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INTRODUCTION

The redistribution of power is a primary goal of most community organizations, as people from disenfranchised groups come together to influence the policies, practices, or attitudes that affect their lives. Through models of social and community development, groups with less power are able to achieve sustainable improvements to the challenges they are facing, ultimately leading to social change (Link & Ramanathan, 2011). Within the field of environmental justice, community groups generally seek procedural or distributive changes, thereby gaining influence over decision-making processes (procedural) or access to material resources such as good jobs and clean air, water, and land (distributive).

Why is it necessary for communities with limited resources and political power to come together to shape policy? Researchers have continuously demonstrated that socio-economically disadvantaged communities are disproportionately exposed to environmental hazards and risks, including toxic waste, air and water pollutants, and noise (Boer et al., 1997; Mohai & Bryant, 1992; Pulido, 1996; Sadd, Pastor, Boer, & Snyder, 1999; Evans & Kantrowitz, 2002). For example, in a landmark study conducted by the United Church of Christ Commission for Racial Justice (1987), researchers found that race was highly associated with the location of commercial hazardous waste facilities. Further studies have found that racial and ethnic minority and low-income populations are inequitably burdened by environmental hazards, and race is a greater explanatory variable to the distribution of environmental hazards than income (Burke & Lauretta, 1993; Faber & Krieg, 2002; Gelobter, 1987, 1992; Goldman & Fitton, 1994; Hockman & Morris, 1998; West, Fly, Larkin, & Marans, 1992). If communities do not organize, it is likely that they will continue to bear the burden of hosting facilities that harm the local community and yet often provide regional or even national benefits, such as heavy industry, waste disposal, and transportation infrastructure.

Environmental injustices can also occur when people are displaced from their land or lose access to natural resources, such as clean water
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and healthy food. While this can occur in urban areas (areas that lack access to healthy food within cities have been termed food deserts), there are also examples of such injustices among rural and indigenous communities. Native and indigenous people have been repressed for over 500 years by ongoing Euro-American colonization, including the dispossession and displacement from land and living resources. Today, indigenous people actively resist the forces of contemporary colonization by reconstructing native nationalism and promoting repossession of land and resources (Wilson & Cavender, 2005).

Environmental justice remains a prominent issue for coalescing communities and for social change. In this chapter, we will highlight two case studies that demonstrate efforts by community groups to influence political and economic decisions and, ultimately, to gain access to resources such as economic development and clean air, land, and water.

In the first case study, we highlight The Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition (CBC), a group based in the Detroit neighborhood of Delray. Delray is a low-income, high-minority community that is host to many hazardous facilities including a steel mill, an oil refinery, a wastewater treatment plant, and other heavy industries. It is also the proposed site to host the American leg of an international bridge that would connect Detroit to Windsor, Ontario. If built, the new border crossing would bring thousands of semi-trucks through the neighborhood each day, resulting in diesel emissions, noise, and the displacement of residents, businesses, and faith organizations. Despite these additional burdens, the CBC has decided to conditionally support the new bridge, adopting a strategy of working to mitigate the harm associated with the proposed bridge while leveraging economic development, rather than outright opposition. This case study will highlight the CBC’s efforts, as well as the difficult decisions that poor minority communities must confront when faced with development that may harm their environment and health, and yet possibly spur needed economic development.

Our second case study takes us to the Wai‘anae coast on the Hawaiian island of Oahu to examine the efforts of activists and educators who are actualizing their vision for restoring Native lands while teaching children about Native culture, including aloha ʻaina (love for the land) and sustainability issues. Wai‘anae is also a low-income community that is home to one of the highest concentrations of Native Hawaiians on the island. This case describes a history of water diversion, previously taken from the Waianae Valley to irrigate sugar cane and pineapple plantations on the other side of the Wai‘anae range, as well as the efforts of community activists to bring water back to the valley to invigorate the land and the indigenous culture.

Using the theoretical lens of social movement theory, we present our case studies to describe the issues confronting these groups and their processes for achieving their visions. The goal of this chapter is to provide concrete examples of current environmental justice organizing efforts, an analysis of
factors that influence both their success and development, and a discussion of how an understanding of social movement theory may provide useful insight for future efforts.

THEORIES FOR ANALYZING AND UNDERSTANDING CHANGE

Social movements can be defined as sustained, collective challenges to power holders in the name of a disadvantaged population living under the jurisdiction or influence of those power holders (Tarrow, 1996). They are generally supported by social movement organizations that seek influence beyond what their constituency has the power to implement on its own (Gamson, 1975). Social movements are a unique form of collective action in that they include people who lack regular access to institutions, who act in the name of new or unaccepted claims, and who behave in ways that fundamentally challenge authorities (Gamson, 1975; Tarrow, 1998).

There are at least two prominent debates within the literature on social movements: one about the origin of social movements and the other about their consequences. The first asks: Why, given the wide breadth of collectively held grievances, do only some grievances result in a collective response? The second asks: Why, given that movements begin with less power than their target, do some groups achieve their goals while others are co-opted or disappear? It is generally agreed that three primary variables largely influence movements' development and success:

- Resource mobilization (McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Cress & Snow, 1996);
- Political opportunity (McAdam, 1996; Tarrow, 1998; McAdam, 1999); and
- Culturally resonant framing (Snow, Rochford Jr. et al., 1986; Noonnan, 1995; McCammon, Muse et al., 2007).

RESOURCE MOBILIZATION THEORY

Resource mobilization theory suggests that the more resources that a social movement organization has at its disposal, the more likely it is to achieve its goals (McCarthy & Zald, 1977). Resources important to the success of a movement include money, constituents, legitimacy, and free spaces (Cress & Snow, 1996). There is debate among resource mobilization theorists about the causal importance of each type of resource as well as the significance of the resource's origin. Is a movement more likely to succeed or fail if it relies primarily upon its constituents' donations, leadership, and political networks rather than deriving resources from outside foundations or groups?
In their seminal book *Poor People’s Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*, Piven and Cloward (1979) argue that resources obtained from outsiders inherently co-opt the group’s goals and tactics. More recent studies argue that outside funding can make a group more sustainable and able to participate in coalitions (Staggenborg, 1988; Cress & Snow, 1996).

**POLITICAL PROCESS THEORY**

Political process theory suggests that a social movement is more likely to form and to be successful when the following three conditions are met:

- Organizational strength—Indigenous resources are mobilized and powerful (Morris, 1981);
- Cognitive liberation—There is a collective assessment that insurgency is necessary and will be successful. This condition is similar to Freire’s notion of critical consciousness (Freire, 1968); and
- Political opportunity—This includes the following four dimensions: The institutional political system is relatively open; the broad set of elite alignments that typically undergird a polity are relatively unstable; the presence of elite allies; the state has a low capacity and propensity for repression (McAdam, 1996; McAdam, 1999).

More recently, political process theorists have elaborated on the role of social networks (Snow, Zurcher Jr. et al., 1980; McAdam & Paulsen, 1993; Dixon & Roscigno, 2003) and social capital (McAdam, Sampson et al., 2005) as mechanisms by which movements are generated and supported.

**Framing Theory**

Frames are what individuals use to understand what happens around them, to identify sources of their problems, and to devise methods for addressing their grievances (Snow, Rochford Jr. et al., 1986; Noonan, 1995; McCammon, Muse et al., 2007). Framing theorists suggest that culturally resonant frames increase the likelihood of the formation and success of a SMO. Thus, because frames problematize something previously seen as normal, they can motivate collective action, thereby increasing the likelihood of social movement formation.

**CASE STUDY 1: THE SOUTHWEST DETROIT COMMUNITY BENEFITS COALITION (CBC)**

According to the 2000 Census, the Southwest Detroit neighborhood of Delray is home to around 4,000 people, with slightly more than 40% of
households living below the poverty line (Michigan Department of Transportation, 2007). Delray has few remaining businesses and many homes are either abandoned, burnt down, or in a high state of disrepair. Further, it is located near three interstates, the state's only oil refinery, one of the nation's largest wastewater treatment facilities, and a host of industries. Because of the close proximity between homes and industry, residents experience poor health outcomes. Residents joke about living in a toxic soup or being treated like scientific experiments. Yet people stay in the area at least in part because housing is affordable and they cannot afford to relocate.

Delray was not always economically devastated. Located at the confluence of the River Rouge and the Detroit River, Delray has been an attractive place to locate industry since the 1880s. Long-time residents reflect upon the heyday of Delray in the 1940s and 1950s, a time when there was a healthy business community, residents could walk to work, and industries gave back in the form of hiring local residents, supporting community institutions such as the local hospital and fire department, and investing in the local economy. However, when Detroit began to lose industry, including two auto manufacturing plants that had been based in Delray, and as economic capital migrated to the suburbs in the form of white flight, Delray began to face growing disinvestment. The construction of Interstate 75 effectively blocked the community from the rest of the city, thereby contributing to geographic isolation of the city. Over time, Delray became a ghost of its former self.

The factors that created contemporary Delray are not unique to this neighborhood. Austin and Schill (1991) describe how the disproportionate placement of toxic pollution in low-income communities of color happens through at least three processes. First, in some scenarios like Delray, housing and industry were originally built together. As whites vacated the housing (but not necessarily the jobs), poorer people of color remained behind, either because of a lack of financial resources or because of housing segregation in the suburbs. This phenomenon was especially common in Detroit (Sugrue, 2005). Second, housing for the poor is often built in the vicinity of existing industrial operations because the land is cheap. Third, sources of pollution are sometimes placed in existing minority communities. The decision to build hazardous facilities in disenfranchised communities can be made of "race neutral" reasons, such as favoring a low concentration of residents. And yet, when land density is correlated with poverty, which is correlated with race, facilities are more likely to end up in socially and economically disadvantaged communities. Furthermore, if racial or class discrimination influenced the siting of previous sources of pollution and contamination, siting based on compatibility may only bring greater impacts to disenfranchised neighborhoods (Austin & Schill, 1991). Without the political will and appropriate resources to either relocate residents or to mitigate environmental burdens, it is likely that environmental injustices will continue to grow.
Organizing for Environmental Justice 191

Given Delray’s high degree of poverty and pollution as well as its geographic isolation from the rest of the region, residents of the community are desperate for reinvestment. Therefore, when a new international bridge crossing was proposed to land in the neighborhood, residents and neighborhood stakeholders responded with mixed feelings. An existing border crossing, located just two miles to the north of Delray, hosts one-quarter of all trade between the US and Canada, resulting in around 8,000 semi-trucks per day and accompanying diesel emissions, traffic, and noise. If a new crossing is built in Delray, the middle-third of the neighborhood will be taken through eminent domain and the remaining residents would have to contend with similar negative impacts.

Delray residents and its community council were originally opposed to hosting the proposed crossing. Between 2003 and 2008, as a joint US-Canada study was conducted to assess the best location for the bridge, Delray and other proposed host communities protested the bridge, a phenomenon known as NIMBY—Not in My Back Yard. The affluent communities that border Detroit were able to successfully mobilize opposition, in one case collecting more than 30,000 signatures on a petition. Delray also mobilized, but not with nearly the same numbers or political influence. During this process, Delray representatives, including its former Community Council President John Nagy, realized that if a bridge was going to be built, it would likely land in Delray. Nagy explained:

Look at all the waste facilities throughout the country. Where are they always located? They’re always located in low-income, high-minority communities because they don’t have political power. . . . And Delray is low-income; Delray is high-minority. So it’s basically environmental racism. (J. Nagy, original interview, 2011)

In 2008, the bi-national study officially concluded that Delray was the best site to host the new crossing, in part because the community was not densely populated and because property values would be comparatively inexpensive to acquire.

Stakeholders within Delray were faced with the difficult decision of how to respond to a new environmental threat. After assessing the community’s power and opportunities for influence, they decided to try a new strategy: Rather than opposing the bridge crossing outright, the community leaders would try to organize stakeholders to gain political leverage, with the goal of turning the proposed bridge crossing into an opportunity to reduce pollution and to bring about economic development. In 2008, this core group of stakeholders established a new organization: The Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition (CBC). As State Representative Rashida Tlaib explained to a town hall meeting in April 2011:

We said "No" when they tried to build the steel mill and it still came. We said "No" when they tried to build the waste water treatment plant and it still came. This time, instead of saying "No" and having the
bridge built without reimbursement, we are going to negotiate and say, “If you are going to build this bridge here, then you are going to compensate our people. (R. Tlaib, Town Hall Meeting, April 16, 2011)

Thus, the CBC decided to focus its energy on organizing constituents, building allies, and negotiating with decision makers to ensure the least amount of pollution and the highest amount of community investment possible.

From 2008 to 2011, the CBC slowly and cautiously began to build outside allies. How was such a politically and economically marginalized group able to convince pro-bridge groups including representatives of the auto industry, the United Auto Workers, and the Michigan Chamber of Commerce to support their position—or at least not to oppose it? The CBC was able to leverage its power by establishing the credible threat that if legislation was passed to build the bridge in Delray without community protections, then the CBC would visibly protest the bridge in the media and also use the courts to sue and delay the project. Thus, organizations that wanted the new bridge, but did not necessarily care about Delray, were convinced to advocate for community protections.

The mechanism through which the CBC is seeking access to the decision-making processes that relate to the bridge is a policy tool called a community benefits agreement. Since their introduction in the early 2000s, community benefits agreements have been applied to a variety of developments to ensure that if residents agree to support a project, then they will receive benefits as well as protections from undesirable burdens (Larsen, 2009). According to the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition website:

A community benefits agreement (CBA) is a legally binding contract between a developer (public or private) and a community group. The purpose of a CBA is to ensure that a development project is also beneficial to the host community. In a CBA, the developer agrees to provide tangible benefits to the host community. These benefits generally focus on economic development, housing, air quality, public safety, traffic management, and enforcement though there are no guidelines for what benefits can be negotiated. In exchange for benefits, the host community agrees to support the development project.

Most community benefits negotiations have sought to provide residents with job training, hiring programs, and affordable housing for residents as well as living wage provisions (Salkin, 2007).

As of December 2011, supporters of the new border crossing have been unable to pass a bill in the Michigan State legislature that would allow for the construction on the new bridge. Yet, proponents of the new bridge maintain that the issue has not died because the economy depends on a safe, efficient border crossing and the homeland security advocates point to the need for redundancy. In the meantime, the Community Benefits Coalition
is continuing to organize within the community by educating and mobilizing residents, faith groups, and business owners while building alliances with outside groups such as unions, interest groups, and elected officials. Further, they work to frame their conditional support for the project by reaching out to media.

Although it is still unknown if the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition will win resources and protections for Delray and its residents, it should be noted that, at least in part, members of the CBC support the new bridge because they have such little hope for alternative, "greener" economic reinvestment. Without cleaner development in already-impacted communities like Delray, it is unlikely that residents' health will ever improve. To really establish safe clean air, land, and water for all people, it is also necessary to adequately address persistent problems like poverty, unemployment, housing dilapidation, and the loss of public services.

CASE STUDY: WATER AND THE WAI'ANAE VALLEY

The Wai'anae valley on the island of Oahu is home to Ka'ala Farm and Cultural Learning Center, which hosts thousands of visitors each year, including school-age children from the surrounding area. It is here that the caretakers of Ka'ala Farm work to preserve Native Hawaiian culture, traditions, and land management. As you stroll through the grounds of Ka'ala Farm, you experience what it might have been like to live in pre-European contact Hawaii, where streams gently water taro patches, food is cooked outdoors in an imu or underground oven, and kapa or bark cloth is stained with indigenous designs. Though the farm is still in need of funding and support to realize its full dream of restoring the valley from its once marginalized status to its original state as the poi basket of the coastal area, one night at Ka'ala Farm is sure to make one a believer that the dream is an important one. This dream is part of a larger movement among Native Hawaiian people to keep the culture, people, and land alive for future generations. Ka'ala Farm, Inc. (KFI) incorporated in 1983 and is funded primarily through foundation and grant support, as well as individual and corporate donors.

Wai'anae was not always this way. Prior to the 1970s, this area was covered with invasive plants and brush which had covered the taro patches that once fed the people. Water that flowed through the valley from Mount Ka'ala, the highest point on the island, and emptied into Pokai Bay was diverted for residential and agricultural needs, leaving the valley dry. While Native Hawaiians had always cared about responsible land development and use, poverty and disenfranchisement left them with little energy or hope for transformation.

The Hawaiian indigenous people have experienced many traumas historically since the arrival of the first Europeans to the islands. First, the
 depopulation of people from estimates of nearly 500,000 to 1 million prior to contact in 1778 to approximately 49,000 within a 50-year time span must have taken a toll on their spirit. This was soon followed by the colonization of the people and a new economy that put a dollar value on land that left little room for the traditional values that intimately bound land with people. Culture in all its forms, including language, music, dance, values, spirituality, and customs, were subject to new laws and policies that were meant to exterminate the Native Hawaiian way of life, if not the people. The illegal overthrow of the sovereign Hawaiian government through a joint resolution of the US Congress destroyed Native Hawaiians’ hope for self-determination. The militarization of the islands and their significant role in World War II only deepened foreign grip as bases were constructed on sacred grounds and highways were built to support military travel over important archeological sites. Even today, Native Hawaiian people, like other native and indigenous people, comprise one of the highest proportions of those who live in poverty, experiencing poor health, low education, and bearing a disproportionate amount of social problems, including involvement in the criminal justice system, teenage pregnancy, depression, and substance abuse (Wilson, 2005).

Yet beneath this bleak picture lies the true spirit and resilience of the people. Today, we also see the appearance of language emergence schools which teach children their native tongue from the moment they enter school; youth are just as likely to know contemporary Hawaiian artists as they would rock and roll or hip-hop artists, styles of hula which were once banned for promoting promiscuity are taught in schools and dance studios across the islands, and the connection between the land and people is slowly being restored as a mainstream value in collaboration with both government and communities. How did this come about? How could years of trauma and oppression be interrupted and possible healing finally come to the people? While it is and should be argued that the spirit of the people was never broken and that, even during its darkest times, there have been pockets of resistance, we point to the years of the 1960s and 1970s as a critical juncture in US history which had far reaching effects in the islands.

Needless to say, the 1960s were a tumultuous time in the US for many. The efforts of the civil rights movement ushered in a new consciousness among Americans that all people were created equal. The efforts among black Americans and their fight for equality and self-determination spurred other ethnic groups in the US, including native and indigenous people, to incorporate the idea that maintaining one’s ethnicity and culture was not un-American.

In Hawaii, as the voices of the native community grew stronger, there was a new movement afoot, which is now known as the Hawaiian Renaissance. Although the concept of a Hawaiian Renaissance was first introduced by King Kalakaua (1836–1890) and his movement to revive and preserve Hawaiian traditions, it was short-lived and was followed soon after by the fall of the
Hawaiian Kingdom (1898). The second wave of the Hawaiian Renaissance is credited to those in the ‘60s and ‘70s who put increasing pressure on authority, became active in political life, and formed groups to address the preservation of its culture and traditions (Kanahele, 1979). For example, in 1969, the State of Hawaii established the State Council on Hawaiian Heritage, which was the first official organization to recognize the value of preserving Hawaiian culture. In 1971, the Hawaii Music Foundation was the first organization set up to perpetuate Hawaiian music (Kanahele, 1979). The 1976 voyage of the Hokule‘a by the Polynesian Voyaging Society, which sailed from Hawaii to Tahiti without modern navigational instruments, served to not only demonstrate that purposeful celestial navigation across the Pacific was possible, but also inspired cultural revitalization and pride among the people (Polynesian Voyager Society).

Also in 1976, Protect Kaho‘olawe Ohana (PKO) filed a suit in federal district court calling for the end of the US Navy’s bombing of the island for target practice, which had been occurring since 1941. In 1980, the Navy agreed to protect historic and cultural sites on the island, to continue soil conservation and revegetation programs, to limit training to the central third of the island, and to allow monthly PKO accesses to the island. In 1981, the entire island was listed on the National Register for Historical Places and designated the Kaho‘olawe Archaeological District (Kaho‘olawe Island Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ohana).

These events bring us back to the Wai‘anae coast where self-determination and cultural revitalization was coming to the surface in the 1960s and ‘70s. The War on Poverty brought federal money to the Wai‘anae community through the Federal Model Cities program and helped to establish the Wai‘anae Community Action Program and the Wai‘anae Rap Center, which ultimately bore the Ka‘ala Farm. The mission of Ka‘ala Farm is to reclaim and preserve the living culture of the Po‘e Kahiko (people of old) in order to strengthen the kinship relationships between the ‘āina (land, that which nourishes) and all forms of life necessary to sustain the balance of life on the islands (Ka‘ala Farm, Inc.). In 1978, community members began their restoration efforts of the valley by addressing water rights. During the summer of that year, members returned the water one mile from a plantation diversion ditch, which was laid over an ancient water system that once fed the valley and produced taro for the entire community.

If you visit Ka‘ala Farm today, as you begin to see the terraced land, it will become clear that the valley was once filled with taro patches. You can listen to stories told by Uncle Eric Enos, one of the co-founders, along with Uncle Butch DeTroye, a former marine who sought the Wai‘anae coast as a place for healing after serving in the Vietnam War and now works as the Learning Center Manager.

Enos uses the diversion of water from the valley as a metaphor for cultural diversion of the Hawaiian people. Diverting the water left the land fallow and dry. Like the land, it left the people with the spiritual void of
living in balance with the earth and with one another (Ka'ala Farm, Inc.). Over time, this void had been filled with unhealthy lifestyles and destructive behaviors. Thus, the act of restoring water to the valley not only brought taro back to the valley, it also brought renewed hope for repairing the damage that cultural diversion had done to the people. Although the origins of Ka'ala Farm are firmly rooted in resistance, today, it seeks collaboration and dialogue with governmental agencies, such as the Board of Water Supply and the State of Hawaii.

Enos further states that it is the responsibility of the community to revive Hawaiian culture, grow healthy food and healthy communities, eat and work together as a family, and take care of one another. The motto of the Ka'ala Farm today states: “If you plan for a year, plant kalo (taro). If you plan for ten years, plant koa (indigenous tree). If you plan for a hundred years, teach the children aloha ‘aina.” Accordingly, environmental justice and sustainability does not begin and end with our acts today, but through the education of future generations.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The two case studies provide examples of how organizing efforts have been activated to promote environmental justice for low-income, high-minority communities. The cases further demonstrate how people can come together to resist injustice and gain power and influence. In both cases, we see examples of both procedural and distributive changes. Through the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition (CBC), we see Delray stakeholders strategically organizing to gain influence over decision-making processes and, potentially, to access new jobs and clean air. In Wai'anae, community activists work to gain access to land and water, but also work in cooperation with the existing power structure in order to have ongoing access to decision-making processes.

In both cases, social movement theory is helpful to further understanding of the organizing efforts of these two communities. In Delray, the community has been under the duress of multiple environmental hazards for years. As such, residents' health has suffered and the rate of poverty has increased. When an international bridge crossing was proposed to land in the neighborhood, residents were faced with a difficult decision about how to respond. While protesting facilities that bring pollution to the host community is a strategy that can work in some instances, the CBC did not believe that it had the power to successfully prevent the crossing. Thus, it chose a strategy based on negotiation and alliance-building. While still open to employing resistance if need be, the CBC is presently working to win small victories in order to build additional power and ultimately influence the political process. Perhaps, if a community benefits agreement is implemented, it will also lead to an influx of resources that residents would
not have had access to if they chose to oppose the project and once again became victims of injustice. This dilemma exemplifies that efforts to promote environmental justice can take many forms and that especially in low-income communities, the answers are not always easy.

The Delray case is also characterized by collaboration in the form of The Community Benefits Coalition (CBC) in that it relies upon local leadership including residents and social service, faith, and business leaders from the community. By mobilizing local individuals and organizations, the CBC was able to strengthen its credibility and organizational strength. At the same time, it has been able to build relationships with outside funders with similar development goals.

Finally, the Delray case demonstrates the importance of framing. In this case, the CBC needed to construct a frame that would facilitate collaboration with allies while, at the same time, promote its own interests including environmental protections and economic development. By pursuing a community benefits agreement, a “bridge with benefits,” rather than opposing the bridge entirely, the CBC has brought itself closer to Michigan and Canadian authorities and businesses that support the new bridge. This could open up the institutional political system to the voices of Delray residents and decrease opposition.

The creation of Ka’ala Farm is also better understood through the lens of social movement theory. First, the effort was born out of a larger social movement, the civil rights movement as well as other cultural movements that captured the nation during the ’60s and ’70s. These movements gave birth to the Hawaiian Renaissance movement, which is largely credited for the re-birth of Hawaiian culture after a near certain death. Second, it was born out of collective action from people within the community who sought political, economic, and cultural power through the restoration of land, values, and traditions. Restoring nearly extinct traditions provides a potential basis for restoring health and dignity to future generations. The reclaiming of culture, water, and land were fundamental acts of challenging authority, including the governmental agencies and commercial interests who allowed for the diversion of the water from the valley as well as the larger forces of colonization and capitalism, which impinged upon the indigenous culture and its values and beliefs (Wilson, 2005). Native and indigenous people, including Native Hawaiians, have continuously faced challenges to keep their traditional social and economic institutions because federal policies have incapacitated traditional indigenous property rights and have undermined preexisting social norms (Tsosie, 2005).

How then was this movement successful, given the predictors of such movements? If we consider resources, we can point to the Federal Model Cities funding which led to the origin of community development organizations that built the capacity for leadership on the Wai’anae coast. However, beyond dollars, there was an increase in the constituency and legitimacy of cultural preservation groups as they began to sprout up across the islands.
and as small and large victories were won against imposing forces. Currently, Ka’ala Farms does not receive any government funding. While this could potentially pose a threat to its sustainability, it has chosen to work cooperatively with governmental entities to educate them about their work and its accomplishments.

These are the kinds of relationships in which elite allies could become a part of a radical coalition among those with power and those without. It also promotes a sense of openness that can act as a critical source of political opportunity for further action. Although the successes of Ka’ala Farm and its counterparts do not assure that it will be free from future repression or threat, the consciousness of Native Hawaiian people has certainly been raised and its networks have broadened beyond the islands. In 2008, Ka’ala Farm celebrated 30 years of water rights in the valley. Time will tell if in a hundred years all Hawaiian children understand and live *aloha ‘aina*.

While the stories of the Delray and Wai’anae community are still in the process of being written, both cases provide examples of struggles against environmental injustice and distinct forms of organizing to counteract oppressive forces. We analyzed these cases through the lens of social movement theory as a way of understanding what factors might predict the successes and shortcomings of future efforts. In both cases, these movements would benefit from broader, more powerful constituencies that support their missions and are invested in their success. In Delray, “success” would mean clean air, good jobs, and sensitivity to community safety and needs. In Wai’anae, it would mean support for the promotion of Native Hawaiian culture and traditional lifestyles as a form of environmental sustainability. While the environments are quite different across the two case studies, there are commonalities that are unquestionable. Both cases demonstrate the power of collective action among low-income, high-minority communities to resist environmental injustices.

**STUDENTS' ASSIGNMENTS**

1. What do you understand about environmental justice and why it is important for development of a nation?
2. Discuss resource mobilization theory and its relation to environmental justice.
3. What is community coalition? How does it work in the community organization method?
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