the factory also allowed the Communist Party to shift attention towards the faults in the industrialists' approach.

Just because chemistry produces new substances, for which the human body has no natural defence, the worker should be the first to be safeguarded from possible aggressions. Instead, the knowledge of the products, processes, dangers is inversely proportional to the distance from the workplace. ... In many factories the same workers designed *risk maps*, deciphering the names of the products used and proposing changes to the plants and conversions of investments.⁷⁵

The attention of some party members—in particular Laura Conti, an environmental and feminist activist who had always been interested in the problems of the factory environment—now focused on workers' health, on how much information they had, and on their struggles for health.⁷⁶ In particular, Conti highlighted the lack of precise controls placed on dangers inherent in production processes. This was a topic that the Communist Party was experienced with, thanks to its proximity to the unions that were the first group to tackle these issues.⁷⁷ “Raw materials, air, water, healthy people enter the factory; products, solid waste, dirty water, fumes and dust, ill people come out. Anything that stays between this *entry* and this *exit* must be under the control of a unique authority: the local authority.”⁷⁸ The risk outlined by Conti was that in the presence of a form of environmental preservation that requires “a diminution of investment profitability”, the latter was transferred from “capital” onto the working class in the form of either a “wage decrease” or a “price increase” or as “greater burdens for the budgets of local authorities.”⁷⁹ Such a reading of the environmental question as a feature of class struggle was widely present within the Party.

The 1970s were marked by another great environmental question: petrochemical industries and water pollution. In the first half of the decade Porto Marghera, a large petrochemical plant near Venice, found itself at the centre of scientific research that highlighted the harmfulness of some of its products such as vinyl chloride, a monomer needed to produce PVC.⁸⁰ In the second half of the decade, there was a serious ecological crisis on the Riviera of Emilia-Romagna: the eutrophication of the Adriatic coast.⁸¹ The group of environmental journals mentioned earlier in this article, were joined by the end of the 1970s by *Ecologia*—later *La Nuova Ecologia*—a monthly with clear political aims. *Ecologia* considered the environmental question a direct consequence of the unjust order of the economic system. The journal marked a significant discontinuity in respect to the past, indicative also of great changes to Italian society. If the homonymous journal of the first part of the decade had mostly intertwined its initiatives with the workers' social mobilisation, now there was the will to find an autonomous political space. According to historian Simone Neri Serneri, anti-capitalism and anti-institutional radicalism could not conceal the passage from a sociological interpretation of pub-

lic health issues “to the assertion of the social centrality of the ecological question”. The criticism of the noxiousness of industrial productions, of the social effects of practices of private appropriation, and of the waste and mismanagement of natural resources led over time to a reinterpretation of these phenomena. They were not seen anymore as the effect of capitalist modes of appropriation and production, but rather as the display of “an ecosystemic structure of industrial society” evidently incompatible with the conservation of adequate life conditions for present and future generations.”⁸²

The high levels of ecological alert reached during the 1970s also forced the secretary of the Communist Party Enrico Berlinguer to consider the new contradictions. A proposal of ‘austerity’ became part of the programs that were supposed to set the foundations for the planned ‘national unity’ governments. According to this proposal, the country had to overcome its socio-economic crisis by redefining the development model that was based on the expansion of consumption and waste and that prevented a fair distribution of resources.⁸³ The conservation of the environment was thus linked not only to the struggle against pollution but also to the urgent need to reform the health system and social services and the need to address the problem of urban planning. In June 1977, the Communist Party faced in a more concrete way the question of the relationship between development and environment in the *Proposta di progetto a medio termine* (Mid-term project proposal) that was made to the political and social forces that were interested in making a significant change to Italian politics.⁸⁴ For the first time the Party took into consideration the links existing between economic policies and the environment. During the Party’s fifteenth conference in 1979 environmental issues were again debated, but without any comprehensive coherence. Notwithstanding these efforts, the Party was not able to get away from a vision that, in substance, tended to favour economic development based on industrial production. This consideration is valid even if, at the end of the 1970s, the Party gave renewed attention to the issue, starting to hold environmental events and debates in the national festivals organized by its newspaper *L’Unità*, and, most of all, supporting the creation in 1980 of the environmentalist association *Lega per l’ambiente*. Later called *Legambiente*, the *Lega* followed a proposal on energy choices that was made in 1978 during a conference of ARCI, a Communist recreational association.⁸⁵ This new environmentalist association, born within PCI’s area of influence, however soon freed itself from the Party’s control.

The Eighties

The new decade was characterized by a post-industrial reality in which free-trade policies, with their monetarist dogma, were given ample space for manoeuvre. During this difficult stage of Italian history, the workers’ movement’s approach to environmental issues continued to fluctuate, in part because of the lack of links

between environmentalists and workers and their experience of workplace prevention. The Communist Party tried, however, to open up to new kinds of debate about environmental issues. Giovanni Berlinguer affirmed that the ecological movements, if to become “a base for the aggregation of progressive forces”, should go beyond “the separation from industrial workers, from whom works and produces.”⁸⁶ Moreover, ten years after the debate on the superiority of the socialist system in the management of the environment, the Communist press started to publish articles stating that “the absence of ecological ferments in the Eastern countries, seems to be more the effect of the greater social control than of real differences in the adopted industrial growth model.”⁸⁷

Nevertheless, presenting the limits of the nature conservation struggle, geophysicist Ezio Tabacco highlighted how the latter was not able to understand “the meaning of social and natural transformations.”⁸⁸ This limit, he affirmed, led it to focus on the accidental aspects (pollution, conservation, etc.) without elaborating ideas for a “new kind of development”, thus leading potentially to a conservative notion of the ecosystem and to a dangerous demonization of mankind. These were, according to Tabacco, the issues on which the workers’ movement should focus in order to develop its own environmentalism “on a human scale”.

In 1983, the theoretical debate about the conflict between the traditions of the workers’ movement and the new instances of environmentalism grew. Bruno Schacherl conducted an important interview with Pietro Ingrao, a member of parliament from 1948 to 1994 who represented PCI’s internal left. In the interview, Ingrao recognised the need for the Party to adapt to the transformation of political priorities, in view of a different interpretation of the world. He suggested the Party should adopt a new project that could include points of view coming from outside its tradition.⁸⁹ Joining the debate, Carlo Bernardini, a physicist, well-known popularizer of scientific ideas, and former Communist independent deputy, asked the Party to avoid embedding environmental choices in the struggle of opposed ideologies. He suggested environmental choices be brought back into what may be called rational environmentalism; that the ideas be free from any sort of neo-romanticism and that they be linked to strong scientific paradigms.⁹⁰ This stance synthesizes in an exemplary way how the Communist Party interacted with the representatives of the environmental movement: it attempted to integrate into the environmental debate ideas of economic development and growth. Bernardini’s fear was that most of the environmental struggles were led by lobbies and reflected only the interests of the elites.

The independent PCI member of parliament, economist, and chemist Giorgio Nebbia lamented instead the delay of the Marxist left and of the workers’ class in realising that “ecology is red” and not a mere “countesses’ vagary” as environmentalism had been termed by some of those who opposed it.⁹¹ From his point of view, the struggles against waste and privilege were, in fact, strictly intertwined; the origin of the environmental crisis was to be found in the factories and

the fields. The ideological substratum that curbed the full affirmation within the left of an autonomous environmental policy was for him most probably the effect of “a raging and anguishing economicism, a rhetoric of sacrifice and defence of the oldest values of productivism, not tuned in with the cultural maturity and richness, the radical need for an alternative, present in many left-wing social sectors.”⁹² On the other hand the *Proposta di alternativa* (Proposal for an alternative) presented at the congress of 1983 brought, at least nominally, environmental preservation to the forefront of Party policies.⁹³ In particular, the humanity/nature relationship was recognised as one of the main problems of the future. The document was also a sort of self-criticism of PCI’s previous positions: it affirmed the need for political action that did not consider environmental issues secondary in respect to the problems of the growth of production. These were however only timid and inadequate attempts that could not increase the confidence of left-wing environmentalists in the Communist Party. The disappointment at the lack of a real environmental policy found new motives in a subsequent series of incoherent choices.

Even if at the 1983 elections the Party felt the need to bring into the parliament a group of Party members and independents from civil society and the scientific milieu, representing environmentalism and its culture, during the seventeenth congress of 1986 a revitalised debate about the energy question saw the victory of those who were in favour of the construction of new nuclear power plants.⁹⁴ In the meantime, on 26 April 1986, the disaster caused by the explosion of one of the four reactors at the Chernobyl plant in the USSR showed the world nuclear power’s real risks. In the period following the accident, the Party’s relationship with the environment was monopolized by the energy issue and by the problems nuclear plants posed. The Chernobyl disaster caused a radical change in the Party’s approach to the nuclear question. For example, the Piedmont Regional Committee, at first in favour of civil usage of nuclear power, changed its position stating that the Party had *always* been in favour of a transitory, limited, and controlled use. Even an institution such as the Communist municipality of Trino, that had always been in favour of the construction of a second nuclear power plant within its borders because of its supposed positive impact on employment, asked for a temporary suspension of the works.⁹⁵

In the face of popular excitement, the attempts to put risks and benefits of nuclear power technology into a rational perspective, which the Party had pursued in years past, disappeared almost completely. The official motive brought forward by Luigi Rivalta,⁹⁶ vice-president of Piedmont’s regional council when the location of the nuclear power plant in Trino had been chosen, was that the council had been convinced, by technical and scientific reports, of nuclear plants’ inherent security, a belief that the Chernobyl accident exposed to radical questioning. This was a weak explanation, since the Three Mile Island accident in 1979, even though it had not caused casualties, had already highlighted the weakness of the belief in *absolute* security.

The Party's position immediately after the Chernobyl accident was to ask for a suspension of activities related to nuclear power in Italy, so as to create the possibility to discuss the country's power policy. The independent members of parliament mentioned earlier, the party's youth organisation FGCI, and the Lega per l'ambiente even promoted the anti-nuclear referendum of 1987. They were joined by the Democrazia Proletaria, the Greens, the Radical Party, and various environmentalist associations. A letter sent on 6 September 1986 by some "Piedmontese metallurgic and mechanic workers" to Ottaviano Del Turco, a CGIL secretary who remained faithful to his belief in nuclear power, highlights some fractures created in the workers' movement by the Party's policy change.⁹⁷ The anti-nuclear struggle brought forward by part of the left was reduced by these activists to prejudicial opposition to the initiatives "favouring productive development and consequently jobs". These workers bemoaned the suspension of the plant's construction, which they felt prevented Trino's many unemployed from improving their situation. They directly attacked the Communist Party, which they thought favoured unemployment. Undoubtedly the position of Communists in this period was difficult, strung as they were between the occupational interests of their class of reference and the fact that it would have been in any case difficult to obtain green votes because of their previous pro-nuclear positions.

The presentation in 1987 of a new electoral program gave the Party the occasion to confront the environmental issue in a more organic manner. The Party reaffirmed for the umpteenth time how its environmentalism was rooted in the debate about workers' health and industrial pollution. The program stated that "workers' health and security are an integrant part of the environmental problem and only a conversion of production based on the priority of human values and balance between mankind and nature may give the needed solutions." It must, moreover, be highlighted that the Party boasted it had always supported the battles that "contributed to raise awareness of the environmental question," but reaffirmed in the meantime its consistent and long-lasting position, against environmental extremism: "the problem is to safeguard and advantage the environment without relinquishing the comprehensive innovation process."⁹⁸

Giovanni Berlinguer began another attempt to include environmental issues in the Party's ideological corpus when he proposed "a welding between the workers' movement and environmentalism that may give new momentum to the great battle for human dignity and daily life quality" as the only solution to the problem of work-related deaths.⁹⁹ Such "welding" was based on the recognition of the "pathogenic work/goods/environment cycle" and on a common request for greater constraints and incentives in the field of health damages and environmental prevention.

The environmental movement asked loudly, even before Chernobyl, for the government to back away from nuclear power production. It considered nuclear power's risks greater than its possible benefits. The Communist Party, on

the other hand, was traditionally bound to defend the workers' occupational destiny and could still only ask for as painless as possible an exit from the use of nuclear technology.

There were, however, other issues more tightly linked to the Communist tradition which by the end of 1987 were being read from an environmental point of view. In a December 1987 document, 'Le proposte del PCI per la siderurgia' (proposals of the Italian Communist Party for iron and steel industry) the Party direction board proposed the environmental reclamation of steelworks, as was already the policy of the Ministry of Environment in the chemical and nuclear fields.¹⁰⁰ Until a few years earlier, however, the Party had defended siderurgical industries against any kind of environmental criticism that could pose a risk to employment levels. In 1987, when the crisis of iron metallurgy had led to the closure of many factories, it became easy for the Communist Party to ask for the environmental reclamation of what had become unused areas.

A radical change in political culture

In 1988 Giovanni Berlinguer wondered why the Communist Party had not experienced much earlier a radical change in political culture in respect to the degradation of the environment "that threatens to compromise life and historical continuity on the planet".¹⁰¹ According to the Communist intellectual, the motives could be found in the traditional Marxist view of historical progress as an expression of the growth of productive forces and the overthrowing of property relationships and political power. The reasons the Party had theretofore neglected the environment were therefore to be found in the underestimation of quality (of production, consumption, and power itself) in the expectation that capitalism would suddenly fall, and in the Party's incomprehension of the progressive degradation caused by the exaggerated and distorted growth of production, of populations, and of pollutants. Perhaps it was precisely this tradition, more than an incomplete definition of the problem to be addressed, that sidelined the insights produced by the austerity policy that emerged in the Communist Party during the 1970s but that were subsequently neglected.

In the same year, Fausto Bertinotti, then a member of CGIL's secretariat, looked for a way to face the "contradictions that explode between the workers and green matters", affirming the merits of the struggle to link employment and environment in order to "eradicate ancient industrialist prejudices that had filtered into the way of thinking of important sectors of the historical left and of subordinate work." He affirmed moreover that the workers' movement should find in the environment "a paradigm for a new development, a new work". This paradigm required the Party to go beyond the assertion that development equals industry. Rather, the paradigm proposed a greater engagement in the production of 'immaterial goods', so as to be able to assert, in front of the failure of the quanti-

tative interpretation of development, the *qualitative* alternative.

To be joined, development and full employment are by now forced to adopt the adjective 'different': a different development as to realize a different modality of full employment. ... The terms of the ancient question are overturned; if there is a possibility to re-propose the aim of full employment, it is precisely in the overcoming of industrialism, in good work and in ecological development.¹⁰²

To reach this 'genetic mutation,' according to Bertinotti it was necessary "to start from the open recognition of the existence, as by now, of a contradiction between some realities of the world of subordinate work and that of environmental matters." In the case of heavy pollution, the factory workers, besides the health risks run by all citizens, also risked losing their jobs. From this point of view, there was a contrast that could be "overcome only by the ability to convince expressed by strong political action". Bertinotti held that the choice of environment preservation had to be accompanied by the creation of alternative job opportunities. Bertinotti's criticisms focused in particular on the unions and their representatives, who often accepted the limits imposed by the market so as to refute those required by the environment.

The acceptance of the limits the environment imposed on growth was, however, not yet, beyond Bertinotti's words, widespread within the Party. Giulio Quercini, a leading PCI representative in Tuscany, on the occasion of an accident at the Farmoplant factory in Massa on 17 July 1988, denied that the closure of polluting chemical plants was a viable option since chemical products could not be eliminated from daily life.¹⁰³ Quercini was convinced that chemical factories were just "one of the conditions needed to realize a more environmentally compatible development". The solution to the problems chemical accidents posed was, for him, to impose a comprehensive discourse on "what to produce" and "how" to produce it; this was a discourse already touched upon by the unions.¹⁰⁴ Quercini thus held that fault lay exclusively with the business world because by refusing to modify the production process they exasperated the populace, which in the end stopped believing in the possibility of a *different* chemical industry. The citizens of Massa had already voted to close the Farmoplant factory in a 1987 referendum, before the disaster occurred. Although the workers, to avoid losing their jobs, had in the end refused any kind of environmental limitations, in this case it was not the "incurable contradiction between environment and development" but rather the effect of the arrogance of one of the representatives of Italy's big capital: Montedison that was to blame. According to Quercini, the plant was the scapegoat of a sterile debate on

ecology and economy, environment and development, greens and reds: the conceptual variations on the issue are infinite. Philosophizing in this way

nobody feels compelled to choose and to respond for the wrong or lacking choices: all may continue to affirm that, after all, we live in the best world possible.¹⁰⁵

Two months after the Farmoplant accident, Luciano Ghelli, then secretary of the PCI federation in Pisa, described the Party's defeat at the 1987 referendum as healthy and useful, since, combined with the media impact of the accident, it allowed the Party to tune into public opinion again.¹⁰⁶ A year after the accident, the Party changed its position and asserted, together with the factory council, the need to close the plant. The Party had to understand once and for all that environmental issues have in some cases, even when the population would be negatively hit by the factory's closure, pre-eminence over the safeguarding of employment.

Regarding the search for a new relationship between the factory and its environment, the experience of the Cornigliano iron mills near Genoa was particularly significant. Here a local health and environment defence committee and CGIL made a positive agreement on the prosecution of the mills' activities. "There is a conflict and often there are harsh polemics; you can dream that the factory is not there (or rather, that it never has been there), but you cannot wish its closure."¹⁰⁷ And this was not only a compromise concerning a factory too cumbersome to ask for its closure, but, as journalist Rinalda Carati wrote, a different way of advancing the environmental struggle, one based mainly on giving more information to the 'working citizens.'¹⁰⁸

This is the framework in which the Italian environmental associations organised themselves. It followed the example of the green parties created in the rest of Europe. The *Lista Verde* (Green List) participated in the 1987 national elections, attracting 2.5 percent of the votes. While the minor groups of the left, such as *Democrazia Proletaria*, and the Radical Party firmly supported the green lists, the Communist leaders feared losing part of their electorate and proposed instead including on the Party's electoral lists, once more, important environmentalist personalities. This state of affairs, however, added fuel to the debate between the environmentalist sectors of the Communist left and the greens that in the long run also conditioned the attitudes of other parts of the Italian left. In this sense it can even be affirmed that "the green point of view had the merit to defy Marxism, to force it to redefine itself and go beyond some of its foundations."¹⁰⁹

The green phenomenon had however a much greater importance: it forced the Italian political world to confront new issues and to debate the validity of its more consolidated paradigms of political belonging; in the meantime it also revealed a possible link between post-Seveso environmentalism and the ideals of the historical left. In fact, as sociologist Donatella Della Porta has highlighted,

the birth of green parties in virtually all Western countries, in some cases even with encouraging electoral results, led to ask whether the environmen-

tal positions were not destined in brief to flank, if not even to substitute, the traditional lines of political belonging and identification, such as capital/work and centre/periphery. Moreover, the emergence of the environmental movements marked the possible entry in scene of a new political class, rooted in the experience of the radical movements of the Seventies, but at the same time linked to the world of the historical left; able, thus, at least in way of principle, to build a bridge between *old* and *new* forms of political representation, to produce unusual alliances, such as the convergence of ample sectors of unionism and left-wing parties in the antinuclear front after the Chernobyl accident.¹¹⁰

At the end of the 1980s the Italian left had however to face the fall of the Berlin Wall. When the wall came down it broke the rigid schemes of internal and international politics, forcing the Italian left into a reorganisation that left minimal space for environmental issues, excepting programmatic calls for the need to include environmentalism and ecology among the founding elements of a new great left-wing political organisation.¹¹¹ Moreover the redefinition of the global context also changed the environmental scenario: sustainable development theories intertwined with the enthusiasm following the Rio de Janeiro conference. A period of harsh environmental contestation gave space to the multiplication of environmental associations; to the mixing of 'ecologismo politico' and the anti-globalisation movement; and to the birth of new left-wing environmentalist groups with their own red-green symbology.

Conclusions

During the period we have considered, the Italian social-Communist left approached environmental issues in many different ways. The Party encountered its greatest difficulties with the environmental question where the question ran up against its strong idea of progress and against the fact that development was seen for most of the Cold War as dependent on industrialisation and economic growth. This made it difficult for the representatives of the Italian workers' movement to accept concepts like 'environmental limits' and 'sustainable development.' For many years few people within the Party, perhaps only a few individual outstanding personalities, could accept that the Italian workers' movement could incorporate ecology within its ideological foundations.

The early attention of the Italian left to the environment was propelled by its concern for the health and security of industrial workers. It may be assumed that elements of this interest later became part of the wider movement of 'ecologismo politico,' with its care for the workers' conditions and for the causes of social iniquity and ecological degradation. In the 1970s the Italian Communist Party expressed also the short-lived but significant concept of 'austerity', that is an alternative form of development characterized by a reduction of consumption and

waste. The Communist Party's interpretation of the environmental question represented however only a small part of the comprehensive world vision of 'ecologismo politico.'

In the 1980s the social-Communist culture came at last to ride the wave of environmentalism in politics. An increasing number of environmentalist references became intertwined with the obligations imposed to the Party by its history, namely the defence of work and the promotion of economic development. Nonetheless, the engagement in the environmental question seemed still partial and instrumental. In too many cases the social-Communist left, even when it was able to propose progressive and innovative environmental ideas, had to relinquish these in front of job blackmail and a rather traditionalist electoral base. The sectors of the workers' movement that linked in various ways their actions with attempts to achieve a more widespread improved physical and environmental welfare for workers and citizens had thus not been able to mix definitively the social-Communist culture with the crucial issue of environmentalism. Nor had they been able to anchor this issue in a vision of development that was concretely alternative to capitalism.

NOTES

- 1 It is difficult to make a sharp distinction, but approximately it may be said that the first half of the article is responsibility of Paolo Pelizzari and the second half of Wilko Graf von Hardenberg, while for the introduction and the conclusions we share, obviously, joint responsibility. Translations of quotations from Italian are by Wilko Graf von Hardenberg. Our gratitude goes to Paul Warde for having copy-edited the text and made insightful comments and to the three anonymous reviewers who read this essay and gave us important suggestions as to improve it. Portions of this article are adapted from the Italian language article by Paolo Pelizzari entitled "Sviluppo e ambiente nel dibattito della sinistra", *Italia Contemporanea*, 247 (2007) and are used with permission.
- 2 The available accounts focus mainly on the history of organised environmentalism and the phenomenon that led in the 1980s to the birth of so-called 'green' parties. See Donatella Della Porta and Mario Diani, *Movimenti senza protesta? L'ambientalismo in Italia* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2004); Roberto Della Seta, *La difesa dell'ambiente in Italia. Storia e cultura del movimento ecologista* (Milano: Franco Angeli, 2000); Andrea Poggio, *Ambientalismo* (Milano: Bibliografica, 1996). A useful literature survey is given by Laura Loiacono, "Ecologia e politica. Un percorso bibliografico," *Giano*, 32 (May-August 1999). For a comparative outlook on the situation in Germany see Simone Neri Serneri, "Storia, ambiente e società industriale. Rassegna di studi tedeschi," *Società e storia*, 50 (1990).
- 3 Between the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century various associations with a more or less marked interest for the preservation of landscapes and natural monuments were founded: *Club Alpino Italiano*, *Touring Club*, *Società Botanica Italiana*, *Associazione per i Paesaggi e i Monumenti Italiani*, and *Pro Montibus et Silvis*. After the Second World War other more modern but still bourgeois preservationist associations

- were set up: *Italia Nostra* (1955), *Pro Natura* (1959), *Lega Italiana per la Protezione degli Uccelli* (1965), and *WWF Italia* (1966). See Edgar H. Meyer, *I pionieri dell'ambiente. L'avventura del movimento ecologista italiano. Cento anni di storia* (Milano: Carabà Edizioni, 1995); Franco Pedrotti, *Il fervore dei pochi. Il movimento protezionistico italiano dal 1943 al 1971* (Trento: Temi Editrice, 1998).
- 4 Della Seta, *La difesa dell'ambiente*, 95. See also Paolo R. Donati, "Dalla politica al consumo. La questione ecologica e i movimenti degli anni settanta," *Rassegna italiana di Sociologia* 30 (1989).
 - 5 See Francesco Carnevale and Alberto Baldasseroni, "La salute degli operai nel secondo dopoguerra," *Qualità Equità*, 10 (1998) and Simonetta Renga, ed., "Il modello sindacale di tutela della salute nei luoghi di lavoro dal dopoguerra ad oggi," *Rassegna di Medicina dei Lavoratori* 6 (1991).
 - 6 Rolf Petri, "Dalla ricostruzione al miracolo economico" in Giovanni Sabbatucci and Vittorio Vidotto, eds., *Storia d'Italia, volume V, La repubblica* (Roma: Laterza, 1997), 330-331. Moreover, because of the international situation, it had not been possible to find an agreement between the social-Communist parties and the managerial sectors of the Christian democrats about an alternative reformist program that could have led to economic and urban planning policies shaped along the lines of the northern European model. See Edgar Meyer, "L'evoluzione della coscienza ambientale attraverso i movimenti ecologisti", in *Storia ambientale. Un nuova frontiera storiografica*, eds. A. F. Saba and E. Meyer (Milano: Teti Editore, 2001).
 - 7 Luigi Ganapini, "L'evoluzione delle strategie sindacali negli anni Cinquanta", introduction to Vittorio Rieser and Luigi Ganapini, eds., *Libri bianchi sulla condizione operaia negli anni Cinquanta* (Bari: De Donato, 1981). On the attention for the environmental impact of industrial work see also the documents published in the same book's "Appendice".
 - 8 Ibid. XXXIV.
 - 9 See Leopoldo Magelli, "Fabbrica, salute e trasformazione dell'ambiente," *Sapere* 9 (1980).
 - 10 About this historical phase see Romano Luperini, *Gli intellettuali di sinistra e l'ideologia della ricostruzione nel dopoguerra* (Roma: Edizioni di Ideologie, 1971).
 - 11 Giuseppe Di Vittorio, "Intervento", in Società Umanitaria, *Convegno nazionale di studio sulle condizioni del lavoratore nell'impresa industriale*, (Milano: Giuffrè, 1954), 238 and 243.
 - 12 CGIL votes collapsed, in just one year, from 63.2 percent to 36.7 percent in FIAT elections. Sergio Garavini and Emilio Pugno, *Gli anni duri alla Fiat* (Torino: Einaudi, 1974), 15. See Sergio Turone, *Storia del sindacato in Italia dal 1943 al crollo del comunismo* (Roma: Laterza, 1992), 211-212. See also Massimo Riva, ed., *Lama. Intervista sul sindacato* (Roma: Laterza, 1976), 31-42.
 - 13 Giovanni Gozzini and Renzo Martinelli, *Storia del Partito Comunista Italiano, volume VII, Dall'attentato a Togliatti all'VIII congresso* (Einaudi: Torino, 1998), 407-409.
 - 14 See Giovanni Contini, "Le lotte operaie contro il taglio dei tempi e la svolta nella politica rivendicativa della Fiom, 1955-1956", *Classe* 16 (1978).
 - 15 Luigi Campigli, *Lavoro salariato e nocività. Infortuni e malattie del lavoro nello sviluppo economico italiano* (Bari: De Donato, 1976).
 - 16 See Paolo Mencarelli, ed., *Luciano Della Mea. Giornalista militante. Scritti 1949-1962* (Mandria: Piero Lacaita, 2007), 12.

- 17 See Istituto Gramsci, *I lavoratori e il progresso tecnico* (Roma: Editori Riuniti, 1956).
- 18 See Massimo Crepet and Bruno Saia, eds., *Medicina del lavoro* (Torino: Utet, 1993). See also Antonio Grieco and Pier Alberto Bertazzi, eds., *Per una storiografia italiana della prevenzione occupazionale ed ambientale* (Milano: Angeli, 1997).
- 19 Nicolò Addario, ed., *Inchiesta sulla condizione dei lavoratori in fabbrica* (Torino: Einaudi, 1976).
- 20 Paul Ginsborg, *Storia d'Italia dal dopoguerra a oggi. Società e politica 1943-1988* (Torino: Einaudi, 1989), 359-73.
- 21 The appearance in 1961 of the *Carta di Gubbio*, a urban planning manifesto for the preservation of historical city centres, was significant of the overall situation. See Edoardo Salzano, *Fondamenti di urbanistica* (Roma: Laterza, 1998), 130-132. Paul Ginsborg holds that the reform of "urban planning, and the way it was sabotaged, is one of the saddest pages of the political history of the Republic. Fiorentino Sullo, a reforming Christian democrat, ... presented for the first time a project for a law on urban planning in July 1962. It was the first (and last) serious attempt to face the problems of property speculation and of the chaotic urban development that have so heavily hit contemporary Italy." Ginsborg, 368. Roberto Della Seta has recalled that the Italian Communist Party was "a reference point for an important part of the urban planning milieu." Della Seta, 17.
- 22 From "Presentazione", in *Tendenze del capitalismo italiano. Atti del convegno economico dell'Istituto Gramsci, volume I, Le relazioni e il dibattito* (Roma: Editori Riuniti, 1962), 9.
- 23 For a still important point of view developed in those years see Franco Momigliano, ed., *Lavoratori e sindacati di fronte alle trasformazioni del processo produttivo* (Milano: Feltrinelli, 1962).
- 24 See Aris Accornero, "Per una nuova fase di studi sul movimento sindacale", in Aris Accornero et al., *Movimento sindacale e società italiana* (Milano: Feltrinelli, 1977), 40-41.
- 25 Maria Luisa Righi, "Le lotte per l'ambiente di lavoro dal dopoguerra ad oggi." *Studi storici*, 2-3 (1992), 623.
- 26 See, for example, *Il Rischio da Lavoro, Atti del convegno nazionale promosso dall'Inca, Roma, 17-19 aprile 1964* (Napoli: Edizioni Glauk, 1964).
- 27 Bruno Trentin, "Sei domande su riforme e riformismo," *Critica marxista* 5-6 (1965), now in Bruno Trentin, *Da sfruttati a produttori. Lotte operaie e sviluppo capitalistico dal miracolo economico alla crisi* (Bari: De Donato, 1977), 167.
- 28 Gastone Marri, "L'ambiente di lavoro in Italia: l'organizzazione della ricerca 'non disciplinare' (1961-1980)," *Sociologia del lavoro* 10-11 (1980): 81.
- 29 Commissione stampa della Camera del lavoro di Brescia, ed., *Sicurezza sociale e tutela della salute dei lavoratori, Atti del convegno di studio promosso dalla CCdL e dall'INCA di Brescia nel novembre 1967* (Brescia: CCdL, 1968), 37-38.
- 30 On the attitude of the CGIL on the proposal and evolution of the *Statuto* see Mario Ricciardi, "La CGIL e lo Statuto dei lavoratori", in CGIL, *I 30 anni della CGIL (1944-1974)* (Roma: Editrice Sindacale Italiana, 1975).
- 31 Ginsborg, 378-379.
- 32 Left-wing town-planners and environmentalists termed "sack of Naples" the misappropriation of public lands and resources by building entrepreneurs that occurred in Naples under the benevolent inattention of municipal authorities.
- 33 The first Italian law on air pollution dates back to 1966, while the legislation on water pollution was drafted between 1976 and 1979, and that on soil and sea pollution only

in 1982.

34 See note 3.

35 See Edgar Meyer, *I pionieri dell'ambiente. L'avventura del movimento ecologista in Italia: cento anni di storia* (Milano: Carabà, 1995).

36 Sergio Gentili, *Ecologia e sinistra. Un incontro difficile* (Roma: Editori Riuniti, 2002), 23. The early environmentalists, such as those gathered in Italia Nostra, had even been accused to be enemies of progress. Meyer "L'evoluzione della coscienza ambientale", 127-128.

37 Early environmentalists and those who dared to talk of economic and territorial planning had been long considered elitists who wanted to save landscapes and conditions of pure air for their own benefit to the detriment of the right of the popular classes to be part of economic development and to the further detriment of motorization and heavy industrialisation, considered to be the only possible forms of progress. Fear of a consequent reduction of unemployment flowed from the latter concern. The reconstruction and the economic boom that followed caused an increase in the quality and quantity of consumption, causing views critical of the development model to become unpopular. See Giorgio Nebbia, "Per una definizione di storia dell'ambiente", *ECO-LOGIA POLITICA - CNS - Rivista telematica di politica e cultura* IX, 27, no. 3 (September-December 1999), <http://www.ecologiapolitica.it/web/3/articoli/nebbia.htm> (Accessed 29 May 2008).

38 Alfredo Milanaccio and Luca Ricolfi, *Lotte operaie e ambiente di lavoro. Mirafiori 1968-1974* (Torino: Einaudi, 1976), 154.

39 A period marking date in the history of political environmentalism is 22 April 1970, when the first Earth Day was celebrated in the USA.

40 The names of most of the involved intellectuals may be found in the notes as authors of various cited articles.

41 Alberto Manacorda, "Come si sfrutta scientificamente la forza-lavoro. Siamo arrivati al 'doping' di classe", *Rinascita* 8 (1970).

42 Corrado Perna, "Difesa della salute dalla fabbrica all'ambiente naturale. Morte da detersivo", *Rinascita* 42 (1970). See also Massimo Crepet and Bruno Saia, eds., *Inquinamento ambientale e rischi per la salute* (Padova: Editoriale Programma, 1991).

43 James O'Connor, "On the Two Contradictions of Capitalism", *Capitalism, Nature, Society* 2, no. 3 (October 1991), <http://www.centerforpoliticecology.org/Cyberbooks/notes.html> (Accessed 29 May 2008).

44 Giovanni Berlinguer, "Ecologia: una guerra senza precedenti attorno all'alternativa fra un dissennato depauperamento e un giusto rapporto tra l'uomo e la natura. Inquinanti e inquinatori", *Rinascita* 26 (1970). Moreover, already since September 1967, the Communist Party had promoted an important investigation on the healthiness of workplaces. See Giovanni Berlinguer, ed., *La salute nelle fabbriche* (Bari: De Donato, 1969).

45 Giovanni Lodi, "L'azione ecologista in Italia: dal protezionismo storico alle liste verdi," in *La sfida verde*, eds. R. Biorcio and G. Lodi (Padova: Liviana, 1988), 18.

46 Giovanni Berlinguer, "Conclusioni," in Istituto Gramsci, ed., *Uomo natura società. Ecologia e rapporti sociali. Atti del convegno tenuto a Frattocchie (Roma) dal 5 al 7 novembre 1971*, 2nd ed. (Roma: Editori Riuniti, 1974), 492.

47 See, in particular, Barry Commoner, *La tecnologia del profitto* (Roma: Editori Riuniti, 1973); Barry Commoner and Virginio Bettini, *Ecologia e lotte sociali: ambiente, popolazione -*

- ne, inquinamento (Milano: Feltrinelli, 1977).
- 48 See Francesco Carnevale, "Il dibattito sull'ambiente di lavoro attraverso le riviste," *Quaderni Piacentini* 9 (1983).
- 49 Dario Paccino, *L'imbroglione ecologico* (Milano: Einaudi, 1972).
- 50 Poggio, 43.
- 51 See Giulio A. Maccararo, *Medicina democratica movimento di lotta per la salute* (Viterbo: Edizioni del centro di ricerca per la pace, 1991); *Conoscenze scientifiche, saperi popolari e società umana alle soglie del Duemila: attualità del pensiero di Giulio A. Maccararo* (Milano: Cooperativa Medicina democratica, 1997).
- 52 Partito Comunista Italiano, *Documenti politici dal 13° al 14° congresso* (Roma: PCI, 1975), 155.
- 53 John R. McNeill, *Something New Under the Sun: An Environmental History of the Twentieth-Century World* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2000), 89-92; Raymond Dominick, "Capitalism, Communism and Environmental Protection: Lessons from the German Experience", *Environmental History* 3, (July 1998).
- 54 McNeill, 162-66; Michael H. Glantz, *Aral Sea*, in *Encyclopedia of World Environmental History*, eds. S. Krech, J. R. McNeill, C. Merchant (New York: Routledge, 2004), 61-63.
- 55 For an account of nature conservation in the USSR see also Douglas R. Weiner, *A Little Corner of Freedom: Russian Nature Protection from Stalin to Gorbachev* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).
- 56 *Per impedire la rovina ecologica della valle Gesso e del comprensorio* (congress proceedings, Borgo San Dalmazzo, 18 June 1972), Archivio dell'Istituto Piemontese Antonio Gramsci, folders 351-371.
- 57 ENEL was the Italian national public power company, created in the 1960s by the centre-left governments.
- 58 Giovanni Berlinguer, "Ecologia e politica", *Rinascita* 25 (1972); Donella H. Meadows et al., *The Limits to Growth* (London: Universe Books, 1972).
- 59 Elio Ognissanti and Aldo Zubini, "L'ecologia ci riguarda tutti," *Rinascita* 39 (1972).
- 60 Lucio Libertini, "Ecologia e sviluppo," *Rinascita* 41 (1972).
- 61 Partito Comunista Italiano, *Documenti politici dal 13° al 14° congresso* (Roma: PCI, 1975), 296-303.
- 62 Marri, 8. See also Collettivo Città Futura, *La nocività in fabbrica* (Roma: Savelli, 1973).
- 63 See Istituto di Psicologia del Cnr, *Stress e lavoro industriale, Seminario, 28-29 giugno 1975* (Roma: Ferri, 1975); Unità operativa di collegamento (presso la cattedra di Fisiologia e igiene del lavoro dell'Università di Roma), *Prevenzione della patologia da ambiente di lavoro. Studio di fattibilità per un programma di ricerca del Cnr* (Roma: Colitti, 1981).
- 64 See Sebastiano Bagnara et al., *Progetto per l'elaborazione e la verifica di un modello interdisciplinare di epidemiologia del lavoro organizzato* (Fidenza: Tipolito Mattioli, 1979).
- 65 See *La salute in fabbrica, volume I, Per una linea alternativa di gestione della salute nei posti di lavoro e nei quartieri, volume II, L'esperienza e le lotte per la gestione operaia della salute* (Roma: Savelli, 1974); and Gianni Moriani, *Nocività in fabbrica e nel territorio* (Verona: Bertani, 1974).
- 66 See Sebastiano Bagnara and Francesco Carnevale, "La costituzione di una linea di intervento sull'ambiente e la nocività," *Classe* 7, (1973).
- 67 For an idea of how environmental problems were represented and perceived in the factories in these years see Andrea Sangiovanni, *Tute Blu. La parabola operaia nell'Italia repubblicana* (Roma: Donzelli, 2006), 247-249.
- 68 The nuclear power plan was obviously conditioned also by great economic and indu-

strial interests: for example, ENEL, Ansaldo, FIAT.

- 69 The energy plan was approved by the whole parliament—the left included—in the summer of 1976.
- 70 See *Camminare eretti. Democrazia proletaria e comunismo, da DP a Rifondazione Comunista*, (Milano: Punto Rosso, 1996). Moreover, beside *Democrazia Proletaria*, FLM (the federation of metal workers unions), ARCI (a cultural association of the Communist area), UIL (the socialist-republican union), and some exponents of the Socialist Party took an anti-nuclear position. The Communist Party continued instead to be substantially in favour of nuclear power. See Simone Neri Serneri, *Incorporare la natura. Storie ambientali del Novecento* (Roma: Carocci, 2005), 288.
- 71 Famous became also the *coloured deaths* of workers at IPCA in Ciriè by Turin, between 1973 and 1974, and the discovery of liver cancer among vinyl chloride workers, between 1974 and 1975. Notwithstanding a partial disengagement, the activity of journals like *Inchiesta*, *Medicina al servizio delle masse popolari*, *Medicina democratica*, *Salute e territorio* and *Sapere* went on. See Francesco Carnevale, “Il dibattito sull’ambiente di lavoro attraverso le riviste,” *Quaderni Piacentini* 9 (1983); Francesco Carnevale, “Salute e lavoro negli anni ottanta,” *Quaderni Piacentini* 7 (1982).
- 72 Francesco Carnevale and Alberto Baldasseroni, *Mal da lavoro. Storia della salute dei lavoratori* (Roma: Laterza, 1999), 244. For a reflection on the complicated relationship between capital, work, and environment see Laura Conti, *Che cos’è l’ecologia: capitale, lavoro e ambiente* (Milano: Mazzotta, 1977).
- 73 Mario Diani, *Isole nell’arcipelago* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1988); Giovanni Lodi, “L’azione ecologista in Italia: dal protezionismo storico alle liste verdi”, in Roberto Biorcio and Giovanni Lodi, eds., *La sfida verde* (Padova: Liviana, 1988).
- 74 Giovanni Berlinguer, “Il profitto, il potere lo spreco,” *Rinascita* 43 (1976).
- 75 Giovanni Berlinguer, “Chimica e vita,” *Rinascita* 42 (1977).
- 76 Laura Conti, “Chi ci avvelena,” *Rinascita* 31 (1976); Laura Conti, “Una guerra del 2000”, *Rinascita* 33 (1976); Laura Conti, “Seveso più di un mese dopo”, *Rinascita* 36 (1976); Laura Conti, “Chi spande diossine e chi se ne serve,” *Rinascita* 43 (1976); Laura Conti, “I bambini di Seveso,” *Rinascita* 9 (1979).
- 77 Laura Conti, “Costi sociali, controllo sociale”, *Rinascita* 26 (1977).
- 78 Laura Conti, “Una guerra del 2000”.
- 79 Laura Conti, “Costi sociali, controllo sociale”.
- 80 See Duilio Casula et al., “Petrochimica. Tecnologia, ambiente di lavoro, prevenzione e patologia”, in *Atti del XLIII congresso nazionale di medicina del lavoro, Parma, 1-4 ottobre 1980*, (Parma: Tipolito Tecnografia, 1980).
- 81 See OCSE, *Acque inquinate: le conseguenze dell’uso di fertilizzanti e pesticidi* (Padova: Muzzio, 1987).
- 82 Neri Serneri, *Incorporare la natura*, 283-284.
- 83 See Enrico Berlinguer, “Conclusioni all’assemblea degli operai comunisti lombardi, 13-01-1977”, in Enrico Berlinguer, *Austerità: occasione per trasformare l’Italia* (Roma: Editori Riuniti, 1977).
- 84 Partito Comunista Italiano, *Proposta di progetto a medio termine* (Roma: Editori Riuniti, 1977).
- 85 Gentili, 38-40.
- 86 Giovanni Berlinguer, “Partecipazione e progetto per la difesa dell’ambiente,” *Rinascita* 22 (1980).
- 87 Ermete Realacci, “L’età verde,” *Rinascita* 10 (1981).

- 88 Ezio Tabacco, "Scienza e informazione nel rapporto uomo-natura," *Rinascita* 4 (1982).
- 89 Bruno Schacherl, "Una scienza nuova per decidere il futuro di uomo e natura," *Rinascita* 5 (1983).
- 90 Carlo Bernardini, "Se bastassero sentimenti e conflittualità," *Rinascita* 5 (1983).
- 91 Giorgio Nebbia, "Progetti per una società neotecnica," *Rinascita* 5 (1983). See also footnote 37.
- 92 Enrico Testa, "Un modo 'altro' di fare politica," *Rinascita* 5 (1983).
- 93 Partito Comunista Italiano, *16° congresso del Partito Comunista Italiano, Atti Risoluzioni Documenti* (Roma: PCI, 1983), 611ff.
- 94 The same contrasts could be detected in the unions. Poggio, 79.
- 95 *Obiettivo ambiente – notiziario di Pro Natura* (December 1986).
- 96 Consiglio Regionale del Piemonte, *Intervento del Consigliere Luigi Rivalta* (Torino, 8 May 1986), Archivio dell'Istituto Piemontese Antonio Gramsci, folders 351-371.
- 97 Letter to Ottaviano Del Turco, 6 September 1986, Archivio dell'Istituto Piemontese Antonio Gramsci, folders 351-371.
- 98 Partito Comunista Italiano, *Documenti politici dal 17° al 18° congresso* (Roma: PCI, 1989), 256-272.
- 99 Giovanni Berlinguer, "Morti post-industriali," *Rinascita* 23 (1987).
- 100 Partito Comunista Italiano, *Documenti politici dal 17° al 18° congresso* (Roma: PCI, 1989), 343.
- 101 Giovanni Berlinguer, "Riprendiamoci il mondo," *Rinascita* 8 (1988).
- 102 Fausto Bertinotti, "Il lavoro buono e l'ecosviluppo," *Rinascita* 13 (1988).
- 103 Giulio Quercini, "I veri responsabili del caso Farmoplant," *Rinascita* 27 (1988).
- 104 A first fire occurred at Farmoplant in August 1980. After this event the workers and unions opened a controversial discussion with Montedison about the risks posed by the production processes. See also "La nube sulfurea - Montedison di Massa," *Rinascita* 33 (1980). This article denounced Montedison's thoughtlessness as regarded plant security and environment preservation. Moreover, it affirmed that the issue was not to choose between industrial employment and tourism development, but to subordinate production processes to precise environmental rulings.
- 105 Giulio Quercini, "I veri responsabili del caso Farmoplant," *Rinascita* 27 (1988).
- 106 Luciano Ghelli, "La duplice lezione della Farmoplant," *Rinascita* 34 (1988).
- 107 Rinalda Carati, "Qui non si dice: 'Chiudiamo la fabbrica,'" *Rinascita* 37 (1988).
- 108 Further information on this struggle may be found in Rinalda Carati and Leila Maiocco, "A Cornigliano abbiamo fatto così," *Rinascita* 28 (1990).
- 109 From the introduction to Fabio Giovannini, ed., *Culture della sinistra e culture verdi. La sfida della rivoluzione ambientale* (Roma: Datatext, 1994), 7.
- 110 Della Porta and Diani, 14.
- 111 On the Party's delays on the environment at this stage see Laura Conti, "Ecologia tra mercato e bisogni," *Critica marxista* 1 (1990).