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Capitalism/ Environmental Justice Kritik

**The notion that transportation can be used for profit is a mask for keeping those in poor areas impoverished and oppressed for the good of capital and strategic investment**

Freemark 11

(Yonah, urbanist and journalist who has worked in architecture, planning, and transportation, June 14th, 2011, “Local Neoliberalism’s Role in Defining Transit’s Purpose”, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/06/14/local-neoliberalisms-role-in-defining-transits-purpose/)

Writing recently in Environment and Planning A, Sociologist Stephanie Farmer argues that the rise of neoliberal ideology in local and national politics has encouraged a “retreat from social redistribution and integrated social welfare policies in favor of bolstering business activity.”\* This, she writes in reference to Chicago, has specifically affected public transportation, which “is increasingly deployed as a means to attract global capital as well as enhance affluent residents’ and tourists’ rights to the city.” This trend, she states, stands in opposition to the mid-century “Fordist strategy of territorial redistribution mobilizing public transportation to enhance economically disadvantaged groups’ access to the city.”\*\* Farmer’s approach provides something of an explanation for Detroit’s experience: Rather than concentrate on the needs of its most impoverished denizens through the assurance of basic bus service, the city’s business and political elite has instead put its resources into the construction of a light rail line whose primary purpose is to stimulate economic development by creating “place-based advantages for capital.” Similarly, Farmer is very critical of Chicago’s approach, arguing that that city’s investments have repeatedly favored “business elites over everyday users by excluding public transit investment in areas outside of Chicago’s global city downtown showcase zone.” Her evidence for this trend is primary in former Mayor Richard Daley’s obsession in constructing a premium-fare, limited-stop express rail link to the airport (including his willingness to construct a station for said service without providing the funds to actually operate the trains) and the transit authority’s Circle Line plan, which she argued would “effectively redraw [and expand] the downtown boundary,” with little benefit for the city’s most transit dependent. The repeated delays in extending the Red Line south of 95th Street into some of Chicago’s least prosperous neighborhoods suggest that there is no political will to invest outside of the wealthiest areas. Farmer’s argument is revealing of the one of the peculiarities of transit promotion: Those who engage in it simultaneously argue for the social welfare benefits of providing affordable mobility for as many people as possible while also suggesting that good public transportation can play an essential role in city-building — essentially for the elite. After all, one of the primary arguments made for investing in new transit capital projects is that their long-term benefits include raising the property values of the land parcels near stations. This creates an uneasy pro-transit coalition in many places where development and real estate interests align their lobbying with that of representatives of the poor to argue for the construction of new transit lines (usually rail), under the assumption that projects will benefit each group. This produces an identity crisis for transit. For whom is it developed? Can its social mobility goals be reconciled with the interests of capitalists in the urban space? Identifying the value of a transportation project is an essential element of the planning process, so asking these questions is essential, since there are limited resources. When it comes to transit, this seems particularly relevant, since most funds invested in bus or rail projects are provided by the public sector. Ultimately, this means that the promotion of almost every transit project is defined by political ideology. Do we invest our funds in a project to connect downtown with the airport, under the assumption that economic benefits will flow down from the top, as conservatives might suggest? Is spending government money on ensuring the efficient transportation of the elite effective because it grows the economy as a whole and eventually aids the poor? Or should public dollars be reserved for redistributive causes, focusing on the needs of those who are least able to provide for themselves? Of course there are many examples in which these questions appear to have been resolved. Even in Chicago, it would be difficult to argue that the subway and elevated lines that run into to the Loop are unhelpful for the poor, since many of the city’s greatest resources even for the impoverished are located in Farmer’s “downtown showcase zone.” Nonetheless, ponder this question next time a transit project is proposed: For whom is it being built, and why?

Environmental Racism exacerbates environmental problems in low-income communities that uniquely hurt people of color. Having lanes for cycling might sound like a good thing but it does not do anything for the poor.

Bullard 04

(Robert Bullard, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), “**POVERTY, POLLUTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL RACISM: STRATEGIES FOR BUILDING HEALTHY AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES” DM)**

The United States is the dominant economic and military force in the world today. The American economic engine has generated massive wealth, high standard of living, and consumerism. This growth machine has also generated waste, pollution, and ecological destruction. The U.S. has some of the best environmental laws in the world. However, in the real world, all communities are not created equal. Environmental regulations have not achieved uniform benefits across all segments of society. [[2](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#2end)] Some communities are routinely poisoned while the government looks the other way. People of color around the world must contend with dirty air and drinking water, and the location of noxious facilities such as municipal landfills, incinerators, hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities owned by private industry, government, and even the military.[[3](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html" \l "3end)] These environmental problems are exacerbated by racism. Environmental racism refers to environmental policy, practice, or directive that differentially affects or disadvantages (whether intended or unintended) individuals, groups, or communities based on race or color. Environmental racism is reinforced by government, legal, economic, political, and military institutions. Environmental racism combines with public policies and industry practices to provide benefits for the countries in the North while shifting costs to countries in the South. [[4](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#4end)] Environmental racism is a form of institutionalized discrimination. Institutional discrimination is defined as "actions or practices carried out by members of dominant (racial or ethnic) groups that have differential and negative impact on members of subordinate (racial and ethnic) groups." [[5](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#5end)] **The United States is grounded in white racism**. The nation was founded on the principles of "free land" (stolen from Native Americans and Mexicans), "free labor" (African slaves brought to this land in chains), and "free men" (only white men with property had the right to vote). From the outset, racism shaped the economic, political and ecological landscape of this new nation. Environmental racism buttressed the exploitation of land, people, and the natural environment. It operates as an intra-nation power arrangement--especially where ethnic or racial groups form a political and or numerical minority. For example, blacks in the U.S. form both a political and numerical racial minority. On the other hand, **blacks in South Africa, under apartheid, constituted a political minority and numerical majority. American and South African apartheid had devastating environmental impacts on blacks**. [[6](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#6end)] Environmental racism also operates in the international arena between nations and between transnational corporations. Increased globalization of the world's economy has placed special strains on the eco-systems in many poor communities and poor nations inhabited largely by people of color and indigenous peoples. This is especially true for the global resource extraction industry such as oil, timber, and minerals. [[7](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#7end)] Globalization makes it easier for transnational corporations and capital to flee to areas with the least environmental regulations, best tax incentives, cheapest labor, and highest profit. The struggle of African Americans in Norco, Louisiana and the Africans in the Niger Delta are similar in that both groups are negatively impacted by Shell Oil refineries and unresponsive governments. This scenario is repeated for Latinos in Wilmington (California) and indigenous people in Ecuador who must contend with pollution from Texaco oil refineries. The companies may be different, but the community complaints and concerns are very similar. Local residents have seen their air, water, and land contaminated. Many nearby residents are "trapped" in their community because of inadequate roads, poorly planned emergency escape routes, and faulty warning systems. They live in constant fear of plant explosions and accidents. The Bhopal tragedy is fresh in the minds of millions of people who live next to chemical plants. The 1984 poison-gas leak at the Bhopal, India Union Carbide plant killed thousands of people--making it the world's deadliest industrial accident. It is not a coincidence that the only place in the U.S. where methyl isocyanate (MIC) was manufactured was at a Union Carbide plant in in predominately African American Institute, West Virginia. [[8](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#8end)] In 1985, a gas leak from the Institute Union Carbide plant sent 135 residents to the hospital. Institutional racism has allowed people of color communities to exist as colonies, areas that form dependent (and unequal) relationships to the dominant white society or "Mother Country" with regard to their social, economic, legal, and environmental administration. Writing more than three decades ago, Carmichael and Hamilton, in their work Black Power, offered the "internal" colonial model to explain racial inequality, political exploitation, and social isolation of African Americans. Carmichael and Hamilton write: The economic relationship of America's black communities . . . reflects their colonial status. The political power exercised over those communities go hand in glove with the economic deprivation experienced by the black citizens. Historically, colonies have existed for the sole purpose of enriching, in one form or another, the "colonizer"; the consequence is to maintain the economic dependency of the "colonized." [[9](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#9end)] Institutional racism reinforces internal colonialism. Government institutions buttress this system of domination. Institutional racism defends, protects, and enhances the social advantages and privileges of rich nations. Whether by design or benign neglect, communities of color (ranging from the urban ghettos and barrios to rural "poverty pockets" to economically impoverished Native American reservations and developing nations) face some of the worst environmental problems. The most polluted communities are also the communities with crumbling infrastructure, economic disinvestment, deteriorating housing, inadequate schools, chronic unemployment, high poverty, and overloaded health care systems.

Only through grassroots action can truly dismantle the current problems surrounding environmental racism. Having bikes is not enough because that is just buying into the false hope of the state being good.

Bullard 97

(Robert Bullard, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), “CONFRONTING ENVIRONMENTAL INJUSTICE: IT'S THE RIGHT THING TO DO” DM)

The impetus behind the environmental justice movement did not come from within government, academia, or from within largely white middle-class nationally-based environmental and conservation groups. The impetus for change came from people of color grassroots activists and their "bottom-up" leadership approach. Grassroots groups organized themselves, educated themselves, and empowered themselves to make fundamental change in the way environmental protection is performed in their communities. The environmental justice movement has come a long ways since its humble beginning in rural, predominately African American Warren County, North Carolina where a PCB landfill ignited protests and over 500 arrests. The Warren County protests provided the impetus for a U.S. General Accounting Office (1983) study, Siting of Hazardous Waste Landfills and Their Correlation with Racial and Economic Status of Surrounding Communities. That study revealed that three out of four of the off-site, commercial hazardous waste landfills in Region 4 (which comprises eight states in the South) happen to be located in predominantly African-American communities, although African-Americans made up only 20% of the region's population. In 1997, both of the operating commercial offsite hazardous waste landfills in the region are located in mostly African American communities. The protests also led the Commission for Racial Justice (1987) to produce Toxic Waste and Race, the first national study to correlate waste facility sites and demographic characteristics. Race was found to be the most potent variable in predicting where these facilities were located -- more powerful than poverty, land values, and home ownership. In 1990, Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality chronicled the convergence of two social movements -- social justice and environmental movements -- into the environmental justice movement (Bullard 1990). This book highlighted African-Americans environmental activism in the South, the same region that gave birth to the modern civil rights movement. What started out as local and often isolated community-based struggles against toxics and facility siting blossomed into a multi-issue, multi-ethnic, and multi-regional movement. The 1991 First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit was probably the most important single event in the movement's history. The Summit broadened the environmental justice movement beyond its anti-toxics focus to include issues of public health, worker safety, land use, transportation, housing, resource allocation, and community empowerment (Lee 1992). The meeting, organized by and for people of color, **demonstrated that it is possible to build a multi-racial grassroots movement around environmental and economic justice** (Alston, 1992). Held in Washington, DC, the four-day Summit was attended by over 650 grassroots and national leaders from around the world. Delegates came from all fifty states including Alaska and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Chile, Mexico, and as far away as the Marshall Islands. People attended the Summit to share their action strategies, redefine the environmental movement, and develop common plans for addressing Environmental problems affecting people of color in the United States and around the world (Alston and Brown 1993). On October 27, 1991, Summit delegates adopted 17 "Principles of Environmental Justice." These principles were developed as a guide for organizing, networking, and relating to government and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). By June 1992, Spanish and Portuguese translations of the Principles were used and circulated by NGOs and community groups at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. Federal, state, and local policies and practices have contributed to residential segmentation and unhealthy living conditions in poor, working class, and people of color communities (Bullard and Johnson 1997). Several recent California cases bring this point to life (Lee 1995). Disparate highway siting and mitigation plans were challenged by community residents, churches, and the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Clean Air Alternative Coalition v. United States Department of Transportation (N.D. Cal. C-93-0721-VRW), involving the reconstruction of the earthquake damaged Cypress Freeway in West Oakland. The plaintiffs wanted the damaged Cypress Freeway (which split their community in half) rebuilt further away. Although the plaintiffs were not able to get their plan implemented, they did change the course of the freeway in their out of court settlement. The NAACP LDF filed an administrative complaint, Mothers of East Los Angeles, El Sereno Neighborhood Action Committee, El Sereno Organizing Committee, et al. v. California Transportation Commission, et al. (before the U.S. Department of Transportation and U.S. Housing and Urban Development), challenging the construction of the 4.5 extension of the Long Beach Freeway in East Los Angeles through El Sereno, Pasadena, and South Pasadena. The plaintiffs argue that the state agencies proposes mitigation measures to address noise, air and visual pollution discriminate against the mostly Latino El Sereno community. For example, all of the freeway in Pasadena and 80 percent in South Pasadena will be below ground level. On the other hand, most of the freeway in El Sereno will be above ground. White areas were favored over the mostly Latino El Sereno in allocation of covered freeway, historic preservation measures, and accommodation to local schools (Lee 1995; Bullard and Johnson 1997). Los Angeles residents and the NAACP LDF have also challenged the inequitable funding and operation of bus transportation used primarily by low-income and people of color residents. A class action lawsuit was filed on behalf of 350,000 low-income, people of color, bus riders represented by the Labor/Community Strategy Center, the Bus Riders Union, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Korean Immigrant Workers Advocates, and individual bus riders. In Labor/Community Strategy Center v. Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Cal. CV 94-5936 TJH Mcx)), the plaintiffs argue that the MTA has used federal funds to pursue a policy of raising costs of bus riders (who are mostly poor and people of color) and reducing quality of service in order to fund rail and other projects in predominately white, suburban areas. In September, 1996, the Labor/Community Strategy Center and their lawyers won an historic out-of-court settlement against the MTA (Bullard and Johnson 1997).

\*Batillecycles

Abelism- Impact

And this has severe implications on their daily lives as they are constrained to live in one place and unable to move from place to place

Golledge et al 1996 (Reginald G. Golledge, PhD in geography and works at University of California, C. Michael Costanzo, and James R. Marston, also professors at University of California. “The Mass Transit Needs of a Non-Driving Disabled Population”. This work was performed as part of the California PATH Program of the University of California, in cooperation with the State of California Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency, Department of Transportation; and the United States Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration.)

The 1992 World Almanac recently revealed that approximately sixty-seven percent of the United States population are drivers. There is no doubt that the ability to drive and the freedom that it gives with respect to economic and social interactions are seen as a tremendously important parts of the American way of life. Non-driving disabled people are not able to enjoy this facet of everyday existence. They must face a range of problems starting with the frustrations of trying to arrange transportation, to battling the beliefs that they are imposing on people's time, to resigning themselves to missed appointments or interactions when arranged transportation does not arrive in time or at all, to being unaware if they are standing at a bus stop as to whether a bus has already departed or is still on its way, to facing a host of problems concerned with being able to get to sites of recreation, shopping, work, or social interaction, in a convenient and non- dependent or non-threatening way. Certainly, having a driver's license gives one the sense that one is in control of the decision process concerning where one can go, when one can go, and how one can get there. It is, in fact, an extraordinarily integral part of time budgeting in all daily and longer term episodic patterns in the USA. While congenitally blind non-drivers can never be truly aware of the potential freedoms that they could have if they were drivers, those adventitiously blinded (i.e., blinded in life after having had vision for some time), are deeply and disturbingly aware of the sudden contraction of their activity spaces and the entire range of their social interactions. The question that arises is, how do they compensate for this loss? For some, family, relatives, friends, or work-mates fill the gap to a reasonable and acceptable extent. Others seek to minimize a felt dependence on others (i.e., in the form of constantly asking for help). Some turn to mass transportation alternatives to solve their travel problems, but this number is far short of what it could be. Others simply turn off and stay at home for they do not feel strong enough or confident enough to become dependent on others or to learn how to use mass transportation systems not designed for them. Thus, it is patently obvious that undertaking research on people's feelings and attitudes towards the problem of movement, and uncovering the frustrations and dependencies that are part and parcel of everyday life for the disabled non-driver, should provide us with clear insights into what is missing from the current state of the art in terms of provision of transportation services for this population. It is necessary to know if these frustrations and dependencies can be reduced by a more effective use of existing mass transportation systems, or whether only new modes of movement can deal with this problem. Solving this question becomes paramount in the attempt to try to define how it is possible to preserve autonomy and dignity in non-driving disabled populations and to help them avoid social isolation. Over four hundred cities nationwide provide mass transportation or specialized transportation that is supposed to be accessible to disabled people. Not all deal with questions of physical or other impairments in a similar way (i.e., user habits learned for one system do not necessarily transfer to systems in other environments. The way that each population has to deal with existing mass transportation systems has a significant impact on the way they are able to operate and live their life on a daily basis.

Random Arguments

Statism CP

Text: We should \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Government is responsible

Holding the government for unequal treatment to communities is key to solving for environmental racism. We have to take the initiative to solve for the current problems.

Bullard 97

(Robert Bullard, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), “CONFRONTING ENVIRONMENTAL INJUSTICE: IT'S THE RIGHT THING TO DO” DM)

Many of the nation's environmental policies distribute costs in a regressive pattern while providing disproportionate benefits for whites and individuals who fall at the upper end of the education and income scale. A 1992 study reported in the National Law Journal uncovered glaring inequities in the way the federal EPA enforces its laws (Lavelle and Coyle 1992). Lavelle and Coyle suggest: There is a racial divide in the way the U.S. government cleans up toxic waste sites and punishes polluters. White communities see faster action, better results and stiffer penalties than communities where blacks, Hispanics and other minorities live. This unequal protection often occurs whether the community is wealthy or poor (1992). The National Law Journal study reinforced what many grassroots activists have known for decades -- **all communities are not treated the same**. Communities that are located on the "wrong side of the tracks" are at greater risk from exposure to lead, pesticides (in the home and workplace), air pollution, toxic releases, water pollution, solid and hazardous waste, raw sewage, and pollution from industries (Goldman & Fitton 1994). Government has been slow to ask the questions of who gets help and who does not, who can afford help and who can not, why some contaminated communities get studied while others get left off the research agenda, why industry poisons some communities and not others, why some contaminated communities get cleaned up while others are not, why some populations are protected and others are not protected, why unjust, unfair, and illegal policies and practices are allowed to go unpunished. In 1990, ATSDR held a historic conference in Atlanta. The National Minority Health Conference focused on contamination in people of color communities (Johnson, Williams, and Harris 1992). In 1992, after meeting with community leaders, academicians, and civil rights leaders, EPA (under the leadership of William Reilly) admitted there was a problem, and established the Office of Environmental Equity. The name was changed to the Office of Environmental Justice under the Clinton Administration. In the same year, EPA produced one of the first comprehensive documents to examine the whole question of risk, environmental hazards and their equity report, Environmental Equity: Reducing Risks for All Communities (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1992). The report and its Office of Environmental Equity were initiated only after prodding from people of color environmental justice leaders, activists, and a few academicians. EPA also established a 25-member National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC) under the Federal Advisory Committee Act or FACA. The NEJAC divided its environmental justice work into six subcommittees: Health and Research, Waste and Facility Siting, Enforcement, Public Participation and Accountability, Native American and Indigenous Issues, and International Issues. The NEJAC is comprised of stakeholders representing grassroots community groups, environmental groups, nongovernmental organizations, state, local, and tribal governments, academia, and industry. In February, 1994, seven federal agencies, including the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), National Institutes of Health (NIH), Department of Energy (DOE), and Centers for Disease Control (CDC) sponsored a national health symposium, "Health and Research Needs to Ensure Environmental Justice." The conference planning committee was unique in that it included grassroots organization leaders, impacted community residents, and federal agency representatives. The goal of the national health symposium was to bring diverse stakeholders and those most affected by environmental problems to the decision making table (National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences 1995). Some of the recommendations from the health symposium included: Conduct meaningful health research in support of people of color and low-income communities, Promote disease prevention and pollution prevention strategies, Promote interagency coordination to ensure environmental justice, Provide effective outreach, education, and communications, and Design legislative and legal remedies. In response to growing public concern, President Clinton on February 11, 1994 (i.e., the second day of the health symposium) issued Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations." This Order is not a new law but is an attempt to address environmental injustice within existing federal laws and regulations. Executive Order 12898 reinforces the 30-year old Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI, which prohibits discriminatory practices in programs receiving federal funds. The Order also focuses the spotlight back on the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), a twenty-five year old law that set policy goals for the protection, maintenance, and enhancement of the environment. NEPA's goal is to ensure for all Americans a safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing environment. NEPA requires federal agencies to prepare a detailed statement on the environmental effects of proposed federal actions that significantly effect the quality of human health. The Executive Order calls for improved methodologies for assessing and mitigating impacts, health effect from multiple and cumulative exposure, collection of data on low-income and minority populations who may be disproportionately at risk, and impacts on subsistence fishers and wildlife consumers. It also encourages participation of the impacted populations in the various phases of assessing impacts -- including scoping, data gathering, alternatives, analysis, mitigation, and monitoring. The Executive Order focuses on "subsistence" fishers and wildlife consumers. Everybody does not buy their fish at the supermarket. There are many people who are subsistence fishers, who fish for protein, who basically subsidize their budgets, and their diets, by fishing from rivers, streams, and lakes that happen to be polluted. These subpopulations may be under-protected if standard assumptions are made using the dominant risk paradigm. The Executive order is one attempt to fix this problem.

Grassroots Good

Only through grassroots action can truly dismantle the current problems surrounding environmental racism. Having bikes is not enough because that is just buying into the false hope of the state being good.

Bullard 97

(Robert Bullard, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), “CONFRONTING ENVIRONMENTAL INJUSTICE: IT'S THE RIGHT THING TO DO” DM)

The impetus behind the environmental justice movement did not come from within government, academia, or from within largely white middle-class nationally-based environmental and conservation groups. The impetus for change came from people of color grassroots activists and their "bottom-up" leadership approach. Grassroots groups organized themselves, educated themselves, and empowered themselves to make fundamental change in the way environmental protection is performed in their communities. The environmental justice movement has come a long ways since its humble beginning in rural, predominately African American Warren County, North Carolina where a PCB landfill ignited protests and over 500 arrests. The Warren County protests provided the impetus for a U.S. General Accounting Office (1983) study, Siting of Hazardous Waste Landfills and Their Correlation with Racial and Economic Status of Surrounding Communities. That study revealed that three out of four of the off-site, commercial hazardous waste landfills in Region 4 (which comprises eight states in the South) happen to be located in predominantly African-American communities, although African-Americans made up only 20% of the region's population. In 1997, both of the operating commercial offsite hazardous waste landfills in the region are located in mostly African American communities. The protests also led the Commission for Racial Justice (1987) to produce Toxic Waste and Race, the first national study to correlate waste facility sites and demographic characteristics. Race was found to be the most potent variable in predicting where these facilities were located -- more powerful than poverty, land values, and home ownership. In 1990, Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality chronicled the convergence of two social movements -- social justice and environmental movements -- into the environmental justice movement (Bullard 1990). This book highlighted African-Americans environmental activism in the South, the same region that gave birth to the modern civil rights movement. What started out as local and often isolated community-based struggles against toxics and facility siting blossomed into a multi-issue, multi-ethnic, and multi-regional movement. The 1991 First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit was probably the most important single event in the movement's history. The Summit broadened the environmental justice movement beyond its anti-toxics focus to include issues of public health, worker safety, land use, transportation, housing, resource allocation, and community empowerment (Lee 1992). The meeting, organized by and for people of color, **demonstrated that it is possible to build a multi-racial grassroots movement around environmental and economic justice** (Alston, 1992). Held in Washington, DC, the four-day Summit was attended by over 650 grassroots and national leaders from around the world. Delegates came from all fifty states including Alaska and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Chile, Mexico, and as far away as the Marshall Islands. People attended the Summit to share their action strategies, redefine the environmental movement, and develop common plans for addressing Environmental problems affecting people of color in the United States and around the world (Alston and Brown 1993). On October 27, 1991, Summit delegates adopted 17 "Principles of Environmental Justice." These principles were developed as a guide for organizing, networking, and relating to government and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). By June 1992, Spanish and Portuguese translations of the Principles were used and circulated by NGOs and community groups at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. Federal, state, and local policies and practices have contributed to residential segmentation and unhealthy living conditions in poor, working class, and people of color communities (Bullard and Johnson 1997). Several recent California cases bring this point to life (Lee 1995). Disparate highway siting and mitigation plans were challenged by community residents, churches, and the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Clean Air Alternative Coalition v. United States Department of Transportation (N.D. Cal. C-93-0721-VRW), involving the reconstruction of the earthquake damaged Cypress Freeway in West Oakland. The plaintiffs wanted the damaged Cypress Freeway (which split their community in half) rebuilt further away. Although the plaintiffs were not able to get their plan implemented, they did change the course of the freeway in their out of court settlement. The NAACP LDF filed an administrative complaint, Mothers of East Los Angeles, El Sereno Neighborhood Action Committee, El Sereno Organizing Committee, et al. v. California Transportation Commission, et al. (before the U.S. Department of Transportation and U.S. Housing and Urban Development), challenging the construction of the 4.5 extension of the Long Beach Freeway in East Los Angeles through El Sereno, Pasadena, and South Pasadena. The plaintiffs argue that the state agencies proposes mitigation measures to address noise, air and visual pollution discriminate against the mostly Latino El Sereno community. For example, all of the freeway in Pasadena and 80 percent in South Pasadena will be below ground level. On the other hand, most of the freeway in El Sereno will be above ground. White areas were favored over the mostly Latino El Sereno in allocation of covered freeway, historic preservation measures, and accommodation to local schools (Lee 1995; Bullard and Johnson 1997). Los Angeles residents and the NAACP LDF have also challenged the inequitable funding and operation of bus transportation used primarily by low-income and people of color residents. A class action lawsuit was filed on behalf of 350,000 low-income, people of color, bus riders represented by the Labor/Community Strategy Center, the Bus Riders Union, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Korean Immigrant Workers Advocates, and individual bus riders. In Labor/Community Strategy Center v. Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Cal. CV 94-5936 TJH Mcx)), the plaintiffs argue that the MTA has used federal funds to pursue a policy of raising costs of bus riders (who are mostly poor and people of color) and reducing quality of service in order to fund rail and other projects in predominately white, suburban areas. In September, 1996, the Labor/Community Strategy Center and their lawyers won an historic out-of-court settlement against the MTA (Bullard and Johnson 1997).

\*Racism Impact

Coalition Building Good

Coalition building solves, integrating governmental policy along with the voices of the people is only hope to solve for the current injustice to those living in poverty

Bullard at al 02

(Robert Bullard, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), “**Growing Smarter: Building Equity into a Fair Growth Agenda” DM)**

People of color communities are not waiting for government, business, or mainstream environmental groups to come up with a “silver-bullet” solution to address race, equity, and urban sprawl problems that directly and indirectly impact them. Some communities are taking action. Whether central city, suburb, or rural, it will take a coordinated effort among the divergent interests to fix the nation’s transportation problems. It will also take time and resources to arrest sprawl and negative impacts it has on central cities. Clearly, people of color organizations that have long and rich track record on social justice and equity have a ready-made issue in transportation and smart growth. They need only siege the issue. They might bring their considerable collective resources to the table. *Proactive Anti-Racism Strategy.* Race still matters in the United States. Addressing social equity and improving race relations need to be an explicit priority in smart growth initiatives. Racial polarization is impeding community and economic development in almost every metropolitan region that have large concentrations of people of color. Dismantling racial barriers and institutional racism would go a long way in boosting financial incentives and reinvestment in central city neighborhoods. *Building a Equity/Fair Growth Movement.* The equity and smart growth issue has the potential for bringing together diverse community-based organizations, homeowners associations, civic clubs, academic institutions, activists, and government to form broad coalitions and alliances. Working together, neighborhood groups in central cities, suburbs, and surrounding rural areas can band together to arrest sprawl and at the same time begin to address longstanding equity issues that divide people by race, income, class, and spatial location. *Plans to Narrow the Public Education Gap.* Education is an investment in the future. The nation’s public schools remain an integral part of our nation’s future. Disparities exist in financing urban and suburban schools. Innovative approaches need to be taken to equalize inherent funding inequities resulting from an outdated taxing system—namely 7 property taxes. As an example, tax revenue collected from retail sales can be shared regionally, allowing jurisdictions with struggling educational systems to invest in them. This would enable the region to provide a well-trained workforce to attract new economic investments. *Neighborhood Revitalization without Gentrification.* Neighborhood revitalization initiatives that minimize “gentrification” pressures and displacement of incumbent residents should be undertaken. In-fill development should be encouraged in place of uncontrolled sprawl. Public space should be planned in the general welfare of all residents, regardless of race, income, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, etc. Other strategies include: provide economic opportunities, including jobs and housing linkage programs; develop and enforce Fair Share Housing; institute Community Land Trusts and land banking that could be used for developments from parks to housing; and design Community Equity Impact Reports to assess the benefits of projects to the community. *Regional Fair Housing Initiatives.* Discrimination is still a major barrier to open housing in most regions. Discrimination costs. A targeted regional fair housing strategy could maximize housing, employment, and educational opportunity options for low-income persons and people of color. Private fair housing efforts should be expanded and coordinated with state fair housing initiatives. Special initiatives are needed to eliminate the “discrimination tax” that is levied on people of color homeowners. Similar efforts are also needed to protect small, disadvantaged, and minority businesses from this illegal tax. *Greenspace Development.* Promote greenspace development that promotes community cohesion, reduces crime, and improves mental health. Trees and greenspace need to be an integral part of all community planning since they increase the shade around buildings and parking lots, and lower air temperatures surrounding vegetation. *Energy Efficient Housing.* Improving energy efficiency in housing is a money saver and could play a major role in improving air quality. Reduction in energy consumption benefits all households. It is especially pertinent for low-income residents since efficiency measures save money, improve human health, reduce air pollution, increase building durability, and enhance property values. *Urban Brownfields Redevelopment.* Current land-use decision-making favors development in the suburbs or “greenfields” rather than inner city areas. Some policies foster abandonment and infrastructure decline. Alternatively, existing policies, such as criteria for funding water/sewer infrastructure could be modified to favor existing, rather than new development. In addition, “brownfields,” or abandoned or underutilized property or buildings, need to be reclaimed and brought back into production. Residents in neighborhoods with brownfields sites must be an integral part of the redevelopment process. *Change Zoning and Promote Transit-Oriented Development.* Change existing zoning codes to encourage multiuse land-development that makes it possible for people to walk, work, shop, and go to school within walking distance of their homes. Planners can shape land uses and development that are amenable to walking, bicycling, and transit use. Transit stations can become more than a place where commuters pass through on their way to somewhere else. Transit-oriented development (TOD) that promotes more dense mixed land uses. *Streets for Walking, Bicycles, and Transit.* Design communities around people rather than around automobiles. As a rule, sprawl development is not pedestrian, bicycle, or transit friendly. Infrastructure enhancements and service improvements are needed to get people out of their homes and cars. Walking and biking are two major travel modes that produce zero pollution. In addition, sidewalks, bike lanes, jogging paths all encourage physical activity, enhance public health, and promote social interaction and a sense of community. *Environmental Justice/Equity Analysis*. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) should demonstrate that their regional transportation plans comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which assure transportation investments promote greater equity in access to opportunities and economic benefits. The assessments will also need to address equity, environmental justice, and adequacy and appropriateness of current data, computer modeling capabilities, processes for assessing needs and developing projects, and use of performance measures. 8 *Improving Access to Jobs.* Sprawl-driven development diverts funds away from central cities. Improving low-income residents’ mobility, particularly for those making the transition from welfare to work, may be the difference between employment and unemployment. Innovative programs are needed to improve transportation efficiency, reduce the impacts of transportation on the environment, reduce the need for infrastructure investment, provide efficient access, examine development patterns and involve the community in such efforts. *Air Quality and Health.* Metropolitan Planning Organizations should incorporate social equity and environmental justice into air quality conformity requirements at all stages of the transportation planning process. It should also encourage the spending of congestion mitigation investments to benefit low-income communities and communities of color, especially if these areas exhibit disproportionately high levels of criteria pollutants. The U.S. DOT should work closely with the federal EPA and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to monitor air quality levels in nonattainment regions. *Public Health and Safety.* Fund research that examines the impact that changes in the built environment can have on public health, such as addition of greenspace, sidewalks, bike paths, lighting, crosswalks, traffic calming, etc. Target research funding to community based organizations (CBOs) and historically black colleges/minority institutions (HBCUs/MIs) to study and design remedies to address pedestrian fatalities and transportation safety issues in people of color communities. Finally, a national strategy is needed to develop and disseminate transportation equity and smart growth messages to the various people of color leaders, organizations, educational institutions, professional associations, fraternal orders, business associations, and other voluntary associations, i.e., church-based, civil rights, education, housing, community development, bankers, health care, legal, etc. People of color take ownership of the transportation equity and smart growth message, they will remain marginalized and on the periphery of the smart growth debate.

Impact- Racism

Environmental Racism exacerbates environmental problems in low-income communities that uniquely hurt people of color. Having lanes for cycling might sound like a good thing but it does not do anything for the poor.

Bullard 04

(Robert Bullard, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), “**POVERTY, POLLUTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL RACISM: STRATEGIES FOR BUILDING HEALTHY AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES” DM)**

The United States is the dominant economic and military force in the world today. The American economic engine has generated massive wealth, high standard of living, and consumerism. This growth machine has also generated waste, pollution, and ecological destruction. The U.S. has some of the best environmental laws in the world. However, in the real world, all communities are not created equal. Environmental regulations have not achieved uniform benefits across all segments of society. [[2](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#2end)] Some communities are routinely poisoned while the government looks the other way. People of color around the world must contend with dirty air and drinking water, and the location of noxious facilities such as municipal landfills, incinerators, hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities owned by private industry, government, and even the military.[[3](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html" \l "3end)] These environmental problems are exacerbated by racism. Environmental racism refers to environmental policy, practice, or directive that differentially affects or disadvantages (whether intended or unintended) individuals, groups, or communities based on race or color. Environmental racism is reinforced by government, legal, economic, political, and military institutions. Environmental racism combines with public policies and industry practices to provide benefits for the countries in the North while shifting costs to countries in the South. [[4](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#4end)] Environmental racism is a form of institutionalized discrimination. Institutional discrimination is defined as "actions or practices carried out by members of dominant (racial or ethnic) groups that have differential and negative impact on members of subordinate (racial and ethnic) groups." [[5](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#5end)] **The United States is grounded in white racism**. The nation was founded on the principles of "free land" (stolen from Native Americans and Mexicans), "free labor" (African slaves brought to this land in chains), and "free men" (only white men with property had the right to vote). From the outset, racism shaped the economic, political and ecological landscape of this new nation. Environmental racism buttressed the exploitation of land, people, and the natural environment. It operates as an intra-nation power arrangement--especially where ethnic or racial groups form a political and or numerical minority. For example, blacks in the U.S. form both a political and numerical racial minority. On the other hand, **blacks in South Africa, under apartheid, constituted a political minority and numerical majority. American and South African apartheid had devastating environmental impacts on blacks**. [[6](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#6end)] Environmental racism also operates in the international arena between nations and between transnational corporations. Increased globalization of the world's economy has placed special strains on the eco-systems in many poor communities and poor nations inhabited largely by people of color and indigenous peoples. This is especially true for the global resource extraction industry such as oil, timber, and minerals. [[7](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#7end)] Globalization makes it easier for transnational corporations and capital to flee to areas with the least environmental regulations, best tax incentives, cheapest labor, and highest profit. The struggle of African Americans in Norco, Louisiana and the Africans in the Niger Delta are similar in that both groups are negatively impacted by Shell Oil refineries and unresponsive governments. This scenario is repeated for Latinos in Wilmington (California) and indigenous people in Ecuador who must contend with pollution from Texaco oil refineries. The companies may be different, but the community complaints and concerns are very similar. Local residents have seen their air, water, and land contaminated. Many nearby residents are "trapped" in their community because of inadequate roads, poorly planned emergency escape routes, and faulty warning systems. They live in constant fear of plant explosions and accidents. The Bhopal tragedy is fresh in the minds of millions of people who live next to chemical plants. The 1984 poison-gas leak at the Bhopal, India Union Carbide plant killed thousands of people--making it the world's deadliest industrial accident. It is not a coincidence that the only place in the U.S. where methyl isocyanate (MIC) was manufactured was at a Union Carbide plant in in predominately African American Institute, West Virginia. [[8](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#8end)] In 1985, a gas leak from the Institute Union Carbide plant sent 135 residents to the hospital. Institutional racism has allowed people of color communities to exist as colonies, areas that form dependent (and unequal) relationships to the dominant white society or "Mother Country" with regard to their social, economic, legal, and environmental administration. Writing more than three decades ago, Carmichael and Hamilton, in their work Black Power, offered the "internal" colonial model to explain racial inequality, political exploitation, and social isolation of African Americans. Carmichael and Hamilton write: The economic relationship of America's black communities . . . reflects their colonial status. The political power exercised over those communities go hand in glove with the economic deprivation experienced by the black citizens. Historically, colonies have existed for the sole purpose of enriching, in one form or another, the "colonizer"; the consequence is to maintain the economic dependency of the "colonized." [[9](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#9end)] Institutional racism reinforces internal colonialism. Government institutions buttress this system of domination. Institutional racism defends, protects, and enhances the social advantages and privileges of rich nations. Whether by design or benign neglect, communities of color (ranging from the urban ghettos and barrios to rural "poverty pockets" to economically impoverished Native American reservations and developing nations) face some of the worst environmental problems. The most polluted communities are also the communities with crumbling infrastructure, economic disinvestment, deteriorating housing, inadequate schools, chronic unemployment, high poverty, and overloaded health care systems.

\*Solvency Takeout

A collaborative effort by both the federal government and the citizens can create a coalition that can solve for the current notions of transportation that uniquely perpetuates injustice and creation of sprawls

Weir 01

(Margaret Weir, Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Chicago in 1986.  Her research and teaching fields include American political development, urban politics and policy, political sociology, and comparative studies of the welfare state, “METROPOLITAN COALITION-BUILDING STRATEGIES” DM)

Proclaiming that “we are all in it together,” urban advocates have for the past decade sought to promote city-suburban political coalitions.1 Their call for concerted regional action to address urban social and economic problems reflects a new political reality: the sharp scaling back of federal urban aid since the 1980s, even as concentrated urban poverty continued to grow. As federal dollars grew more scarce and social policy devolution granted states more discretion over spending, the need to gain new allies and to build power in new arenas became increasingly evident to many urban advocates. The call for metropolitan alliances also reflects a long underappreciated economic reality: the economic fate of cities and suburbs are linked. A wealth of studies now documents the interdependence of cities and suburbs.2 Many of these studies argue that all nonpoor suburbs have a long-term interest in reducing urban poverty because such poverty depresses regional economic growth. Others point to the shared economic interests of cities and particular suburbs, especially fiscally distressed suburbs. Despite this outpouring of research, identifying the “we” and figuring out how to get them together has proven challenging. Efforts to build equity-oriented metropolitan alliances have faced a formidable array of obstacles. These include longstanding political animosities between cities and suburbs, bitter racial divisions, entrenched administrative practices, and the narrow and short-term perspective that dominates the thinking of politicians and civic organizations in cities as well as suburbs. Yet, in metropolitan regions across the country, urban advocates have been building new alliances of varying reach and durability. This paper evaluates what we can learn from these efforts, drawing particularly on case material related to improving infrastructure and investment in low-income communities.3 I highlight four factors that appear consistently in successful and durable collaborations for reducing metropolitan inequalities. The first is the central role of relationship building among coalition members. The second is the ability to reframe problems so that formerly disparate interests find some common ground for collaborative action. The third is access to information and the capacity to analyze often complex data. The fourth is the ability to operate effectively in the multiple political arenas that span the federal system. After illustrating these factors, I then show how each of them has mattered for the development of specific metropolitan alliances. Finally, **effective influence at the state and federal levels is particularly important for most successful coalitions**, the last part of the paper shows how some Case material for this paper is draw from the secondary literature as well as from my own research, including interviews in Chicago and Washington D.C. with state legislators, city officials, advocates in the areas of transportation and community reinvestment, and other individuals notable metropolitan alliances have won access to those arenas. FOUR ELEMENTS OF DURABLE METROPOLITAN COLLABORATION Relationship-Building. Relationship-building is key to durable and successful collaborations. It is not only the first step, it is the central ongoing task of coalition-building. In efforts to build coalitions that cross metropolitan political boundaries or that stretch across a state, advocates in the same broad field may not know one another. When coalitions seek to unite groups active in different issue areas, the problem is compounded. Most research on relationship-building emphasizes the importance of repeated interactions in building trust.4 Small steps that link different groups in common actions are an essential part of the process. In addition to these close ties among direct cooperators, members of successful collaborations have knowledge of and access to more distant interests. Such “weak ties” can provide resources, knowledge or political support at critical moments. This suggests that it is well worth seeking out relationships with groups that have power or a reputation for power even if their immediate value to the coalition may not be evident. Organizations and coalitions use hiring decisions and member recruitment to extend the range of relationships. Defining Common Interests. Thinking about problems in regional terms does not come naturally to most metropolitan actors. Thinking is ways that link the interests of the urban poor to others in the metropolitan area is even more rare. Political boundaries promote narrow and local perspectives on regional problems. Many suburban residents look to their city boundaries as a form of protection from urban problems; for many localities, strengthening these boundaries has long been a central goal. Local politicians, driven by short-term electoral considerations and hot-button racial issues, often reinforce such narrow perspectives. Despite the continuing power of these barriers to collaboration, there are several processes through which groups within metropolitan areas can build common perspectives. The search for such areas of agreement does not imply complete overlap of agendas across groups or even similar motivations. Groups can begin to cooperate even around small areas of agreement. One approach to defining common interests involves what sociologists call the “strategic framing” of issues. Frames can be defined as “the specific metaphors, symbolic representations and cognitive cues” that define the issue.5 What is the issue about and whose interests does it touch? Investigators who study social movements point to the importance of framing in determining the scope and ultimately the success of social movements. Strategic framing can seek to redefine an issue so that groups who did not see their interests as intertwined find new bases of cooperation. The movement for “smart growth with equity” attempts such a redefinition of interests.6 The aim is to unite advocates for low-income communities with environmentalists and other potential allies, including business and labor. The interests of environmentalists and advocates for low-income communities have historically been difficult to reconcile.7 The anti-growth perspective of many environmental groups clashed with the support for jobs and growth on the part of urban advocates. More recently, advocates for low-income people and environmentalists have tangled directly over growth controls and affordable housing. The smart growth movement attempts to locate common ground among these groups. Environmentalists’ concerns about sprawl need to be addressed through revitalizing declining urban neighborhoods and providing affordable housing as part of revitalization. Portland, Oregon, which implemented state land use controls nearly 30 years ago, is widely acknowledged as the leader developing this kind of coalition. A similar logic is at work in recent efforts in Illinois to link environmental groups primarily concerned with stopping highway development with urban groups that support improved public transportation. A second way in which common interests can be built is when antagonistic groups learn through experience that their interests are at least partly complementary. The role of the Community 6 Reinvestment Act (CRA) in making banks realize there was a profit to be made in lending to low and moderate income home buyers provides an example of this process. First enacted in 1977, the CRA is an anti-redlining measure that required banks to lend throughout the areas from which they draw deposits. Although many banks vigorously resisted the measure and regulators failed to enforce it, in cities where local community-based organizations were strong, the CRA sparked collaborations that proved profitable to banks.8 By the 1990s, most banks had established community affairs departments and had discovered that it was indeed in their interest to lend to low and moderate income communities. Some initial coercion or regulation may be necessary to promote this kind of learning. For example, Oregon’s homebuilding industry initially opposed the state’s land use regulations but once they were in place, some of the builders came to support the law. A third way that low income advocates can win regional allies is by persuading regional organizations to extend their mission to encompass issues of highest concern to low-income communities. In many cases, this does not entail redefining interests, but rather broadening the action agenda. The American Lung Association’s increased attention to the asthma of inner city children provides an example of this kind of mission extension. The advantage of this strategy is that it does not require creating new organizations but rather extending the capacities of existing organizations. The emergence of new problems can provide an opportunity for redefining problems and identifying new allies. The past five years of economic growth have prompted business leaders in many regions to see sprawl, transportation, and the spatial mismatch between jobs and housing as problems that concern them. In some regions, such as Chicago, this has generated new business initiatives centrally concerned with promoting regional equity.9 In other settings, advocates have to press to ensure that equity considerations enter into business thinking about regionalism. Information and Expertise. Information and expertise are essential components of regional coalition- building strategies. They are particularly important in launching new policy initiatives because data can help cast issues in a new light, either documenting the extent of a problem or highlighting common interests that may not be apparent on the surface. Data and expertise can show that some solutions are more feasible than previously thought. Data can also highlight patterns of public spending that fail to Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) of 1975, which required banks to disclose the geographic location of their residential lending. The availability of that information, combined with new data disclosure requirements after 1989, was essential to showing patterns of noncompliance with the CRA. Disclosure requirements are not always sufficient to make data useful. Lending data was initially released in a form that made it difficult to use; only concerted pressure produced a more useable format. Although the Transportation Equity Act of 1998 (TEA-21) required the federal government to release data about public spending on transportation, local advocates have thus far found the data difficult to use to document unequal geographic patterns of spending. Even when data is available in a useful format, community organizations may not have the capacity to analyze it. Because of these difficulties, intermediary organizations that specialize in analyzing data are often critical components of regional coalitions. These organizations can build the expertise and invest in the computer equipment and software needed to analyze often complex data. In the field of community reinvestment, organizations such as the Woodstock Institute, the National Training and Information Center, and the National Community Reinvestment Coalition have played an essential role by providing analyses of local bank lending patterns for community groups. Such analyses are necessary for any plausible challenge to lending practices. More recently, these intermediary groups have also played a key role in state campaigns to regulate the latest predatory lending practices. In addition to analyzing data, intermediary organizations can produce new information. Using a variety of strategies, including surveys, new information is often a critical first step to documenting a address or even exacerbate some problems. The increase in home mortgage lending would not have been possible without the Home 9 common problem. New technologies have made information more valuable in organizing new coalitions. The development of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping is a particularly valuable tool. In his book Metropolitics Myron Orfield stresses the key role that large colored maps played in visually displaying the common interests among the elements of the metropolitan coalition he sought to build in the Twin Cities.10 Visual evidence of the common tax burden that the cities and some suburbs bore for the development of “executive suburbs” was powerful way to show doubtful suburbs that they had common fiscal interests with the city. In some cities, local intermediary organizations, such as Chicago’s Metropolitan Chicago Information Center now can provide local organizations access to these tools. Creating intermediaries that local organizations can access is itself a process requiring organization. The most successful uses of information occur when a supra local network of organizations is built to address similar problems. Such networks facilitate sharing information as well as strategy. Multi-level Political Action. Then notion of“ metropolitan collaboration” implies that action is confined to one level of government. The word “collaboration” implies a conflict-free process. Yet, successful regional collaborations have the ability to influence policy at the federal and state levels; they also possess sufficient political power to deploy more conflict-oriented approaches when necessary. Even in an era of significant policy devolution, federal regulations significantly affect the prospects for metropolitan collaborations. In many policy areas, federal regulations set the framework for metropolitan action. They can tilt the balance of power among local actors in ways that give weaker groups a foot in the door. For example, regulations regarding disclosure of information (as in the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act) and regulations requiring bank compliance (as in the Community Reinvestment Act) dramatically changed the balance of power between banks and community organizations. Federal actions can create new arenas of decision making that shake up existing power relationships, as in the 1992 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). ISTEA gave more authority and discretion over spending decisions to Metropolitan Planning Organizations in hopes of curbing the power of state highway departments. Federal provisions can provide new channels of funding as in TEA-21's Access to Jobs program, which gave community groups a direct stake in regional initiatives to insert equity concerns in transportation decisions. Access to state politics is particularly important for creating and sustaining regional alliances. Because there are very few regional organizations with significant decision making power, most key regional decisions actually get made at the state level. The entrenched localism of much decision making in the states and the salience of partisan divisions has made this a particularly tough arena for promoting city-suburb coalitions. State-wide campaigns supported by a wide array of local groups – often united by only thin agreement, rather than deep common interest – may be the best strategy for prevailing in state politics.

\*Doesn’t Solve For Equity

Only adopting an environmental justice framework that actively dismantles social equity can solve for the racist ideologies and implications, reforming politics does not do anything.

Bullard 04

(Robert Bullard, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), “**POVERTY, POLLUTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL RACISM: STRATEGIES FOR BUILDING HEALTHY AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES” DM)**

The dominant environmental protection paradigm manages, regulates, and distributes risks. It also institutionalizes unequal enforcement, trades human health for profit, places the burden of proof on the "victims" and not the polluting industry, legitimates human exposure to harmful chemicals, pesticides, and hazardous substances, promotes "risky" technologies, exploits the vulnerability of economically and politically disenfranchised communities, subsidizes ecological destruction, creates an industry around risk assessment and risk management, delays cleanup actions, and fails to develop pollution prevention as the overarching and dominant strategy. The U.S. EPA defines environmental justice as the "fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including racial, ethnic, or socio-economic groups should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local, and tribal programs and policies." [[14](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#14end)] In 1992, the U.S. EPA published Environmental Equity: Reducing Risks for All Communities--the first time the agency embarked on a systematic examination of environmental risks to communities of color. [[15](http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html#15end)] Environmental equity may mean different things to different people. Equity is distilled into three broad categories: procedural, geographic, and social equity. *Procedural equity* refers to the "fairness" question: the extent that governing rules, regulations, evaluation criteria, and enforcement are applied uniformly across the board and in a nondiscriminatory way. Unequal protection might result from nonscientific and undemocratic decisions, exclusionary practices, public hearings held in remote locations and at inconvenient times, and use of English-only material as the language to communicate and conduct hearings for non-English speaking publics. *Geographic equity* refers to location and spatial configuration of communities and their proximity to environmental hazards, noxious facilities, and locally unwanted land uses (LULUs) such as landfills, incinerators, sewer treatment plants, lead smelters, refineries, and other noxious facilities. For example, unequal protection may result from land-use decisions that determine the location of residential amenities and disamenities. Unincorporated, poor, and communities of color often suffer a "triple" vulnerability of noxious facility siting. Social Equity assesses the role of sociological factors (race, ethnicity, class, culture, life styles, political power, etc.) on environmental decision making. Poor people and people of color often work in the most dangerous jobs, live in the most polluted neighborhoods, and their children are exposed to all kinds of environmental toxins on the playgrounds and in their homes. The environmental justice framework rests on developing tools, strategies, and policies to eliminate unfair, unjust, and inequitable conditions and decisions. The framework attempts to uncover the underlying assumptions that may contribute to and produce differential exposure and unequal protection. It brings to the surface the ethical and political questions of "who gets what, when, why, and how much." Some general characteristics of this framework include the following: The environmental justice framework adopts a public health model of prevention (i.e., elimination of the threat before harm occurs) and the precautionary principle as the preferred strategy. The environmental justice framework shifts the burden of proof to polluters/dischargers who do harm, who discriminate, or who do not give equal protection to people of color, low-income persons, and other "protected" classes or vulnerable populations. The environmental justice framework allows disparate impact and statistical weight or an "effect" test, as opposed to "intent," to infer discrimination. The environmental justice framework redresses disproportionate impact through "targeted" action and resources. In general, this strategy targets resources where environmental and health problems are greatest (as determined by some ranking scheme but not limited to quantitative risk assessment). The environmental justice paradigm embraces a holistic approach to formulating environmental health policies and regulations, developing risk reduction strategies for multiple, cumulative and synergistic risks, ensuring public health, enhancing public participation in environmental decision-making, promoting community empowerment, building infrastructure for achieving environmental justice and sustainable communities, ensuring interagency cooperation and coordination, developing innovative public/private partnerships and collaboratives, enhancing community-based pollution prevention strategies, ensuring community-based sustainable economic development, and developing geographically-oriented community-wide programming.

\*We PIC

My partner and I REJECT the word ‘we’ in the 1ac- replace it with my partner and I.

WE is bad because it defines universal inclusion – instead of allowing individuals the choice to chose what they support the affirmative – this destroys individual choice and freedom allowing for government intervention.

There is only a chance that’s bad

Petro, 1974 (Sylvester, Professor of Law at Wake Forest University, University of Toledo Law Review, p.480)

However, one may still insist, echoing Ernest Hemingway – “I believe in only one thing: liberty.” And it is always well to bear in mind David Hume’s observation: “It is seldom that liberty of any kind is lost all at once.” Thus, it is unacceptable to say that the invasion of one aspect of freedom is of no importance because there have been invasions of so many other aspects. That road leads to chaos, tyranny, despotism, and the end of all human aspiration. Ask Solzhenitsyn. Ask Milovan Djilas. In sum, if one believes in freedom as a supreme value, and the proper ordering principle for any society aiming to maximize spiritual and material welfare, then every invasion of freedom must be emphatically identified and resisted with undying spirit.

\*Should PIC

TEXT: You write the affirmatives plan text just without the word “should” use the word “I recommend” or “we recommend” if you really want to. OUGHT is best

“Should” and “I recommend” is functionally the same - use of the world “should” invokes universal ethical claims this A. turns case B. Guts solvency - Forcing meta level choices causes policy inaction.

Greene, 02 (Joshua David Greene, currently an Assistant Professor of Psychology at Harvard University. “THE TERRIBLE, HORRIBLE, NO GOOD, VERY BAD TRUTH ABOUT MORALITY AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT.” Dissertation presented to Princeton University in candidacy for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. November 2002. [http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/~jgreene/GreeneWJH/Greene-Dissertation.pdf](http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/%7Ejgreene/GreeneWJH/Greene-Dissertation.pdf))

Given that moral realism is false, it is equally pointless to appeal to moral rights in the context of a purely moral disagreement. Suppose some people are discussing whether their mutual friend should confess to her husband that she’s had an extramarital affair. “She must tell him. Gustave has a right to know!” one of them asserts. If realism were true, such a claim might convey useful information about the Moral Truth, but to people who know the terrible, horrible truth about morality, such assertions are no more effective than an expressivist “Boo!” or “Hurrah!,” and probably less so given that revisionists will inevitably find people who speak as if they have the Moral Truth on their side somewhat annoying. Assertions about rights, wrongs, duties, and obligations (over)state a position, but they do nothing to defend it. They tell you what to do, but they don’t tell you why, and they certainly don’t give someone who is inclined to disagree a reason to change her mind. Contrast assertions about rights and other deontological entities with these contributions: “I think it’s selfish to tell him. Let her live with it! Why make things worse for him?” This statement suggests a shift in perspective. Rather than conceiving of her confession as an act of bravery performed out of respect for her husband, it is portrayed as a selfish act, one of sacrificing her husband’s happiness in order to ease her own sense of guilt. To this one might reply, “She should tell him because he probably already suspects, and knowing is better than always wondering.” This comment performs a useful service by drawing one’s attention to a relevant “empirical” issue, namely the possibility that her husband already suspects her infidelity and that he may have less to lose in being told about it than one might suspect. Another friend adds, “Would you want to live a lie? I’d want to know the truth no matter what.” This comment suggests yet another shift in perspective, one achieved through the empathetic exercise of role-reversal. Unlike empty assertions about rights and duties, comments such as these do offer something of value. Some draw attention to relevant facts (“Good point! I hadn’t thought of that!”), while others offer new perspectives on the same facts, inducements to view the same situation in a different evaluative light (“Good point! I hadn’t thought of it *that* *way*!”). Moral realists, and those anti-realists who would emulate them, have the option of dogmatism, of blindly acting by moral norms that one takes to be authoritative. Revisionists, in contrast, have no choice but to acknowledge that all moral judgment is an imprecise process of weighing values. The nature of moral action requires the drawing of lines: One either jumps in and saves the drowning child, or one does not. One either votes to allow abortion or one does not. Of course, one will sometimes make compromises by adopting middle-of- the-road courses of action, but, at some level, all action is discrete. To any particular course of action one must say either “yes” or “no.” Thus, while the inputs to moral judgment are fuzzy, fluid, and continuous considerations, the practical outputs of moral judgment are discrete actions. Deontology is intuitively appealing because it offers answers as clear and forceful as our intuitions, drawing theoretical lines that translate into practical lines, the kinds of lines that we, like it or not, are forced to draw by the nature of action. But, contrary to appearances, nature contains no true moral lines. We begin with only a mush of morally relevant considerations, things we care about, and any lines that get drawn must be drawn by us. Therefore, any attempt to settle a moral question with deontological appeals to rights, obligations, etc. always begs the question. Such appeals are merely attempts to settle moral issues by insisting that they have, in effect, already been settled by Mother Moral Nature and the lines she has drawn. In contrast to deontological language, characteristically consequentialist words like “good,” “bad,” “better,” and “worse” may be used by revisionists without too much cringing because such words lend themselves to talk of balancing, to making sense of the moral mush rather than denying its mushiness. Justifying one’s opposition to the action under consideration by labeling it “bad” is as bad as doing so by labeling it “wrong,” but less dogmatic uses of “bad,” “good,” etc. can be useful. One can use such terms in one’s subjective accounting of costs and benefits. When one says, for example, “It’s bad enough that she did it… Why make things worse for him?” the “bad” and “worse” are not controversial labels that beg the ultimate moral question, but rather indications of uncontroversial16 moral2 sub-judgments that will feed into the all-things- considered judgment that practice requires. Often one can think of words like “good” and “bad” as non-specific placeholders for evaluatively relevant factual terms. Continuing with the example above, a revisionist might just as easily say, “Her actions have caused a lot of unhappiness already… Why create additional unhappiness for him?” Zealous revisionists may prefer a formulation of the latter sort, one completely purged of realist moral language, but the advantages here are minimal. Likewise, when one says that it’s “better” to know than to wonder, one can easily interpret this as an empirical assertion, probably one to the effect that knowing the unpleasant truth makes one happier in the long run. What about the “should” in “She should tell him, because…?” Here we might say instead, “I recommend telling him, because…” but, again, the gain is minimal. In this context the emphasis is on the factual claim following the “because,” and not on abstract moral considerations. What goes for private debates about marital infidelity goes for public moral debates as well. In the context of an openly anti-realist dialogue, what would it mean to say that a fetus has a right to life or that a woman has a right to choose? If all one means in saying these things is that one is against abortion, or in favor of allowing it, then why not just say that?17 Packaging one’s opinion as a claim about “rights” is just pointless propaganda. Perhaps, one might argue, that an appeal to a right can be understood as an appeal to a default assumption. To appeal to the moral right to free speech, for example, might be to appeal to the generally accepted principle that people should be able to say what they want in almost all cases. The problem is that in any real controversy in which “rights” are invoked, the question is inevitably about the limits of those rights. Therefore, it is pointless18 for civil libertarians to defend flag-burning by appeal to the right to free speech, regardless of how natural this feels. Everyone is generally in favor of free speech. The debate is about whether to make an exception for this sort of speech. Pointing out that this case would be an exception does nothing to change the minds of those who want it to be an exception. In this case, as in others, appeals to rights are, once again, just question-begging propaganda, useless in the face of anti-realists who know the meta-ethical truth and aren’t willing to play along.

The affirmatives approach to language causes large conflicts-only the counter plan can solve the affirmative.

Greene, 02 (Joshua David Greene, currently an Assistant Professor of Psychology at Harvard University. “THE TERRIBLE, HORRIBLE, NO GOOD, VERY BAD TRUTH ABOUT MORALITY AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT.” Dissertation presented to Princeton University in candidacy for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. November 2002. [http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/~jgreene/GreeneWJH/Greene-Dissertation.pdf](http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/%7Ejgreene/GreeneWJH/Greene-Dissertation.pdf))

In this essay I argue that ordinary moral thought and language is, while very natural, highly counterproductive and that as a result we would be wise to change the way we think and talk about moral matters. First, I argue on metaphysical grounds against moral realism, the view according to which there are first order moral truths. Second, I draw on principles of moral psychology, cognitive science, and evolutionary theory to explain why moral realism appears to be true even though it is not. I then argue, based on the picture of moral psychology developed herein, that realist moral language and thought promotes misunderstanding and exacerbates conflict. I consider a number of standard views concerning the practical implications of moral anti-realism and reject them. I then sketch and defend a set of alternative revisionist proposals for improving moral discourse, chief among them the elimination of realist moral language, especially deontological language, and the promotion of an anti-realist utilitarian framework for discussing moral issues of public concern. I emphasize the importance of revising our moral practices, suggesting that our entrenched modes of moral thought may be responsible for our failure to solve a number of global social problems.