Forest Service

Race, Class, Gender, and American Environmentalism

Author **Dorceta E. Taylor**

Taylor, Dorceta E. 2002.

Contents

List of Abbreviations

Introduction

Most researchers studying the environmental movement base their analyses on historical accounts that advance a dominant perspective. According to this perspective, wilderness enthusiasts urged people to preserve wilderness and wildlife, respect nature, and cease destroying the environment. At the beginning of the 20th century, the damming of the Hetch Hetchy Valley[1] to provide water for the city of San Francisco and battles to pass wildlife protection bills sparked major controversies among environmental activists, developers, and other business interests. These controversies played significant roles in defining the early environmental movement. The movement focused on wilderness preservation, wildlife and habitat protection, and outdoor recreation issues. It adopted a reform environmental agenda strengthened significantly throughout the 20th century. The publication of Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring" energized the movement in the 1960s, and Earth Day 1970 brought unprecedented public attention to environmental issues (for example, see Bramwell 1989, Fox 1985, Nash 1982).

The above perspective, however, describes only one of several pathways of environmental activism (see fig. 1). Furthermore, it does not account for how race, class, gender, labor market experiences, and politics influence environmental attitudes and activism. It assumes that social class has no bearing on environmental outcomes, experiences, and perceptions. Further, it implies that everyone had similar environmental experiences and responses to environmental occurrences or that experiences and responses that are unaccounted for are not important. Clearly, this is not the case. Social class matters (Mueller 1992: 19-20; Oliver and Marwell 1992: 251-272; Zald 1996: 267-268). That is, race, class, and gender do affect how people express grievances and frame issues and how they define which issues they consider important. These factors also influence how people interpret the world. Later discussions will show that race, class, and gender influence the development of environmental paradigms, the path of environmental activism, the agenda, and the policy prescriptions chosen.

This paper expands the limited scenario described above. By examining how environmentalism is affected by race, social class, gender, politics, and labor market experiences, we can identify four major pathways of environmental activism: (1) The first pathway is a wilderness, wildlife, and recreation approach (described above). This pathway was chosen primarily by middle class, white males, although it attracted middle class, white female participants as the 20th century progressed. This pathway developed a strong reform agenda and is currently the dominant sector of the environmental movement. (2) A second pathway took on an urban environmental agenda focused on parks, open spaces, public health, sanitation, worker rights, pollution abatement, and housing reform. This pathway also was chosen by white, middle class males and females who remained in the cities. (3) A third pathway, a working class environmental agenda focused on worker rights, occupational health and safety, and access to recreation, was pursued by the white working class and in cooperation with progressive, white, middle class, female activists. (4) A fourth pathway, taken by people of color, addressed social justice concerns such as self-determination, sovereignty, human rights, social inequality, loss of land base, limited access to natural resources, and disproportionate impacts of environmental hazards and linked them with traditional working class environmental concerns such as worker rights and worker health and safety to develop an environmental justice agenda (see fig. 1).

---

[1] A controversy arose over a proposed dam on the Toulumne River in the Hetch Hetchy Valley (which lies adjacent to the Yosemite Valley).

Figure 1—Paths of environmental activism.

In addition to the four pathways of environmental activism discussed above, there have been four waves of mobilization around environmental issues, namely, the premovement era (1820s to 1913), the post-Hetch Hetchy era (1914 to 1959), the post-Carson era (1960 to 1979), and the post-Love Canal/Three Mile Island (TMI) era (1980 to the present) (Taylor 1998) (see table 1). These four major periods of mobilization are addressed in detail within the discussion of the four major environmental pathways. The premovement era was characterized by a preponderance of outdoor recreationists, scientific and technical professionals, and individual enthusiasts who advocated environmental protection and wise use of resources. The turn-of-the century wildlife protection, forest conservation, and wilderness preservation battles led to the formation of the environmental movement. Another round of controversies involved dam building in wilderness areas during the 1950s, which also resulted in increased mobilization around environmental issues. The publication of “Silent Spring” in 1962, however, mobilized large numbers of people hitherto uninvolved in environmental activities, and the modern environmental movement was born. A second major event of the post-Carson era, Earth Day 1970, also enhanced environmental mobilization. The fourth phase (the post-TMI/Love Canal era) began around the time of the Three Mile

the early movement (post-Hetch Hetchy era), the romantic environmental paradigm (REP) emerged to play a significant role in environmental thought; this lasted till the post-Carson era. During the 1960s, the new environmental paradigm (NEP) eclipsed the use of the REP. Though the NEP is still the dominant paradigm, in recent years, the environmental justice paradigm (EJP) has emerged to challenge it (see Taylor, n.d., for more detailed discussions of paradigms[3]).

Wilderness, Wildlife, and Recreation

White middle class males and the outdoors—Outdoor- and wilderness-oriented, elite White middle class males influenced by cultural nationalism[4] or romanticism[5] and transcendentalism[6] began espousing proenvironmental ideas while publicizing the natural wonders of the country. Writers and poets like William Cullen Bryant and landscape artists like Thomas Cole, Winslow Homer, Thomas Moran, and Albert Bierstadt were among the leading cultural nationalists. Speaking through their poetry and art, they raised middle class consciousness about the beauty and intrinsic value of unique American landscapes and wilderness. Other outdoor enthusiasts like John James Audubon (bird illustrator) and George Catlin (explorer) began speaking out about the destruction of nature and the development of national parks in the early 1800s. Henry David Thoreau also advocated setting aside land for parks in the 1850s, and Frederick Law Olmsted laid out a management plan for the Yosemite Reserve in

The Premovement Eraij.02]0spr dmTw 96 T4433201melit4433201ISBTTf5 8 0 0 40000 J 400096 T432006 Tc -085(3)Tj/TT1 1

1865 (this area was later renamed Yosemite National Park). In the mid 1800s, Ralph Waldo Emerson, a Harvard University professor influenced by the French scholar Jean Jacques Rousseau, introduced romanticism and transcendentalism to the American elite. Lecturing to students (like Thoreau) and the New England middle classes in lyceums, atheneums, and community halls across the region, he influenced many to revere the wilderness and value and care for the environment (Nash 1982: 1-160; Ranney and others 1990: 488-516; see footnote 3). John Muir, also influenced by romanticism and transcendentalism, publicized the wilderness and outlined the boundaries of what would become Yosemite National Park. Other activists such as the ecologist and statesperson George Perkins Marsh (1857, 1965) and conservationists such as George Bird Grinnell (1911a, 1911b, 1912) and Gifford Pinchot (1906, 1908, 1947) also had profound effects on environmental politics. These activists sought to overturn the ECP—the dominant social paradigm of the time[7] (Dunlap and Van Liere 1978: 10-19; Kuhn 1962; Milbrath 1984: 7-15; Pirages 1982: 6) by articulating a REP.

The activists opposed the ECP by writing and speaking about the destruction and domination of nature and urged humans to live harmoniously with nature and to consider other species. They argued that nature had intrinsic worth. In addition, they called for government protection of wildlands to preserve them for future generations. The romantics and transcendentalists recognized that the destruction of resources could have devastating long-term consequences, and therefore urged people to care for the land for future generations. They also advocated the return to a simpler lifestyle. They outlined the boundaries of some of the earliest national parks and campaigned tirelessly for the establishment of a system of national parks (Muir 1890, 1901). Conservationists focused on wildlife protection by passing bills, setting hunting limits, and by designating, saving, and patrolling sanctuaries. Though conservationists agreed with the preservationists that the level of destruction of resources was problematic and that government control of resources was essential, they disagreed with the preservationists as to the extent to which environmental protection meant excluding commercial development of resources.[8] They also championed the “wise use” of resources for current generations; they disagreed about depriving current generations of resources to benefit future generations. Despite the fact that environmental activists had disagreements among themselves, the general message of curbing wanton destruction of the environment and its resources influenced the public and shifted societal attitudes toward greater environmental awareness and concern. Thus, by the 1880s, environmental groups like The Appalachian Mountain Club and the Boone and Crockett Club were formed, and the transition from the premovement era (dominated by individual enthusiasts like Thoreau, Muir, Roosevelt, and Grinnell, and scientific-technical professionals like Marsh and Pinchot) to mass movement began to take shape (Fox 1985, Nash 1982).

The shift to the REP was crucial in getting people to listen to and support the emerging environmental message. The REP became widely accepted throughout the environmental movement and still forms the nucleus of American environmental ideology.

---

[7] A dominant social paradigm is a world view that shapes the values, metaphysical beliefs, institutions, and habits that provide the social filters through which members of a society view and interpret the external world.

[8] Note there were people like Theodore Roosevelt and George Bird Grinnell who were influenced by romanticism who took a utilitarian approach toward resource management.

The early environmentalists were mainly financially secure men; many were businessmen or had strong ties to industry. They were free to embark on outdoor expeditions at will. They sought out the wilderness as an antidote to the ills of the urban environment. They did not include issues relating to the workplace or to the poor in their agenda. They were basically middle class activists procuring and preserving environmental amenities for middle class benefits and consumption. In some cases, businessmen sought to protect environmental resources because it enhanced their entrepre-

White male outdoor enthusiasts—The most prominent environmental activists (writers, landscape artists, policymakers, founders of environmental organizations, environmental spokespersons, etc.) in the premovement post-Hetch Hetchy eras were men. As more men explored the wilderness, hunted, fished, and climbed mountains, the degradation of forests and declining wildlife stocks heightened their interest in wilderness preservation, wildlife conservation, habitat restoration, and pollution control. Thus, these activists continued to develop agendas and discourses around the following areas of interest: (a) game and bird protection, (b) forest, timber, and water conservation, (c) wilderness preservation, and (d) range management. Many environmental organizations were formed from 1900 to 1914 when activists were involved in high-profile environmental controversies. These organizations supported the work of activists and helped to consolidate the emerging environmental agenda. Over time, conservation and preservation groups began collaborating with each other to protect wildlife and forests. Although women were members of these organizations, and a few rose to positions of prominence, membership, leadership, and the agenda of the organizations were dominated by men.

From 1914 to 1959, men (many of whom had significant business ties) sought to consolidate the environmental agenda by establishing and reinforcing contacts with government, influential policy groups, and industry. They espoused a brand of environmentalism that sought to make small incremental changes or reforms in the existing system by working with both government and industry. This laid the groundwork for reform environmentalism (McCloskey 1992: 77-82). The environmental movement grew rapidly in the first three decades of the 20th century. Data I compiled from the "Conservation Directory" (National Wildlife Federation 1993, 1994) and "Gale Environmental Sourcebook" (Hill and Piccirelli 1992) show that of 1,053 organizations, 44 were founded between 1845 and 1899. Seventy-eight organizations, however, were formed between 1900 and 1929. Despite the early enthusiasm for and rapid growth of the movement in the first three decades of the 20th century, by the 1930s, the newly formed movement began to stagnate—the growth of the movement slowed, the political activities and issues no longer capturing the imagination of the public. This period of apathy continued through the 1940s; 30 organizations were formed during the 1930s and 39 were formed during the 1940s (see also Fox 1985, Gottlieb 1993, Nash 1982, Paehlke 1989, Taylor 1992). During the 1950s, however, a proposal to build a dam that would threaten Dinosaur National Monument sparked new waves of environmental protests (Fox 1985). Seventy-seven new organizations were formed during the1950s.

White middle class female outdoor enthusiasts—Mountaineering clubs like the Appalachian Mountain Club and the Sierra Club made it easier for women to explore the outdoors. As more women ventured into the outdoors, however, they began con-

also active in efforts to save Hetch Hetchy and Jackson Hole (in Wyoming). Like the

1972: 381-383). Some of these youthful environmentalists joined the leading environmental organizations, whereas others formed their own organizations. This brought new energy, ideas, and constituencies into the reform environmental movement. Consequently, the concerns of the movement broadened to include more issues relating to the urban environment, community, home, and humans. More attention was paid to environmental hazards, and industry was scrutinized more heavily.

Earth Day—The second surge of mobilization in the post-Carson era came in 1970, before and after Earth Day. Between 1970 and 1979, membership in the eight major environmental organizations mentioned above went from 892,100 to more than 1.5 million. More environmental groups were formed in the post-Carson era than at any other period in history; 469 or 45 percent of the 1,053 environmental groups studied were formed between 1960 and 1979. The mobilization of the 1960s and 1970s, however, was largely a White middle class mobilization. Surveys of the membership of leading environmental groups and of environmental activists nationwide in the late 1960s and early 1970s support this claim. A 1969 national survey of 907 Sierra Club members indicated that the organization had a middle class membership. Seventy-four percent of the members had at least a college degree; 39 percent had advanced degrees. Ninety-five percent of the male respondents were professionals—physicians, lawyers, professors, engineers, and teachers—and 5 percent occupied clerical and sales positions, were owners of small business, or were unskilled laborers. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents said their family income was over $12,000 per year; 30 percent reported family incomes of over $18,000 per year (Devall 1970: 123-126). In comparison, only 11 percent of the general population had 4 or more years of college in 1970 and the national median income was $6,670 for men and $2,237 for women (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2000a: 2; 2000b: 1).

A 1971 study of the Puget Sound chapter of the Sierra Club found a similar profile. Ninety-seven percent of the respondents had at least a bachelor's degree, and 71 percent had a master's or doctorate. Eighty-three percent of the members occupied professional jobs, and 9 percent were students. Only 3 percent were clerical workers, and another 3 percent were unemployed. In this study, 66 percent of the club members were male, half of them between 30 and 44 years old. Forty-two percent of the respondents claimed to be political independents, 33 percent were Democrats, and 24 percent were Republicans (Faich and Gale 1971: 270-287).

The above profile was not unique to the Sierra Club. A 1972 study of 1,500 environmental volunteers nationwide showed that 98 percent of the volunteers were white, and 59 percent held a college or graduate degree. Forty-three percent held professional, scientific-technical, academic, or managerial jobs. Half of the respondents had family incomes of more than $15,000 per year, 26 percent had incomes of between $10,000 and $15,000 per year, and the remainder earned less than $10,000 per year (Zinger and others 1972). In general, studies find that environmentalists are highly educated, older, urban residents who are political independents. In addition, education and, to a lesser extent, income is associated with naturalistic values and environmental concerns

(Buttel and Flinn 1974: 57-69, 1978: 433-450; Cotgrove and Duff 1980: 333-351; Devall 1970: 123-126; Dillman and Christensen 1972: 237-256; Faich and Gale 1971: 270-287; Harry 1971: 301-309; Harry and others 1969: 246-254; Hendee and others 1969: 212-215; Lowe and others 1980: 423-445; Martinson and Wilkening 1975; Tognacci and others 1972: 73-86; Wright 1975).[20]

Paradigmatic Shift—The New Environmental Paradigm

A major ideological shift also occurred during the post-Carson era. During the 1960s and 1970s, the romantic environmental paradigm gave way to a broader vision of environmentalism—the new environmental paradigm (NEP).[21] Building on the basic ideological framework of the REP, the NEP expanded on the environmental dialogue and articulated a bold new vision that critiqued the development of large, complex, and energy-intensive issues such as nuclear power, population control, pollution prevention, risk reduction, energy, recycling, and environmental cleanups.

During this era, the environmental movement enjoyed strong public support. Opinion polls show what could be described as a "Carson" and an "Earth Day" effect. There was a steady increase in concern about pollution through the latter part of the 1960s and a sharp increase in concern throughout the 1970s. For instance, in 1965, 17 percent of the respondents in a Gallup survey said they wanted the government to devote most of its attention to reducing air and water pollution. By 1970, however, 53 percent of the respondents wanted the government to devote most of its time to these issues (Gallup 1972: 1939). State of the Nation (SON) polls conducted between 1972 and 1976 also showed that 46 to 60 percent of the respondents indicated they were "very concerned" about reducing water and air pollution (SON 1972-76). The General Social Survey conducted every year from 1973 to 1978 found that between 50 and 61 percent of the respondents thought too little money was being spent on the environment (National Opinion Research Center—NORC 1973-80). In an Opinion Research Corporation's (ORC) sample 58 percent of those polled thought a slower rate of economic growth is needed to protect the environment (ORC 1978). Polls also showed that most respondents were not willing to relax environmental standards to achieve economic growth, did not think that pollution control requirements had gone too far, and did not think we had made enough progress on cleaning up the environment to start limiting the cost of pollution control (ORC 1977). A distinction should be made between concern and support for the environment and environmental activism. Not all people who are concerned about the environment or generally support environmental causes become environmental activists (Taylor 1989; 2000).

The Middle Class and the Reform Environmental Agenda

Organizational characteristics—Throughout the 1980s, White, middle class, reform environmentalism continued to dominate the environmental landscape. Environmental organizations grew increasingly big, bureaucratic, hierarchical, and distant from local concerns and politics. Many focused on national and international issues, lobbied Congress and business, and continued to cultivate close ties with industry (through funding, negotiations, and board representation). Grassroots organizing had long given way to direct-mail recruiting, and direct-action political strategies rarely were used. From the

---

[20] A 1969 National Wildlife Federation study found an inverse relation between age and environmental concern and that urban dwellers were less likely to be concerned about environment than other respondents (see Buttel and Flinn, 1974: 57-58).

[21] Term coined by Dunlap and Van Liere in their 1978 article, "The New Environmental Paradigm." See also Cotgrove and Duff (1980: 333-351) for a discussion of the dominant social paradigm.

1970s onward, environmental groups used the courts and the environmental agencies to pursue environmental claims through legal and policy channels (Taylor 1992). Consequently, they developed extensive oversight and monitoring capacities. They also developed strong research arms designed to produce information independent of government or industry. Slightly fewer organizations were formed during the 1980s than in the previous decade. If the first 4 years of the 1990s are indicative, however, there could be significant decline in the number of organizations being formed in the 1990s. Between 1980 and 1994, 292 organizations were formed, 277 of which originated in the 1980s.

Leadership and male dominance—Men dominate the top leadership positions in reform environmental organizations. A 1992 nationwide study conducted by the Conservation Leadership Foundation found that of the 248 chief executive officers (CEOs) and top leaders surveyed, 79 percent were men. Their mean age was 45 years, and 50 percent had a bachelor's degree and 49 percent master's or doctorate (Snow 1992: 48-49). My analysis of 1,053 organizations found that 80 percent of the top leaders (president, CEO, chair) were men as were 64 percent of the general leaders (secretaries, accountants, program managers, etc.). The Conservation Leadership Foundation's national study of environmental volunteers also found that men dominated the volunteer sector of the reform environmental movement. Sixty-one percent of the volunteers were men. Ninety-three percent were over 35 years old, 79 percent had at least a bachelor's degree, and 53 percent had a graduate degree. Seventy-one percent were in managerial or professional jobs, whereas 3 percent described themselves as skilled laborers (Snow 1992: 111-112). The membership profile of the reform sector in the 1990s is similar to that of the environmental organizations of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

Defining the agenda—Early in 1981, the CEOs of 10 major environmental organizations (the Group of Ten) met to discuss and outline an environmental agenda for the future. The presidency of Ronald Reagan represented a threat to the environmental gains of the preceding two decades, so the deliberations of the Group of Ten had an air of urgency as they entered into their discussions (Rosenbaum 1991, Vig and Kraft 1994). Publication of "An Environmental Agenda for the Future" (Cahn 1985) (hereinafter Agenda) was the outcome of that meeting. The group identified 11 agenda items for future consideration: nuclear power and waste issues, human population control, energy strategies, water resources, toxics and pollution control, wild living resources, private lands and agriculture, protected land systems, public lands, urban environment, and international responsibilities.

The 10 CEOs included John Adams, Natural Resources Defense Council; Louise Dunlap, Environmental Policy Institute; Jay Hair, National Wildlife Federation; Frederic Krupp, Environmental Defense Fund; Jack Lorenz, Izaak Walton League; J. Michael McCloskey, Sierra Club; Russell Peterson, National Audubon Society; Paul Pritchard, National Parks and Conservation Association; William Turnage, Wilderness Society; and Karl Wendelowski, Friends of the Earth. In the Agenda this group and their staff wrote:

> *While our informal group reflects the diversity of today's environmental movement*, our agenda is by no means an attempt to speak for the movement as a whole. Rather, through informal collaboration, it presents a consensus among *a representative cross-section of conservation leaders*...the common objective is to protect and enhance the quality of life worldwide (Cahn 1985: 2; emphasis added).

Contrary to the beliefs of the Group of Ten, the people defining the agenda for the future were not reflective of the diversity of the contemporary environmental movement or the conservation leadership nationwide. This is evidenced by the fact that at about the same time the Agenda was being developed, many submovements were either

Table 2—Percentage of organizations considering each issue important, and the average percentage of organizational resources being spent on each issue

Organizational focus	Issue important	Organizational resources
	Percent	
Fish and wildlife management and protection	92	19
Protection of waterways	91	7
Public lands management	90	12
Environmental education	90	—
Water quality	87	6
Air quality	87	3
Wilderness	86	4
Land use planning	84	4
Toxic waste management	79	8
Preservation of private land	76	11
Agriculture	72	4
Energy conservation and facility regulation	71	2
Mining law and regulation	62	1
Marine conservation	45	3
Population control	35	—
Nuclear power or weapons	34	1
Zoological or botanical gardens	23	1
Sustainable development	—	3

Source: Compiled from Snow (1992: 55, 110).

In addition, housing conditions were abominable. Workers lived in crowded, unsafe, unsanitary, over-priced housing. Unemployed and homeless people lived in parks and on undeveloped lots. For example, when construction began on site for Central Park (New York), over 300 dwellings—including the Black community of Seneca Village—located within the boundaries of the park, were demolished by Olmsted's work crew (Board of Commissioners of the Department of Public Parks 1859: 59-68; Rosenszweig and Blackmar 1992). Evictions were also common. In 1903 alone, 60,463 or 14 percent of the families in Manhattan were evicted. Twenty percent of the population of Boston and New York City were said to be living in distress, and 1 in 10 New Yorkers were buried in paupers graves in Potters Field (Dubofsky 1996: 27). The little free time workers had was spent in local pubs or in the streets. Because of overcrowding, private personal and family activities (such as courtship, drinking, and socializing) often spilled onto the streets. This rankled the middle class who set out to Americanize and acculturate immigrants and curb what they saw as morally bankrupt, uncivilized behavior. Not surprisingly, interactions between both groups grew increasingly tense (Beveridge and Schuyler 1983; Dickason 1983; Peiss 1986; Rosenzweig 1983, 1987). Some of these tensions were fought around the issues of access to and utilization of urban open space.

not expected to act on their impulses to explore the wilderness the way Thoreau, Muir, and other men did (Muir 1924).[22] A rift developed between the sexes whereby males were socialized around conquest (hunting and mountaineering, for instance) and romanticism, whereas women were socialized in home and community building. Adventurous undertakings such as living in the wilds, mountaineering, hunting, fishing, etc. were praised and encouraged among men but still frowned on when undertaken by women. Consequently, some women lived these experiences vicariously through their husbands, brothers, and friends. Some of the most revered male environmentalists of the period—Thoreau, Olmsted, and Muir—had female friends who played important roles in directing, mentoring, or shaping their intellectual growth and political activism.[23] Not surprisingly, many of these women focused on local environmental issues, becoming amateur natural historians, gardeners, and collectors of plants, animals, feathers.

Nonetheless, some middle class White women broke this mold. Such women combined their interest in ecology, the environment, health, moral upliftment, cultural enlightenment, and civic improvement with political activism and a desire to help the poor. Starting in the 1850s, Ellen (Swallow) Richards, Vassar College graduate and the first female to attend Massachusetts Institute of Technology, worked and wrote during the time of Thoreau, Marsh, and Emerson. She was the first American to apply the concept of *oekologie* (ecology) to her work. Using her background in sanitary chemistry and nutrition, Richards focused on the home environment—sanitation, waste, home economics, and food chemistry. Richards also was concerned with air and water pollution and wrote extensively about the causes of pollution. Richard's work helped inspire several middle class White women's movements—the consumer nutrition movement, environment education (municipal housekeeping) movement, sanitary reform movement, and the home economics movement (Clarke 1973, Gottlieb 1993: 216-217).

Other women combined the ideologies underlying the urban park building and the sanitary movements and applied the concepts to their undertakings with the working class. As crowding reached unbearable levels in the cities in the mid to late 1800s, the streets became the social and recreational space of the working class. Children roamed the streets and were often jailed for playing or loitering in them (Rosenzweig 1983, 1987). During the Progressive Era (1880 to 1920s), upper middle class women—the wives and daughters of wealthy industrialists—sought to remedy the situation by building small neighborhood playgrounds and "sand gardens." One prominent group involved in this effort was the Massachusetts Emergency and Hygiene Association (MEHA). Explicating the basic ideology of the male urban park builders, the female park builders and recreation planners believed that recreation would improve the health and moral and cultural outlook of the children. They believed that recreation should be provided in a structured environment that also offered opportunities to teach morals, religion, culture, and basic hygiene. Middle class women saw their efforts to acculturate working class

---

[22] See for example the life-long correspondence between Jeanne Carr and John Muir and between Emily Pelton and Muir; many of these appear in Muir (1924), "The Life and Letters of John Muir."

[23] Lydian Emerson, wife of Ralph Waldo Emerson influenced Thoreau; Elizabeth Wooster Baldwin influenced the intellectual development of Olmsted; and Jeanne Carr, wife of Ezra Slocum Carr, Muir's former professor, was a significant influence on Muir's intellectual development, politics, and activism.

children as the most effective means of improving the lives of the working class. They occupied a niche ignored by the male park builders who focused on grandiose urban parks or park systems designed with a bias toward passive recreation. Playgrounds and small neighborhood parks, designed for children and active recreation, were sorely needed. Although the male park builders touted the health benefits of parks, they did nothing more than build the parks; they did not work to improve sanitation or health conditions among the poor. They assumed that people would soak up the culture and morals and glean the health benefits of simply using the parks. Their female counterparts, however, took steps to ensure that these benefits would accrue to the working class. The women actively sought to improve sanitation and health and to teach the morals and culture they wanted the working class to imbibe. Starting with the first sand garden in a church yard in Boston's North End in 1885, sand gardens and playgrounds were soon built in cities throughout the country. Unlike the grand parks designed by the male park builders, the spartan sand gardens and playgrounds were designed—and in the early days—paid for and staffed by middle class women. The women involved in these ventures greatly influenced designing and setting standards for playground equipment and on the playground and recreation movements that swept the country from the late 1800s to the 1930s (Dickason 1983: 83-98; Kelly 1996: 154-160; Rosenzweig 1983).

Another group of middle class White women, working in the more progressive settlement houses, expanded their activist agenda beyond playgrounds, morals, acculturation, and hygiene. One of the most significant groups of female activists was found at Hull House located in one of Chicago's toughest slums. There, Jane Addams, Alice Hamilton, Florence Kelley, and their colleagues linked their interest in recreation to environmental issues in the home, community, and workplace. Activists in the settlement houses, rejected the notion (common in charity circles at the time) that poverty was caused by immorality and human failing. Believing that urban poverty was related to environmental inequalities, they undertook housing, sanitation, health, and occupational reforms (Boyer 1978).

The female activists worked with laborers as the working class was undergoing major social and political transformations. During the 1870s and 1880s, a period of rapid industrial expansion, skilled workers formed craft unions and were able to use their skills to exact benefits from employers. This was particularly true of workers in the iron, steel, and farm machinery industries who were able to determine the pace of work, the organization of the job, and the rate of pay. Semiskilled and unskilled workers benefitted from the strike actions and wage demands of the skilled, unionized workers. Semi-

and helped to establish the field of industrial medicine (Gottlieb 1993: 47-80, 218-227). Most significantly, the collaboration of settlement house activists and the working class gave birth to a working class environmental agenda, aspects of which are still present in the contemporary working class and environmental justice agenda of today. The agenda built around social, economic, and environmental justice contained the following elements: environmental health, community health, worker health and safety, worker rights, safe and affordable housing, reduction of community and workplace environmental hazards, pollution, and access to open (recreation) space. The main concern of the settlement houses was the restructuring of the urban environment.

The Changing Focus of the Urban Environmental Agenda

Over time, middle class White women still maintained their interest in natural history, garden clubs, and local ecology, but they shifted the focus to other aspects of their activism. By the turn of the century, groups such as MEHA, placed less emphasis on playground construction and supervision as these tasks were turned over to cities and other government entities with the capital and human resources to fund and operate them more effectively. Furthermore, with few European immigrants entering the country, improved living and working conditions, and with many immigrant groups forming their own ethnic organizations and social networks, there was less need for the acculturation, morality, and hygiene lessons from the upper class. As the Progressive Era (the progressive political activism that swept the country from the 1880s to the 1920s) drew to a close, some of the concerns (like worker rights) addressed by activists of the era were being tackled by labor unions. As these changes occurred, middle class White urban environmentalists gradually began working on more general environmental issues.

From the 1920s onward, urban park building continued, with city and state governments being responsible for building, maintaining, and supervising parks and for setting the standards for the equipment to be used in them. Similarly with housing, government took over constructing public and low-income housing. The concern for health and sanitation evolved into concerns over environmental quality and quality-of-life issues. Again, city and state governments have taken over the role of providing basic services; citizen's groups adopted the role of monitoring the government's performance and lobbying for improved or expanded services. These issues transcended the urban domain and also became a part of the suburban and rural environmental agenda.

The White Working Class and the Environment

Working Class Conditions and Unionization

Concerns of the working class were expressed in the urban agenda developed during the Progressive Era. Worker rights, housing, sanitation, health, and pollution topped the agenda. Whereas conservation and preservation battles motivated middle class Whites to join reform environmental organizations, Taylorism (scientific management or Fordism) impelled the working class to unionize. Between 1880 and 1920, employers introduced Taylorism to the factories. Consequently, assembly lines moved faster, workers lost control over their work, the owners got richer, and the workers saw little material benefits for their increased output. Union rolls swelled: from 1897 to 1904, union membership rose from 447,000 to over 2 million. From 1909 to 1918, about 3 million workers joined the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW). The United Mine Workers, for instance, grew from 14,000 in 1897 to 300,000 in 1917. In addition, 400,000 garment workers unionized between 1909 and 1913 (Dubofsky 1996: 94-95, 102-103, 118-119). As workers pinned their hopes to the unions during the 1900s, however, some issues such as hazard reduction in the workplace and community, were downplayed at the expense of creating and maintaining jobs (especially during

the Great Depression) and wage increases and benefits (in the post World War II era). Nevertheless, from 1914 to 1959, with or without the support of the union, workers expressed their discontent about poor working conditions by taking actions such as organized and wildcat strikes and protests and by demanding safety equipment to use on the job (Hurley 1995).

Gender Relations and the Environment

There was considerable overlap in the interests of working class men and women. Because both groups worked under dangerous conditions and lived in polluted communities, family and community health and safety concerns were salient. Whereas White middle class women pondered how best to express their environmental interest in an arena of segregated male and female experiences, working class men and women did not have much choice about how they related to the environment. Rural and working class women spent long hours on the farms, living on the frontier, or toiling in the cities. They did not have the financial security or free time to ponder or undertake extensive travel or expeditions. Like men, working class women toiled in jobs that exposed them to toxins and other hazardous conditions. As the pace of industrialization intensified, between 1870 and 1920, the number of female factory workers increased from 34,000 to more than 2.2 million. In 1920, more than 8.6 million women worked outside the home (Dubofsky 1996: 114). At home, urban women could not escape the environmental hazards that pervaded the community. Consequently, their interests and experiences were closely linked to those of the men. Their concerns and activism, therefore, dovetailed more easily. Because women had the responsibility for raising the family, concern about housing and sanitation were paramount.

Occupational Health and Safety

Although the environmental activities of the sixties and seventies heightened awareness of environmental issues among the working class, and although some joined outdoor recreation organizations such as the Izaak Walton League, by and large, the working class did not flock to reformist environmental organizations. Instead, they intensified their efforts to strengthen the traditional working class agenda. Applying pressure to and working through their unions and newly formed working class environmental organizations, they sought to improve working conditions, bring the issues of worker health and safety into the national consciousness, push for safety equipment, etc. Using the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's (OSHA) guidelines, workers reported environmental violations and filed complaints, thereby forcing companies to comply with the regulations. In addition, they used collective bargaining strategies to ascertain general environmental improvements and to establish safety committees at the workplace. They negotiated the "right to refuse hazardous work" clauses, and insisted on hazard pay and safety equipment as part of their union contracts (Hurley 1995, Robinson 1991).

The working class was also concerned about the health of residents and the environment near the factory. During this period, working class environmental groups were formed to reduce pollution in the community; the focus was on air and water pollution, factory emissions, and sanitation hazards (illegal dumping and garbage removal). Although the broadened emphasis of the reform environmental movement included reduction of pollution, collaboration between middle and working class activists was still limited and strained. Because the middle and upper classes no longer lived near the sights, sounds, and smell of the factories, middle class environmental groups did not lend much support to working class environmental struggles. The middle class focused on preventing the degradation of their communities and improving the environmental amenities nearby.

since it first gained national attention in 1978. This could have been the scenario if media coverage had waned, if the quick-fix technological solutions offered by bureaucrats had worked, and if other problems had emerged to eclipse the resonance that toxics had in people's mind. Toxics have however, remained in the news and have continued to be a mobilizing factor because what people thought was the worst-case scenario when the story first captured national attention in the late 1970s turned out to be just the tip of the iceberg. The constant parade of new discoveries of toxic contamination (each new one seeming worse than the one that preceded it) has kept the issue at the top of the agenda of many activists and foremost in the mind of many citizens. In addition, many large firms—some long-time providers of jobs and supporters of local civic organizations and events—were found to be sources of the contamination. Many people felt that the trust or social compact between host communities and corporations

Americans between 1854 and 1855. During the 1890s, Great Lakes Indians found themselves living on barren reservations doing odd jobs for local Whites. Timber companies collaborated with the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) to strip the land of trees to transform Native Americans into farmers (DeLoria 1994: 5-7). As DeLoria (1994: 4) argues, from the 1890s to the 1960s Indians were the "Vanishing Americans" because most people thought Native Americans had been exterminated.

Termination and uban relocation—During the Great Depression, the BIA was ordered to find lands for homeless California Indians who were living in poverty on the outskirts of cities or in remote mountainous areas of the state. At the same time, wealthy, white landowners were having financial difficulties so the program was used to assist them rather than Native Americans. To prevent the landowners from going bankrupt, lands classified as "submarginal" by the Department of Agriculture were purchased from White landowners and given to Indians. Native Americans who moved to these lands were organized into tribal governments by the BIA under the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act. Throughout World War II, Indians moved to the west coast to work in the war industries, but they lost their jobs to returning White veterans after the war (DeLoria 1994: 6). Toward the end of the post-Hetch Hetchy era, Native Americans began organizing to end discrimination and bring some basic civil and human rights to their communities. Though Native American protest organizations have existed since the 1910s, the modern protest movement began during World War II. In 1944, young Native American intellectuals formed the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) and embarked on an effort to unite Indian nations (pan-tribalism) for the purpose of influencing state and federal decisions affecting Native Americans (compensation for territory or resources, termination policy, etc). The NCAI also stressed the importance of preserving Native American cultural traditions and institutions. Taking a moderate approach of advocating the needs of Native Americans while participating in the policy debates regarding Native American nations, NCAI enjoyed moderate success (Cornell 1988: 119; Lenarcic 1982: 145-148; Weeks 1988: 261-262). In the 1950s, the BIA launched a program to remove Indians from the reservations, sell the land, and terminate the tribal system. The BIA undertook a massive relocation program that placed thousands of Indians in low-paying jobs in urban areas such as Minneapolis, Chicago, and San Francisco (DeLoria 1994: 6). Native Americans responded to these actions by organizing protest groups in their communities.

Organizing for environmental and social change—The intensified efforts of Native Americans for equality, justice, and basic human and civil rights began in the 1940s and 1950s. In 1960, the Chicago Conference of Native Americans produced a document—The Declaration of Indian Purpose (the final version of which appeared in June 1961)—that called for united action among Indian nations, the right to self government, the right to determine their economic destiny, tribal nationalism, complete autonomy to protect Native American land rights, and the right to protect Native American cultural heritage. Young Native Americans attending this meeting and dissatisfied with the pace of Native American progress launched an organization to speed up the process. The National Indian Youth Council (NIYC)—founded in 1961—aimed to help Indian people understand and support the idea of tribal nationalism and to chart a future course of action to deal with the issues facing Native Americans. In 1964, they took action to challenge the state of Washington's restriction of Native American fishing rights. The NIYC organized a "fish-in," mounted legal challenges, and participated in many nonviolent collective actions. The fish-ins were sometimes met with violence. For instance, on Labor Day, 1970, Indians from the Nisqually and Payallup Tribes set up a fishing camp

near Tacoma, Washington. Almost 300 Tacoma city police, state police, and state game wardens armed with telescope rifles and tear gas, raided the camp. Men, women, and children were severely beaten and arrested illegally (for disorderly conduct). The cars of the Native Americans were impounded and destroyed while in police custody (DeLoria 1994: 12). Though the battle between Indians and the state of Washington regarding fishing rights was not resolved until 1974 (in favor of the Native Americans), NIYC, buoyed by its success in challenging a state government, undertook a

small farmers. Those hired out were primarily field hands and domestics, but skilled slaves also were hired out. This gave skilled slaves a measure of autonomy because they could bargain for wages and keep some of the money they worked for; many used this income to later purchase their freedom (Genovese 1974: 388-392).

Some of the early organizing efforts to improve the lives of African Americans occurry used

of the North, they were recruited as strike breakers and were offered the most dangerous factory jobs. Because of rigid segregation, they lived in the most dilapidated, crowded, unsanitary, and unsafe housing. They earned lower wages and paid higher rents than Whites (Dubofsky 1996: 12; Hurley 1995; Morris 1984; Tuttle 1980).

The great migration and the urbanization of African Americans—

Women and the civil rights and Black Power movement—Although women were crucial to the operation and success of the civil rights movement and the Black Power Movement, both movements were male dominated. Women were viewed as supporters of the male leadership rather than as equal partners. In one of the major civil rights groups, SNCC, women questioned their relegation to clerical tasks. The Nation of Islam also emphasized female subservience. However, African American women, having developed leadership and organizational skills in the church and as school teachers, etc., played pivotal roles in these movements as the roles of Rosa Parks and Fannie Lou Hamer indicate (Andersen 1993: 284; Evans 1979, 1989: 271; Hamer 1967).

As was the case in many cities across the country, Blacks in Gary, Indiana, linked the struggle for civil rights with those of environmental equality. During the 1950s and 1960s, labor activists, NAACP representatives, and community residents decided to push for recreational rights. The Midtown section of Gary where most Blacks lived, had a severe shortage of recreational facilities, and the two existing neighborhood parks were poorly maintained. Blacks were barred from using other city parks and living in other neighborhoods. Marquette Park, which had a public beach, was guarded to ensure that Whites had exclusive use of the facilities. When Whites used fear, intimidation, and vigilante tactics to deny Blacks use of recreational facilities, the police did not protect the rights of Blacks. As early as summer 1949, a multiracial group of about 100 residents and labor activists calling themselves the Young Citizens for Beachhead Democracy, rallied at city hall, then drove to Marquette Beach to take control of the beach. As the caravan neared Miller, one of the most exclusive neighborhoods in the Gary metropolitan area, the protesters encountered an angry mob of Whites wielding bats, clubs, iron pipes, and rocks. Though the caravan was greeted with a torrent of rocks, they continued on to the beach. The protesters spread out their blankets, hung banners, and planted an American flag in the sand. Their takeover of the beach, however, was short lived. Police arrived, and claiming that the beach was closed for the day, promptly ordered the picnickers to leave. The group left but printed up flyers about their excursion and distributed them at the city's factory gates (Hurley 1995: 119-120).

The beach takeover generated publicity, but mainstream civil rights groups like the NAACP criticized the action as unnecessarily militant. Another group promoting racial harmony, the Anselm Forum, rejected invitations to participate because they thought revolutionaries had masterminded the plan. The Midtown Youths Council also charged the rally was orchestrated by "pinkos and radicals" solely to create dissension. With the Black community in disarray about the beach protest, city officials ignored the problem. Within a few years, however, the campaign to integrate Marquette Park had the full backing of civil rights groups. In July 1953, two car loads of young Black women from the NAACP visited Marquette Park. While they were at the beach, their cars were vandalized and when they returned to their cars, a gang of White youths threatened and assaulted the women. As the youths were about to overturn the cars, the police arrived and dispersed the crowd but made no arrests. Civil rights leaders used the incident to demand that the city protect Black beach goers. The mayor promised protection, and true enough, a few weeks later when Black representatives from the Urban League and the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance visited the park, there was no trouble. Although some Blacks continued to experience hostility, no full-scale violence occurred. As the police presence at the park receded, however, Whites escalated their attacks on Blacks. Blacks did not feel secure about visiting the park. In 1961, another incident forced civil rights leaders to revisit the issue of Marquette Park. On Memorial Day, a Black man was severely beaten on the beach by Whites as the police looked on. Five

hundred Blacks jammed city council chambers demanding that the city investigate the actions of the police, integrate the police force patrolling the park, and issue a public statement deploring the actions. The mayor refused to take action and urged Blacks to be patient. Even during the 1960s and 1970s when Richard Hatcher, the first African American Mayor of the City, was in office, Blacks still felt uncomfortable using Marquette Park. Racial violence still erupted at the park. Adopting an avoidance strategy, Blacks stayed away from the beach when Whites were there and used it late evenings and nights. They also used less popular (but more polluted) beaches to the west of the city and congregated in one section of the beach—regardless of which beach they were using. Rather than relaxing and enjoying the environmental amenities, Blacks were concerned with amassing large enough numbers to stave off threats and danger (Hurley 1995: 120-122). Blacks in other cities such as Chicago and Detroit had similar experiences when they tried to use public parks and beaches. During the 1960s and 1970s, Blacks throughout the country also organized campaigns to reduce pollution, improve sanitation, clean up neighborhoods, and reduce the incidence of lead poisoning in African American communities.

Appropriation of land and loss of citizenship—In the first half of the 1800s, territory (which later became Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California) was appropriated from Mexicans living in the Southwest. The area had a regional economy based on farming and herding; an elite class of wealthy Mexican landowners dominated the affairs of the region (Cortes 1980: 697-719). Under the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which resulted from the Mexican American War of 1846-48, Mexicans living in the Southwest were considered U.S. citizens. Between 7,500 and 13,000 Mexicans (Californios) lived in California in 1848, and they were the power elite; however, within 50 years, they were a powerut mos, do, whiil . cic-0e rng;yesrut cieo, (Jiobues 18a:in

g th49wneospourived s tn Californial coed wittughe sdshe

and the United States was informal and largely unrestricted. Throughout the century, Mexican Americans were offered some of the worst jobs for low wages. They were often paid less to do the same jobs as Whites. This split labor market[28] has been further divided by gender; Mexican American women are assigned worse jobs than Mexican American men and receive lower wages (Dubofsky 1966: 13; Takaki 1993: 318-319). Mexican Americans often toiled in “factories in the fields” where about 2,000 men, women, and children worked in 100-plus degree heat, had no drinking water, shared eight outdoor toilets, and slept among the insects and vermin (Dubofsky 1996: 24).

Farm labor, repatriation, and community organizing—About the same time the Southwest was demanding an increased pool of cheap labor to fuel its development, World War I and the 1924 National Origins Act drastically reduced the supply of labor from Europe and Asia. Employers in the Southwest, therefore, resorted to recruiting African Americans from the South and Mexicans; Mexicans were exempt from the immigration quotas of the National Origins Act (Acuna 1988: 141-143; Grebler and others 1970: 63-65). As late as 1930, 45 percent of all Mexican American men worked in agriculture, and another 28 percent of the men worked as unskilled, nonagricultural workers (Cortes 1980: 708). Because men migrated to find work, women were often left to care for the family. This resulted in Latinas working outside the home. By 1930, 21 percent of Mexican American women were employed as farmworkers, 25 percent in unskilled manufacturing jobs, and 37 percent in domestic and other service work

As the United States geared up for World War II, labor shortages led to a new federal policy on Mexican immigration. In 1942, the bracero program was launched. Under the agreement between the United States and Mexico, laborers were given contracts to work in the United States for specific periods. The bracero program undercut wages and thwarted unionization drives. By 1960, braceros supplied 26 percent of the Nation's seasonal farm labor. Growers paid the braceros less than American workers, and were,

they spoke out about working conditions, they were fired and quickly replaced. Influenced by Gandhi and King, Cesar Chavez used various non-violent direct-action strategies in his efforts to organize migrant workers. The farmworkers launched a grape pickers' strike, and in 1965 a table grape boycott. In 1970, after years of violent confrontations and harassment, the growers finally recognized the UFW as the union representing the farmworkers. The growers also agreed to improve the working conditions of the farm laborers (Levy 1975). The UFW also campaigned tirelessly against the use of pesticides and was influential in the decision to ban dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT). Despite the fact that the UFW was cofounded by women, Chicanas faced gender discrimination in the Chicano movement. Although they played crucial roles as activists and organizers, many were denied leadership roles (Amott and Matthaei 1991: 82-86; Mirande and Enriquez 1979: 202-243).

The UFW organizing campaigns stimulated the formation of cooperatives. Chicanos organized co-ops to make the transition from migrant farm laborers to growers and producers. Using the 1964 Title III Economic Opportunity Act (that originally directed most of its funding to African Americans in the South to relieve rural poverty), Chicanos pushed for and obtained funding to establish co-ops in California. In 1969, Cooperativa Campesina was established in Watsonville. The widespread attention this co-op received from the media and universities paved the way for the formation of other co-ops. One of the largest and longest lived co-ops was Cooperativa Central (1971-85) located on a 220-acre strawberry ranch in Salinas. Using the parcel system (borrowed from the ejido system of cooperative farming of common lands in Mexico), families farmed parcels of 2 to 5 acres, depending on the productivity of the land. The cooperative was responsible for irrigation, fumigation, marketing, and accounting. The cooperatives offered the migrant farmworker several advantages: they were free from the unpredictable demand for labor and abysmally low wages, co-op members controlled field conditions, inability to speak English was not a stumbling block, they were familiar with the farming system, co-op operations were built around the family unit, and each family had one vote in the operations of the cooperative. In 1976, Cooperativa Central established Tecnica Incorporada with funds from the California Comprehensive Employment Training Act to provide management and training assistance to aid the establishment of new co-ops. Two years later, Cooperativa Central formed La Confederacion Agricola to provide technical assistance to other co-ops (Rochin 1986: 103-104; Wells 1981: 416-432, 1983a: 772-773, 1983b, 1990: 150).

During the post-Carson era, a third group of Latinos (Cubans) migrated to the United States in large numbers. Unlike Chicanos and Puerto Ricans, Cuban immigrants were from the middle and upper classes. They were the political and economic elites who lost power during the revolution. They controlled many resources and were able to migrate with them. Their0r3lvott.cs wirmed par-

basic rights accorded the White working class (Anderson and Lueck 1992: 147-166; Carlson 1992: 67-84; Friday 1994: 2-7, 51, Lenarcic 1982: 140). Chinese were hired to do menial tasks, and as the claims played out, white gold miners sold their old claims to Chinese miners. Consequently, as the California Gold Rush ran its course, the percentage of Chinese miners steadily increased. In 1850, Chinese miners accounted for 1 percent of all miners; by 1860, they were 29 percent and by 1870, more than 50 percent of the miners (Jiobu 1988a: 34).

were subject to rising anti-Japanese sentiment. In 1907, Japanese immigration was partly curtailed when Japan agreed to limit the number of laborers emigrating. Under this arrangement, the second wave of young men leaving were allowed to marry and bring their wives because women were not considered laborers (Chan 1990: 62; Duleep 1988: 24; Kitano 1980; Kitano and Daniels 1988: 55-56; Peterson 1971: 30-55).

The Japanese gravitated toward farming. Using the skills acquired in their homeland, they grew fruits and vegetables successfully on marginal land in California. In 1910, 30,000 Japanese in the United States were involved in agriculture; between 30 and 40 percent of the Japanese in California were in agriculture. Most were field hands working under the padrone system. Under the system, a Japanese labor contractor (Dano-san) organized a group of Japanese laborers (as many as 100 laborers) and contracted with farmers to work the fields. The padrone system enabled workers who spoke little or no English to work; they also maintained the cultural integrity of their communities by working as a part of these units. Because the work groups in the padrone system functioned as quasi-unions, the Dano-sans actually bargained for better wages for the workers (Jiobu 1988a: 42-43).

The Japanese made the transition from farm laborers to farm owners and growers. In 1900 there were 39 farmers, but by 1909 there were 13,723 Japanese farmers. In 1910, the Japanese controlled 2 percent of all of California's farmland (17,035 acres owned and 17,762 acres leased); by 1919, their crops were valued at $67 million (Jiobu 1988a: 42-43). Most of these farmers owned small plots; however, their success spurred the passage of the Alien Land Act of 1913. This bill declared aliens (Asians really) ineligible for citizenship and, therefore, ineligible to own land. Japanese farmers forestalled the seizure of their properties by transferring the title of their land to their American-born children (Jiobu 1988b: 357-359).

The Filipinos—Another group of Asian immigrants, the Filipinos, started migrating to the United States in 1903 after the Spanish American War. Under the pensionado plan, the first wave of Filipinos were college students who studied in the United States then returned home to occupy high-level government positions. Soon, thousands of field laborers migrated to Hawaii and California. Unlike the pensionados, most of the second wave of immigrants were poorly educated, young, single men fluent in neither English nor Spanish; 20 percent were married, but only 12 percent brought their wives. Like the Japanese, field laborers were organized in the padrone system. Filipino padrones, however, settled for lower wages than their Japanese counterparts in order to win contracts. They also undercut the bids of Mexican laborers who contracted with employers on an individual basis (Jiobu 1988a: 49-51).

Exclusion, internment, and loss of land—In 1917, immigrants from India were excluded by immigration laws, and the National Origins Act effectively stopped immigration from Korea and Japan. Filipinos were excluded in 1934 (Chan 1991; Espiritu 1997: 18; Sharma 1984). About 60 percent of the Filipinos were migrant farmworkers composing, for instance, 80 percent of the asparagus growers (Chan 1991; Espiritu 1997: 29;). Like their Latina counterpart, Asian women were at times discriminated against even more severely than the Asian men. For example, Japanese female farmworkers in Hawaii earned 55¢ per day compared to the 78¢ earned by Japanese men (Takaki 1989: 135). Chinese women were barred from entering the United States before the

The Japanese exclusion occurred at a time when the Japanese were embarking on successful business ventures and trying to integrate themselves more fully into American Society. Clubs such as the Japanese American Citizen's League (JACL)—founded in the 1920s–served an integrationist function (Kitano and Daniels 1988: 55). The Japanese were successful in the tuna industry. In 1916, 13 percent of all tuna fishermen were Japanese; however, by 1923, 50 percent of the tuna fishermen were Japanese. The Japanese introduced the poling method of catching tuna—a method that inflicted minimal damage to the fish (Jiobu 1988a: 43).

The Japanese also continued to enter the agricultural business. By the 1940s, the Japanese dominated a small but important segment of California (and west coast) agriculture. Although they were less than 2 percent of the population of California, they produced 30 to 40 percent of the fruits and vegetables grown in the state. In 1940, about 40 percent of the Japanese population was directly involved in farming, and many others were involved in related businesses. In addition, urban Japanese dominated the contract gardening industry. The Japanese marketed their produce, bought supplies, and hauled products to market by using Japanese-owned businesses developed through mutual credit associations (Jiobu 1988a: 43).

The lives of the Chinese, Koreans, Filipinos, and Asian Indians improved during World War II because their governments were allies of the United States (Espiritu 1997: 42-43). Life for Japanese-Americans however, changed dramatically after the bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941. By summer 1942, over 110,000 Japanese Americans—almost the entire west coast population—were interned in relocation camps enclosed by barbed-wire fences and patrolled by armed guards. Because they were given little time to prepare for the forced evacuation, many families abandoned their homes, farms, businesses, and belongings. The internment, which lasted until 1944, devastated the Japanese community emotionally and psychologically. It eroded the economic position of the Issei (first generation) and weakened their position in the family and community. This was particularly true of the male heads of households who lost most of their authority and legitimacy in the family (Amott and Matthaei 1991: 225-229; Espiritu 1997: 42-43; Jiobu 1988a: 46-47; Kitano and Daniels 1988: 64, 567).

Leading up to the Depression, Filipino padrones undercut the wages of white field laborers, which led to violent encounters as Whites retaliated. In 1929, Whites would contract for $1.50 to $1.70 per ton to pick grapes, whereas Filipinos received 90¢ per ton. During the Depression, however, wages for Filipinos fell dramatically. In 1929, Filipino asparagus workers earned $4.14 per day, and by 1933 they earned $3.30 per day. Consequently, Filipinos began to unionize. In 1934, Filipinos went on strike against the Salinas fields, but two rival Filipino unions undermined their attempt (Jiobu 1988a: 50-52). In addition, in the 1930s, Filipino workers in the Pacific Northwest began to unionize (Friday 1994: 3). Farmworkers seeking out-of-season jobs labored in the canneries in Alaska and made up about 15 percent of the workforce (Jiobu 1988a: 50).

Gender Relations Among People-of-Color Groups

Whereas middle class White women were considered frail, and it was taboo for them to engage in strenuous outdoor activities, such taboos did not extend to women of color. Hence, women of color worked in the fields, hauled heavy equipment and products long distances, were forced on long treks as their communities were relocated, and had to fight to defend their territories. They shared the same indignities meted out to men of

color. Their outdoor experiences were not undertaken for the purposes of recreation, exploration, or feminist liberation; the experiences of minority women were a function of work, enslavement, attempts to escape slavery, or territorial defense. Women of color did not have the time, money, or freedom to contemplate vacations and expeditions.

Because of the conquest and domination of people of color, at some points, men and women of color from the respective racial groups and ethnic groups shared common environmental experiences. When they were separated spatially and occupationally,

To understand the position of workers of color and the likelihood that they would adopt pro-environmental positions, one has to recognize the existence of split and dual labor markets and understand the role of race, class, and gender in structuring and perpetuating oppressive work environments. During the 1800s and early 1900s, oppression among Whites vis-a-vis the work place and access to environmental amenities amounted to White-on-White class and ethnic oppression. That is, native-born Whites of Northern European descent composed the middle class that discriminated against the immigrant and Southern and Eastern Europeans. The latter group comprised a large portion of the working class. However, when people of color were introduced into the workforce, regardless of their social class or ethnic or racial background, they were subject to harsher forms of discrimination in their interactions with middle and working class Whites. At the outset, the relationship between Whites and people of color in America, was marked by extreme forms of oppression such as enslavement, internment, and deportations, and dispossession and denial of land. Throughout the 20th century the oppression continued in the form of rigid occupational, educational, and residential segregation among other things (see footnote 3).

This meant that while the White working class was able to start advocating a radical working class environmental agenda at the turn of the century, people of color saw racial oppression as their biggest problem in the community and in the workplace. This is not to say that they were unable to perceive other forms of discrimination—they did—but they had to overcome the racial oppression in the workplace in order to relieve occupational discrimination (Hurley 1995, see footnote 3). When both the employers and the unions reinforced patterns of *de jure* and *de facto* discrimination and segregation, workers of color were left to their own devices or social networks to resolve their problems.

On the job, workers of color had to deal with the class oppression of unsafe, hazardous work and the racial and gender oppression of being permanently assigned to the most dangerous jobs for the lowest wages. People of color were aware that these jobs were the least likely to be cleaned up and made safe. The White worker, because of his or her race, knew that with time, he or she would be moved to safer jobs. Workers of color knew such opportunities did not exist for them. The interlocking and multiple sources of oppression (race, class, and gender) led workers of color to support occupational safety improvements, and demand racial equality. The demand for racial equality often put workers of color at odds with White workers who thought that safer working conditions, higher wages, and increased job opportunities for Blacks would come at the expense of progress for White workers (see footnote 3).

The Environmental Justice Movement

It was the image of a silent spring, a spring silent of bird song, that motivated thousands of middle class Whites to become active in the reform environmental movement in the 1960s. In the early 1990s, another image motivated people of color to form the environmental justice movement. They were aroused by the specter of toxic springs—springs so pervasive and deadly that no children sang. Soon after the publication of Carson's "Silent Spring," middle class Whites relocated to pristine areas and cleaned up and slowed or prevented the degradation of their communities. Long before the phenomenon known as NIMBYism (Not In My Backyard) was labeled, middle class residents skillfully used zoning laws, legal challenges, and every other means available to them to control and maintain the integrity of the communities in which they lived. Their success left developers and industry flustered; but only temporarily.

Because effective community resistance is costly, industry responded to the challenges of middle class White communities by identifying the paths of least resistance (Blumberg and Gottlieb 1989, Powell 1984, Trimble 1988). By the 1980s, working class White communities recognized that that path went through their communities as well. As working class communities organized to stop the placement of LULUs in their neighborhoods, industry quickly adjusted to the new political reality. Consequently, the path of least resistance became an expressway leading to the one remaining toxic frontier (in the United States, that is)—people-of-color communities. By the 1990s, people-of-color communities were characterized by declining air and water quality, increasing toxic contamination, health problems, and declining quality of life. Since the 1970s, there have been isolated efforts to mobilize communities of color around environmental issues; such efforts began paying off during the late 1980s (Hurley 1995). From 1987 through the early 1990s, the book "Toxic Waste and Race" (UCC 1987) did for people of color and the environmental justice movement what "Silent Spring" did for middle class Whites in the 1960s.

The environmental justice movement, which began to take shape in the early 1980s with campaigns opposing the siting of landfills and the discovery of DDT contamination in African American communities in Alabama, gained momentum with the publication of a 1983 U.S. Government Accounting Office and a 1987 United Church of Christ (UCC) Commission for Racial Justice study that linked race and class with the increased likelihood of living close to toxic waste sites (UCC 1987, U.S. Government Accounting Office 1983). The UCC study claimed that race was the most reliable predictor of residence near hazardous waste sites in the United States (UCC 1987). This widely-publicized study was significant because it was the first to effectively bridge the race relations and environmental discourses.[29] The study framed the environmental discourse in terms of racial injustice as it reported the findings of a national study of environmental inequality. The study framed the findings—that minorities were more likely to live close to hazardous waste sites than Whites—as a case of "racism" and "toxic injustice" in which minority communities were being "targeted" as repositories of hazardous waste sites. The UCC study also helped to stimulate the mobilization of minority environmental activists who used the injustice frame to campaign against perceived environmental racism and seek "environmental justice" (see for example, Bullard 1993; Taylor 1993, 2000: 508-580).

Three years after the UCC study, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry sponsored the National Minority Health Conference. The conference focused on environmental contamination and environmental justice (Institute of Medicine 1999: 3). That same year, 25 researchers and T*colorihe NationadTc-0. researchers and y3e Agency 000e

on environmental justice policies,[30] and (b) plan a national environmental justice conference. The conference, the First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit, was held in Washington, DC in 1991. The 600-plus delegates at the Summit ratified the principles of environmental justice.[31] Since then the principles have been widely used in government agencies, policy institutions, environmental justice organizations (EJOs), and other nonprofit groups. During the 1990s, hundreds of EJOs were formed and have had significant impact on corporate behavior (especially siting decisions and operations of facilities) and environmental policy and planning (Bryant and Mohai 1992; Bullard 1993; Taylor 1999: 33-68). In 1994, President Clinton issued an environmental justice Executive Order (EO 12898 1994)[32] that mandated agencies like the EPA to incorporate environmental justice considerations into their operations. In

This framing was the obvious bridge that transformed the previous attempts of people of color to articulate their environmental concerns in a way that linked their past and present experiences in an effective manner. Environmental justice embodied all these concerns and experiences. The environmental justice movement sought to (1) recognize the past and present struggles of people of color; (2) find a way to unite in the various struggles; (3) organize campaigns around fairness and justice as themes that can interest a variety of people—these are also themes that all people of color had built a long history of community organizing around; (4) build a movement that linked occupational, community, economic, environmental, and social justice issues; (5) build broad class and racial coalitions; (6) strive for gender equity; (7) use a combination of direct-action and nondirect-action strategies; and (8) educate, organize, and mobilize communities of color. Because many people of color still live, work, and play in the same community, the environmental justice agenda made explicit connections between issues related to workplace and community, health, safety, environment, and quality of life.

The environmental justice paradigm—Through the "Principles of Environmental Justice" adopted at the 1991 People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit, people-of-color environmental justice groups articulated an environmental justice paradigm (EJP) that outlines the movement's ideology. The ideological foundations of the movement are (1) **ecological principles**—to be guided by gaia or ecocentric principles, becoming stewards of the earth, developing a land ethic, reducing consumption of resources, taking personal responsibility to reduce consumption, a commitment to improving access to environmental amenities for people of color, and developing environmental education programs in communities of color; (2) **justice**—use notions of intergenerational and intragenerational equity to inform decisionmaking, asserting the rights and freedom of people of color, demanding respect for people of color, supporting international human rights issues, and opposing human-subjects experimentation; (3) **autonomy**—uphold treaties and observe Native American sovereignty, promote self-determination of people of color, and improve cultural relations between different racial and ethnic groups; (4) **corporate relations**

Although people-of-color environmental organizations trace their organizational roots back to 1845, most of these organizations (68 percent) were formed since 1980. In comparison, only 28 percent of the White environmental organizations have been

generally limited to the perspective of White middle class male environmental activism. The tendency to view all environmental activism through this lens limits our understanding of how class, race, and gender relations structured environmental experiences and responses over time. It also makes it difficult to understand the contemporary environmental movement and accurately predict the rise of the grassroots mobilization and the environmental justice movement.

The inability of the White middle class environmental supporters of the reform environmental agenda to recognize the limits of that agenda has led working class Whites, people of color, and some middle class activists, marginalized by the reform environmental discourse, to develop alternative environmental agendas. White working class grassroots and environmental groups differ from those of White middle class reform groups in the emphasis the former groups place on workplace and community experiences. Occupational health and safety and jobs are still minor parts of the agendas of reform environmental organizations, but they are major issues for white grassroots and people-of-color environmental justice groups. In addition, issues relating to toxics, the urban environment, and environmental risks and burdens are more prominent on the agendas of working class grassroots and environmental justice groups than on the agendas of reform environmental organizations. Environmental justice groups differ from White working and middle class groups in their use of networks involved in past social justice struggles and religious groups. They use the injustice frame to identify and analyze racial, class, and gender disparities and to emphasize improved quality of life, autonomy and self-determination, human rights, and fairness.

The environmental movement is a powerful social movement; however, it faces many challenges. Among the most urgent is the need to develop a more inclusive, culturally sensitive, broad-based environmental agenda that will appeal to many people and unite many sectors of the movement. To do this, the movement must reevaluate its relation with industry and the government, reappraise its role and mission, and develop strategies to understand and improve race, class, and gender relations.

Acuna, R. 1988. Occupied America. 3rd ed. New York: Harper and Row.

Andersen, M.L. 1993. Thinking about women: sociological perspective on sex and gender. 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan.

Anderson, T.L.; Lueck, D. 1992. Agricultural development and land tenure in Indian Country. In: Anderson, T.L., ed. Property rights and Indian economies. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield Publishers: 147-166.

Almquist, E.M. 1979. Black women and the pursuit of equality. In: Freeman, J., ed. Wo13.57. 3

Board of Commissioners of the Department of Public Parks. 1859. Second annual report. Description of the Central Park. New York, NY: Department of Public Parks.

Bonacich, E. 1994. A theory of ethnic antagonism: the split labor market. In: Grusky, D., ed. Social stratification: class, race, and gender in sociological perspective. Boulder, CO: Social Inequality Series. 474-486.

Boyer, P. 1978. Urban masses and moral order in America: 1820-1920. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bramwell, A. 1989. Ecology in the 20th century: a history. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Brown, D. 1970. Bury my heart at Wounded Knee. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bryant, B.; Mohai, P., eds. 1992. Race and the incidence of environmental hazards: a time for discourse. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Bullard, R., comp. 1992. People of color environmental groups directory. Flint, MI: Mott Foundation.

Bullard, R. 1993. Confronting environmental racism: voices from the grassroots. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Bullard, R., comp. 1994. People of color environmental groups directory. Flint, MI: Mott Foundation.

Buttel, F.H.; Flinn, W.L. 1974. The structure and support for the environmental movement, 1968-70. Rural Sociology. 39(1): 56-69.

Buttel, F.H.; Flinn, W.L. 1978. Social class and mass environmental beliefs: a reconsideration. Environment and Behavior. 10: 433-450.

Cahn, R., ed. 1985. An environmental agenda for the future. Washington, DC: Island Press. 155 p.

Carlson, L.A. 1992. Learning to farm: Indian land tenure and farming before the Dawes Act. In: Anderson, T.L., ed. Property rights and Indian economies. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield Publishers.

Carson, R. 1962. Silent spring. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Chan, S. 1990. European and Asian immigrants into the United States. In: Comparative perspective, 1820s-1920s. In: Yans-McLaughlin, V., ed. Immigration reconsidered: history, sociology, and politics. New York: Oxford University Press: 37-75.

Chan, S. 1991. Asian Americans: an interpretive history. Boston, MA: Twayne.

Citizen's Clearinghouse for Hazardous Wastes (CCHW). 1991. Everyone's Backyard. 9(5): 2.

Clarke, R. 1973. El-1.y. Boss.5): 2. El-1.y. BossjT*Cew Yttenvir fut7 and farming befo1In: Compa.y.

Cortes, C. 1980. Mexicans. In: Thornstrom, S., ed. Harvard encyclopedia of American ethnic groups. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press: 697-719.

Cotgrove, S.; Duff, A. 1980. Environmentalism, middle-class radicalism and politics. Sociological Review. 28(2): 333-351.

Debo, A. 1970. A history of the Indians in the United States. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Deloria, V. 1969. Custer died for your sins. New York: Macmillan.

Deloria, V. 1994. God is red: a native view of religion. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Press.

Devall, W.B. 1970. Conservation: an upper-middle class social movement: a replication. Journal of Leisure Research. 2(2): 123-126.

Dickason, J.G. 1983. The origin of the playground: the role of the Boston women's clubs, 1885-1890. Leisure Sciences. 8(1): 83-98.

Dillman, D.A.; Christenson, J.A. 1972. The public value for pollution control. In: Burch, W.; Cheek, N.H.; Taylor, L., eds. Social behavior, natural resources, and the environment. New York: Harper and Row: 237-256.

Downs, A. 1972. Up and down with ecology—the issue-attention cycle. Public Interest. 28: 38-50.

Drake, St. C.; Cayton, H.R., eds. **1993**. Black metropolis: a study of Negro life in a northern city. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Dubofsky, M. 1996. Industrialism and the American worker, 1865-1920. 3rd ed. Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson.

Duleep, H.O. 1988. Economic status of Americans of Asian descent. Washington, DC: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Dunlap, R.E.; Mertig, A. 1992. American environmentalism: the U.S. environmental movement, 1970-1990. Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis.

Dunlap, R.E.; Van Liere, K.D. 1978. The "new environmental paradigm." Journal of Environmental Education. 9(4): 10-19.

Emerson, R.W. 1883. Nature. In: Essays. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company: 161-188.

Espiritu, Y.L. 1997. Asian American women and men. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Evans, S. 1979. Personal politics. New York: Knopf.

Evans, S. 1989. Born for liberty: a history of women in America. New York: Free Press.

Executive Order (EO). 1994. Executive Order 12898 (President Clinton) "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations." 59 Federal Register 7629, February 16.

Faich, R.G.; Gale, R.P. 1971. The environmental movement: from recreation to politics. Pacific Sociological Review. 14(2): 270-287.

Fligstein, N. 1981. Going North: migration of Blacks and Whites from the South, 1900-1950. New York: Academic Press.

Fox, S. 1985. The American conservation movement: John Muir and his legacy. Madison**,** WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Franklin, J.H. 1967. From slavery to freedom. 3rd ed. New York: Knopf.

Friday, C. 1994. Organizing Asian American labor: the Pacific Coast canned-salmon industry, 1870-1942. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Gallup Poll. 1972. The Gallup poll: public opinion 1935-1971. New York: Random House.

Genovese, E. 1974. Roll, Jordan, roll: the world the slaves made. New York: Vintage Books.

Geschwender, J.A. 1978. Racial stratification in America. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.

Glenn, E.N. 1986. Issei, Nisei, war bride: three generations of Japanese American women at domestic service. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Gottlieb, R. 1993. Forcing the spring: the transformation of the American environmental movement. Covelo, CA: Island Press.

Graham, F. 1990. The Audubon Ark: a history of the National Audubon Society. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Grebler, L.; Moore, J.W.; Guzman, R.C. 1970. The Mexican American people. New York: Free Press.

Grinnell, G.B. 1911a (May). Letter to Henry Fairfield Osborn. Fairfield, CT: Connecticut Audubon Society. George Bird Grinnell Papers.

Grinnell, G.B. 1911b (May). Letter to W.W. Grant. New York: New York Public Library Annex, Audubon Papers.

Grinnell, G.B. 1912 (February). Letter to Madison Grant. Fairfield, CT: Connecticut Audubon Society. George Bird Grinnell Papers.

Habermas, J. 1975. Legitimation crisis, translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston, MA: Beacon Press. Original title:

Hill, R.; Piccirelli, A. 1992. Gale environmental sourcebook. Detroit, MI: Gale Publishing.

Hurley, A. 1995. Environmental inequalities: class, race, and industrial pollution in Gary, Indiana, 1945-1980. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina.

Ichioka, Y. 1988. The Issei: the world of the first generation Japanese immigration, 1885-1924. New York: Free Press.

Ingram, D. 1987. Habermas and the dialectic of reason. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Institute of Medicine. 1999. Toward environmental justice: research, education, and health policy needs. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Jiobu, R.M. 1988a. Ethnicity and assimilation: Blacks, Chinese, Filipinos, Japanese, Koreans, Mexicans, Vietnamese, and Whites. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Jiobu, R.M. 1988b. Ethnic hegemony and the Japanese in California. American Sociological Review. 53: 353-357.

Johnson, C. 1923. How much is the migration a flight from persecution. Opportunity. 1: 272-274.

Johnson, T.; Nagel, J.; Champagne, D. 1997. American Indian Activism: Alcatraz to the Longest Walk. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Josephy, A. 1968. The Indian heritage of America. New York: Knopf.

Kaufman, P.W. 1996. National parks and the woman's voice: a history. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Kazis, R.; Grossman, R.L. 1982. Fear at work: job blackmail, labor and the environment. New York: The Pilgrim Press.

Kelly, J. 1996. Leisure. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kitano, H.H. 1980. Japanese. In: Thronstrom, S., ed. Harvard encyclopedia of American ethnic groups. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press: 561-571.

Kitano, H.H.; Daniels, R. 1988. Asian Americans: emerging minorities. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kuhn, T. 1962. The structure of scientific revolutions. 2nd ed. [1970]. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lai, H.M. 1980. Chinese. In: Thronstrom, S., ed. Harvard encyclopedia of American ethnic groups. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press: 217-234.

Lenarcic, R.J. 1982. The moon of red cherries: a brief history of Indian activism in the United States. In: Baydo, G.R., ed. The evolution of mass culture in America, 1877 to the present. St. Louis, MO: Forum Press: 135-155.

Levy, J. 1975. Cesar Chavez: autobiography of La Causa. New York: Norton.

Lovejoy, A. 1955. Essays in the history of ideas. New York: A. Braziller.

Lowe, G.D.; Pinhey, T.K.; Grimes, M.D. 1980. Public support for environmental protection: new evidence from national surveys. Pacific Sociological Review. 23: 423-445.

Lurie, N.O. 1982. The American Indian: historical background. In: Yetman, N.; Steele, C.H., eds. Majority and minority. 3rd ed. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon: 207-229.

Lyman, S. 1974. Chinese Americans. New York: Random House.

Marks, C. 1991. The social and economic life of Southern Blacks during the migration. In: Harrison, A., ed. Black exodus: the great migration from the American South. Jackson, MI: University Press of Mississippi.

Marsh, G.P. 1857. Report made under authority of the legislature of Vermont on the artificial propagation of fish. Burlington, VT: Free Press Print.

Marsh, G.P. 1965 [1864]. Man and nature: physical geography as modified by human hand. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Martinson, O.B.; Wilkening, E.A. 1975. A scale to measure awareness of environmental problems: structure and correlates. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Sociological Society. Chicago. IL: Midwest Sociological Society.

Mazmanian, D.; Morell, D. 1992. Beyond superfailure: America's toxics policy for the 1990s. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

McCloskey, M. 1992. Twenty years of change in the environmental movement: an insider's view. In: Dunlap. R.; Mertig, A., eds. American environmentalism: the U.S. environmental movement, 1970-1990. Philadelphia, PA: Taylor and Francis: 77-88.

McGarity, T.O.; Shapiro, S.A. 1993. Workers at risk: the failed promise of the occupational safety and health administration. Westport, CT: Praeger.

McNickle, D. 1973. Native American tribalism: Indian survivals and renewal. New York: Oxford University Press.

Milbrath, L. 1984. Environmentalists: vanguard for a new society. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Mirande, A. 1985. The Chicano experience: an alternative perspective. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Mirande, A.; Enriquez, E. 1979. La Chicana: the Mexican American women. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mohai, P. 1985. Public concern and elite involvement in environmental conservation issues. Social Science Quarterly. 55(4): 820-838.

Mohai, P. 1991. Black environmentalism. Social Science Quarterly. 71(4): 744-765.

Moore, J.W. 1970. Mexican Americans. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Moquin, W.; Van Doren, C., eds. 1971. A documentary history of Mexican Americans. New York: Bantam.

Morris, A. 1984. The origins of the civil rights movement: black communities organizing for change. New York: The Free Press.

Morrison, D.E.; Hornback, K.E.; Warner, W.K. 1972. The environmental movement: some preliminary observations and predictions. In: Burch, W., Jr.; Cheek, N.H.; Taylor, L., eds. Social behavior and natural resources and the environment. New York: Harper and Row: 259-279.

Mueller, C.M. 1992. Building social movement theory. In: Morris, A.; Mueller, C.M., eds. Frontiers in social movement theory. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press: 3-25.

Muir, J. 1890. The proposed Yosemite National Park—treasures and features. Golden, CO: Outbooks, Inc.

Muir, J. 1901. Our national parks. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Muir, J. 1924. The life and letters of John Muir. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. 2 vols.

Nabakov, P., ed. 1991. Native American testimony. New York: Penguin.

Nash, R. 1982. Wilderness and the American mind. 3rd ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

National Opinion Research Center (NORC). 1973-1980. General social survey. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

National Wildlife Federation. 1993. Conservation directory. 38th ed. Washington, DC: National Wildlife Federation.

National Wildlife Federation. 1994. Conservation directory. 39th ed. Washington, DC: National Wildlife Federation.

Oliver, P.E.; Marwell, G. **1992.** Mobilizing technologies for collective action. In: Morris, A.D.; Mueller, C.M., eds. Frontiers in social movement theory. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press: 251-272.

Olmsted, F.L. 1860a. (November 13). Letter to Board of Commissioners of the Central Park. On file with: Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. (Frederick Law Olmsted Papers).

Olmsted, F.L. 1860b. (December 8). Letter to Charles Loring Brace. On file with: Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. (Frederick Law Olmsted Papers).

Olmsted, F.L. 1861. Park. In: Ripley, G.; Dana, C.A., eds. New American cyclopaedia: a popular dictionary of general knowledge. 2: 768-775.

Olson, J.; Wilson, R. 1984. Native Americans in the twentieth century. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press.

Opinion Research Corporation Public Opinion Index (ORC). 1977. Vol. 35.

Petersen, W. 1971. Japanese Americans. New York: Random House.

Pinchot, G. 1906 November.

Scase, R. 1992. Class. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Sharma, M. 1984. Labor migration and class formation among the Filipinos in Hawaii, 1906-1946. In: Cheng, L.; Bonacich, E., eds. Labor immigration under capitalism: Asian workers in the United States before World War II. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press: 579-615.

Snow, D. 1992. Inside the environmental movement: meeting the leadership challenge. Covelo, CA: Island Press.

Snow, D.; Rochford, B., Jr.; Worden, S.; Benford, R. 1986. Frame alignment processes, micro-mobilization and movement participation. American Sociological Review. 51: 464-481.

State of the Nation (SON). 1972-1976. Poll conducted by Potomac Associates.

Stiffarm, L.A.; Lane, P. 1992. The demography of Native North America: a question of American Indian survival. In: Jaimes, M.A., ed. The state of Native America: genocide, colonization, and resistance. Boston, MA: South End Press: 23-53.

Suro, R. 1989. Grassroots groups show power battling pollution close to home. New York Times. July 2, Sec. A1.

Takaki, R. 1989. Strangers from a different shore: a history of Asian Americans. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Takaki, R. 1993. A different mirror: a history of multicultural America. Boston, MA: Little Brown.

Taylor, D.E. 1989. Blacks and the environment: toward an explanation of the concern and action gap between Blacks and Whites. Environment and Behavior. 21(2): 175-205.

Taylor, D.E. 1992. Can the environmental movement attract and maintain the support of minorities. In: Bryant, B.; Mohai, P., eds. Race and the incidence of environmental hazards. Boulder, CO: Westview Press: 28-54, 224-230.

Taylor, D.E. 1993. Environmentalism and the politics of inclusion. In: Bullard, R., ed. Confronting environmental racism: voices from the grassroots. Boston, MA: South End Press: 53-62.

Taylor, D.E. 1998. The urban environment: the intersection of White middle class and White working class environmentalism, 1820-1950s. Advances in Human Ecology. 7: 207-292.

Taylor, D.E. 1999. Mobilizing for environmental justice in communities of color: an emerging profile of people of color environmental groups. In: Aley, J.; Burch, W.; Conover, B.; Field. D., eds. Ecosystem management: adaptive strategies for natural resources organizations in the 21st century. Philadelphia, PA: Taylor and Francis. 33-68.

Taylor, D.E. 2000. The rise of the environmental justice paradigm: injustice framing and the social construction of environmental discourses. American Behavioral Scientist. 43(4): 508-580.

Thoreau, H.D. 1893. Excursions, the writings of Henry David Thoreau. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Tognacci, L.N.; Weigel, R.H.; Wideen, M.F.; Vernon, D.T.A. 1972 . Environmental quality: how universal is public concern. Environment and Behavior. 4(3): 73-86.

Tolnay, S.; Beck, E.M. 1991. Rethinking the role of racial violence in the great migration. In: Harrison, A., ed. Black exodus: the great migration from the American South. Jackson, MI: University Press of Mississippi: 20-35.

Trimble, L.C. 1988. What do citizens want in siting of waste management facilities? Risk Analysis. 8(3): 375-378.

Tsai, S.-S.H. 1986. The Chinese experience in America. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press.

Tuttle, W.M., Jr. 1980. Race riot: Chicago in the red summer of 1919. New York: Atheneum.

United Church of Christ (UCC). 1987. Toxic waste and race. New York: United Church of Christ.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1920. 14th Census of the United States, 1920, Department of Commerce. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1975. Historical statistics of the United States: colonial times to 1970. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census 2000a. Table P-2. Race and Hispanic origin of people by median income and sex 1947-1998. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census, http://www.census.gov/hhes/income/histinc/p02.html. (December 13, 2000).

U.S. Bureau of the Census 2000b. Table A-3. Mean earnings of workers 18 years old and over, by educational attainment, race, Hispanic origin, and sex 1975-1999. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census, http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/education/tableA-3.txt. (December 19, 2000).

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1995. Environmental justice 1994 annual report: focusing on environmental protection for all people. Washington, DC.

U.S. Government Accounting Office. 1983. Siting of hazardous waste landfills and their correlation with the racial and socio-economic status of surrounding communities. Washington, DC.

Vig, N.J.; Kraft, M.E. 1994. Environmental policy in the 1990s, 2nd ed. Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Waterman, L.; Waterman, G. 1989. Forest and crag: a history of hiking, trail blazing, and adventure in the Northeast Mountains. Boston, MA: Appalachian Mountain Club.

Wax, M. 1971. Indian Americans: unity and diversity. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Weeks, P. 1988. The American Indian experience. Arlington Heights, IL: Forum Press.

Wells, M. 1981. Political mediation and agricultural cooperatives: Strawberry Farms in California. Economic Development and Cultural Change. 30(2): 413-432.

Wells, M. 1983a. Mediation, dependency, and the goals of development. American Ethnologist. 10(4): 770-788.

Wells, M. 1983b. Collective goals and individual interests in agricultural production cooperatives. In: Dunn, W., ed. Values, ethics, and the practice of policy analysis. Lexington: Lexington Books: 151-171.

Wells, M. 1990. Mexican farmworkers become strawberry farmers. Human Organization. 49(2): 149-156.

Woodward, C.V. 1974. The strange career of Jim Crow. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wright, S. 1975. Explaining environmental commitment: the role of social class variables. In: Proceeding of the annual meeting of the Midwest Sociological Society. Midwest Sociological Society.

Zald, M.N. 1996. Culture, ideology, and strategic framing. In: McAdam, D.; McCarthy, J.D.; Zald, M.N., eds. Comparative perspectives on social movements: political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press: 261-274.

Zinger, C.L.; Dalsemer, R.; Magargle, H. 1972. Environmental volunteers in America. Prepared by the National Center for Voluntary Action for the Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, DC: Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Monitoring.

Zinn, M.B.; Eitzen, D.S. 1990. Diversity in families. New York: Harper Collins.

Forest Service