

GREEN OF ANOTHER COLOR:

BUILDING EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN FOUNDATIONS AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MOVEMENT

A Report by the Philanthropy and Environmental Justice Research Project
Northeastern University

Dr. Daniel R. Faber, Project Director
Deborah McCarthy, Project Research Assistant

First Edition

April 10th, 2001

**Funding for this research project and report was provided by
the Nonprofit Sector Research Fund of the Aspen Institute;
the Research, Scholarship, and Development Fund of Northeastern University;
and the Marion and Jasper Whiting Foundation.**

ADVISORY BOARD

Grantmakers interested in learning more about the environmental justice movement are encouraged to contact the advisory board members listed below.

Ann Bastian

New World Foundation
666 West End Avenue
New York, NY 10025
Tel: (212) 497-3470

Harolynne Bobis

Bullitt Foundation
1212 Minor Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101-2825
Tel: (206) 343-0807
hbobis@bullitt.org

Millie Buchanan

Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation
6 East 39th Street, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10016
Tel: (212) 684-6577
millieb@noyes.org

Jack Chin

*Funders Forum On Environment
and Education*
200 Granville Way
San Francisco, Ca 94127
Tel: (415) 242-9445
c200gran@earthlink.net

Cindy Choi

Environmental Justice Fund
310 8th Street, Suite 309
Oakland, CA 9407
Tel: (510) 834-8920

Diana Cohn

Solidago Foundation
141 Wooster Street
New York, NY 10012
Tel: (212) 777-6018
solidago@igc.org

Vic DeLuca

Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation
6 East 39th Street
New York, NY 10016
(212) 684-6577
vic@igc.org

Marjorie Fine

*Unitarian Universalist Veatch
Program at Shelter Rock*
48 Shelter Rock Road
Manhasset, NY 11030
Tel: (516) 627-6576
mfine@veatch.org

Tom Goldtooth

Indigenous Environmental Network
P.O Box 485
Bemidji, MN 56601
Tel: (218) 751-4967
ien@igc.org

Penn Loh

Alternatives for Community & Environment
2343 Washington St., 2nd Floor
Roxbury, MA 02119
Tel: (617) 442-3343
ace@essential.org

Vernice Miller-Travis

Ford Foundation
320 E. 43rd Street
New York, NY 10071
Tel: (212) 573-4641
v.miller-travis@fordfound.org

Richard Moore

*Southwest Network for Environmental
and Economic Justice*
P.O. Box 7399
Albuquerque, NM 87194
Tel: (505) 242-0416

Tirso Moreno

*Farmworker Network for Economic
and Environmental Justice*
815 South Park Avenue
Apopka, FL 32703
Tel: (407) 886-5151

Deepak Pateriya

Environmental & Economic Justice Project
1715 West Florence Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90047
Tel: (323) 789-7920

Cynthia Renfro

Beldon Fund
99 Madison Avenue, 8th Floor
New York, Ny 10016
Tel: (212) 616-5600
cynthia@beldon.org

Christina Roessler

French American Charitable Trust
303 Sacramento Street, 4th Floor
San Francisco, Ca 94111
Tel: (415) 288-1305
croessler@factservices.org

Jane Rogers

San Francisco Foundation
685 Market Street, Suite 910
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: (415) 733-8500
jpr@sff.org

Peggy Saika

*Asian Pacific Environmental
Network*
310 8th Street, Suite 309
Oakland, CA 94067
Tel: (510) 834-8920
apenadmin@hotmail.com

Yalonda Sinde

*Community Coalition
for Environmental Justice*
105 14th Avenue, Suite 2-C
Seattle, WA 98122
Tel: (206) 720-0285
yalondas@yahoo.com

Peggy Shepard

West Harlem Environmental Action
271 West 125th Street, Suite 211
New York, NY 10027
Tel: (212) 961-1000

Rhea Suh

William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
525 Middlefield Road, Suite 200
Menlo, Park CA 94025
Tel: (650) 329-1070
r.suh@hewlett.org

Diane Takvorian

Environmental Health Coalition
1717 Kettner Boulevard, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel: (619) 235-0281
dianet@environmentalhealth.org

Midge Taylor

Public Welfare Foundation
2600 Virginia Avenue, suite 505
Washington, D.C. 20037
Tel: (202) 965-1800
midge@publicwelfare.org

Connie Tucker

*Southern Organizing Committee for Economic
and Social Justice*
P.O. Box 10518
Atlanta, GA 30310
Tel: (404) 755-2855
socejtp@igc.org

Stephen Viederman

Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation
6 East 39th Street
New York, NY 10016
Tel: (212) 684-6577
stevev@noyes.org

Table of Contents

Executive Summary of Findings.....	i
Acknowledgments.....	ii
Preface.....	iii
About the Authors.....	iv
<i>Introduction</i> Transforming Green Politics: Philanthropy and the Environmental Justice Movement.....	1
<i>Section I</i> Deeper Shades of Green: The Promise of the Environmental Justice Movement.....	8
The Evolution and Structure of the Environmental Justice Movement	8
Fighting Environmental Racism: The Civil Rights Movement and Environmental Justice	11
Dying for a Living: The Occupational Health Movement and Environmental Justice.....	13
Protecting Cultural and Biological Diversity: The Native Land Rights Movement and Environmental Justice	15
Poisoning for Profit: The Environmental Health Movement and Environmental Justice.....	17
The Export of Ecological Hazards to Third World Dumping Grounds: The Solidarity Movement and Environmental Justice.....	21
Organizing for Social Change and Economic Reform: The Community Empowerment Movement and Environmental Justice.....	23
Conclusion: The Future of Green Politics.....	26
<i>Section II</i> Not Enough Green To Go Around: Promoting Greater Foundation Support for the Environmental Justice Movement.....	29
Growing the Green: Financial Support for the Environmental Movement.....	29
Table 1: Total Giving to the Environmental Movement.....	30
Table 2: Foundation Giving to the Environment.....	31
Not Enough Green to Go Around: The Lack of Foundation Support for the Environmental Justice Movement.....	31
Table 3: Foundation Giving to the Environmental Justice Movement.....	32
Table 4: Sample of Top Foundation Supporters of the Environmental Justice Movement.....	34
Enlarging the Base of Foundation Support for the Environmental Justice Movement.....	35
Integrated Funding Strategies.....	36
Regranting Initiatives.....	38
Summary of Recommendations.....	40

**Section III Greener Giving:
Adopting Exemplary Grantmaking Practices in Support of Environmental Justice.....41**

Exemplary Grantmaking Practices in Support of Environmental Justice.....41
Providing General Support Over Project-Specific Funding.....42
Utilizing Criteria Supportive of Community Organizing When Evaluating
the Effectiveness of Grantees.....46
Providing Multi-Year Funding in Support of Environmental Justice.....49
Summary of Recommendations.....51

**Section IV Green of Another Color:
Promoting Greater Diversity & Inclusive Practices Among Environmental Grantmakers ..52**

The Benefits of Diversity and Inclusive Practices.....52
Principles of Environmental Justice.....55
Promoting Greater Diversity & Inclusion in the Environmental Grantmaking Arena.....57
The Multicultural Fellowship Program, San Francisco Foundation.....60
Summary of Recommendations.....61

**Section V The Greening of Philanthropic Activism:
Utilizing Mission-Related Investing and Shareholder Action
in Support of Environmental Justice.....62**

Philanthropic Activism in Support of Environmental Justice.....62
Utilizing Mission-Related Investing Strategies.in Support
Of Environmental Justice.....63
Mission-Related Shareholder Action in Support of Environmental Justice.....65
Shareholder Action in Support of Environmental Justice:
The Case of Jessie Smith Noyes and the SouthWest Organizing Project.....67
Suggested Guidelines by SWOP and Noyes for Community-Investor Relations.....68
Program-Related Investments and Mission-Related Purchasing Practices
in Support of Environmental Justice69
The Greening of Philanthropic Activism.....70
Summary of Recommendations.....71

List of Resource Boxes on Environmental Justice Organizations and Programs.....72

Endnotes.....74

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Green of Another Color: Building Effective Partnerships Between Foundations and the Environmental Justice Movement

A Report by the Philanthropy and Environmental Justice Research Project

- (1) The environmental justice movement is perhaps the most underfunded social movement in the United States. During the four-year period from 1996-99, foundations provided an estimated \$169.923 million in funding, an average of only \$42.481 million per year for the entire movement. In fact, we estimate that only two-tenths of one percent of all foundation grants are dedicated to the environmental justice movement. Additionally, only 4.27 percent of all environment-related grants are dedicated to the movement. For a point of comparison, just one traditional membership-based environmental organization – the National Wildlife Federation – had a total income [from all sources] of \$82.378 million in 1998, a figure some \$39 million *more* than all estimated foundation grants combined to the environmental justice movement.
- (2) Foundation support for the environmental justice movement is increasing, however, from an estimated \$27.498 million in 1996 to \$49.248 in 1999. Given the \$4 million in additional annual funding from the newly-created Ford Foundation environmental justice portfolio coming in 2001-02, these increases should continue to rise in the near future. Nevertheless, foundation support for the movement remains insufficient.
- (3) Members of the Environmental Grantmakers Association (EGA) are estimated to have provided over eighty percent (\$64.915 million) of total foundation support (\$81.103 million) for the environmental justice movement from 1996-99.
- (4) Just twelve foundations provided 20.5 percent (\$34.858 million) of all foundation support estimated for the movement between 1996-99, and are the principal sources of funding for the strategic regional networks and national constituency-based networks. With a couple of exceptions, these foundations cannot be expected to increase their commitments. Therefore, other foundations inside and outside of EGA are needed to increase their levels of support.
- (5) One of the primary fundraising challenges confronting the environmental justice movement is related to a lack of racial diversity in the philanthropic community. Although there has been progress in recent years among environmental grantmakers in terms of diversifying their own staff and leadership, as well as paying greater attention to issues of diversity at the EGA meetings, more inclusive practices are needed if funding barriers are to be overcome.
- (6) As institutions of significant financial and political clout, foundations possess the ability to undertake additional actions which go beyond the traditional role of dispersing funds to further the philanthropic mission. Environmental grantmakers, however, are underutilizing mission-related investing strategies and mission-related shareholder actions which could be used in a collaborative fashion to bolster the work of grantees in the environmental justice movement.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge those individuals who aided us in the investigation and construction of this report, *Green of Another Color*. The following persons granted us a significant portion of their valuable time and energy to be interviewed for the report: James Abernathy, Environmental Support Center; Leticia Alcantar, Tides Foundation; Ann Bastian, New World Foundation; Laurie A. Betlach, Lannan Foundation; Bob Bingaman, Sierra Club; Harolynne Bobis, Bullitt Foundation; China Brotsky, Tides Foundation; Karie Brown, Tides Foundation; Millie Buchanan, Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation; Carol Cheek, Lannan Foundation; Jack Chin, Director of the Funders' Forum on Environment & Education; Cynthia Choi, Environmental Justice Fund; Diana Cohn, Solidago Foundation; Fernando Cuevas, Jr., Farmworker Network of Economic and Environmental Justice (FWNEEJ); Vic De Luca, Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation; Veronica Eady, Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs; Marjorie Fine, Unitarian Universalist Veatch Program at Shelter Rock; Debra George, Northeast Network for Environmental Justice (NEJN); Lois Marie Gibbs, Executive Director of the Center for Health, Environment, and Justice (CHEJ); Warren Goldstein-Gelb, Alternatives for Community and Environment (ACE); Tom Goldtooth, Indigenous Environmental Network (IEN); Julie Herman, Beldon Fund; Deborah Holder, Unitarian Universalist Veatch Program at Shelter Rock; John Hunting, Beldon Fund; Joshua Karliner, Transnational Resource and Action Center (TRAC); Orin Lengelle, Action for Community and Ecology in the Rainforests of Central America (ACERCA); Penn Loh, Executive Director of Alternatives for Community & Environment (ACE); Jane McAlevey, Unitarian Universalist Veatch Foundation at Shelter Rock; Vernice Miller-Travis, Ford Foundation; Stephen Mills, Sierra Club; Richard Moore, Southwest Network for Environmental and Economic Justice (SNEEJ); Tirso Moreno, Farmworker Network for Economic and Environmental Justice (FWNEEJ); Dan Nicolai, Louisiana Labor-Neighbor Project; Ali Noorani, Greater Boston Urban Resources Partnership; Deepak Pateriya, Environmental and Economic Justice Project; Christopher Peters, Seventh Generation Fund; Janet Phoenix, Northeast Network for Environmental Justice (NEJN); Rachel Pohl, Hemenway & Barnes; Alejandro Queral-Regil, Sierra Club; Cynthia Renfro, Beldon Fund (formerly Turner Foundation); William J. Roberts, Beldon Fund; Christina Roessler, French American Charitable Trust (FACT); Jane Rogers, San Francisco Foundation; Peggy Saika, Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN); Peggy Shepard, West Harlem Environmental Action (WE ACT); William Shutkin, Alternatives for Community & Environment; Khalida Smalls, Greater Boston Environmental Justice Network (GBJEN); E. Gail Suchman, New York Lawyers for the Public Interest; Diana Takvorian, Environmental Health Coalition; Elizabeth Tan, French American Charitable Trust (FACT); Midge Taylor, Public Welfare Foundation; Connie Tucker, Southern Organizing Committee for Economic and Social Justice; and Stephen Viederman, Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation.

An additional two dozen people were interviewed for the report but requested anonymity. All those individuals interviewed were notified of their right, upon request, to make statements which would be not be attributable to them or which could be held in confidence (not to be repeated). We also wish to thank following individuals for providing us with assistance in the collection of documents and other data sources: Helen Alessi, SEO Internship in Philanthropy; Seth Borgos, Unitarian Universalist Veatch Program at Shelter Rock; Barbara Bryan, New York Regional Association of Grantmakers (NYRAG); Stuart Clarke, Turner Foundation; Patricia Denn, Northeastern University; Mark Dowie, MIT; Kevin Kelly, Turner Foundation; Steven Lawrence, Director of Research at the Foundation Center; Holly Minch with the Strategic Press Information Network (SPIN) Project; Melvin Oliver, Ford Foundation; and Thomas W. Van Dyck, Investment Consulting Group. A special word of thanks to Alan J. Abramson, David Williams, and Cynthia Schuman at the Nonprofit Sector Research Fund of the Aspen Institute in Washington, D.C. Without the support of the Fund, this research project would not have been possible.

Preface

In the United States, communities of color and lower-income neighborhoods are historically the hardest hit by environmental and public health problems. Residents must deal daily with hazards from midnight dumping of chemical wastes on vacant lots, lead contamination in building materials, and toxic air and water pollution, to a lack of greenspace and parks, and decrepit housing, schools, and public transportation. Yet these neighborhoods and the organizations which represent them typically possess few resources to confront these threats. These injustices are not so much the failing of law or science as they are the result of *political disempowerment and economic abandonment*.

The *Philanthropy and Environmental Justice Research Project* recognizes that the growth of community-based organizations, strategic regional networks, and constituency-based national networks committed to the principles of economic and environmental justice are essential to the efforts of people of color and lower-income communities to organize and mobilize the resources needed to eradicate these environmental and public health threats. We also believe that the environmental justice movement is essential to constructing a more inclusive, democratic, and pro-active environmental politics in the United States. Unlike many traditional environmental organizations, however, the environmental justice movement remains sorely under-supported by the philanthropic community at-large.

This report, *Green of Another Color*, represents the findings of a year-and-a-half long investigation and assessment of the state of relations between the foundation community and the environmental justice movement, and was produced in close consultation with key representatives of the movement and foundation community. With financial support provided by a \$43,000 grant from the Nonprofit Sector Research Fund of the Aspen Institute in Washington, DC, the report is being distributed among members of the Environmental Grantmakers Association and other foundation networks, as well as key organizations within the environmental justice movement.

The aim of this report is to help forge more effective partnerships between and within the environmental justice movement and the philanthropic community. In particular, the report should serve as an important educational tool for current and potential funders by: (1) providing information regarding the importance and accomplishments of the environmental justice movement over the last ten years, including those of the strategic networks; (2) demonstrating the gross underfunding the movement by the philanthropic community in general, and the Environmental Grantmakers Association membership in particular, in relation to other segments of the environmental movement; (3) providing recommendations as to which grantmaking practices would be most appropriate given the structure and needs of the movement, (4) discussing the importance of diversity and inclusive practices in foundation settings for improving environmental grantmaking practices and for overcoming the funding barriers currently confronting the environmental justice movement; and (5) evaluating the manner in which grantmakers can better utilize their institutional clout to support the work of the environmental justice movement beyond the disbursement of grants by undertaking mission-related investing strategies and mission-related shareholder actions against socially and ecologically irresponsible companies. We envision this document as being a valuable resource for foundation staff, officers, and board members, as well as individual donors and participants in the environmental justice movement.

We welcome all comments regarding the report. We would also like to hear from you if this report has proven helpful to your own efforts in any manner, whether you be a foundation program officer or board member, environmental justice organizer or advocate, policy-maker, researcher, or scholar. Please drop us a line at dfaber@gis.net, or via regular mail.

About the Authors

Dr. Daniel R. Faber, Director

Dr. Deborah McCarthy, Research Associate

Philanthropy and Environmental Justice Research Project

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Northeastern University

360 Huntington Avenue

Boston, MA 02115

Tel: (617) 373-2878

dfaber@gis.net

Daniel Faber, Director: Dr. Faber is an Associate Professor of Sociology at Northeastern University, and a long-time environmental justice advocate and scholar. In 1984, he co-founded the Environmental Project On Central America (EPOCA). Based with Earth Island Institute in San Francisco, and the Environmental Policy Institute in Washington, D.C., EPOCA worked to broaden and deepen the movement for peace, social justice, and sustainable development by addressing the human and ecological impacts of U.S. policy in the region, and involved U.S. environmentalists in efforts to change that policy. During his tenure as Research Director (1984-90), EPOCA organized a regional network of Central American environmentalists (REDES) for the purpose of coordinating research efforts and policy proposals; organized regional and international environmental justice conferences, such as the *1989 Congress on the Fate and Hope of the Earth* held in Managua, which included over 1,200 participants from over 70 nations; and organized international support for a number of popular-led “leader” environmental justice projects and programs throughout the region, including *Campesino to Campesino* in Nicaragua. Dr. Faber is the author of numerous publications on environmental injustice. His book on Central America’s ecological crisis, *Environment Under Fire*, is one of four works recognized by *Choice Magazine* as an “1993 Outstanding Academic Book of the Year on Latin America.” His latest book is the edited collection, *The Struggle for Ecological Democracy: Environmental Justice Movements in the United States* (1998). Dr. Faber has served as a participating editor with the journals *Latin American Perspectives* and *Organization & Environment*. He is currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, and a faculty member of the Latino, Latin American and Caribbean Studies (LLACS) and Environmental Studies Programs at Northeastern University. Dr. Faber has also served as a consultant to many environmental organizations. He has just completed a major study (with Dr. Eric Krieg) entitled, *Unequal Exposure to Ecological Hazards: Environmental Injustices in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*. In addition, Dr. Faber is a Research Associate with the Environmental Task Force of the Nicaragua Network, and is authoring another report on the political-economic and ecological causes and consequences of the Hurricane Mitch and Salvadoran earthquake disasters in Central America. Both the Massachusetts and ETF reports will be utilized by activists, policy-makers, and researchers to propose programs and policies which are economically viable, socially just, and environmentally sustainable.

Deborah McCarthy, Research Associate: Dr. McCarthy is a Thoreau Teaching Fellow at the University of Maine. She will begin a position as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the College of Charleston in the Fall of 2001. She recently received her Ph.D. from Northeastern University for her dissertation entitled, *The Color of Green: Lessons Learned from the Developing Relationship Between Foundations and the Environmental Justice Movement*. Dr. McCarthy has been researching issues of environmental injustice for a number of years. Her Masters Degree in Urban Affairs and Planning at Virginia produced a Master’s Thesis entitled, *Towards a “People Centered” Approach to Participatory Planning: An Analysis of Grassroots Conflicts Over Waste Facility Siting*. From 1997-99, Ms. McCarthy served as a researcher with the Assets and Income Inequality Project under the Directorship of Professor Tom Shapiro, co-author with Melvin Oliver of the award winning book, *Black Wealth, White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. She has presented her work at several conferences, including: *Philanthropy and the Environmental Justice Movement in the United States*, Eastern Sociological Society annual meeting, Boston, MA, 1999; and *Citizen Protest Around the Three Mile Island Accident: New Social Movement Theory and Questions about the Diversified as well as Unified Nature of Social Movements*, Eastern Sociological Society annual meeting, Philadelphia, PA, 1998

INTRODUCTION

TRANSFORMING GREEN POLITICS: PHILANTHROPY and the ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MOVEMENT

This struggle emerging from the environmental experience of oppressed people brings forth a new consciousness....to make a true connection between humanity and nature. This struggle to resolve environmental problems may force the nation to alter its priorities; it may force the nation to address issues of environmental justice and, by doing so, it may ultimately result in a cleaner and healthier environment for all of us.

---- Bunyan Bryant¹

Transforming Green Politics: Linking Philanthropy and Environmental Justice

In the dawn of the new millennium, the ecology movement in the United States is confronting an immense paradox. On the one hand, over the last four decades environmentalists have built one of the more broadly-based and politically powerful social movements in this country's history. As a result, U.S. governmental policies for protecting the environment and human health are among the most stringent in the world. On the other hand, despite having won many important battles, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the traditional environmental movement is losing the war for a healthy planet.

With the ascendancy of neo-liberal economic policy, globalization, and the growing concentration of corporate power over all spheres of life, the ability of the movement to effectively solve the ecological crisis is being undermined. While there is no doubt that ecological problems would be much worse absent the mainstream environmental movement and current system of regulation, it is also clear that the traditional strategies and policy solutions being employed are proving to be increasingly limited. In particular, the linkages between environmental abuse, poverty and economic inequality, racism, the lack of democracy, and consolidation of corporate power are typically ignored. As stated by Pablo Eisenberg, "*although we know that our socioeconomic, ecological, and political problems are interrelated, a growing portion of our nonprofit world nevertheless continues to operate in a way that fails to reflect this complexity and connectedness.*"² Much of the environmental movement has become so fragmented, parochial, and dominated by single-issue approaches that its capacity to champion the types of fundamental social and institutional changes required to solve the ecological crisis is greatly diminished. As a result, most existing environmental laws are poorly enforced and overly limited in prescription, emphasizing, for instance, ineffectual *pollution control* measures which aim to limit public exposure to "tolerable levels" of industrial toxins rather than promoting *pollution prevention* measures which prohibit whole families of dangerous pollutants from being

produced in the first place. In addition, other problems such as the acceleration of sprawl, the destruction of wetlands and other unique habitats, and the growth in U.S. emissions of greenhouse gases that cause global warming continue to worsen. The U.S. system of environmental regulation may be among the best in the world, but it is grossly inadequate for safeguarding human health and the integrity of nature.

Perhaps the most critical factor for explaining the hegemony of neo-liberalism and the incapacity of the state to adequately address the ecological crisis is what Robert Putnam has termed the decline in *social capital*, or those social networks and assets that facilitate the education, coordination and cooperation of citizens for mutual benefit.³ Over the past generation, the social networks which integrate citizens into environmental organizations and other civic institutions have seriously deteriorated in communities across the country. The resulting decline in social capital inhibits genuine citizen participation in the affairs of civil society and engagement in the realm of politics, including the ability to tackle environmental problems in an equitable and effective fashion.⁴ With interactions which build mutual trust eroded, greater sectors of the populace become increasingly cynical of their ability to collectively effect meaningful ecological and social changes. Instead, a growing number of people retreat into what Jurgen Habermas terms *civil privatism*, with an emphasis on personal lifestyle issues such as career advancement, social mobility, and conspicuous consumption. When social and environmental problems are confronted, increasingly individualized or “privatized” solutions become the favored response. As a result, the various racial, ethnic, class, and religious divides in American society become accentuated, as the “haves” increasingly disregard the needs of the “have nots,” witness the attack on affirmative action, the social safety net, labor rights, consumer safeguards, and ecological protection in favor of reduced taxes, fiscal conservatism, increasingly harsh punishments for criminal misconduct, and less governmental regulation of industry.

Unfortunately, too many mainstream environmental organizations adopt corporate-like organizational models which further inhibit broad-based citizen involvement in environmental problem-solving. For some groups, citizen engagement means simply sending in membership dues, signing a petition, and writing the occasional letter to a government official. As stated by William Shutkin, there is a “*tendency for many non-profit environmental organizations to treat members as clients and consumers of services, or volunteers who help the needy, rather than as participants in the evolution of ideas and projects that forge our common life.*”⁵ In the effort to conduct studies, draft legislation, and organize constituencies to support passage of environment-friendly initiatives, much of the mainstream movement has gravitated toward a greater reliance on law and science conducted by professional experts. The aim of this move towards increased professionalization is to regain legitimacy and expert status in increasingly hostile neo-liberal policy circles. The effect, however, is to reduce internal democratic practices within some environmental organizations and state regulatory agencies. The focus on technical-rational questions, solutions, and compromises, rather than issues of political power and democratic decision-making, is causing a decline in public interest and participation in national environmental politics.

To overcome this crisis of democracy and the corporate assault upon nature requires the reinvigoration of an *active environmental citizenship* dedicated to the *principles of ecological*

democracy, which include: (1) *grassroots democracy and inclusiveness* – a commitment to the vigorous participation of people from all walks of life (especially more marginalized communities of color) in the decision-making processes of business, government, and other social institutions that regulate their lives, as well as civic organizations and social movements which represent their interests; (2) *social & economic justice* -- meeting all basic human needs and ensuring fundamental human and civil rights for all members of society; and (3) *sustainability and environmental protection* – ensuring that the integrity of nature is preserved for both present and future generations of all citizens. These three pillars on which the concept of ecological democracy rests provide a meaningful vision for building a more just and ecologically sound American society.

Fortunately, there are signs that a powerfully new active environmental citizenship committed to the principles of ecological democracy is emerging in America and throughout the world. The revitalization of grassroots environmental organizations committed to genuine base-building and political-economic reform is a reaction to the new challenges posed by neo-liberalism and corporate-led globalization, and includes the use of direct action against timber companies, polluters, the World Trade Organization (as seen in the “battle in Seattle”), the World Bank, and others (as well as criticism toward the “corporatist” and exclusionary approaches of mainstream environmental organizations). Pressing for greater economic equality, greater business and government accountability (such as the “right to know” about hazards facing the community), and more comprehensive approaches to environmental problem-solving (such as adoption of the precautionary principle over risk-assessment, source reduction and pollution *prevention* over pollution *control* strategies, “Just Transition” for workers out of polluting industries over job blackmail, etc), the struggle for ecological democracy represents the birth of a *transformative* environmental politics.

At the forefront of the struggle for ecological democracy and a new active environmental citizenship is the environmental justice movement. No other force within the broader context of grassroots environmentalism currently offers the same potential as the environmental justice movement for: (1) bringing new constituencies into environmental activism, particularly in terms of oppressed peoples of color, the working poor, and other populations who bear the greatest ecological burden; (2) broadening and deepening our understanding of ecological impacts, particularly in terms of linking issues to larger structures of corporate power; (3) constructing and implementing new grassroots organizing and base-building strategies over traditional forms of advocacy, as well as developing new organizational models, which rebuild social capital and maximize democratic participation by community residents in decision-making processes; (4) connecting grassroots and national layers of environmental activism; (5) creating new pressure points for policy change; (6) building coalitions and coordinated strategies with other progressive social movements, including much of the labor movement; and (7) bringing more innovative and comprehensive approaches to environmental problem-solving, particularly in terms of linking sustainability with issues of social justice.

Environmental justice activists clearly recognize the importance of community building, promoting active forms of citizen participation in decision-making processes, and forging stronger partnerships with other community organizations in order to build a more vibrant and democratic

civil society. As stated by Mark Gerzon, “...strengthening the capacity of communities for self-governance – that is, making the crucial choices and decisions that affect their lives,” – is the most critical task confronting the environmental movement in rebuilding social capital and a vibrant ecological democracy.⁶ Because environmental justice activists emphasize based-building strategies which take a multi-issue approach, they function as *community capacity builders* to organize campaigns which address the common links between various social and environmental problems (in contrast to isolated single-issue oriented groups, which treat problems as distinct). In this respect, the movement has done an outstanding job of *enlarging the constituency* of the environmental movement as a whole by incorporating poorer communities and oppressed peoples of color into strong, independent organizational structures. The movement has done important work in helping to *span community boundaries* by crossing difficult racial, class, gender-based, and ideological divides which weaken and fragment communities.⁷

Finally, the movement is facilitating *community empowerment* by emphasizing *grassroots organizing and base-building* over traditional forms of environmental advocacy. Under the traditional advocacy model, professional activists create organizations which speak and act on behalf of a community. In contrast, the grassroots organizing approach by the environmental justice movement emphasizes the mobilization of community residents to push through the systemic barriers that bar citizens from directly participating in the identification of problems and solutions – so that they may *speak and act for themselves*.⁸ Base-building implies creating accountable, democratic organizational structures and institutional procedures which facilitate inclusion by ordinary citizens, and especially dispossessed people of color and low-income families, in the public and private decision-making practices affecting their communities.

If the environmental justice movement continues to build upon the already impressive successes it has established in these areas, and find ways to collaborate with the broad array of grassroots citizens groups representative of the white middle-class, we may witness the creation of a truly broad-based ecology movement, inclusive of all races and ethnicities, the working poor, and women, that is capable of implementing a national and international strategy to end the abuses of nature wrought by corporate America. In short, the environmental justice movement is critical to the larger effort to build a more broadly-based, democratic, and effective ecology movement in the United States -- one which can challenge and transform structures of power and profit which lie at the root of the ecological crisis.

Environmental grantmakers and other foundations can play an instrumental role in facilitating the transformation of green politics in America by funding those organizations championing the sorts of fundamental social and institutional changes needed to address the ecological crisis. However, if foundations and the environmental movement continue to conceive of the ecological crisis as a collection of unrelated problems, and if the reigning paradigm is defined in neo-liberalist terms, then it is possible that some combination of regulations, incentives, and technical innovations can keep pollution and resource destruction at “tolerable” levels for many people of higher socio-economic status. However, poorer working class communities and people of color which lack the political-economic resources to defend themselves will continue to suffer the worst abuses. If, however, the interdependency of issues is emphasized, as in the environmental justice movement, so that environmental devastation,

ecological racism, poverty, crime, and social despair are all seen as aspects of a multi-dimensional web rooted in a larger structural crisis, then a transformative ecology movement can be invented.⁹ This is the aim of environmental justice activism, and foundations need to better assist the movement in achieving this goal.

The purpose of this report is to help foundations and the environmental justice movement build more effective partnerships. This document aims to accomplish this goal by providing information, resource materials, and a series of recommendations which foundation officials (as well as individual donors and activists) might utilize to reform current grantmaking practices and construct more beneficial relationships with the movement.

The report is divided into five sections.

Section I: Deeper Shades of Green catalogues the evolution and structure of the environmental justice movement. Numerous summary boxes which highlight the work and accomplishments of specific community-based organizations, as well as the strategic regional networks and national constituency-based networks for environmental justice, are also provided throughout the section.

Section II: Not Enough Green To Go Around documents the lack of funding for the environmental justice movement, and provides recommendations to foundations for how they might go about increasing their level of support. These recommendations include the adoption of horizontally-integrated, vertically-integrated, and cluster funding strategies, as well as regranteeing initiatives. Resource boxes on regranteeing organizations and funding strategies are included.

Section III: Greener Giving analyzes civil investing as a new approach to philanthropy, and makes a series of recommendations regarding exemplary grantmaking practices (general support, evaluation criteria, multi-year funding, etc) which funders can adopt in support of the environmental justice movement. Resource boxes on various organizations, grantmaking practices, and resource materials are also provided.

Section IV: Green of Another Color analyzes the importance of diversity issues for foundations and their grantmaking practices in relation to the environmental justice movement. Recommendations for promoting greater diversity and inclusive practices among environmental grantmakers are included. A number of resource boxes on educational materials for funders, internship programs, and diversity practices at other foundations are also provided.

Section V: The Greening of Philanthropic Activism analyzes additional actions which can be undertaken beyond the role of dispersing funds to further the mission of the foundation. These efforts, which include mission-related investing strategies and mission-related shareholder actions, can be better utilized by foundations to support the work of the environmental justice movement. Recommendations for how these practices can be better utilized, as well as resource boxes on organizations which provide support services to foundations, are also included.

We strongly encourage readers to make use of the resource materials contained in the report, and to contact members of the advisory board to learn more about philanthropic practices and the environmental justice movement. A list of the advisory board members precedes the table of contents in the beginning pages of the report. An index to the resource boxes on various environmental justice organizations and programs can be found at the conclusion of the report.

Local-Level Policy Accomplishments of the Environmental Justice Movement: The Case of “Brownfields” to “Greenfields” in Portland, Oregon

The Brownfields initiative was developed by the Clinton-Gore administration in 1993 to clean-up abandoned, lightly contaminated sites and restore them to productive community use. Since its creation, the initiative has awarded over 500 grants to communities nationwide, totaling over \$140 million. These grants have resulted in the creation of nearly 7,000 new jobs and have leveraged over \$2.3 billion in private investment. One of the over-riding principles of the environmental justice movement is that the community “speaks for itself,” a principle too often ignored in the case of “brownfields” redevelopment. The affected community is regularly absent from the decision-making table, leaving developers, lenders, regulators, and other governmental officials to decide which properties will be cleaned up and what they will become.

In Portland, Oregon, an innovative partnership between community residents, the state, and private sector is creating a new model of *community-based site selection*. The North-Northeast Portland Brownfields Community Advisory Committee (CAC), a part of the City’s EPA-designated Brownfields Showcase Project, has worked together since late 1998 to design and implement outreach efforts, to develop site selection criteria, to identify potential sites, and to solicit community participation. The majority of CAC members are people of color, and all live in North-Northeast Portland (which is home to the city’s most racially and economically diverse neighborhoods, as well as a disproportionate number of its brownfields). The CAC has sponsored a number of public forums where community residents come together to decide which sites will receive public sector resources for assessment, setting in motion a process that should lead to cleanup and revitalization. All of the proposed redevelopments provide housing, economic opportunities, and/or cultural enhancement for low-income families and people of color. These initiatives are being replicated in many cities throughout the country. For instance, the Urban Habitat Program’s Brownfields Project provides stakeholders in the San Francisco Bay Area with information, resources, and a regional network to facilitate brownfields redevelopment in a manner that places the environmental, economic, and social concerns of low-income communities of color at center stage. For more information on the CAC, contact Warren Fluker, CAC Chair, at: wfluker@msn.com.

National-Level Policy Accomplishments of the Environmental Justice Movement: The National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC)

On February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, entitled “Federal Action to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations,” which directs all federal agencies with a public health or environmental mission to make environmental justice an integral part of their policies and activities. The Order reinforces the Civil Rights Act of 1964, prohibiting discriminatory practices in programs receiving federal support. Section 5.5 of the Order specifically outlines processes for public participation and access to information. In his *Memorandum on Environmental Justice* that accompanied the Order, President Clinton declared that the Order was intended to, among other things, “...provide minority communities and low-income communities access to public information on, and an opportunity for public participation in, matters relating to human health or the environment.”

To ensure that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) would receive significant input from affected stakeholders, the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC) was established prior to the Order in 1993. NEJAC is a federal advisory committee which provides independent advice to EPA, and is chartered to meet until September of 2001. Members are appointed by EPA and represent community-based groups; academic and educational institutions; state and local governments; tribal governments; non-governmental organizations; business and industry; and environmental organizations. These representatives help NEJAC to serve as a forum for integrating environmental justice with other EPA priorities and initiatives. A number of NEJAC subcommittees related to waste and facility siting; enforcement; health and research; public participation and accountability; indigenous peoples; and international issues have contributed to significant changes in EPA practices. These accomplishments include the creation of research projects and health programs which identify high risk communities; reviews of the Agency’s enforcement and compliance work plan; conducting public dialogue meetings in five major cities concerning possible solutions to urban problems resulting from the loss of economic opportunities caused by pollution and the relocation of businesses; and the development of a public forum protocol for interagency meetings.¹⁰ EPA’s Office of Environmental Justice (OEJ) and regional offices throughout the country have established relations with local environmental justice organizations and begun projects. As a result, in a few short years, the movement has overcome exclusionary practices to have meaningful impacts on policy development and enforcement. For instance, one victory of the EPA Accountability Campaign helped force Chevron to abate emissions in the primarily African American/Laotian community of Richmond, California, which resulted in a settlement for the community and \$5 million for community programs and worker trainings.

NEJAC also worked closely with EPA, the Environmental Counsel of the States, and other groups to very recently produce the EPA document, “Public Involvement in Environmental Permits: A Reference Guide,” which can be used by all stakeholders to improve the quality of citizen participation in the Agency’s permitting decisions.¹¹

SECTION I

DEEPER SHADES OF GREEN:

The EVOLUTION of the ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MOVEMENT

From Buffalo, New York, to Brownsville, Texas; from Watsonville, California, to Warren County, North Carolina; from the Hopi reservation on the Black Mesa to Humboldt County in the Pacific Northwest; African Americans, Asian immigrants, Chicanos, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans are fighting for health and safety, fishing rights, and protection of ecosystems in barrios, ghettos, forests, fields, and factories. Atomic and chemical workers, janitors, farm workers, public service employees, uranium miners, and transit workers are all demanding the right to know about dioxin, endocrine disruptors, pesticides, and lead poisoning in the places where they live, work, and play.

-- Carl Anthony, Urban Habitat Program

The Evolution and Structure of the Environmental Justice Movement

In reaction to the economic and ecological injustices accentuated by the rise of neo-liberalism and corporate-led globalization, as well as the neglect of the mainstream environmental movement, a deeper shade of green politics is evolving in the United States. In Latino and Asian-Pacific neighborhoods in the inner cities, small African American townships, depressed Native American reservations, Chicano farming communities, and white working-class districts all across the country, peoples traditionally relegated to the periphery of the ecology movement are challenging the wholesale depredation of their land, water, air, and community health by corporate polluters and indifferent governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations. At the forefront of this new wave of grassroots activism are hundreds of community-based environmental justice organizations working to reverse the disproportionate social and ecological hardships borne by people of color and poor working class families.

There have been three stages in the evolution of the U.S. environmental justice movement. The first stage began in the fall of 1982, when the state of North Carolina attempted to dump over 6,000 truckloads of PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls) in the mostly African-American and rural Warren County. More than 500 protesters were jailed over the siting of the landfill, marking the first time African Americans had mobilized from around the country to defend a local group opposing what they defined as environmental racism. Inspired by this struggle, numerous locally-based environmental justice organizations were created all over the country during the 1980s, although most remained isolated or loosely connected to one another.

The second stage in the movement's evolution began with the 1991 First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit, the single most important event in the movement's history. In addition to adopting the Principles of Environmental Justice [see resource box, Section IV of this report], the Summit led to a recognition of the need to build stronger institutional linkages between these local and sometimes isolated community-based groups.¹² As a result, a number of strategic regionally-based networks, as well as national constituency-based and issue-based networks for environmental justice, were created and consolidated during the 1990s. These regionally-based environmental justice networks include the Southern Organizing Committee (SOC), Southwest Network for Economic and Environmental Justice (SNEEJ), and the Northeast Environmental Justice Network (NEJN). The Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN); Indigenous Environmental Network (IEN), and the Farmworker Network for Economic and Environmental Justice (FWNEEJ) constitute the national constituency-based networks.

In the new century, the movement is now entering a third stage of development. As witnessed by the evolution of a number of new organizational entities, such as the Environmental Justice Fund; National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC); the National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit in 2002; the consolidation of the regional and national-constituency-based networks; and so forth, there is now developing a national, multi-racial environmental justice movement which is greater than the sum of its parts. A new infrastructure is emerging for building inter-group collaboration and coordinated programmatic initiatives which are taking the movement beyond the local level to have a broader policy impact at the state and national levels. The people of color-led environmental justice movement might have only been borne with the local Warren County fight in 1982, but it is beginning to come of age in the new millennium.

The ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FUND

was established in 1995, and is a collaboration of six regional and/or national environmental justice networks: the Asian Pacific Environmental Network; Farmworker Network for Economic and Environmental Justice; Indigenous Environmental Network; Northeast Environmental Justice Network; Southern Organizing Committee for Economic and Social Justice; and the Southwest Network for Environmental and Economic Justice. The Fund works toward the following goals: to provide a mechanism for the networks to engage in the development and allocation of resources necessary to further the goals of the movement; to promote ethical fundraising principles and strategies which benefit communities of color; and to provide a venue for strategic collaboration among the networks around other initiatives. The Fund has initiated the Strategic Assessment Project in coordination with the Environmental and Economic Justice Project (EEJP), whereby each network undertakes a self-assessment of its program and organization, as well as an assessment of the movement. In addition to pursuing workplace fundraising strategies as a supplemental means of financing the movement, the Fund also serves as the lead anchor organization for the *Second National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit*, or Summit II of Spring, 2002. For more information, contact:

Cynthia Choi, National Coordinator
Environmental Justice Fund
310 8th Street, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94607
Tel: (510) 267-1881

The diversity of people participating in these local, regional, and national organizations is matched by the diversity of political paths and approaches taken to achieving environmental justice. For the most part, activists in the environmental justice movement have emerged out of six other political movements to embrace the mantra of environmental protection and sustainability, and include: (1) the civil rights movement, particularly that component devoted to combating environmental racism; (2) the occupational health and safety movement, particularly that component devoted to protecting non-union immigrants and undocumented workers; (3) the indigenous land rights movement, particularly that component devoted to the cultural survival and sovereignty of Native peoples; (4) the public health and safety movement, particularly that component devoted to tackling issues of toxics and lead poisoning; (5) the solidarity movement, particularly those components working for human rights and the self-determination of Third World peoples in the age of globalization; and (6) the social and economic justice movement, particularly those components involved in multi-issue grassroots organizing in oppressed communities of color and poor working class neighborhoods all across the country.

Although the community-based organizations and regional/national networks for environmental justice established by these activists often bear the distinctive political imprints of the original movements from which they emerged, *all are united in the larger struggle* to link grassroots activism and participatory democracy to problem-solving around the issues of environmental abuse, racial oppression, poverty and social inequality, and political disempowerment.¹³ In this respect, there is occurring a steady and undeniable sublation of these various political heritages into a larger environmental justice body politics: whereby these differing elements are achieving a deeper appreciation and understanding of the other, and merging it with their own political consciousness and movement-building strategies. The movement is now greater than the sum of its parts.¹⁴

ENVIRONMENTAL & ECONOMIC JUSTICE PROJECT (EEJP)

is a national organization founded in 1993 which provides organizational training and support to local and regional environmental and economic justice groups around the country. EEJP's programs are designed to build organizational capacity at the local, regional, and national levels; to assist in the strategic development of environmental justice networks, and to encourage the creation of a strong international grassroots environmental justice movement. EEJP also facilitates an international collaboration of grassroots environmental and economic justice organizations in the U.S. and six Third World countries. Four convenings have been organized since 1996 to build relationships and foster discussions among the international participants on strategies and campaigns countering the negative impacts of globalization. EEJP has also organized two international activist exchanges (to Brazil & the Phillipines) to build understanding and strengthen opportunities for organizations to develop collaborative work. For more information, contact:

Anthony Thigpenn, Executive Director
Deepak Pateriya, Program Director
Environmental and Economic Justice Project
1715 West Florence Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90047
Tel (323) 789-7920

The SOUTHWEST ORGANIZING PROJECT (SWOP) was founded in 1979, and is a multi-racial, multi-issue, statewide, grassroots membership organization in New Mexico that addresses environmental contamination as part of a broad agenda for social, racial, and economic justice. SWOP focuses on increased citizen participation and building leadership skills so residents can participate in decision-making on issues affecting their lives, including racial and gender equality, environmental justice, community and worker protection. As seen in the Community Environmental Program and other organizing efforts, SWOP's priority is to ensure greater corporate accountability on environmental and labor issues, particularly as they relate to regional economic development. SWOP is also a leader in the environmental justice movement among grassroots groups which engage in cross-border organizing and exchanges. For more information, contact:

Jeanne Gauna or Michael Leon-Guerrero, Co-Directors
Southwest Organizing Project (SWOP)
211 1th St., SW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
Tel (505) 247-8832
www.swop.net

The SOUTHERN ORGANIZING COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL JUSTICE (SOC) was formed in the mid-1970s from roots in the civil rights and peace movements. SOC is currently playing a critical role in building new multi-racial/cultural and multi-state organizing efforts and alliances for environmental justice in the South. For instance, SOC stimulated a new level of networking activity by convening the Southern Community/ Labor conference for Environmental Justice in New Orleans of December 1992, which was attended by over 2,000 people (including 500 youth). SOC has continued to work on the Conference mandate for a campaign to develop state networks that will feed into a regional structure based on collective and democratic decision-making. For more information, contact:

Connie Tucker, Executive Director
P.O. Box 10518
Atlanta, GA 30310
Tel: (404) 755-2855
E-Mail: socejp@igc.apc.org

Fighting Environmental Racism: The Civil Rights Movement and Environmental Justice

The legacy of the civil rights movement is one of the most important foundations on which the modern environmental justice movement is predicated. While the quality of life for all U.S. citizens is compromised by a number of environmental and human health problems, not all segments of the citizenry are impacted equally. In contrast to white professionals, who can often buy themselves access to ecological amenities and a cleaner environment in non-industrial urban, suburban, and rural areas, people of color face a much greater exposure rate to toxic pollution and other environmental hazards. For communities of color, this takes the form of exposure to: (1) greater concentrations of polluting industrial facilities and power plants; (2) greater concentrations of hazardous waste sites and disposal/treatment facilities, including landfills, incinerators, and

trash transfer stations; and (3) lower rates of environmental enforcement and clean-up.¹⁵ Unequal exposure to environmental hazards is thus experienced by people of color in terms of where they “work, live, and play.”¹⁶

Hazardous waste sites nationwide are among the more concentrated environmental hazards confronting communities of color. According to a 1987 report by the United Church of Christ’s Commission on Racial Justice, three out of five African Americans and Latinos nationwide live in communities that have illegal or abandoned toxic dumps. Communities with one hazardous waste facility have twice the percentage of people of color as those with none, while the percentage triples in communities with two or most waste sites.¹⁷ A subsequent follow-up study conducted in 1994 has now found the risks for people of color to be even greater than in 1980, as they are 47 percent more likely than whites to live near these potentially health-threatening facilities.¹⁸ Federal governmental enforcement actions also appear to be uneven with regard to the class and racial composition of the impacted community. According to a 1992 nationwide study which appeared in the *National Law Journal*, Superfund toxic waste sites in communities of color are likely to be cleaned 12 to 42 percent *later* than sites in white communities. Communities of color also witness government penalties for violations of hazardous waste laws which are on average only one-sixth (\$55,318) of the average penalty in predominantly white communities (\$335,566). The study also concluded that it takes an average of 20 percent longer for the government to place toxic waste dumps in minority communities on the National Priorities List (NPL), or Superfund list, for cleanup than sites in white areas.¹⁹

PEOPLE ORGANIZED IN DEFENSE OF EARTH AND HER RESOURCES

(PODER) was founded in 1991 to represent the primarily lower-income African American and Latino residents of East Austin, Texas. Dedicated to facilitating broader community participation in corporate and governmental decision-making on issues of environmental quality and economic development, PODER has worked to successfully revise the city’s enterprise zone/tax abatement ordinance, relocate a gasoline storage tank facility, close a garbage truck facility, relocate the Robert Mueller Municipal Airport and a BFI recycling plant, close the Holy Street Power Plant, and develop comprehensive alternatives to discriminatory land-use and economic development policies. Most recently, PODER was successful in having the East Austin Overlay (EAO) amended to insure greater public participation by the community in commercial, industrial, and city land use planning, allowing residents to further eliminate hazardous sites in their neighborhoods. For more information, contact:

Susan Almanza, Director
55 N IH #205B
Austin, TX 78702
Tel: (512) 472-9921

Focusing on issues of environmental racism, this component of the environmental justice movement is committed to battling the disproportionate impacts of pollution in communities of color, the racial biases in government regulatory practices, and the glaring absence of affirmative action and sensitivity to racial issues in the established environmental advocacy organizations.²⁰ The issue of environmental racism has helped to link issues of civil rights, social justice, and environmental protection. In 1982, civil rights leaders joined ranks with local residents in opposing the establishment of a polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) disposal landfill in the

predominantly black and poor rural Warren County, North Carolina. The massive civil disobedience campaign led to more than 500 arrests and brought national media attention to the issue of ecological racism. This event signaled the launch of the environmental justice movement. In 1988, a Southern Environmental Assembly was held in coordination with the Super Tuesday primary elections. Dr. Benjamin Chavis, Jr., was joined by Joseph Lowery of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, among other civil rights leaders, in a series of 80 workshops over two days which joined community-based and national environmental groups to link environmental concerns with social justice ones. In 1992, the National Urban League's *State of Black America* included - for the first time in the seventeen years the report has been published -- a chapter on environmental threats to African Americans. The growing linkages between civil rights, racial justice, and environmental protection has also inspired investigations into the class, gender, and ethnic dimensions of disproportionate exposure to environmental hazards.

The LABOR OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM (LOHP) collaborates with other organizations to help local communities in the West that have been disproportionately affected by hazardous waste, air and water pollution, and toxic chemicals. LOHP works with community-based organizations and the environmental justice networks to develop health and safety training and other programs that link the workplace and community. For example, LOHP works with Laotian immigrants and the Asian Pacific Environmental Network and the Contra Costa County Health Department to educate community members and health care providers in Richmond, California (one the state's most polluted cities) about the dangers of hazardous materials. LOHP is part of the Center for Occupational and Environmental Health at the University of California at Berkeley's School of Public Health. For more information, contact:

Pam Tau Lee
Labor Occupational Health Program
University of California at Berkeley
2223 Fulton Street
Berkeley, CA 94720-5120
Tel: (510) 642-5507
ptlee@uclink4.berkeley.edu

Dying for a Living: The Occupational Health Movement and Environmental Justice

The environmental justice movement also emerges out of the long-time struggles for labor rights and better occupational health and safety conditions for vulnerable workers. Health and safety equipment and procedures are often seen by business as lowering labor productivity and cutting into profits. Spurred by governmental de-regulation and lack of enforcement, American corporations and government agencies are spending less on the prevention of health and safety problems that impact workers at the job site. There are now only 800 inspectors nationwide to cover the 110 million workers in 6.5 million workplaces. As a result, American workers are being exposed to greater hazards at the point of production. Some 16,000 workers are injured on the job *every day*, of which about 17 will die. Another 135 workers die *every day* from diseases caused by longer-term exposure to toxins in the workplace. In all, over 55,000 deaths and almost 6 million injuries occur each years as a result of dangerous working conditions.²¹

These types of occupational hazards are even more profound for workers lacking the minimal protections afforded by unions or formal rights of citizenship. The working and living conditions experienced by migrant farmworkers are especially dangerous. Not only are field and housing facilities frequently substandard and contribute to a high rate of disease, but farmworkers and their families are also heavily exposed to chemical poisons. Over 313,000 of the 2 million farmworkers in the United States – 90 percent of whom are people of color and undocumented immigrants – suffer from pesticide poisoning each year. Of these, between 800 and 1,000 die.²²

The plight of such vulnerable workers is spurring new coalitions between farm worker associations such as the United Farm Workers (UFW), immigrant rights groups, consumer and environmental organizations, labor, and the environmental justice movement. Recent examples include legislative right-to-know campaigns, farmworkers' struggles against pesticide abuses impacting workers in the field and nearby communities, and campaigns against the reproductive dangers of high-tech industry. At the national level, the constituency-based Farmworker Network for Economic and Environmental Justice (FWNEEJ) has taken the lead in linking labor rights issues with workplace and community hazards.

The FARMWORKER NETWORK FOR ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE (FWNEEJ) was created in 1993 by farmworker membership organizations from the U.S. and Caribbean with convening assistance from New World, Public Welfare, and the Funding Exchange. FNEEJ's primary goals are to: enlarge resources for directing organizing around pesticide hazards to farmworker families and their communities; promote exchange and mutual support among farmworker organizations on health and environmental issues; support the sustainability of agriculture; assure higher standards of safety and quality in agricultural products for consumers; and forge a common voice for farmworkers in the environmental justice movement and related policy debates over regulation, sustainable agriculture, and occupational health and safety. There have been a number of significant accomplishments. For instance, one FNEEJ membership organization -- the Farmworker Association of Florida (FWAF) -- has gained significant improvements in wages and working conditions for workers in over 40 Central Florida companies. FWAF has also secured passage of Florida's *Right-to-Know* law to protect farmworkers; filed successful complaints for violations and advocated for better government enforcement of pesticides, field sanitation, and other health and safety issues; conducted a study on the effects of pesticides on farmworkers; and continues to address injustices suffered by farmworkers in the workplace and community. Last year, the Farmworker Network undertook a national outreach program and held two convenings bringing together a wide range of local organizing projects. By-laws now require two board members from each affiliate, both of which must be top officers and one of which must be a woman. For more information on the FNEEJ and/or the FWAF, contact:

Tirso Moreno
815 South Park Avenue
Apopka, FL 32703
Tel: (407) 886-5151
www.farmworkers.org

In the United States, there are now a number of important organizations linking community-based environmental justice issues to worker health and safety, particularly around

issues of pesticides and farmworkers. *Centro Independiente de Trabajadores Agricolas* (Florida, NY); *Comité de Apoyo a los Trabajadores Agricolas* (Glassboro, NJ); the *Farmworker Association of Florida* (Apopka, FL); *Farmworker Institute for Education and Leadership Development* (Tuscon, AZ); *Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste* (Woodburn, OR); Border Agricultural Workers Project (El Paso, TX); *Unión Sin Fronteras* (Coachella, CA); and *Washington Farmworkers Union* (Granger, WA) are among dozens of farmworker organizations addressing the hazards posed by pesticides to human health and the environment. For instance, the *Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC)* has successfully worked to raise wages in the pickle industry by 100 percent between 1986-96; established protections for members from pesticide exposure beyond EPA minimum standards; eliminated the “independent contractor system;” and created the first workable mechanism Midwestern farmworkers have ever had to enforce pay, safety, working and housing regulations - a union contract – which is now overseen by the Dunlop Commission (an independent, private lab board chaired by former Labor Secretary, John Dunlop).

Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC)

For more information about the links between farmworker issues and environmental health, contact:

Baldemar Velasquez, President
 Farm Labor Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO
 1221 Broadway Street
 Toledo, OH 43609
 Tel: (419) 243-3456
info@floc.com

**Protecting Cultural and Biological Diversity:
 The Native Land Rights Movement and Environmental Justice**

The environmental justice movement also emerges out of struggles by Native Americans, Chicanos, African-Americans, and other marginalized indigenous communities to retain and protect their traditional lands. A key component of the corporate offensive against environmentalism involves efforts to contain and roll back policies establishing national parks, as well as protections for wilderness, forests, wild rivers, wetlands, and endangered species. The reason is that globalization is facilitating a much more aggressive and destructive scramble by American business for cheaper sources of renewable and nonrenewable natural resources. These include efforts to exploit the majestic old-growth forests in Alaska’s Tongass National Forest and ancient redwoods in the Pacific Northwest habitat of the endangered spotted owl; the rich deposits of low-sulfur coal that lie underneath the Black Mesa homelands of the Hopi and Navajo Indians in the Four Corners region of the American Southwest; the vast oil and natural gas reserves that lay in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska, and to open up more wetlands and fragile ecosystems to agricultural, commercial, and residential developers. Much of the land richest in natural resource wealth targeted for acquisition by business interests are home to indigenous

communities established long ago by Spanish and Mexican land grants in the 18th-19th centuries, or during Reconstruction following the Civil War, or by treaty with the U.S. government. The Native American land base alone amounts to 100 million acres, and is equivalent in size to all “wilderness lands” in the National Wilderness Preservation System. In fact, Native lands in the lower 48 states are larger than all of New England. The Navajo Reservation alone is five times the size of Connecticut, and twice the size of Maryland.²³ Two-thirds of the uranium and one-third of all low sulfur coal reserves lie on Native lands. Some fifty billion board feet of timber standing on

reservation forests is currently threatened by logging interests and hydro-electric dam projects. In an attempt to gain control over and exploit the low-cost resources on these lands, a nationwide corporate attack on Native Americans has been initiated, including calls for the termination of treaty rights.²⁴

Native lands and the tribes which depend upon them for survival have already suffered decades of abuse at the hands of indifferent government agencies and rapacious corporations, resulting in problems of severe poverty and ecological degradation. But in recent years new resource wars against indigenous communities have intensified in every corner of the country. Such schemes to exploit new resource reserves are motivated less by oil, coal, or timber shortages than by the desire of corporations to bring in lower cost oil, coal, timber, and other fuels and raw materials to more effectively compete in the world market. The result has been the growth in offshore drilling, mining, and destructive timber harvests with all attendant adverse social and environmental consequences, including the contamination of indigenous communities and their environment with toxic chemicals and radioactive waste produced by mining and industrial operations. There have been more than 100 separate proposals to dump toxic waste in Native communities over the last decade. Many communities are still demanding clean-up of old dump and Superfund sites. Decades of uranium mining is resulting in catastrophic

The INDIGENOUS ENVIRONMENTAL NETWORK:

To tackle the social and ecological crises confronting indigenous communities, the environmental justice movement is linking concerns for natural resource protection and sustainability with issues of land and sovereignty rights, cultural survival, racial and social justice, alternative economic development, and religious freedom. At the forefront of these struggles is the national constituency-based Indigenous Environmental Network (IEN). Formed in 1992, IEN is a resource network committed to building mutual support strategies by providing technical and organizational assistance to over 600 Native American organizations and activists across North America. Working primarily on reservation-based environmental issues, which include: forestry, nuclear weapons and waste, mining, toxic dumping, water quality and water rights, IEN is now moving to create regional inter-tribal networks that build the capacity of local organizations as well as the national structure. Its National Council and annual conference are in themselves important centers for collaboration, advocacy and consensus building among activists representing indigenous peoples from all over the world. For more information, contact:

Tom Goldtooth, National Coordinator
P.O. Box 485
Bemidji, MN 56601
Tel: (218) 751-4967
E-Mail: ien@igc.org
www.alphacdc.com/ien

death and disablement by environmentally-related disease in dozens of Native communities. Since the 1950s, uranium tailings and mining wastes have so contaminated the environment, for instance, that elevated rates of cancer, birth defects, and other health problems among the Navajo have resulted. According to the *First Nations Development Institute*, an organization working to foster sustainable projects which are consistent with the needs of the Native American communities and which build the organizational capacity of tribes, about 126 species of plants and animals are listed as threatened or endangered on Indian lands (tribal lands include 49 percent of all threatened or endangered fish, 26 percent of birds, and 22 percent of mammal species).

The RURAL COALITION is an alliance of over 90 culturally diverse community-based groups in the United States and Mexico who collaborate to advance social justice and sustainable development in rural areas. Since 1978, leaders of poor communities and communities of color – including farmworker groups, indigenous communities in the U.S. and Mexico, small farmers, and grassroots groups in impoverished areas of Appalachia and elsewhere – have banded together to confront structural injustices in policies, programs and delivery of government services; share skills, encouragement and strategies; seek and leverage resources to support their organizations and project work; make government entities more responsive; and support one another in local and global struggles. For more information, contact:

Rural Coalition/Coalición Rural
1411 K Street NW, Suite 901
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 628-7160
ruralco@ruralco.org

Poisoning for Profit: The Environmental Health Movement and Environmental Justice

The environmental health movement in general, and community-based anti-toxics organizations in particular, constitute another critical foundation from which the environmental justice movement has emerged. In thousands of communities across the United States, billions of gallons of highly toxic chemicals including mercury, dioxin, PCBs, arsenic, lead, and heavy metals such as chromium have been dumped in the midst of unsuspecting neighborhoods. These sites poison the land, contaminate drinking water, and potentially cause cancer, birth defects, nerve and liver damage, and other health effects. The worst of these are called National Priority List (NPL) or Superfund sites, named after the 1980 law to clean up the nation's most dangerous toxic dumps. In a 1991 study, the National Research Council found that there were over 41 million people who lived within four miles of at least one of the nation's over 1,500 dangerous Superfund waste sites.²⁵ It is estimated that groundwater contamination is a problem at over 85 percent of the nation's Superfund sites -- a particularly alarming statistic when we realize that over 50 percent of the American people rely upon groundwater sources for drinking. Although these dumps are the worst of the worst, it has been estimated that there are as many as 439,000 other illegal hazardous waste sites in the country.²⁶ Public health problems related to lead poisoning, pesticide abuse, dioxin and mercury contamination of the environment by municipal incinerators and power plants, and a host of other sources, are also critical.

The CENTER FOR HEALTH, ENVIRONMENT AND JUSTICE (CHEJ) was founded in 1981 as the Citizens Clearinghouse for Hazardous Waste (CCHW) by Lois Gibbs following the 1978-1980 struggle at Love Canal, New York, where 900 lower-income families fought for and won relocation after they discovered that their neighborhood was built next to a massive toxic waste dump. CHEJ has since worked with a network of over 8,000 local grassroots environmental groups on issues ranging from hazardous waste dumps, incinerators, pollution from chemical plants, radioactive waste, and recycling. CHEJ trains and assists local people to fight for justice, become empowered to protect their communities from environmental threats and build strong, locally controlled organizations. CHEJ connects these strong groups with each other to build a movement from the bottom up so that grassroots groups can collectively change the balance of power. This is accomplished by providing scientific and technical assistance; organizing and leadership training; and information services. CHEJ has also produced over 100 guidebooks and information packages, as well the quarterly magazine *Everyone's Backyard*, which includes a state-by-state chronicle of victories won by grassroots environmental justice organizations. For more information, contact:

Lois Marie Gibbs, Executive Director
Center for Health, Environment and Justice
150 S. Washington Street, Suite 300
P.O. Box 6806
Falls Church, VA 22040
Tel: (703) 237-2249
E-Mail: chej@chej.org

THE COMMUNITY COALITION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE (CCEJ) is a Seattle-based grassroots organization working on social, economic, and environmental health issues that disproportionately impact people of color, refugees, immigrants, indigenous, and low-income people. CCEJ works for environmental justice by serving as a catalyst for community organizing, political advocacy, activism and education in the Pacific Northwest. CCEJ has established a number of innovative efforts in recent years, including: CCEJ Environmental Justice Resource Center, which provides educational materials to the public; the South Seattle Toxics Project, which provides technical and fundraising assistance, training, and other services to residents; the Pass It On! Project, which is a collaboration between CCEJ, Seattle Public Utilities, and the Master Home Environmentalist Program aimed at alleviating indoor and outdoor air pollution and improving water quality for marginalized populations in the city; and the highly publicized *Stop the Burning! Campaign*, which successfully shut down a medical waste incinerator in Seattle. CCEJ is also the lead anchor group and member of the Ad-Hoc committee to establish the Northwest Network for Environmental & Economic Justice, which would bring together people of color and EJ activists in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. For more information, contact:

Yalonda Sinde, Director
Community Coalition for Environmental Justice
105 14th Avenue, Suite 2-c
Seattle, WA 98122
Tel: (206) 720-0285
E-Mail: yalondas@yahoo.com

COMMUNITIES FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT (CBE)

was formerly a white-led organization named Citizens for a Better Environment working on issues of toxics and environmental health in Los Angeles. Since the name change in 1996, CBE has worked with the Liberty Hill Foundation to become a statewide voice for environmental justice and health. Today, people of color comprise 60 percent of the staff, 80 percent of management and 70 percent of the board of directors (including members directly from organized communities). Through projects such as LA CAUSA (Los Angeles Comunidades Asambleadas Unidas para un Sostenible Ambiente), CEB is developing leadership and membership among grassroots activists throughout California, researching cumulative exposures to environmental hazards, educating healthcare providers on health risks, developing critiques of market incentive programs that may adversely affect communities of color, and developing pollution prevention projects. Successes include: the closing and cleanup of the La Montana recycling plant; the relocation of two others (including the installation of dust containment processes); EPA-enforced closing of the Maywood incinerator; and an investigation by the California Department of Toxic Substance Control that resulted in the closing of a hexavalent chrome-plating operation adjacent to the Suva Elementary School in Bell Gardens (the school was also decontaminated). For more information, contact:

Carlos Porras, Executive Director
5610 Pacific Blvd., Suite 203
Huntington Park, CA 90255
Tel (323) 826-9771
E-Mail: cporras@cbela.org
Web: <http://cbela.org>

Coupled with the assault on the regulatory capacities of the state, American business is now externalizing more costs and spending less on prevention of health and safety problems inside and outside of the factory, as well as on reducing pollution and the depletion of natural resources. According to EPA's Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) for 1998, some 23,000 industrial facilities reported releasing a total of 7.3 billion pounds of chemical pollutants into the nation's air, water, land, and underground. The vast majority of these pollutants – some 93.9 percent (or 6.9 billion pounds) – were released directly on-site, posing greater risks for nearby communities.²⁷

As is evident from the growing toxic waste problems, pollution, and other environmental costs, many neo-liberal policy initiatives directed at these current crises are actually intensifying problems they were designed to cure. Most environmental laws require business to *contain* pollution sources for proper treatment and disposal (in contrast to the previous practice of dumping onside or into nearby commons). Once the pollution is “trapped,” the manufacturing industry pays the state or a chemical waste management company for its treatment and disposal. The waste, now commodified, becomes mobile, crossing local, state, and even national borders in search of “efficient” (i.e., low-cost and politically feasible) areas for treatment, incineration, and/or disposal. Because these communities have less political power to defend themselves, possess lower property values, and are more hungry for jobs and tax generating businesses, more often than not, the waste sites and facilities are themselves hazardous and located in poor working class neighborhoods and communities of color.²⁸

As stated by one government report, billions of dollars are spent “to remove pollutants from the air and water only to dispose of such pollutants on the land, and in an environmentally unsound manner.”²⁹

Ever since Love Canal, thousands of local citizen organizations have been created to fight for the clean-up of toxic waste dumps, the regulation of pollutants from industrial facilities, the enforcement and improvement of federal and state environmental standards, and many other issues. Now emerging from a more diverse array of settings, including poor working class communities, with notably high numbers of women in key activist and leadership positions, these local organizations are increasingly making the links between issues of corporate power, governmental neglect, and citizen disenfranchisement. As a result, many of these organizations are working in close collaboration with (or evolving into) environmental justice organizations. At the national level, organizations such as the Center for Health, Environment and Justice (CHEJ) headed by Lois Gibbs (formerly the Citizen's Clearinghouse on Hazardous Waste) have taken a lead role in galvanizing the anti-toxics movement to address the issue of political-economic power, with most of their efforts concentrated in white working and middle-class communities. However, there are a number of prominent activists of color who emerged from the white-led anti-toxics and environmental health movements to take up leadership roles in the environmental justice community. Today, there are a great variety of multi-racial local and national organizations organizing people of color and/or lower-income communities around environmental health issues.

The ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH COALITION (EHC) was founded in 1980, and is a community-based organization in San Diego which combines grassroots organizing, advocacy, technical assistance, research, education and policy development in its work, helping community members develop solutions to environmental health problems. EHC's programs concentrate on problems of toxic contamination of local neighborhoods, the workplace, San Diego Bay, Tijuana, and the border region. EHC won a five-year battle with the San Diego Port District in July of 1997, ending the use of the toxic pesticide methyl bromide. A toxic pesticide which causes birth defects and other health problems, and is an ozone destroyer, methyl bromide had been used to fumigate imported produce unloaded at the Port. The practice posed significant health risks to nearby communities, including Barrio Logan, one of San Diego's poorest neighborhoods. Surrounded by more than 100 toxic polluting facilities, residents in Barrio Logan had experienced high rates of asthma, headaches, sore throats, rashes, damaged vision, and other health problems. This unprecedented local victory resulted in the first policy in the world to prohibit the common practice of using methyl bromide as a port fumigant. In fact, EHC was the only local environmental group to participate with national and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in 1997 during discussions on the Montreal Protocol, an international treaty regarding the phasing out of ozone-depleting chemicals. The EHC campaign has become a model which many other environmental health organizations are now using to pressure ports to reduce the use of dangerous pesticides. Since the victory, the Port District has committed \$20 million for the creation of an important wildlife refuge in the economically depressed South Bay, adopted a plan to reduce pesticide use at all of their facilities, and agreed to provide funding for comprehensive community planning and expansion of the redevelopment area in Barrio Logan. Because of EHC's efforts, Barrio Logan was recently chosen by a Federal-State Interagency Committee (which included EPA) as one of 15 national environmental justice pilot projects to address air pollution problems. EHC's Border Environmental Justice Campaign also works with groups on the U.S.-Mexican border. For more information, contact:

Diane Takvorian, Executive Director
Environmental Health Coalition (EHC)
1717 Kettner Blvd., Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel. (619) 235-0281

www.environmentalhealth.org

The Export of Ecological Hazards to Third World Dumping Grounds: The Solidarity Movement and Environmental Justice

The human rights and solidarity movements, including the South African anti-apartheid and anti-intervention in Central America struggles in the 1980s, among others, provide an important foundation for the emergence of the contemporary environmental justice movement. Solidarity movements in support of popular-based environmental organizations in the Third World are assuming an ever greater importance in the era of corporate-led globalization. The growing ability of multinational corporations and transnational financial institutions to dismantle unions, evade environmental safeguards, and weaken worker/community health and safety regulations in the United States is being achieved by crossing national boundaries into politically repressive and economically oppressive countries, such as in Mexico, Indonesia, Burma, Nigeria and Central America generally.³⁰ As a result, various nationalities and governments are increasingly pitted against one another as never before in a bid to attract capital investment, leading to one successful assault after another on labor and environmental regulations seen as damaging to profits. Aided by recent “free trade” initiatives such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and enforced by bodies such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), corporate-led globalization is leading to the export of more profitable yet more dangerous production processes and consumer goods, as well as waste disposal methods, to developing countries where environmental standards are lax, unions are weak, and worker health and safety issues ignored.³¹ In August of 2000, for instance, an international trade tribunal ruled that Mexico violated NAFTA by not allowing California-based Metalclad Corporation to open a 360,000 tons per year hazardous waste treatment and disposal site in San Luis Potosi, a state in central Mexico, because of public concerns over health and environmental damage. The Mexican government was ordered to pay \$16.7 million to the company.

CorpWatch was founded in 1996, and works to counter corporate-led globalization through education, networking and activism. Formerly known as, and now the public arm of the Transnational Resource and Action Center (TRAC), CorpWatch focuses on environmental justice, labor and human rights, and on democratic control over corporations. The multi-racial organization conducts broad public education activities including publications, workshops, media outreach, and an internet web site utilized by environmental justice advocates throughout the world. The site not only highlights Corpwatch’s overall work, but also has links to corporations and industries, research tools, publications, related web sites and government resources, as well as a section on how to research corporations. CorpWatch also coordinates a fax and cyber-based action alert on global environmental and social justice issues. CorpWatch is conducting two campaigns at present focusing on climate change and “climate justice” and on the United Nations and its recent steps toward collaboration with large corporations. For more information, contact:

Josh Karliner, Executive Director
CorpWatch
P.O. Box 29344
San Francisco, CA 94129
Tel: (415) 561-6567
www.corpwatch.org

The efforts of entities such as the Southwest Network for Environmental and Economic Justice (SNEEJ) has increased attention on the United States-Mexico border, where there are more than 2,000 factories or *maquiladoras*, many of them relocated U.S.-based multinational corporations. One study of the border town of Mexicali indicated that stiff environmental regulations in the United States and weaker ones in Mexico were either the main factor or a factor of importance in their decision to leave the United States.³² In fact, Lawrence Summers, Undersecretary of the Treasury of International Affairs and key economic policy-maker under the Clinton administration, is infamous for writing a December 12, 1991, memo as a chief economist at the World Bank that argued that “the economic logic behind dumping a load of toxic waste in the lowest wage country is impeccable,” and that the Bank should be “encouraging more migration of the dirty industries to the LDCs [less developed countries].”

Forging links with Third World popular movements combating such abuses is yet another profound challenge confronting the U.S. environmental justice movement. Given the repression faced by environmental activists in much of Mexico and the developing world, however, perhaps the most fundamental prerequisite in the quest for sustainable development is the struggle for human rights. Initially led by organizations such as the Environmental Project On Central America (EPOCA) and Third World Network in the 1980s, a host of environmental justice organizations in the U.S. and abroad are now focusing on the interconnections between corporate-led globalization and growing problems of poverty, human rights violations, environmental degradation, and the lack of democracy for poor Third World peoples.³³ For instance, the Sierra Club and Amnesty

THE SOUTHWEST NETWORK FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC JUSTICE (SNEEJ) is a regional, bi-national network founded in 1990 by representatives of 80 grassroots organizations based throughout the U.S. Southwest, California, and Northern Mexico. Composed primarily of people of color, SNEEJ provides networking, training, technical assistance and capacity building to local affiliates. The Network strives to strengthen low-income communities and organizations of color under stress from environmental degradation and economic injustice. Members of the network are among the pioneers of the environmental justice movement. One of the Network’s primary efforts include the Border Justice Campaign, which is developing a movement to hold industrial and government agencies accountable for environmental and social problems along the Mexico/U.S. border. Others include the Worker Justice Campaign, as well as efforts on EPA accountability, high-tech industry, sustainable communities and youth leadership, support for farmworker communities against pesticide abuses, and environmental support work on Native land issues. Each of these initiatives assist community-based organizations on both sides of the border to build collective understandings of and responses to the problems resulting from globalization. For instance, through the EPA Accountability Campaign in 1994, SNEEJ forced the EPA to subpoena the records of over 95 U.S. corporations operating in Mexico for their contamination of the New River. This was the first enforcement action that used NAFTA environmental ‘side bars’ and the Executive Order on Environmental Justice, and became one of the largest single enforcement actions ever taken by EPA. For more information, contact:

Richard Moore, Coordinator
SNEEJ
P.O. Box 7399
Albuquerque, NM 87194
Tel (505) 242-0416
Email: sneej@flashnet.org

International have combined to support the work of EarthRights International (ERI) and other organizations around human rights issues. Unless popular movements in the U.S. and the developing world can unify into a larger international movement for social and environmental justice, living standards and environmental quality throughout the world will continue to deteriorate. The environmental justice movement is proving crucial to these organizing efforts for “fair trade” and sustainable development, promoting strategies which emphasize grassroots mobilization, international solidarity with popular movements in the developing countries, and cross-movement alliance building.

EARTHRIGHTS INTERNATIONAL (ERI) was co-founded in 1995 by Ka Hsaw Wa, a recent recipient of the Goldman Prize, which is granted to individuals who assume great personal risks in promoting environmental protection efforts. ERI is leading a worldwide effort to create a new understanding that the abuse of human rights and the environment go hand-in-hand. Programs are designed to: investigate, monitor, and expose human rights and environmental abuses occurring in the name of development; to increase the accountability of governments, transnational corporations, and international financial institutions; protect individuals and communities at work defending the earth; and ensure biodiversity, conservation, and ecological integrity. ERI achieves these goals through grassroots organizing, education, and training; litigation; documentation and publications; advocacy at local, national, regional, and international venues; and media work. The EarthRights Resource Center, located in Washington, D.C., also provides information, legal assistance, and strategic advice to groups involved in joint human rights and environmental work. ERI is launching a new “International Right to Know” campaign, which would extend the existing reporting requirements of domestic environmental, occupational health and safety, labor rights legislation to U.S. corporate activities in other countries. The campaign is being built in coalition with the AFL-CIO, Sierra Club, Center for International Environmental Law, Friends of the Earth, Amnesty International, and other organizations For more information, contact:

EarthRights International
2012 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel (202) 466-5188
email: eri@jgc.org

Organizing for Social Change and Economic Reform: The Community Empowerment Movement and Environmental Justice

Finally, a significant element of environmental justice activism has evolved out of movements for social and economic justice, particularly in poorer communities of color. Emphasizing issues of affordable and safe housing, crime and police conduct (including racial profiling and police brutality), un/under-employment and a living wage, accessible public transportation, city services, redlining and discriminatory lending practices by banks, affordable daycare, deteriorating schools and inferior educational systems, job training and welfare reform,

The ASIAN PACIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL NETWORK (APEN) was formed in 1993 to encourage grassroots organizing and leadership development in Asian American and Pacific Islander communities around such problems as lead poisoning, industrial pollution, workplace safety, and community development. APEN has played a leading role in interjecting Asian Pacific perspectives on debates within the environmental movement relating to immigration rights and community empowerment; completed community-driven surveys on the consumption of contaminated seafood; organized healthy community garden projects; and organized the first ever West Contra County Environmental Health Festival, in which over 500 community members and 40 organizations participated. APEN also serves as a clearinghouse and resource for a variety of diverse Asian Pacific groups working on multi-issue projects in their own communities. Most recently, the Laotian Organizing Project (LOP) mobilized hundreds of high school students in Richmond, California to win approval for a pilot teacher-advisory program to strengthen counseling services and improve the school-based environment; while in Contra Costa County, APEN co-organized a campaign to secure resources for the implementation of a multi-lingual emergency warning system in case of a chemical accident at nearby industrial plants. For more information, contact:

Joselito Laudencia, Executive Director
Asian Pacific Environmental Network
310 - 8th Street, Suite 309
Oakland, CA 94607
Tel (510) 834-8920
E-Mail: apen@igc.apc.org

and a host of other issues, many of these organizations have expanded their political horizons to incorporate problems related to lead poisoning, abandoned toxic waste dumps, the lack of parks and green spaces, poor air quality, and other manifestations of environmental justice into their agenda for community empowerment. Although many organizations are not strictly self-defined as “environmental” per se, they may devote considerable attention to environmental issues in their own communities. In fact, in recent years some of the most impressive environmental victories at the local level have been achieved by multi-issue oriented economic justice organizations.

MINNESOTA ALLIANCE FOR A PROGRESSIVE ACTION (MAPA) is a multi-issue, multi-constituency, statewide coalition of 27 organizations concerned with economic, environmental and social justice. MAPA includes members focused on base-building, research, public education, policy development, lobbying and direct action, and provides popular education workshops for its members. MAPA is current working on comprehensive campaign reform and integrating current work with the immediate concerns of urban communities of color. For more information, contact:

David Mann, Executive Director
Minnesota Alliance for a Progressive Action
1821 University Avenue, Suite 307
St. Paul, MN 55104
Tel (651) 641-4050
www.mapa.org

A model example of this type community-based organization is Direct Action for Rights and Equality (DARE). DARE was established in 1986 to bring together low-income families in communities of color within Rhode Island to work for social, economic, and environmental justice. A multi-issue, multiracial dues-paying membership-based organization made up of 900 low-income families, members are organized into block clubs (similar to chapters), identify issues of common concern at regular organizational meetings, and develop a strategy to address the problem.

Since its establishment, DARE has successfully campaigned for the cleanup of over 100 polluted vacant lots and improved neighborhood playgrounds and parks throughout Providence. One of DARE's most significant victories was recently achieved when Rhode Island became the first state in the nation to guarantee health care coverage for day care providers. Through this agreement with DARE, Rhode Island has set a new standard for other states to follow and implement. DARE is beginning work on campaigns to win jobs and career training from local companies for young people and implementing further strategies to reduce pollution in low-income neighborhoods.

Also included in this corner of environmental justice activism are the contributions of social justice-oriented religious groups and alliances, particularly those located in disenfranchised communities of color. For instance, the Los Angeles Metropolitan Churches is a network of 40 African-American congregations in Los Angeles County. The Environmental Justice Project organizes these churches to facilitate environmental cleanup and other positive changes in South Central Los Angeles (www.lametro.org). In Minnesota, the St. Paul Ecumenical Alliance of Congregations (SPEAC) began faith-based organizing in 1990 through a wide variety of civic and religious-based institutions within St. Paul,

Minnesota's lowest-income census tracts. Today, SPEAC's nineteen congregations of color/low-income have strategically expanded their alliances at the neighborhood, metropolitan, and regional levels to impact St. Paul's core city issues of reclaiming metro-polluted land for living wage job creation, as well as related issues of regional tax base sharing and reinvestment, public finance reform, affordable home ownership, and fair welfare reform.

SOUTHERN ECHO is a statewide base-building organization in Mississippi which provides comprehensive training, educational, legal, and technical assistance to community-based organizations in African American communities throughout the South. Using an inter-generational model that stresses the active participation of young people, Echo helps local groups gain the information and tools necessary to influence political, economic, educational, and environmental policy, and to hold decision-makers accountable to the interests of the African-American community. The organization maintains an emphasis on sustaining and training leaders, and has held 38 residential training schools for almost 2000 participants. Southern Echo also brings a globalization perspective to the issues of welfare reform, environmental justice, economic development, and public education. The Environmental Democracy Project is a current effort which provides technical assistance and training to poor, rural Mississippi communities concerned about exposure to agricultural chemicals and other pollutants. For more information, contact:

Leroy Johnson, Director
Southern Echo
P.O. Box 10433
Jackson, MS 39289
Tel (601) 352-2750
www.southernecho@cwix.org

Working in close collaboration with aging inner ring suburban municipalities, SPEAC and the Interfaith Action (IA) of Minneapolis recently won a total of \$68 million dollars in state funds which is being utilized to turn polluted dirt into pay dirt, by redirecting funds from outer ring suburban development on agricultural land (“green fields”) into the reclamation of abandoned, polluted industrial land in the inner cities (“brown fields”). This funding, when fully spent and matched by private investment over the next six years, will yield about 2000 permanent, good wage industrial jobs which will be easily accessible to people who need them most, rather than promoting urban sprawl. This campaign has become a model for metropolitan stability throughout the country.

Conclusion: The Future of Green Politics

The U.S. environmental justice movement now confronts a historic task. As corporate-led globalization intensifies unsustainable resource use, human poverty, and environmental destruction across every corner of the planet, the need for a mass-based international movement committed to the principles of environmental justice is becoming more critical. Unfortunately, while the traditional environmental movement has played a crucially progressive role in stemming many of the worst threats posed to the health of the planet and its inhabitants, the movement is now proving itself increasingly incapable of instituting more sustainable and socially just models of development in the face of neo-liberalism and the restructuring of the world economy.

Green politics in the United States must be transformed, and the environmental justice movement is central to this process. Just as in the 1930s, when the labor movement was forced to change from craft to industrial unionism, so today does it appear to many that labor needs to transform itself from industrial unionism into an international conglomerate

WEST HARLEM ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION (WE ACT) was created in 1988 to educate and organize the predominantly African American and Latino communities of northern Manhattan in New York City on a broad range of environmental justice issues. These include the use of East, West, and Central Harlem and Washington heights as a dumping ground for noxious facilities and unwanted land uses, including two sewage treatment facilities, six of Manhattan’s eight diesel bus depots, and a marine garbage collection transfer station. Coupled with the air pollution supplied by three major highways, an Amtrack rail line, the NY/NJ Port Authority, and several major diesel truck routes, these facilities gave northern Manhattan an asthma mortality and morbidity rate that is up to five times greater than citywide averages. Through “The Clean Fuel - Clean Air - Good Health” campaign and other initiatives, these issues are now being addressed. For instance, in December of 1993, efforts to correct problems at the North River Sewage Treatment Plant resulted in settlement with the city for a \$1.1 million community environmental benefits fund and designation of WE ACT as a monitor of the city’s \$55-million consent agreement to fix the plant. WE ACT is a key anchor group in the **NORTHEAST ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE NETWORK (NEJN)**, which among other accomplishments, organized the first federal *Symposium on Health Research and Needs to Ensure Environmental Justice* in 1994. For more information on WE ACT and/or NEJN, contact:

Peggy Shepard, Executive Director
West Harlem Environmental Action
271 West 125th Street, Suite 211
New York, NY 10027
Tel (212) 961-1000
whea@igc.apc.org

union inclusive of women and all racial/ethnic peoples just to keep pace with the restructuring of the world economy. And just as in the 1960s, when the environmental movement changed from a narrowly based conservation/preservation movement to include white, middle class families, so today does it seem to many that it must evolve into a more broadly-based, multi-racial international environmental justice movement. Rather than existing as a collection of isolated organizations fighting defensive “not-in-my-backyard” battles (as important as they may be), the environmental justice movement must continue to evolve into a political force which challenges the systemic causes of social and ecological injustices as they exist “in everyone’s backyard.” We must have social and environmental justice throughout the United States and the rest of world in order to protect local initiatives and gains. To achieve this goal, the environmental justice movement must have the firm financial and broader institutional support of the foundation community.

ALTERNATIVES FOR COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT (ACE) is a multi-racial organization founded in 1993 working to promote initiatives that bring lasting environmental, economic, and public health benefits. Based in Roxbury, Massachusetts, a low-income community of color, ACE has developed a powerful bottom-up approach to environmental organizing and advocacy. ACE also brings professional legal and technical resources to enhance and complement existing neighborhood capacities. ACE actively builds multi-racial coalitions and serves as the primary resource for the environmental justice movement in Greater Boston and throughout New England. ACE has developed a number of initiatives, including youth education and leadership development in the form the Roxbury Environmental Empowerment Project (REEP). Serving as the catalyst for the creation of the Greater Boston Environmental Justice Network (GBEJN), Neighborhoods Against Urban Pollution (NAUP), and Clean Buses for Boston (CBB), ACE has successfully broken down traditional racial divides to work with a wide variety of community groups. ACE works with these partners not only to remedy past injustices or resist new ones, but also to create alternative paths towards sustainable and just communities. Among its many impressive victories, ACE successfully fought a proposed South Bay asphalt plant that many feared would worsen the air quality in an already congested neighborhood; prevented a New Hampshire company from locating a trash transfer station next to a nearby Superfund site blamed for making residents sick; worked with local business to replace toxic products with clean alternatives; and pressured the Metropolitan Boston Transit Authority to adopt a “no-idling” bus law and to replace aging, exhaust-spewing diesel buses with vehicles that run on cleaner fuels. For more information, contact:

Penn Loh, Executive Director
Alternatives for Community & Environment
2343 Washington Street, 2nd Floor
Roxbury, MA 02119
Tel: (617) 442-3342, ext.24.

The URBAN HABITAT PROGRAM was founded in 1989, after almost a decade with Earth Island Institute, became an independent project under the sponsorship of the Tides Center in 1998. UHP is dedicated to building multicultural urban environmental leadership for socially just, ecologically sustainable communities in the San Francisco Bay Area. UHP works with communities through collaborative projects, policy advocacy, and ecological education. UHP is now implementing a strategic plan that links all project work to a central strategy of rebuilding urban communities and stopping suburban sprawl. This work includes the: Metropolitan Regional Organizing for Justice and Sustainability Project; Transportation and Environmental Justice Project; Brownfields Leadership and Community Revitalization Project; Hunters Point Environmental Health Project; Parks and Open Space for All People; and the Leadership Development Program. UHP also co-publishes with California Legal Rural Assistance, *Race, Poverty, and the Environment*, a nationally-recognized journal which provides a voice to the environmental justice movement. For more information, contact:

Carl Anthony, Executive Director
The Urban Habitat Project
P.O. Box 29908, Presidio Station
San Francisco, CA 94129-9908
Tel: (415) 561-3333
E-Mail: uhp@igc.apc.org

Louisiana not only produces one-quarter of all the petrochemicals in the United States, but also disposes of roughly one-quarter of the nation's hazardous wastes. Due to poor environmental laws, the state's chemical plants, especially those located in poor African American communities in the corridor between New Orleans and Baton Rouge known as "Cancer Alley," release nearly ten times as much pollution per worker as such plants in New Jersey and California. A number of environmental justice organizations have emerged to combat the crisis in environmental health created by this pollution. **The LOUISIANA ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION NETWORK (LEAN)** is a statewide grassroots organization concerned about toxic pollution and its effect on the environment and human health. **The LOUISIANA LABOR-NEIGHBOR PROJECT**, established in 1991, grew out of a coalition of community, environmental and union activists formed during a worker lockout at the BASF Chemical Corporation plant in Geismer, Louisiana. Labor-Neighbor provides organizing and technical assistance to community, labor and church groups in the lower Mississippi River corridor. For more information, contact:

Marylee Orr, Executive Director
LEAN
P.O. Box 66323
Baton Rouge, LA 70895-6323
Tel: (225) 928-1315
E-Mail: lean007@aol.com

Dan Nicolai, Director
Louisiana Labor-Neighbor Project
2416 South Darla Avenue
Gonzales, LA 70737
Tel: (225) 647-5865
E-Mail: pacellnp@etel.net

SECTION II

NOT ENOUGH GREEN TO GO AROUND: PROMOTING GREATER FOUNDATION SUPPORT for the ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MOVEMENT

I am saddened by the lack of funding that goes to community, grassroots, and environmental justice groups with real constituents, to whom they are responsible, while the bulk of funding goes to the already wealthy membership organizations, who have no public accountability.

--- Steve Viederman, President (1987-2000)
Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation

Growing the Green: Financial Support for the Environmental Movement

Americans are a generous people when it comes to supporting charitable causes. According to *Giving USA 2000*, total philanthropic giving reached an estimated \$190.16 billion in 1999 [the latest year for which figures are available] -- an outstanding 9.2 percent increase over 1998 figures of \$174.52 billion. Individuals gave \$159.32 billion, and were the single largest source of total charitable giving (83.9 percent). As seen in Table I on the following page, environmental causes (including wildlife and habitat conservation) benefitted greatly from this generosity. Total giving to the environment reached an estimated \$5.83 billion in 1999 and constituted 3.1 percent of total charitable giving. Furthermore, with one exception (1989), environment and wildlife organizations have seen strong increases in the dollar amount of contributions each year over the past decade. For instance, contributions to the environment increased by 28.3 percent in 1998 to \$5.25 billion, and by 11.1 percent in 1999.³⁴

In the United States, foundations are the second largest source of financial support for all charitable causes, and now provide over ten percent of total giving, according to *Giving USA 2000*. The record-setting expansion of the U.S. economy and stock market boom over the last six years has contributed to unprecedented growth in foundation giving in all fields. According to Foundation Center data (as seen in Table 2), annual giving by all of the nation's nearly 47,000 grantmaking foundations grew from \$13.8 billion in 1996 to an estimated \$22.8 billion in 1999 -- a record-breaking increase of 65.2 percent (or \$9.0 billion) over the four year period. An accelerated growth in the establishment of new foundations has contributed greatly to these increases. Between 1980 and 1998, the number of active grantmaking foundations more than doubled from just over 22,000 to around 47,000. Among the 17,000+ largest active foundations, close to one-third (31.6 percent) were formed in the 1990s, far exceeding any prior decade. In fact, the current annual growth rate of new foundations is roughly double the growth rate of the early

1990s. These newly active foundations have contributed nearly \$700 million in giving and added \$10.4 billion to foundation endowments.³⁵

Table I: Total Giving to the Environmental Movement <i>(in billions of dollars)</i> Source: Giving USA 2000					
	1996	1997	1998	1999	Totals 1996-99
Total Charitable Giving (all causes)	\$138.55	\$153.77	\$174.52	\$190.16	\$657.0
Total Charitable Giving to the Environment	\$3.81 (+1.6%)	\$4.09 (+7.4%)	\$5.25 (+28.3%)	\$5.83 (+11.1%)	\$18.98 (+53.0%)
Environment as Percentage of Total Giving	2.7%	2.6%	3.0%	3.1 %	2.9%

The financial support offered by foundations has played a fundamental role in strengthening the environmental movement. Although there is no database which catalogues total foundation giving to environmental organizations, the Foundation Center has conducted samples of over 97,000 grants of \$10,000 or more as reported by 1,009 foundations (including 800 of the 1,000 largest by total giving) from 1994-98. These funders, while representing only 2.3 percent of the total active number of grantmaking institutions, awarded approximately half of all foundation grant dollars in 1998. According to the sample, the share of grant dollars targeting the environment (including animals and wildlife) grew to a record 5.6 percent in 1998, up from 5.2 percent in 1997 (compared to less than 4 percent in the early 1990s). Actual dollars grew by 30.3 percent, from roughly \$414.26 million to \$539.77 million during this same period, and set new records for shares of grant dollars and grants for the environment.³⁶

Utilizing the baseline percentages provided by the Foundation Center sample, we calculate that 5.4 percent (or \$745.20 million) of total foundation giving (\$13.8 billion) went to the environment in 1996. Utilizing averages from 1997 (5.2%) and 1998 (5.6%), as well as 1996, we conservatively estimate that 5.4 percent (or \$1.231 billion) of total foundation giving (\$22.8 billion) went to the environment in 1999.³⁷ Therefore, as seen in Table 2, we expect that total foundation giving to environment-related organizations increased a record-setting \$486 million dollars (or 65.2 percent) from 1996-99, and totaled \$3.898 billion over the four years.

Table 2: Foundation Giving to the Environment

(in millions of dollars)

Source: *Foundation Giving Trends: Update on Funding Priorities 2000*

(Foundation Center Sample of 1,009 Foundations, \$10,000+ Grants)**

	1996	1997	1998	1999	Totals 1996-99
FC Sample of Foundation Grants to all Causes (1009 Foundations)	\$7,279.16	\$7,944.66	\$9,711.40	N/A	N/A
FC Sample of Grants to the Environment (1009 Foundations)	\$393.68	\$414.26 (+\$20.58)	\$539.77 (+\$125.51)	N/A	N/A
Environment as % of all FC Sample Foundation Grants	5.4	5.2	5.6	5.4 (estimate)	5.4 (estimate)
Actual Total Foundation Grants to all Causes³⁸	\$13,800.0	\$16,000.00 (+ \$2,200.0) (+ 15.9%)	\$19,460.00 (+ \$3,460.0) (+21.7%)	\$22,800.00 (+\$3,340.0) (+17.2%)	\$72,060.00 (+ \$9,000.0) (+65.2%)
Estimate of Actual Foundation Grants to Environment (% Based on FC Sample)	\$745.20	\$832.00 (+ \$86.80) (+11.6%)	\$1,089.76 (+ \$257.76) (+30.9%)	\$1,231.20 (+ \$141.44) (+12.9)	\$3,898.16 (+ \$486.00) (+65.2%)

Not Enough Green to Go Around: The Lack of Foundation Support for the Environmental Justice Movement

In contrast to the traditional environmental movement, it appears as if foundations are not offering adequate support to the environmental justice movement. In fact, given the number of organizations and the size of the constituencies being served, our calculations would suggest that the environmental justice movement is perhaps the most underfunded social movement in the country today. Utilizing the 2000 edition of *FC Search 4.0: The Foundation Center's CD-ROM Database*, which contains records for over 215,000 recent grants of \$10,000 or more awarded by more than 1,000 of the largest foundations listed in the Grantmaker file, we analyzed the levels

Table 3: Foundation Giving to the Environmental Justice Movement

(in millions of dollars)

Source: *FC Search 4.0 Database*

(Foundation Center Data on 1000+ Foundations, \$10,000+ grants)

	1996	1997	1998	1999	Totals 1996-99
EGA Member Grants to the EJ Movement (FC Search 4.0 Sample)	\$12.476	\$19.836	\$16.375	\$1.720* \$16.229 (estimate)	\$50.407* \$64.915 (estimate)
Non-EGA Member Grants to the EJ Movement (FC Search 4.0 Sample)	\$2.062	\$4.853	\$5.228	\$.39* \$4.044 (avg. est.)	\$12.533* \$16.187 (estimate)
Total Foundation Grants to the EJ Movement (FC Search 4.0 Sample)	\$14.538	\$24.690	\$21.603	\$2.110* \$20.273 (avg. est.)	\$62.940 \$81.103 (estimate)
Percentage of all Environmental Grants Dedicated to Environmental Justice Movement (FC Search 4.0 Sample)	3.69 of \$393.68	5.96** of \$414.26	4.00 of \$539.77	4.00 (estimate based on 1998 avg.)	4.27 (estimate based on 1996-98 avg)
Estimate of Total Foundation Grants to Environment (See Table 2)	\$745.20	\$832.00	\$1,089.76	\$1,231.20	\$3,898.16 \$974.54 avg.
Estimate of Total Grants Dedicated to Environmental Justice Movement	\$27.498	\$49.587	\$43.590	\$49.248	\$169.923 \$42.481 avg.
Percentage of all Foundation Grants Dedicated to the Environmental Justice Movement	2/10 of 1% .00199 of \$13,800 mil	3/10 of 1% .00309 of \$16,000 mil.	2/10 of 1% .00223 of \$19,460 mil	2/10 of 1% .00216 of \$22,800 mil	2/10 of 1% .00236 of \$72,060 mil.

of foundation support for environmental justice organizations engaged in community organizing and advocacy between 1996-99. The list of these organizations was drawn from the *People of Color Environmental Groups 2000 Directory* produced by the Environmental Justice Research Center at Clark Atlanta University (available from the C.S. Mott Foundation).³⁹ As seen in Table 3, the FC database found only \$14.538 million in foundation support for the environmental justice movement in 1996, compared to \$24.690 in 1997, and \$21.603 in 1998. Well over four-fifths of the grant dollars were provided by Environmental Grantmakers Association (EGA) members (note: 1999 data marked * is incomplete; we also believe that 1997 figures marked** are elevated by a \$3.3 million Kellogg Foundation grant to Americans for Indian Opportunity).

When compared to the *2000 Foundation Giving Trends* report utilized in Table 2, we found that the actual levels of foundation support reported in the *FC Database Search* comprised only 3.69 percent (\$14.528 million) of the FC sample grants to the environment (\$393.68 million) in 1996. When applying this percentage (3.69%) to our estimate of \$745.2 million in total foundation grants to the environment, we calculated that only \$27.498 million in grants came to the environmental justice movement in 1996. Utilizing the same formula, we also estimate that foundation support for environmental justice rose to just over \$49 million in 1999.

Although increases in funding for the environmental justice movement have occurred since 1996, and should climb further in 2001-2002 with \$4 million in additional annual funding from the newly-created Ford Foundation environmental justice portfolio, foundation support for the movement remains insufficient. *On average, only two-tenths of one percent of all foundation grant dollars are dedicated to the environmental justice movement.* Much of the financial backing for the movement remains concentrated in a handful of [mostly] EGA foundations, including: Beldon; Bullitt; Charles Stewart Mott; Jessie Smith Noyes; Needmor; New World; Norman; Public Welfare; Solidago; Tides; Turner; and the Unitarian Universalist Veatch Program at Shelter Rock. Table 4 summarizes the funding provided to the environmental justice movement by these twelve foundations (utilizing annual reports or supplemental data provided by the funder). U.S. and foreign-based environmental justice organizations were included in the sample of grantees if: (1) the grantee was identified by the funder as environmental justice oriented; (2) the grantee identified a primary mission of the organization to be environmental justice; (3) the grantee was an environmental organization led by people of color; and/or (4) the primary constituency of the organization were low-income and/or people of color. Organizations created to provide major support services to the environmental justice movement were also included, such as the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University.⁴⁰

If our estimates are correct, then out of 47,000+ foundations in the United States, these twelve foundations alone provided \$34.858 million (20.5%) out of the estimated total of \$169.923 million in funding for the environmental justice movement between 1996-99. Of these, C.S. Mott, J.S. Noyes, Public Welfare, and Veatch were the larger contributors. Although figures are not available, interviews confirm that these twelve foundations are also the principal source of funding for the strategic regional/national networks, as well as many of the key anchor groups engaged in community organizing inside and outside of these networks. There are other foundations too numerous to mention which devote a significant portion of their grants to environmental justice, but are constrained by geographical limitations (for instance, the San

Francisco Foundation) or smaller portfolios (for instance, the Liberty Hill Foundation). It is clear that the overall funding base of the environmental justice movement is insufficient, and needs to be enhanced by creating a broader base of EGA and non-EGA member supporters. With a couple of exceptions, most of the current foundation backers are providing maximum levels of funding, and cannot be expected to increase current levels of support. The Ford Foundation initiative is important, but other grantmakers need to follow suit.

**Table 4: Sample of Top Foundation Supporters
of the Environmental Justice Movement**

(in millions of dollars)

Source: Foundation Annual Reports

	1996	1997	1998	1999	Totals
Beldon	\$.562	\$.380	\$.535	\$.360	\$ 1.837
Bullitt	\$.071	\$.146	\$.246	\$.055	\$.519
C.S. Mott	\$ 1.348	\$ 1.805	\$ 1.894	\$ 2.367	\$ 7.414
J.S. Noyes	\$.911	\$ 1.088	\$ 1.107	\$ 1.038	\$ 4.144
Needmor	\$.240	\$.270	\$.528	\$.535	\$ 1.573
New World	\$.180	\$.180 (est.)	\$.185	\$.160	\$.705
Norman	\$.205	\$.295	\$.405	\$.349	\$ 1.254
Public Welfare	\$ 1.535	\$ 1.595	\$ 2.085	\$ 1.768	\$ 6.983
Solidago	\$.052	\$.149	\$.440	\$.537	\$ 1.177
Tides	\$.007 (n/a)	\$.222	\$.123	\$.339	\$.690
Turner	\$.189	\$.315	\$.630	\$ 1.295	\$ 2.429
Veatch	\$ 1.820	\$ 1.780	\$ 1.720	\$.815	\$ 6.135
Total Funding	\$ 7.119	\$ 8.225	\$ 9.897	\$ 9.617	\$ 34.858

The lack of resources for organizations serving people of color and lower-income communities is particularly noticeable given the income levels of the traditional environmental

organizations. The National Wildlife Federation, for instance, had a total income from all sources of \$82.378 million in 1998, which was nearly \$39 million more than all estimated foundation grants combined provided to the entire environmental justice movement. In fact, just five environmental organizations – the Sierra Club, Natural Resources Defense Council, National Wildlife Federation, Environmental Defense Fund, and Wilderness Society – received over \$177.75 million in reported income in 1998. As reported by Mark Dowie in *Losing Ground: American Environmentalism at the Close of the Twentieth Century*, almost 70 percent of the total money raised for the environment was absorbed by twenty-four organizations that comprise the Washington-based mainstream sector of the movement in 1993. As Dowie concludes, “...American environmentalism is both defined and limited by the philanthropy that supports it.” In this case, the potential of the environmental justice movement to grow and prosper is being constrained by the lack of philanthropic support.⁴¹

Enlarging the Base of Foundation Support for the Environmental Justice Movement

Given the growing levels of collaboration between the strategic regional/national networks, the accelerated growth and development of both new and old community-based organizations, and the undertaking of comprehensive projects and new policy initiatives, the environmental justice movement needs additional resources.

Interviews with existing foundation and movement representatives reveal a widespread opinion that those organizations and networks engaged in base-building and community organizing are particularly underfunded. Foundations can help the movement continue to evolve into a higher stage of development by expanding the levels of support currently being offered.

There are many challenges confronting funders, however, who want to support the grassroots environmental justice movement. In contrast to the traditional national environmental organizations with centralized offices and designated fundraisers, community-based environmental justice groups are spread out and often difficult to find, and even harder to evaluate. Furthermore, because they are underfunded, these organizations often lack the resources and staff to engage in extensive outreach activities to the philanthropic community. As a result, they may have different structures, processes, and modes of interaction to which funders are not accustomed. Also, their multi-issue orientation may not fit nicely into more

ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT CENTER

is dedicated to improving the health of the natural environment and promote community sustainability through increasing the organizational effectiveness of regional, state and local organizations working on environmental issues. Since 1990, ESC has assisted more than 1,300 grassroots organizations. ESC's programs in Training and Organizational Assistance, Technology Resources, Workplace Solicitation, State Environmental Leadership and, most recently, the Environmental Loan Fund, help vital environmental justice organizations and other groups become better managed, funded and equipped. For more information, contact:

Jim Abernathy, Executive Director
4420 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 2
Washington, DC 20008-2301
Tel (202) 966-9834
www.envsc.org

narrowly prescribed program areas. We strongly recommend that funders contact members of this report's advisory board for input and advice regarding these issues [see advisory board, p.i.]. For funders with limited capacity and/or resources, we encourage the adoption of integrated funding strategies and regranting practices as a means for ensuring that resources reach these groups.

Integrated Funding Strategies

Community-based groups engaged in community organizing form the core of the environmental justice movement, yet they often have the most difficulty accessing funding from the environmental grantmaking community. Part of the problem is that many foundations underestimate the far-reaching implications that 'small' successes at the local level can have for the American environmental movement as a whole. Not only do local accomplishments provide important stepping stones to larger state and national level policy and legal victories; community-based organizing is essential to establishing more genuine forms of civic engagement and comprehensive approaches to environmental problem-solving. As stated by one foundation official, "*...it's dangerous when national policy discussions aren't informed by community voices ... even the most well intentioned person can get caught up in 'inside-the-beltway' thinking. I think national groups are important, but they don't always legitimately represent community interests.*" In short, community organizing is the best way to push through the systemic barriers that bar people of color and low-income families from participating fully in the democratic process.

Whenever possible, we recommend that funders support a variety of local, state, regional, national, and international organizations committed to tackling problems of social and environmental injustice. One approach to funding the movement involves a *horizontally integrated funding strategy* oriented to the principal of base-building, whereby grants are broadly and equitably dispersed among the community-based groups and the strategic networks engaged in organizing and policy work, as well as other [often collaborative] efforts. The advantage of this bottom-up approach is that it fosters parallel development and partnerships for base-building organizations at a variety of (local, state, regional, and national) levels. Solidago, Public Welfare, and the Beldon Fund, a leading funder of grassroots environmental groups, are among the foundations commonly employing this grantmaking technique.

Another technique involves the adoption of a *vertically integrated funding strategy*, whereby a grantmaker supports different types of organizations involved in research, legal and technical assistance, training, policy advocacy, as well as community organizing around issues of environmental injustice. Preferably, these different types of organizations are all working in collaboration with base-building organizations around commonly held goals. For instance, while the Strategic Progressive Information Network (SPIN) Project provides media training services, the DataCenter provides research help, and the Environmental Research Foundation provides technical assistance, all of them do so in a collaborative fashion which helps to build the capacity of community-based organizations. Important legal support is often provided by regional and national organizations such as: California Rural Legal Assistance; the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law; the Center for Constitutional Rights; the NAACP Legal Defense Fund;

Tulane Environmental Law Clinic; and the National Conference of Black Lawyers. By funding broadly and deeply, the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation and the Unitarian Universalist Veatch Program at Shelter Rock effectively combine this vertically integrated funding strategy with a horizontally integrated approach.

The *cluster funding strategy*, as utilized by, among others, the New World Foundation and French American Charitable Trust (FACT), is another funding technique. In this approach, organizations that have some relationship to one another, whether formal or informal, are grouped by the foundation into “clusters” and then funded. Clusters can be organized around particular environmental issues (ex: health impacts of toxic chemicals), geography (ex: southern California), constituency (ex: Native Americans), industry (ex: the high-tech industry), or linkages to other social movements (ex: environmental justice and labor, or Just Transition). Typically, this approach involves targeted funding of key *anchor groups* – organizations (usually base-building) that are recognized by their peers as playing a leadership role in a given cluster. As explained by Diana Cohn of the Solidago Foundation, “*we often fund either a strategic network or an anchor group, and then focus additional funding on the groups with which they work.*” The cluster approach typically encourages and supports the development of alliances that ultimately have far more impact than any single organization would typically have on its own.

Depending upon the circumstances of the foundation, any one of these funding strategies may be more easily employed (in isolation and/or combination) by grantmakers new to the environmental justice movement. Please contact advisory board members for further information.

The French American Charitable Trust

The French American Charitable Trust (FACT) was created in 1989 as a family foundation in 1980, and distributes \$3.5 million in grants each year to community-based non-profit groups in the United States and France. A distinguishing characteristic of FACT’s grantmaking philosophy is a commitment to funding base-building organizations working on issues of social, economic, and environmental justice. To achieve this mission, FACT has adopted geographic-oriented (South and California) and issue-oriented (environmental health and low-wage workers) cluster funding strategies in coordination with a vertically integrated approach to grantmaking. According to Christina Roessler, FACT’s Managing Director, “*while base-building organizations are the core component of our [FACT] funding strategy, we realize that many elements are needed to create a vibrant, dynamic mix of activity necessary to achieve progressive social change. For this reason, we do not limit ourselves exclusively to funding base-building organizations. We also fund groups that provide training, technical assistance, research, policy-development, media assistance, and legal assistance. The critical factor for us is that these groups must interact in a consistently collaborative way with base-building organizations.*” For an excellent discussion of these grantmaking concepts and strategies, see *FACT: Five Year Report 1995-1999*. To receive the report, contact:

FACT Services Co., Inc.
303 Sacramento Street, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Tel: (415) 288-1305
E-Mail: fact@factservices.org

Resources on Regranting Initiatives

Ann Bastian, Senior Program Officer
New World Foundation
666 West End Avenue
New York, NY 10025
Tel: (212) 497-3470

Karie Brown, Director of Programs
Tides Foundation
P.O. Box 29903
San Francisco, CA 94129-0903
Tel: (415) 561-6400
www.tides.org

Evelyn E. Garlington, Executive Director
Jack Beckford, Program Officer
The Fund for Southern Communities
4285 Memorial Drive, Suite G
Decatur, GA 30032
Tel: (404) 292-7600
E-Mail: Fund4South@mindspring.com
www.fex.org/south.south.html

Christopher Peters, Executive Director
Seventh Generation Fund for Indian
Development, Inc.
P.O. Box 4569
Arcata, CA 95518
Tel: (707) 825-7640
E-Mail: office@7genfund.org
www.7genfund.org

Lois Gibbs, Executive Director
Center for Health, Environment and Justice
150 South Washington Street, Suite 300
Falls Church, VA 22046
Tel: (703) 237-2249
E-Mail: CCHW@essential.org
www.essential.org/cchw

Regranting Initiatives

Community groups doing important work around issues of environmental justice are often too small to appear on the radar screens of most foundations. Even though these organizations are often very effective, they typically lack the capacity to effectively network with foundations at the national level. Funders can overcome this barrier by supporting regranting initiatives. By providing funds to regranting programs at other foundations or organizations which are more knowledgeable about the work of these local groups, foundations can easily and effectively support grassroots environmental justice work. As one funder noted, *"one way we deal with access problems is by providing grants to intermediaries who can re-grant to organizations the intermediaries relate to better."* Regranting is a particularly efficient means for investing in the groups that are just starting up, and are too small or culturally removed to have access to foundations.

A number of institutions specialize in regranting programs aimed at serving the environmental justice movement [see resource box on regranting]. For instance, individual donors and/or foundations wishing to support environmental justice-oriented philanthropy, or to design a donor-advised fund, may give to either the New World Foundation or Tides Foundation.

HONOR THE EARTH is a national foundation and advocacy organization dedicated to working with the philanthropic community to increase funding and support for grassroots Native communities working on environmental problems. Their mission is to increase funding and public support for the more than 200 Native groups in North America which are working to build sustainable communities (most often with little or no foundation support). Honor the Earth provides grants to those groups on the front lines of the Native environmental justice movement. Although small, these grants have high impact by building broader public support for indigenous environmental justice initiatives and helping to break the isolation and invisibility of Native communities. Honor the Earth has also launched strategic initiatives involving nuclear waste and Native lands, as well as buffalo protection and restoration. For more information, contact:

Winona LaDuke, Program Director
P.O. Box 75423
St. Paul, MN 55101
Tel: (612) 721-0916
E-Mail: honorearth@earthlink.net
Web: <http://www.honorearth.com>

The Fund for Southern Communities also provides funding, technical assistance and networking for environmental justice organizations and progressive community groups in North and South Carolina and Georgia. The Community Leadership Development Grant Program (the mini-grants program) at the Center for Health, Environment and Justice (CHEJ) fulfills an important need for leadership development, skills training, and coalition building in the grassroots environmental health and justice movement. The report *An Assessment of the Community Leadership Development Grant Program* is available from CHEJ upon request. The Seventh Generation Fund of Arcata, California, also provides grants, technical assistance, leadership training, and administrative support to Native American groups working to preserve the land, maintain healthy communities, and engage in sustainable practices. In addition to Seventh Generation, Honor the Earth provides grants to those groups on the front lines of the Native environmental justice movement. Although small, these grants have high impact by building broader public support for indigenous environmental justice initiatives and helping to break the isolation and invisibility of Native communities [see resource box].

The DATA CENTER is a public interest research center that provides research and information services to community-based organizations working for social, environmental and economic justice. For more information, contact:

Fred Goff, President
1904 Franklin Street, Suite 900
Oakland, CA 94612-2912
Tel: (510) 835-4692
E-Mail: datacenter@datacenter.org
web: <http://www.igc.org/datacenter>

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- (7) The philanthropic community in general, and environmental grantmakers in particular, need to increase their level of funding to the environmental justice movement. A small number of foundations are bearing a disproportionate share of the burden, and cannot be expected to deepen their current commitments. Therefore, it is critical that new funders step forward to assume an increased share of the responsibility.
- (8) New foundation supporters should specifically target local organizations, strategic regional networks, and national constituency-based networks engaged in base-building activities and community organizing around issues of environmental justice. These organizations are the foundation for the continued growth and success of the movement, yet are typically the most underfunded.
- (9) Grantmakers should consider the employment of *integrated funding strategies* as a means for ensuring that adequate resources reach these base-building groups in the environmental justice movement. These methods include:
 - (1) *Horizontally Integrated Funding Strategies* which aim to evenly disperse grants among key community organizations and the strategic networks engaged in base-building work;
 - (2) *Vertically Integrated Funding Strategies* which aim to fund different types of organizations involved in research, legal and technical assistance, training, policy advocacy, as well as community organizing around issues of environmental justice. Preferably, these different layers of organizations are all working in collaboration with base-building organizations around commonly held goals;
 - (3) *Cluster Funding Strategies* which aim to identify and fund groups of organizations that share a common issue, geographic location, constituency, industry focus, and/or linkage to other social movements. Typically, this approach involves funding *anchor groups* which are engaged in base-building work and are recognized by their peers as playing a leadership role.
- (10) Foundations can overcome limitations to funding smaller, community-based environmental justice organizations by supporting *regranting initiatives*. A number of foundations and organizations provide regranting services to both individual donors and/or other foundations, and should be better utilized by environmental funders in support of environmental justice.

SECTION III

GREENER GIVING: ADOPTING EXEMPLARY GRANTMAKING PRACTICES IN SUPPORT OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

As a foundation, we are trying to support organizations that are looking to transform the existing power structure.....in facilitating more democratic participation by the public in decision-making. We feel that people of color and the poor, as represented by the environmental justice movement, have been left out those processes.

Christina Roessler, Managing Director
French American Charitable Trust (FACT)

Exemplary Grantmaking Practices in Support of Environmental Justice

In order for the U.S. ecology movement to become more broadly-based and politically effective, philanthropy must be reinvented. Many foundations are beginning to respond to this challenge, placing a growing emphasis on what is termed *civil investing*.⁴² In contrast to traditional grant-making functions, whereby foundations decide what the community needs and then create/select organizations to provide and/or advocate for these “needed” services, civil investing emphasizes popular organizing and democratic base-building as a means for increasing civic participation in community and national affairs. Civil investing creates an infrastructure for activism by catalyzing philanthropic resources in support community organizing efforts which mobilize a broad-base of citizens to be directly involved in the identification of social and environmental problems and the implementation of potential solutions – to create an *active environmental citizenship* committed to the principles of *ecological democracy* .

Civil investing strategies thus subordinate advocacy and litigation strategies to genuine community organizing and democratic base-building. Too often traditional advocacy involves a process whereby organizations speak and act *on behalf* of communities -- particularly lower-income and/or communities of color – without being *grounded in* these communities. In contrast, civil investing aims to assist the efforts of the environmental justice movement to organize community members to *speak and act for themselves*, as popularly stated by the late Dana Alston of the Public Welfare Foundation.⁴³ This approach facilitates advocacy and litigation strategies grounded in community organizing efforts that flow ‘from the bottom up,’ rather than being imposed from ‘the top down.’ As stated by social scientist Mark Gerzon, “...*strengthening the capacity of communities for self-governance – that is, making the crucial choices and decisions that affect their lives – is the most critical task of philanthropy in rebuilding civil society.*”⁴⁴ Civil investing promotes movement-building strategies which thus aim to eradicate the causes of social and environmental justice as grounded in larger political-economic power relations, rather than

merely providing stop-gap solutions which treat the symptoms but not the cause.

So, what does it mean to practice *civil investing*? A foundation's decision to embrace principles of civil investing involves more than the adoption of horizontally/ vertically integrated and/or cluster funding strategies [as described in Section II) aimed at grassroots level citizen-led environmental groups, such as those of the environmental justice movement. It also involves adopting exemplary grantmaking practices which serve to enhance the capacity of individual grantees to build social capital in their own communities. The key ingredients to democratic renewal and a vibrant environmental citizenry are strong voices located in thousands of local organizations which serve as an expression of the collective desire for clean air and water, safe food and workplaces, protected natural habitats and parklands, and a seat at the decision-making table. These voices can only be raised to the proper level of amplification if funders are dedicated to not only providing additional funding, but to also providing this funding in the most appropriate manner.

The environmental justice movement is engaged in the types of base-building and grassroots organizing, including the engagement of new constituencies of traditionally marginalized people, necessary to foster meaningful social change. In the course of conducting interviews with current funders and movement representatives, there was general agreement that in order to best provide the flexibility and autonomy necessary for the environmental justice movement to achieve this result, foundations should embrace a specific set of exemplary grantmaking practices. These practices include: (1) an emphasis in general support over programmatic specific funding; (2) the utilization of evaluative criteria which is considerate of the special difficulties faced by grantees engaged in grassroots organizing around environmental justice; and (3) placing greater emphasis on multi-year funding commitments over an annual application process. We recommend that any new potential funders of the environmental justice movement embrace these grantmaking practices whenever possible.

Providing General Support Over Project-Specific Funding

Foundations should prioritize the provision of general support grants over project-specific grantmaking practices when funding the environmental justice movement. General support grants afford grantees greater autonomy and flexibility to meet both organizational and community needs, and to pursue a larger strategic vision which is self-determined. Civil investing, first and foremost, is about empowering the constituencies of community groups and grassroots movements to decide for themselves their organizational needs and political strategies. However, the reluctance of many foundations to provide general support is one mechanism by which funders indirectly determine and control the policies and priorities of environmental organizations, a responsibility properly belonging to the latter's boards, staff, and membership.⁴⁵ Program-specific or special project funding can result in a tendency for grantmakers to define the problems, find experts who have solutions, and then offer grants to the community that accepts both. This does not promote community self-determination.⁴⁶ As stated by researcher Ira Silver, "*the problem with [traditional] philanthropy is that too often foundations set the issues for the community, rather than taking the issues from the community.*"⁴⁷ In other words, foundations want

to “build community,” yet they often act as if they know what is best for communities.

The importance of providing general support grants as a means for insuring strong, independent organizations was unanimously endorsed by all the movement representatives and current funders we interviewed. General support grants are superior in that they give grantees greater flexibility to pay for general operating expenses, such as salary and equipment purchases, as well as specific projects. As Jane McAlevey, a former Program Officer with the Unitarian Universalist Veatch Program at Shelter Rock explains, “*it became clear to me that general support grants were crucial in providing resources necessary for organizations in the environmental justice movement to learn better fundraising practices, bring on needed administrative staff, and keep the organization functioning on a day-to-day basis.*” Even the best-planned project is not likely to be successful if the organization carrying out the project is understaffed, undertrained, and underequipped.

Project-specific grants can also serve to divert a group's energies away from its central mission. As Karie Brown of the Tides Foundation explained to us, “*...the problem is that a lot of these non-profits are driven by getting their project based grants rather than their own strategic vision of where they need to go.*” In contrast, general support grants not only allow grantees to grow into fully functioning organizations but also give them the flexibility to engage in base-building activities which garner greater community support, respond more efficiently to community demands (particularly during emergencies and other unforeseen events), and establish decision-making processes that empower group and community members. General support grants also better allow organizations to develop long-term strategies that go beyond reactive, tactical responses to problems. As environmental researcher Giovana Di Chiro has stated, “*as grassroots activists working in direct response to threats of pollution, resource exploitation, and land-use decisions in their communities, they realize that the decision-making process itself is a primary issue in the debate over environmental problems. They reject the top-down approach as disempowering, paternalistic, and exclusive and instead are committed to developing a more democratic, local, and regionally based, decentralized organizational culture.*”⁴⁸ This work of base-building and developing more integrated, multi-issue approaches to tackling problems does not often fit into the confines of project-specific funding.

Technical Assistance Grants

Technical assistance grants are an additional way in which funders can help build the capacity of their grantees. Technical assistance can assume a number of forms, including the provision of mini-grants for such needs as leadership development, training programs, long-range planning, organizational evaluation, legal issues, technological enhancement, fundraising, conferences, and networking opportunities. Technical assistance grants in these forms can be particularly empowering in providing the services needed by newly emerging environmental justice groups which have underdeveloped fundraising and technological capacities. We recommend that funders establish mechanisms by which technical assistance in a variety of forms could be provided in order to meet special needs self-determined by the grantees.

Environmental grantmakers focused on the environmental justice movement should also exercise extreme caution when offering strategic suggestions to environmental justice organizations. All foundation and environmental justice representatives interviewed for the report indicated to us that funder initiated projects can be harmful to the organizational and political autonomy of the movement. As noted in a recent National Network of Grantmakers (NNG) report, *"there is a fine line between grantmakers sharing information and interfering....Funders need to exercise caution around their decision to show leadership and chart new ground. A good funding initiative that includes the recipient community in its planning is different from controlling or setting the agenda, but it is easy to overstep this area."*⁴⁹

In certain instances, experienced funders may be in a position to identify critical vacuums in the infrastructure of the environmental justice movement. The unique vantage point of funders afforded by their tremendous access to information regarding the movement often puts them in a position to recognize the need for a special project strategy. However, the identification of these vacuums must occur through a highly collaborative process involving extensive discussions and analysis with grantees. Any special project must have a buy-in from environmental justice groups in the field. Successful examples of genuine collaborations that have resulted in the creation of special projects that serve to enhance the capacity of the environmental justice include: the SPIN Project, a media training and assistance organization; the Progressive Technology Project (PTP), which is a regranteeing program to further the strategic uses of technology in base-building organizations; and the Strategic Training and Education for Power Project (STEPP), which is an intensive training program that helps base-building organizations increase their internal capacity for leadership and strategic program development. Foundations which have participated in the creation of these special projects include the French American Charitable Trust, the Unitarian Universalist Veatch Program at Shelter Rock, the New World Foundation, Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation, the McKay Foundation, and Albert A. List Foundation.⁵⁰

THE STRATEGIC TRAININGS AND EDUCATION FOR POWER

(STEP)PROJECT is an intensive training program that helps base-building organizations increase their internal capacity for leadership and strategic program development. This project developed out of the Action for Grassroots Empowerment & Neighborhood Development Alternatives (AGENDA), the Environmental and Economic Justice Project (EEJP), and the Grassroots Policy Project. Many grassroots organizations have difficulties associated with building and sustaining a base over time, building the leadership capacities of organizational members, moving from reactive to proactive strategies, and creating strategic links among their programs. STEPP helps groups to address these issues and to better integrate their programs and campaigns into a strategic approach that has internal consistency and that furthers their long-term goals for social change. For more information, contact:

Deepak Pateriya, EEJP
1715 West Florence
Los Angeles, CA 90047
Tel: (323) 789-7920

***The STRATEGIC PRESS
INFORMATION NETWORK (SPIN)***

PROJECT was created in 1997, and provides critically needed media assistance to a broad range of social policy, advocacy, and grassroots organizations working on human rights, social justice and the environment. As witnessed by the *Environmental Justice Media Training Initiative*, the Project offers considerable public relations consulting, comprehensive media training and media planning and strategic assistance to a wide variety of local, regional, and national environmental justice organizations looking to develop a more comprehensive and professional media communications capacity. Over the last four years, representatives of organizations such as: the Asian Pacific Environmental Network; Center for Health, Environment and Justice; Communities for a Better Environment; Environmental Health Coalition; Environmental Justice Fund; Indigenous Environmental Network; Louisiana Environmental Action Network; People United for a Better Oakland; Southwest Network for Environmental and Economic Justice; and Youth Action have benefitted from the more advanced media trainings provided at the SPIN Academy. The Project is now looking to expand the *Initiative* and a range of other media support work on behalf of the environmental justice movement. For more information, contact:

Holy Minch

SPIN Project - Independent Media Institute

77 Federal Street, 2nd Floor

San Francisco, CA 94107

Tel: (415) 284-1414

E-Mail: infor@spinproject.org

Offering general support to an organization, therefore, should not necessarily preclude foundations from collaborating with the grantee as a partner on special projects in other areas, as long as the necessary precautions are followed. The movement leaders interviewed for this study indicated that foundations do need to seek out and offer feedback on grantee plans and approaches. This information can be valuable for both grantmakers and movement leaders in crafting a funding strategy. Foundations should be flexible enough so that grantees may propose new initiatives which are collaborative in nature. Foundations can also play a supportive role in movement building and strategy-making, as long as the grantee can set the agenda without fear of reprisal. One funder tried to clarify the situation. He noted that if a group asked the foundation for advice on how to proceed in a certain arena, then it would be appropriate for the foundation to offer advice on the group's strategy, goal development, networking possibilities, etc. But he warns that "*I don't think it's our role to go in and organize them. I do think it is appropriate to say, 'look we have been funding you for a while and it is our observation that you haven't gotten past this point (etc) ... and if you think it makes sense we will give you money to help figure that out.'*" But I don't think it is appropriate for us to go in and say 'look if you had a media plan (for instance) that would be the difference'." Environmental funders must always respect the role of grantees in determining the course of the movement.

Utilizing Criteria Supportive of Community Organizing When Evaluating the Effectiveness of Grantees

Grantmakers should also adopt flexible criteria which take into strong consideration the importance of base-building and community organizing (as well as advocacy, legal, and educational work) when selecting potential grantees and evaluating their effectiveness.

Over the past two decades, the environmental justice movement has achieved a number of impressive accomplishments. In low-income towns and communities of color throughout the country, hazardous waste sites are now being cleaned up, brownfields are being re-developed, incinerators are being shut down, parks and conservation areas are being established, local pollution threats are being eliminated, cleaner and more accessible means of public transportation are being adopted, and unique habitats and wildlands are being protected. At the national level, the creation of the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC) and passage of Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations," have significantly improved the performance of the EPA with regard to policy design, implementation, and enforcement at the Federal level.

Resource Guide on Exemplary Grantmaking Practices

For a comprehensive resource guide
on exemplary grantmaking practices, see:

Ellen Furnari, Carol Mollner, Teresa Odendahl,
and Aileen Shaw, *Exemplary Grantmaking
Practices: Manual*, a report by the National
Network of Grantmakers, 1997, pp.1-74.

Available from:
The National Network of Grantmakers
1717 Kettner Blvd., Suite 110
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel: (619) 231-1348
E-Mail: nng@nng.org

Despite these achievements, however, much of the movement remains in its infancy. Understaffed and underfunded, many community-based organizations are struggling to educate and mobilize their memberships and larger constituencies around issues of environmental injustice. One of the easiest ways for a foundation to thwart the movement's very large task of democratic base-building is to define success too narrowly. A set of funding criteria that is overly reliant on short-term measurable programmatic outcomes can be particularly insensitive to the challenges confronting environmental justice groups engaged in the longer-term work of community organizing and comprehensive policy reform. As stated by Cynthia Choi of the Environmental Justice Fund, "*grassroots organizations prefer multi-*

year general support. It is very difficult to plan campaigns, initiatives and to impact an issue on a year to year basis. However, some foundations don't share that perspective and don't readily provide support for strategic planning, evaluation, and capacity-building work. They want to see x number of people being served, concrete measurable objectives. And alot of what this movement is about is very slow ... its about human and infrastructure development. We're not typically going to see dramatic change within a one-year grant. There is going to be alot of work fraught with both progress and set-backs. And that is inherent in constituency base-building."

Rather than focusing on immediate policy successes, current and potential grantmakers should base their evaluations on much longer time spans. Many funders and movement leaders we interviewed indicated the importance of foundations being patient. One funder cautions that *"the biggest mistake is getting impatient for results. There is real conflict between building a movement and the short-term ego needs of a foundation program officer. There is a temptation to focus on having something glitzy to say, 'Look what my group did.' That's not the most important measure of the work ."* More often than not it takes grassroots organizations a lengthy period to accomplish true base-building goals. As stated by Diana Cohn of the Solidago Foundation, another long-time funder of the movement, *"...it can take many years to build an organization with enough power to participate in the many levels of decision-making that affect environmental quality."* The importance of patience, as explained by Vic De Luca, President of the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation, is that *"funders need to have some sense that they have to be in this for the long haul. That is...base-building requires that you have to build from the bottom up. You have to give people the opportunity to become leaders, and to develop their organizations and strategies. Problems of environmental injustice have been with us for decades, so it is unreasonable to assume that 3-5 years of funding will resolve these issues."*

As a complement to adopting standards appreciative of longer-term outcomes, we recommend that funders also view organizational structure and process as equally important criteria for evaluating grantees. As stated by Marjorie Fine, Executive Director of the Unitarian Universalist Veatch Program at Shelter Rock, *"...the biggest challenge with grassroots grantmaking is appreciating the process of the groups. For instance, people of color groups have spent considerable energy working on 'internal practices,' ... ranging from developing a membership base to sorting out issues of race, class, and gender within organizational networks. This takes time, but, ... its' the only way to bring about widespread social and structural change."* As a result of this approach, Veatch considers questions of membership, leadership and governance, strategy, and impact when evaluating existing or potential grantees engaged in grassroots organizing (see *Veatch Checklist* box on the next page). The other funders of the movement that we interviewed concur, emphasizing that foundations should be looking at a group's organizational structure, decision-making processes, strategic vision, accountability to membership and community constituents, and leadership development.

Discretionary Grants

Often the issues addressed by grassroots level groups do not fit foundation funding time-lines. By being restricted to an annual grantmaking process foundations can have difficulty responding to grantee needs that come up during the year. Unforeseen issues or crises develop which demand a grantee group's immediate attention. Foundations can assist groups in responding to these unexpected events by supplementing general support grants with discretionary grants that can be put aside for emergency situations. By setting up a large discretionary pool, when a crisis occurs or window of opportunity is opened for a grantee, the foundation can move. This pool of money can lead to very positive results. A group can call a foundation and the foundation can quickly make a decision to grant them the money. These funds should be made available through a brief application procedure, such as a simple letter of application, so that disbursement is fast.

Veatch Program Checklist for Evaluating Environmental Justice Organizations

What is Meant by “Grassroots Community Organizing for Environmental Justice”

- Mobilizing large numbers of traditionally marginalized people in one geographic location;
- Members are actively engaged in the work of the organization beyond donating money;
- The organization is democratic, with a leadership and staff who are accountable to the membership and larger community;
- Principal Objectives:
 - ** To develop the capacity of community members to effectively participate in public life;
 - ** Deliver concrete victories on issues of direct concern to its constituency;
 - ** Affect institutions, public policies and power relationships in a way that advance environmental, social, and economic justice.

Membership

- Does the organization have a membership and constituency base?
- Is there an effective membership recruitment and retention plan? Is it central to the group?
- Does the membership reflect the diversity of the community?
- Is there active participation in the group by people of color and women?
- Are race & gender addressed in the education and leadership development work of the group?

Leadership & Governance

- Is the organization democratic? Specifically, does the membership have some direct control over the decision-making process of the organization? Programmatic policies? The budget? Staffing?
- Are members and leaders involved in all levels of the organization, including issue campaigns, membership recruitment, fundraising, and financial oversight?
- Is the leadership elected? Is it actively changing every few years? Is authority delegated adequately? Are there multi-layered levels of leadership in the organization? Does leadership emerge from the community?
- Are people of color and women part of the decision-making and leadership bodies?
- Does the organization have an identifiable process for leadership development?
- If the organization is staffed, are professional community organizers included in the staffing structure? Are they trained and regularly provided additional training opportunities?

Strategy

- Does the organizational mission identify environmental and social justice as part of its work?
- Does the organization regularly assess the political terrain and devise short- and long-term strategies to address their concerns? Does the group work collaboratively in coalitions?
- Does the organization systematically educate its constituency, members, leadership, and staff?
- Does the organization have a strategic plan to make them viable and sustainable for the long haul?
- Is the organization developing its own culture, social relationships and celebrations?

Impact

- Is the organization developing creative solutions to difficult community problems?
- Does the organization have a record of and/or the capacity of delivering victories?
- Is the organization increasing civic participation of communities traditionally left out of the political process?
- Does the organization have a stated method for organizational evaluation? Is the evaluation process a measure of objectives met as well as a learning tool for the organization?

How foundations conduct evaluations are just as important as the adopted evaluation criteria. Judging whether a group is democratic and representative of its community is extremely difficult without getting into the field. In the words of one funder: *"you can't do this without getting out there, at least to see people networking. You have to leave the office."* The funders and movement leaders we interviewed all expressed the view that grantmakers should assess the value of community-organizing work and the effectiveness of the grantee by conducting site visits, attending key meetings and conferences, and witnessing organizational events (particularly those involving interactions between the grantee and their constituency). As stated by one foundation official, *"the most common mistake funders make is to not stay in touch with their grantees ... Many funders do not have close enough ties to groups on the ground, so they are left in the dark about major events. Support continues to groups with tremendous internal and external problems, while other groups can't move forward due to lack of resources when they are ready in every other way to move the work. There is huge cost in missed opportunities."* Coordinated site visits with longer-term foundation supporters can be even more helpful in introducing new funders to the vast variety of local organizations and regional/national networks in the environmental justice movement, as well as the issues they are confronting. Coordinated site visits by groups of funders also reduce the time and energy which grantee staffs must devote to grantmaking considerations, and thereby help the groups to become more effective. We encourage potential funders to contact members of this report's advisory board for obtaining information and advice on conducting coordinated site visits.

Much of the confusion over how and what to evaluate can be cleared up by involving the grantees and other representatives of the environmental justice movement in the process of fashioning evaluation criteria. As stated to us by Ann Bastian of the New World Foundation, *"we share our thinking with groups very openly, and now that we've developed a long-term relationship, these groups have a very good understanding of us, and vice-versa. In other words we are not sitting behind a curtain evaluating and only sending them the money but are engaged in talking about that evaluation and assessment process."* This process would benefit foundations by providing access to the knowledge of expert community organizers, as well as foster greater self-determination by the grantee groups. Given the increasing trend in philanthropy toward more "entrepreneurial" or "corporatist" approaches to environmental grantmaking [especially by many of the newer foundations], where Boards are emphasizing more immediate and quantifiable "returns" on their "investments," it is important that funders act proactively to create criteria which are supportive of grassroots organizing and environmental justice. We consider the genuine participation of movement representatives in the formulation of such criteria as being essential to the success of such an endeavor.

Providing Multi-Year Funding in Support of Environmental Justice

In order to facilitate longer-term strategic planning and program implementation, we recommend that funders provide multi-year funding to environmental justice organizations. It is often difficult for foundations to balance an interest in providing seed grants for new organizations and providing long term support to help existing organizations develop what the National Network of Grantmakers (NNG) term "an infrastructure for social change." However, the movement

leaders and foundation officials we interviewed unanimously called for more multi-year funding. As stated by Leticia Alcantar of the Tides Foundation, *"we need to have better expectations about how long this type of work takes. A year to year grantmaking approach causes insecurity. We need to make serious commitments. Progress is measured differently if we are talking about true democracy and if we are really trying to change the system."* Grassroots organizations need long-term funding support in order to build their infrastructures and plan strategically for the future. Effective base building, which is not going to happen if a group is only supported for only two or three years, depends on multi-year funding. In the words of Peggy Saika, former Director of the Asian Pacific Environmental Network, *"multi-year funding is really important, and I think for alot of the foundations its fundamentally important how they define 'multi-year.' Some think its two years and they are out. That is not adequate. Foundations have to see themselves in it for the long haul."*

Streamlining the Application Process

Fundraising responsibilities can be a source of stress for grassroots environmental justice organizations which are under-staffed, under-supported, and over-worked. Foundations can be responsive to the special needs of these groups by simplifying and streamlining their grant application procedures. One way to reduce the need for groups to create a new proposal for every grant application is to adopt common grant application (CGA) forms, such as those developed by the National Network of Grantmakers. In our interviews, many movement leaders emphasized the helpfulness of such a form. As stated by Louisiana activist Dan Nicolai, *" a standardized form makes it so you don't have to write 20 different grants and a narrative and budget. They're all on the same form. Which is important if your access to computer technology is limited or you time is limited, which is true in most cases with environmental justice groups."* Also, shorter applications could be accepted by foundations from groups requesting smaller levels of funding or from groups that have previously applied.

Part of the advantage of multi-year funding is that it relieves groups of the costs, time, and energy constraints associated with applying for grants on a yearly basis. Such constraints are especially difficult for financially strapped and under-staffed grassroots organizations. In the view of Diana Cohn, Senior Program Officer at the Solidago Foundation, *"the time underserved EJ organizations are spending on fundraising is problematic. Often the Executive Directors are involved in doing the foundation rounds when their time, effort, and expertise is needed in their own communities."* Another advantage of multi-year funding is that grantees are better able to engage in longer-term strategic planning. Strategic planning and program implementation can be stifled if the groups *"never know from year to year if they can count on the money,"* says Christina Roessler, Managing Director of the French American Charitable Trust. Multi-year funding is especially important for organizations working on high-profile campaigns and projects. As one movement leader explains, *"when you organize and you*

agitate around these issues you create a reaction from the opposition. So it doesn't make sense to give a group a whole lot of money for two years and provoke this big reaction and then say 'sorry, we're moving on to something else, we're going to take you off our cycle for a couple of years.' Then they lack money to address the counter-reaction coming from companies and politicians."

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) The philanthropic community in general, and environmental grantmakers in particular, need to place a stronger emphasis on *civil investing* strategies vis-a-vis the environmental justice movement. A foundation's decision to embrace principles of civil investing involves more than the adoption of horizontally/vertically integrated and/or cluster funding strategies [as described in Section II) aimed at grassroots level citizen-led environmental justice groups. It also involves adopting exemplary grantmaking practices which serve to enhance the capacity of individual grantees to build social capital in their own communities.
- (2) As part of a *civil investing* orientation, foundations should embrace a specific set of exemplary grantmaking practices. These practices include: (1) an emphasis in general support over programmatic-specific funding; (2) the utilization of evaluative criteria which is considerate of the special challenges faced by grantees engaged in grassroots organizing around environmental justice; and (3) placing greater emphasis on multi-year funding commitments over an annual application process. We recommend that any new potential funders of the environmental justice movement embrace these grantmaking practices whenever possible.
 - (A) Foundations should prioritize the provision of general support grants over project-specific grantmaking practices when funding the environmental justice movement. General support grants afford grantees greater autonomy and flexibility to meet both organizational and community needs, and to pursue a larger strategic vision which is self-determined.
 - (B) Grantmakers should also adopt flexible criteria which take into strong consideration the importance of base-building and community organizing (as well as advocacy, legal, and educational work) when selecting potential grantees and evaluating their effectiveness.
 - (C) Grantmakers should also provide multi-year funding to environmental justice organizations in order to facilitate longer-term strategic planning and program implementation
- (3) In certain instances, experienced funders may be in a position to recognize the need for a special-project strategy to address critical vacuums in the infrastructure of the environmental justice movement. However, any special-project initiatives by foundations to address these vacuums must occur through a highly collaborative process involving extensive discussions and analysis with grantees. Foundations should not impose special- project funding without a buy-in from environmental justice groups in the field.

SECTION IV

GREEN of ANOTHER COLOR: PROMOTING GREATER DIVERSITY and INCLUSIVE PRACTICES AMONG ENVIRONMENTAL GRANTMAKERS

Recruiting and retaining minority professionals for environmental grantmaking may be challenging, but the benefits clearly warrant the effort. By diversifying the board, staff and participants at our foundations, we can better understand and address the complex issues and perspectives that will shape the solutions to contemporary and future environmental problems.

From *Embracing Cultural Diversity: What You Can Do*
A 2000 Report by the EGA Inclusive Practices Project

The Benefits of Diversity and Inclusive Practices

There has been important progress made in promoting greater diversity and inclusiveness in the environmental philanthropic community in recent years. In the early 1990s, several environmental grantmakers organized a group called “Funders Concerned About Minorities and the Environment,” which sponsored briefings, workshops and meetings at various foundation events, and a newsletter with the intended goal of raising the profile of environmental justice organizations led by people of color.⁵¹ In concert with these efforts, the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation, Needmor Fund, Turner Foundation, Bullitt Foundation, Beldon Fund, Public Welfare Foundation, New World Foundation, Solidago Foundation, San Francisco Foundation, Tides Foundation, French American Charitable Trust, Unitarian Universalist Veatch Program at Shelter Rock, the Ford Foundation, and other key environmental grantmakers have taken important steps in: diversifying their boards, grantmaking committees, and/or staff; better incorporating underserved communities into decision-making processes; promoting programs which train people of color and lower-income persons to become environmental and philanthropic professionals; increasing their support for people of color-led and environmental justice-related organizations; and/or examining and reforming their own organization’s culture, policies, and practices in order to better foster inclusiveness and diversity. More recently, through the efforts of the Environmental Grantmakers Association (EGA) *Inclusive Practices Project*, additional funders such as the Sudbury Foundation, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Merck Family Fund, Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, Florence and John Schumann Foundation, and Wallace Alexander Gerbode Foundation, among other environmental grantmakers, are examining and taking action on issues of diversity.

These same foundations and others have also successfully worked with the EGA Management and Program Committees in recent years to place more people of color in leadership roles at the EGA Annual Fall Retreat, as well as to promote greater inclusion of environmental justice leaders and environmental professionals of color as plenary speakers, facilitators, and

workshop participants. At the Town Meeting of the EGA Fall Retreat, October 30, 1998, Vic De Luca, current President of the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation, made a formal resolution which called upon the Program Committee for the EGA Retreat: “...to include principles of gender, ethnic and racial diversity in developing the program and selecting speakers and in planning sessions with workshop facilitators and ad-hoc sponsors.” Since the introduction of the resolution, the speakers and presentation topics at the EGA Retreat have become noticeably more diverse, with such workshop titles as, “Delving Deep into Diversity: An Exploration into Issues of Race and Diversity,” “Is There Room for Justice in the Environmental Justice Movement?,” and “It Takes More than White Crayons to Color the World Green,” among others. As a result of these and other highly commendable efforts, more foundations are beginning to afford greater attention to issues of diversity, inclusiveness, and environmental justice in their grantmaking practices. An important example of such would be the newly established environmental justice portfolio in the Asset Building & Community Development Program at the Ford Foundation, established under the initiative of Vice-President Melvin Oliver.

Despite such recent progress, most foundations have paid inadequate attention to the importance of diversity issues, particularly with regard to race. One of the primary fundraising challenges confronting the environmental justice movement is related to a lack of diversity in the philanthropic community in general, and much of the EGA membership in particular. A foundation culture that is homogeneous in terms of the composition of its staff and board members establishes parameters which limit the expression of alternative value systems, perspectives, and viewpoints. As stated to us by Karie Brown of the Tides Foundation, “...it is very intimidating for people, particularly people of color, to break into the funding world because philanthropy tends to be, unfortunately still, very white.” Given the power dynamics involved, these boundaries are difficult for those of different cultural backgrounds – as both foundation officials and environmental activists – to bridge. As a leader of an environmental justice-related organization told us, “... at one point, I hired a white person to do fundraising because I could sense when I walked into a foundation meeting the discomfort in dealing with an ethnic person with whom they shared so little in common.” In the course of our interviews, a view was constantly expressed that the lack of diversity in the environmental grantmaking arena is impairing the ability of traditionally marginalized peoples, as found in the environmental justice movement, to build effective partnerships with a broader base of the EGA and other funders. Rather, funding for the movement remains restricted to a smaller core of grantmakers – foundations which incidentally seem to have made significant progress in diversifying their own boards and staff.

Achieving greater inclusiveness and cultural diversity within the foundation community is central to facilitating more effective environmental grantmaking strategies, movement-building, and policy work. A strong consensus of opinion expressed by the foundation officials and environmental justice leadership we interviewed indicates that the quality of grantmaking improves significantly as a result of greater diversity among decision-makers. Foundation officials regularly indicated that greater diversity in the composition of the foundation board and staff tends to promote greater accessibility by those environmental organizations representing people of color and lower-income communities. A heightened level of discourse and grantmaking occurs in the foundation setting because of the manner in which diversity contributes to a deeper comprehension of the specific social issues and environmental injustices confronting these constituencies, as well

as a stronger appreciation for the goals and strategies developed by organizations to address these problems. In the words of Connie Tucker, Executive Director of the regional network Southern Organizing Committee (SOC), *“if funders don’t have that kind of diversity in staff then you also don’t have that diversity of ideas.”* Such an understanding, for instance, allows a diverse board to take more short-term grantmaking risks on newer organizations and initiatives which can reap substantial longer-term benefits further down the road. In turn, foundations committed to issues of diversity and inclusiveness are also seen by potential recipients as more responsive to a diversity of communities. As stated by Cynthia Renfro of the Beldon Fund, *“...diversity helps transcend the existence of distrust on the part of many people of color and impoverished groups towards foundations whose staffs and boards are often white and middle-upper class.”* Seen as more accessible, these foundations are more likely to receive a richer variety of proposals from environmental organizations, including the environmental justice movement, that otherwise would not apply for funding.

Although people of color and lower-income communities are disproportionately impacted by a host of environmental and human health problems, they have remained largely peripheral to the concerns of many traditional environmental organizations [and grantmakers]. Only a handful of the mainstream groups, including the Natural Resources Defense Council, Greenpeace, and, most recently, the Sierra Club [the only organization with strong local membership chapters] have devoted any significant resources to communities impacted by ecological racism and/or class-biased environmental hazards. However, the environmental justice movement is now mobilizing these new constituencies, which are among the fastest growing in the United States today, to join the environmental cause. Foundations committed to principles of diversity and inclusiveness are in a better position to establish productive dialogues and avoid cultural misunderstandings with these new constituencies. These grantmakers are also in a better position to target and evaluate deserving recipients for funding. Greater diversity in the foundation arena can also serve as a catalyst for developing newer and more creative funding strategies by broadening the network(s) of environmental organizations familiar to the grantmaker.

It is in the long-term interest of the philanthropic community to reach these new constituencies and broaden the base of support for the environmental movement. Because the environmental justice movement is also linking sustainability and environmental protection with issues of social justice, civil rights, economic development, and political power, many of the solutions being pursued offer a more comprehensive and holistic approach to environmental problem-solving. By constructing staff which better reflect the socio-economic make-up of these new constituencies, environmental grantmaking is more likely to evolve in a complementary fashion with the new environmentalism. Clearly, philanthropy should be better mobilized to build the base of the environmental movement and support new coalitions and organizing strategies which overcome the limitations of single-issue approaches to what are highly interconnected social and ecological problems. By promoting diversity and inclusive practices, the philanthropic community can facilitate grantmaking strategies that address environmental issues in a more coordinated and comprehensive fashion.

Principles of Environmental Justice

PREAMBLE

WE THE PEOPLE OF COLOR, gathered together at this multinational People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit, to begin to build a national and international movement of all peoples of color to fight the destruction and taking of our lands and communities, do hereby re-establish our spiritual interdependence to the sacredness of our Mother Earth; to respect and celebrate each of our cultures, languages and beliefs about the natural world and our roles in healing ourselves; to insure environmental justice; to promote economic alternatives which would contribute to the development of environmentally safe livelihoods; and, to secure our political, economic and cultural liberation that has been denied for over 500 years of colonization and oppression, resulting in the poisoning of our communities and land and the genocide of our peoples, do affirm and adopt these Principles of Environmental Justice:

- (4) **Environmental justice** affirms the sacredness of Mother Earth, ecological unity and the interdependence of all species, and the right to be free from ecological destruction.
- (5) **Environmental justice** demands that public policy be based on mutual respect and justice for all peoples, free from any form of discrimination or bias.
- (6) **Environmental justice** mandates the right to ethical, balanced and responsible uses of land and renewable resources in the interest of a sustainable planet for humans and other living things.
- (7) **Environmental justice** calls for universal protection from nuclear testing, extraction, production and disposal of toxic/hazardous wastes and poisons, and nuclear testing that threaten the fundamental right to clean air, land, water, and food.
- (8) **Environmental justice** affirms the fundamental right to political, economic, cultural and environmental self-determination of all peoples.
- (9) **Environmental justice** demands the cessation of the production of all toxins, hazardous wastes and radioactive materials, and that all past and current producers be held strictly accountable to the people for detoxification and the containment at the point of production.
- (10) **Environmental justice** demands the right to participate as equal partners at every level of decision-making including needs assessment, planning, implementation, enforcement and evaluation
- (11) **Environmental justice** affirms the right of all workers to a safe and healthy work environment, without being forced to choose between an unsafe livelihood and unemployment. It also affirms the right of those who work at home to be free from environmental hazards.

- (12) **Environmental justice** affirms the right of all workers to a safe and healthy work environment, without being forced to choose between an unsafe livelihood and unemployment. It also affirms the right of those who work at home to be free from environmental hazards.
- (13) **Environmental justice** protects the right of victims of environmental injustice to receive full compensation and reparations for damages as well as quality health care.
- (14) **Environmental justice** considers governmental acts of environmental injustice a violation of international law, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the U.N. Convention on Genocide.
- (15) **Environmental justice** must recognize a special legal and natural relationship of Native Peoples to the U.S. government through treaties, agreements, compacts and covenants affirming sovereignty and self-determination.
- (16) **Environmental justice** affirms the need for urban and rural ecological policies to clean up and rebuild our cities and rural areas in balance with nature, honoring the cultural integrity of all our communities, and providing fair access for all to the full range of resources.
- (17) **Environmental justice** calls for the strict enforcement of principles of informed consent, and a halt to the testing of experimental reproductive and medical procedures and vaccinations on people of color.
- (18) **Environmental justice** opposes the destructive operations of multinational corporations.
- (19) **Environmental justice** opposes military occupation, repression and exploitation of lands, peoples and cultures, and other life forms.
- (20) **Environmental justice** calls for the education of present and future generations which emphasizes social and environmental issues, based on our experience and an appreciation of our diverse cultural perspectives.
- (21) **Environmental justice** requires that we, as individuals, make personal and consumer choices to consume as little of Mother Earth's resources and to produce as little waste as possible; and make the conscious decision to challenge and reprioritize our lifestyles to insure the health of the natural world for present and future generations.

Adopted October 27, 1991, in Washington, D.C.

Promoting Greater Diversity and Inclusion in the Environmental Grantmaking Arena

Environmental grantmakers have a unique opportunity to help build a more powerful and effective movement for social justice and environmental protection. Issues of diversity and inclusion are central to this mission. Promoting greater diversity and inclusiveness in the environmental grantmaking community can serve to facilitate the integration of new constituencies into the environmental movement, promote more innovative and powerful coalitions of environmental activists, build linkages between organizations working on traditional and newly emerging environmental issues, and catalyze alternative approaches to environmental problem-solving and policy-making. To achieve these aims, there must be a greater appreciation in the grantmaking community of the special challenges confronting lower-income communities and people of color as represented by the environmental justice movement. Therefore, we encourage environmental grantmakers to implement the following recommendations with regard to issues of diversity and inclusiveness:

(1) *To promote greater diversity on their own staff, board, and key committees:* The composition of a staff and board of trustees is one of the clearest indicators of a desire to be responsive to all communities of people suffering environmental harm. Therefore, foundations should strive for a broad decision-making base that is inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, gender, and class, as well as sexual orientation and age.

(2) *To actively court new grantees which are diverse, and to support efforts for greater inclusiveness and diversity in the boards, staff, membership, and served constituencies of organizations traditionally funded by the foundation.* The San Francisco Foundation Policy on Diversity, for instance, explicitly encourages its recipients to construct boards and staff which are reflective of their constituency. Many other foundations request information of potential grantees regarding the diversity of organizational staff and constituency served.

(3) *To better include in foundation evaluation, planning, and decision-making processes those organizations which represent diverse populations and underserved communities.* Community-based organizations and regional and national constituency-based networks in the environmental justice movement are particularly important.

(4) *To provide opportunities for dialogue about the issues of diversity and inclusiveness within the foundation setting, including board and staff retreats, workshops and trainings.* Change can often be incremental, and as part of an ongoing process, but only as long there is open discussion and a working plan around diversity issues. Sharing information and lessons learned among other grantmakers is particularly important.

(5) *To support programs and practices which prepare and/or recruit people of color and other diverse populations for careers in the foundation community and environmental movement.*

All of these recommendations are highly interrelated. The foundation officials we interviewed indicated that there are enormous difficulties in identifying, recruiting, and retaining qualified people of color for staff and leadership roles within foundations and the environmental movement. *Beyond the Green*, a 1992 report of the Environmental Careers Organizations (ECO), notes that career pipelines for young people of color wishing to enter the environmental profession are in short supply. Qualified activists within the environmental movement, particularly those which are people of color, are often hesitant to leave the world of organizing and move to a new location to begin a career in philanthropy. Moreover, foundations are often hesitant to recruit qualified individuals out of important organizational settings because such a practice can rob the movement of crucial talent. This is a structural problem common throughout philanthropy.

To address this issue, we recommend that foundations partner with each other and the environmental justice movement to prepare and identify candidates of color to serve in the philanthropic community. A hiring hall is one suggestion which should be explored, a function which could perhaps be administered by the EGA. One model program for training people of color to serve in the non-profit sector or philanthropy is provided by the Multicultural Fellowship Program at the San Francisco Foundation (see description on the next page). The establishment of an equivalent-type of Multicultural Fellowship Program to serve the East-Coast based foundation community would be particularly valuable. The fellowship could involve the participation of a number of foundations based in New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., and other Eastern cities. The New York Regional Association of Grantmakers (NYRAG) once sponsored such a program – the *Diversity Internship Program* -- with some success.

The *Diversity Internship Program* placed over 43 students in internships in 24 host organizations between 1995 and 1998. This program is now managed as the Sponsors for Educational Opportunity (SEO) *Internship in Philanthropy*, and is dedicated to providing promising students of color the opportunity to discover and develop careers in philanthropy (see resource box below for contact sources and

Resources On Diversity and Philanthropy

For a discussion of principles and strategies for promoting diversity and inclusive practices within the environmental grantmaking community, see:

Embracing Cultural Diversity: What is the Value Added? and *Embracing Cultural Diversity: What You Can Do.*

Available from Jack Chin, Coordinator
Fundors Forum On Environmental Education,
200 Granville Way, San Francisco, CA 94127.
phone: 617-242-9445. e-mail:
c200gran@earthlink.net.

Building on a Better Foundation: A Toolkit for Creating an Inclusive Grantmaking Organization

A Report by the Donors Forum of Chicago, the Minnesota Council on Foundations, Northern California Grantmakers, and the New York Regional Association of Grantmakers.
Available from Barbara Bryan, President,
New York Regional Association of Grantmakers
505 Eighth Avenue, Suite 1805
New York, NY 10-18-6506
Tel: (212) 714-069, ext.26. Fax: (212) 239-2075. E-Mail: bbryan@nyrag.org.
Web://www.nyrag.org

The Council on Foundations has a number of resources available on promoting diversity issues in the philanthropic community available at <http://www.cof.org>.

information). In addition to SEO's *Internship in Philanthropy*, a number of other programs exist which could be expanded upon or serve as a type of model for training and integrating people of color into environmental philanthropy and non-profits. Paid internship programs for college students of color provide important opportunities for people of color to gain the training and experiences necessary to prepare themselves for careers in philanthropy and/or the environmental movement. For instance, the Everett Public Service Internship Program provides paid internships for university students to work in environmental nonprofits and foundation settings. Likewise, the *Changing Charity Fellowship Initiative*, a project of The Union Institute's Center for Public Policy, is an 18-month nonresidential fellowship established to support the promotion of people of color to senior positions in non-profit organizations. UI's Center for Public Policy is committed to serving non-profit efforts to provide needed services, sustain democracy, and enhance social justice. We strongly recommend that environmental grantmakers and other foundations participate in (and perhaps expand) these and/or the many other internship programs which help facilitate the participation of people of color in philanthropy.

Internship Opportunities

For information regarding internship programs for people of color, contact:

Helen Dorado Alessi
Sponsors for Educational Opportunity
The SEO Internship in Philanthropy
23 Gramercy Park South
New York, NY 10003
Tel: (212) 979-2040
halessi@egf-ny.org

Bristow Hardin, Director
Center for Public Policy – The Union Institute
1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW, Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 496-1630
E-Mail: bhardin@tui.edu
www.tui.edu/OSR/ CPP/ CPPprojects.html

Everett Public Service Internship Program
c/o Co-op America
1612 K Street NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 872-5335
infor@everettinternships.org
www.everettinternships.org

“...just as biodiversity is the hallmark of a healthy ecosystem, cultural diversity and environmental justice are the hallmarks of healthy communities and organizations, including our own.” ---- Environmental Grantmakers Association,
Philanthropy as Stewardship

The Multicultural Fellowship Program
The San Francisco Foundation

One model for promoting diversity in philanthropy is provided by the Multicultural Fellowship Program at the San Francisco Foundation, one of America's largest community foundations, whose mission is to promote vibrant, sustainable communities throughout the Bay Area (the foundation is endowed with \$680 million in assets and each year awards grants of \$45+ million to nonprofit organizations). The Multicultural Fellowship Program seeks to increase diversity in the nonprofit and philanthropic sectors by providing young professionals of color with challenging work experiences and leadership opportunities in the areas of grantmaking and community building. Offered as a two-year position, each Fellow is assigned to work in one of three multidisciplinary program teams: urban impact; health and education; or environment and social justice team. The latter champions preservation, environmental protection, and social justice issues and invests grantmaking resources in increasing the access of under-represented communities to information and processes that will allow their voices to be heard at policy tables. Duties include assisting the Program Executive in research, analysis, and grantmaking.

All program grantmaking and convening is performed under the supervision of, and in cooperation with, the Program Executive. The Fellow collaborates with Foundation staff, community leaders, and funders on joint projects and initiatives, plans community events and conferences, and participates in professional development trainings and seminars in addition to staff meetings. The one-on-one, daily, professional support, together with the training and guidance in philanthropy, the nonprofit sector and career planning provided by the Program Executives makes the Program highly unique within Foundations, even among similar fellowship or internship programs. This direct experience and hands-on work in grantmaking, where the Fellows are given considerable responsibility and opportunity in the analytic and decision-making process, is invaluable. This opportunity is the core of the Fellowship experience, and includes all aspects of grantmaking – site visits, analyzing proposals, relationship building with organizations, preparing recommendations with the Program Executives, and taking grants forward to the Board. This experience has certainly assisted all Fellows with securing positions after their Fellowships. The two-year duration gives Fellows more in-depth and broader work experience in grantmaking, completing Fellows projects, and other internal Foundation work, as well as gaining a greater knowledge of the community. Benefits to the Program Executives include receiving at least a year and a half of experienced support from their Fellows after the initial six months of training. Since its inception in 1990, the Multicultural Fellowship Program has provided invaluable philanthropic experience and training for at least 32 young professionals of color, 13 of whom are now employed in philanthropy and 14 in nonprofit leadership (with 2 in government and 1 in the private sector). For more information, contact:

Jane Rogers, Program Executive
The San Francisco Foundation
685 Market Street, Suite 910
San Francisco, CA 04105
Tel: (415) 733-8500
jpr@sff.org

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) Grantmakers need to develop a greater appreciation of the special fundraising challenges confronting the environmental justice movement which are related to a lack of racial and cultural diversity in the philanthropic community in general, and the environmental grantmaking community in particular. Although important progress has been made in recent years, achieving greater inclusiveness and cultural diversity within the foundation community is needed in order to facilitate more effective environmental grantmaking practices, movement-building strategies, and policy work;
- (2) Foundations should strive for a broader decision-making base that is inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, gender, and class. This can be achieved by promoting greater diversity on their staff, board, and key committees;
- (3) Foundations should actively court new grantees which serve diverse constituencies, especially marginalized people of color and low-income communities as represented by the environmental justice movement;
- (4) Foundations should encourage greater inclusiveness and diversity in the staff, boards, membership, and served constituencies of current and potential grantees;
- (5) Foundations should include in their evaluation, planning, and decision-making processes those organizations which represent diverse populations and underserved communities;
- (6) Foundations need to provide better opportunities for dialogue about the issues of diversity and inclusiveness within their own institutional setting, including board and staff retreats, workshops and trainings, and other meetings;
- (7) Foundations should better support programs and practices which prepare and/or recruit people of color and other diverse populations for careers in philanthropy and the environmental movement; and
- (8) Foundations should partner with each other and the environmental justice movement to prepare and identify candidates of color to serve in the philanthropic community.

SECTION V

THE GREENING Of PHILANTHROPIC ACTIVISM: UTILIZING MISSION-RELATED INVESTING and SHAREHOLDER ACTION in SUPPORT of ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

The fundamental challenge of philanthropy is the wise stewardship of resources for the betterment of mankind.....Responsible stewardship should consider the environmental effects of the actions of any corporation in which we own stock, and weigh these consequences in our investment decisions. Our grantmaking choices and public relations materials can also be vehicles for promoting environmental responsibility to the broader community.

Philanthropy as Stewardship
Environmental Grantmakers Association

Philanthropic Activism in Support of Environmental Justice

Philanthropic activism is a process whereby grantmakers go beyond the traditional role of dispersing funds to undertake additional actions and responsibilities which further the mission of the foundation. As institutions, foundations possess considerable financial resources and political clout in American society. In 1999, the nation's nearly 47,000 grantmaking foundations awarded upwards of \$22.8 billion to non-profit organizations, based on endowment values of over \$385.1 billion (an estimated \$1.23 billion in grants to environment-related organizations). There is a growing recognition that this institutional clout provides environmental funders with the ability, as well as the obligation, to support struggles for environmental protection and social justice, beyond the awarding of grants. It is our recommendation that the political-economic power of the foundation community be wielded in a more strategic fashion by environmental grantmakers to bolster the work of their own grantees as well as the environmental justice movement as a whole. The primary means by which this might be accomplished is through the more widespread adoption of the mission-related investing strategies and mission-related shareholder actions. Program-related investments and mission-related purchasing practices may also be of some utility in certain instances. These strategies are described below:

(1) ***Mission-Related Investing Strategies***: By adopting *mission-related investing strategies*, foundations can screen out investments which would otherwise support companies that engage in environmentally destructive and socially irresponsible business practices. Mission-related investing thus aligns the investment and asset management strategies with the overall mission of the foundation in support of environmental justice;

(2) **Mission-Related Shareholder Action:** *Mission-related shareholder action* uses the power of stock ownership by foundations to promote social and environmental justice through company dialogue and the filing of shareholder resolutions. By engaging in a variety of shareholder actions, funders can leverage their economic power to support campaigns by their grantees (or other environmental justice organizations) which are attempting to reform the behavior of a specific company (or companies) in which the foundation holds stock. For instance, by sponsoring environmentally and socially oriented shareholder proxy resolutions, foundations can make their voices (and the voices of their grantees) heard by corporate decision-makers;

(3) **Program-Related Investments:** Through Program-Related Investments (PRIs) and investments in community activities, foundations can also invest their assets in ways that support their grantmaking programs related to environmental justice. PRIs are loans, loan guarantees and equity investments that support a foundation's mission. Foundations can record PRIs as grants or use them to supplement a grantmaking program;

(4) **Mission-Related Purchasing Practices:** Through investment and purchasing decisions, funders can also support socially and environmentally responsible organizations and businesses controlled by people of color, women, and other traditionally bypassed groups.⁵²

All of these forms of philanthropic activism are proving to be increasingly important. More than \$2 trillion is invested today in the United States in a socially responsible manner, up a strong 82 percent from 1997, according to a 1999 study by the non-profit Social Investment Forum (SIF), a trade association of financial professionals. The \$2.16 trillion includes all segments of social investing – screened portfolios, shareholder advocacy and community investing – and accounts for roughly 13 percent of the \$16.3 trillion under professional management in the U.S., as reported by *The 1999 Nelson's Directory of Investment Managers*. In fact, socially responsible assets grew at roughly twice the rate of all other stocks (42 percent) under management in the U.S. during this time. However, many in the environmental grantmaking community have been slow to adopt Socially Responsible Investment (SRI) strategies. We recommend that funders make better use of these strategies, when appropriate, to support initiatives by the environmental movement in general, and the environmental justice movement in particular. In each of these areas of philanthropic activism, slow but steady progress is being made in establishing such partnerships. However, more can and should be done.

Utilizing Mission-Related Investing Strategies in Support of Environmental Justice

All investments -- whether they be by private individuals or foundations -- have social and environmental impacts. However, many foundations refuse to take responsibility for the investments they make in environmentally destructive and socially irresponsible companies. Investment management is typically treated as a totally separate and/or secondary mission in comparison to the grantmaking functions of the foundation. As a result, foundation staff and administrators of grant programs seldom demonstrate any interest or expertise in the financial management of foundation assets. As stated by investigative journalist Mark Dowie, "...most

foundation portfolios are managed as if investments had no value, and foundation fiduciaries were bound by the same standards of care as pension funds and personal trusts."⁵³

This legacy of neglect has serious consequences, namely the reinforcement of socially and ecologically abusive business practices. According to the Council on Foundations' *1996 Foundation Management Report*, only one in ten foundations invests at least part of its portfolio within specific socially responsible guidelines. Many of this nation's largest environmental grantmakers frequently make large investments in high-tech electronics, oil, chemical, timber, mining, bio-technology, and other environmentally-destructive industries --- investment portfolios that directly contradict the very mission of the foundation. In April 1998, the newsletter *Climate Change Report* analyzed the major environmental funders and found "a complete disconnect between their investment and grantmaking portfolios. Pro-environment foundations own stock in virtually all of the companies that supported a \$14 million advertising campaign [in 1997] that sought to prevent the U.S. from committing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions." On the other hand, smaller and medium-sized grantmakers are twice as likely as foundations with more than \$100 million in assets to use such responsible investor guidelines. The Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation, the Compton Foundation, and most recently, the Beldon Fund, among others, rank among the most prominent users of values-based portfolio screens.⁵⁴

One of the more effective means by which foundations might respond to this paradox is through the pursuit of mission-related investing strategies. Mission-

Resources on Philanthropic Activism

Program-Related Investments: A Guide to Funders and Trends, 1995; and *The PRI Index: 500 Recent Foundation Charitable Loans and Investments*, 1997; available from the Foundation Center on-line at www.fdncenter.org

Mission-Based Investing: Extending the Reach of the Foundations, Endowments and NGOs by Kinder, Lydenberg and Domini, June 1998. A foundation guide to responsible-investing resources by a leading social investment firm. For a free copy, contact KLD at 270 Congress Street, 7th Floor, Boston, MA 02210.

Passive, Dissonant or Making a Difference: Which Way for Foundation Investing? By Mark Dowie, 2000. An easy-to-read report on program-related investing, investment screening, and shareholder activism in the foundation community. For a free copy, contact the Financial Markets Center at P.O. Box 334, Philomont, VA 20131. Phone: (540) 338-7754. E-Mail: Finnkctr@aol.com

Philanthropy as Stewardship: Recommended Principles & Practices for Operating in an Environmentally Responsible Manner by the Environmental Grantmakers Association, 2000, p.19-20. This booklet as well as current updated information, resources and contacts can be found at www.ega.org

For additional information about mission-related investing and shareholder activism, visit the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation web site: www.noyes.org. Especially useful are the sections on Investment Policy, and the "President's Essay" in the 1998 annual report. The former president of J.S. Noyes, Stephen Viederman, also published an interesting piece in *Foundation News and Commentary* (January/February 1997) entitled "Adding Value to Your Grants."

related investing is a process whereby a foundation attempts to align its asset management and investment strategies with the overall grantmaking mission of the institution. Most commonly, this involves screening out investments which would otherwise go to environmentally destructive and socially irresponsible companies.

There are now a series of newly developed funds and assessment tools which make it possible for foundations to maximize investment performance while remaining consonant with their overall grantmaking mission (see resource guide). Since 1997, total assets in all sectors of the economy under management in screened portfolios for socially concerned investors rose 183 percent, from \$529 billion to \$1.49 trillion, according to the Social Investment Forum.⁵⁵ Security is added to the investment process because environmental liabilities and opportunities that might impact the shareholder value of a company are systematically evaluated. Most studies show superior performance of screened funds because good environmental management is seen as a positive indicator of good corporate governance. For instance, the mutual fund rating company Morningstar recently compared screened and non-screened mutual funds. They found that screened funds were twice as likely to have the highest five star rating, and four times less likely to have the lowest rating of one star. A large body of empirical literature, summarized in the winter 1997 *Journal of Investing*, suggests that socially screened investments provide competitive returns – including screened investments in bonds and foreign equities.

Mission-Related Shareholder Action in Support of Environmental Justice

Another underutilized form of philanthropic activism which could be implemented more firmly in support of the environmental justice movement is mission-related shareholder action. *Mission-related shareholder action* uses the power of stock ownership by foundations to promote social and environmental justice through company dialogue and the filing of shareholder resolutions. Rather than trying to eliminate dissonant investments, foundations use their shares to either file or support shareholder resolutions challenging a company's egregious practices or policies. In some instances, foundations may even provide grants for the purchase of stock, which allows the grantee organization to file the shareholder resolution itself against the offending corporation. By engaging in these kinds of shareholder actions, funders can leverage their economic power to support campaigns by their own grantees or other environmental justice organizations which are attempting to reform the behavior of a specific company (or companies) in which the foundation holds stock.

Shareholder action is becoming increasingly common, especially among the large, bottom line-oriented institutional investors of state and some private employee retirement plans. According to the Social Investment Forum, social investors active in shareholder advocacy control nearly a trillion dollars. Over 120 institutions and mutual fund families have leveraged assets valued at \$922 billion in the form of shareholder resolutions. These institutional investors use the power of their ownership positions in corporate America to sponsor or co-sponsor proxy resolutions on social and environmental issues. They also vote their proxies on the basis of formal policies embodying social/environmental responsibility goals and actively work with companies to

encourage more responsible levels of corporate citizenship. In fact, the fastest growing component of socially responsible investing is the growth of portfolios that employ both screening and shareholder advocacy. Assets in portfolios utilizing both strategies grew 215 percent, from \$84 billion in 1997 to \$265 billion in 1999.

CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM: A PROJECT OF AS YOU SOW. *As*

You Sow is a non-profit organization dedicated to promoting environmental protection, social justice, and corporate accountability, and houses two programs. The Environmental Enforcement Program (EEP) holds corporations accountable for complying with consumer and environmental laws, especially those mandating the provision of toxic warnings. The Corporate Accountability Program (CAP) provides shareholder dialogue and resolution management services to the non-profit, socially responsible investment, and foundation communities. CAP is also a leading proponent of shareholder activism and pioneered the solicitation of mainstream institutional shareholders on socially oriented proxy resolutions. CAP's Environmental Initiative is focused on toxics, genetically engineered food, sustainable forestry, and environmental justice, while the Labor & Human Rights Initiative is concerned primarily with sweatshops and human rights issues. CAP will assess the viability of a proposed campaign, conduct background research, prepare and file resolutions, produce educational materials, build coalitions, conduct media campaigns, and lead dialogue with selected companies. For more information, contact:

As You Sow – Corporate Accountability Program

540 Pacific Avenue

San Francisco, CA 94144

Tel: (415) 291-9868

E-Mail: asyousow@igc.org

Web: www.asyousow.org

Mission-related shareholder action is now one of the key principles recently adopted by 65 foundations in the Environmental Grantmakers Association. As stated in *Philanthropy as Stewardship*, shareholder action encourages efforts which, “...*indicate foundation priorities to investors acting on behalf of the foundation or directly to corporations in which the foundation*

“... integrity required that we reduce the dissonance between investment management and grantmaking values. Thus began our journey of mission-related investing, which led us to realize that through this we could add value to our grantmaking through other means. Otherwise we were squandering our assets.”

Steve Viederman, President (1987-2000)

Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation

*holds stock; and to express support for environmentally sound practices.”*⁵⁶ However, despite this resolution, mission-related shareholder action remains grossly underutilized in the philanthropic community in general, and the environmental grantmaking community in particular.

Shareholder Action in Support of Environmental Justice: Jessie Smith Noyes and the SouthWest Organizing Project⁵⁷

In 1993, the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation began an experiment, collaborating with a grantee, the SouthWest Organizing Project (SWOP), to see how shareholder activity could support their organizing efforts to make the Intel Corporation more accountable to local communities. SWOP is a community-based organization based in Albuquerque working on issues of economic and environmental justice. Earlier that year, SWOP had prepared a report, *Intel Inside New Mexico*, which raised serious concerns regarding excessive water usage, air pollution, jobs, and the true costs of state subsidies relating to Intel's expansion of their computer chip manufacturing facilities in the state. SWOP tried to engage Intel in discussions about the report, but the company only offered to meet alone with Jeanne Guana, SWOP's Co-Director. This condition did not satisfy SWOP's needs as a participatory, constituency-based organization.

In response, SWOP agreed that Noyes (which held Intel stock in a socially screened portfolio) could launch a shareholder initiative as a complement to their organizing strategy. Noyes appeared at Intel's Annual Shareholders' Meeting in Albuquerque in May, 1994, and asked, from the floor, when Intel would respond to SWOP's report. The Chief Operating Officer replied that they did not deal with "vocal minorities." As a result, with SWOP's agreement and participation, Noyes filed a shareholder resolution to be voted on at Intel's 1995 Annual Meeting. The resolution asked the company to commit themselves to sharing information with local communities by revising their Environmental, Health and Safety (EHS) policy. The resolution got Intel's attention, and in December 1994 a high-level Intel official and manager of the New Mexico site met with Noyes in New York. As a result of that meeting, Intel initiated a series of facilitated discussions in January of 1995 with SWOP on a range of issues (Noyes did not participate).

With the help of the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility (ICCR) and through Noyes's outreach efforts to other foundations, the vote on the resolution at Intel's 1995 Annual Meeting received support from almost 5 percent of the shareholders voting, sufficient enough to allow Noyes to refile the resolution a second time for the 1996 annual meeting. Prior to the proxy vote, Noyes canvassed all [then] 250 members of the EGA to identify foundations holding Intel stock and solicit their support for the proxy. Few responded. Of the large foundations, only Rockefeller and MacArthur are known to have voted for the resolution (as did a group of smaller foundations). The Ford Foundation, which routinely votes all proxies, opposed the resolution.

In partnership with SWOP, Noyes continued discussions with Intel on issues of accountability and transparency to communities, and the need for a revised EHS policy. In December of 1995, a draft of the revised EHS policy that included the language requested by Noyes was presented to Noyes. In coordination with SWOP, Noyes withdrew the resolution for the 1996 meeting. This victory, although limited, was important, and demonstrates that shareholder action can be a powerful tool which other community organizations can use to press for corporate accountability.

Excerpted from "President's Essay," by [then] President Steve Viederman (in collaboration with Louis Head and Jeanne Guana, Co-Director of SWOP), in *Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation 1997 Annual Report*, pp.9-12 .

Suggested Guidelines by SWOP and Noyes for Community-Investor Relations

Definition:

Shareholder activity is an effort on the part of owners of companies – shareholders – to change the policies and/or the behavior of companies through a variety of means, including meetings with corporate officials, letter writing, proxy voting, co-filing of shareholder resolutions initiated by others, and/or initiating a shareholder resolution. Initiation of a shareholder resolution is usually the end of an unsuccessful effort to obtain satisfaction from the corporation on the issues raised through meetings and letter writing.

Assumptions:

Shareholder activity can be an effective part of a community strategy toward corporate accountability, transparency and responsibility.

Principles:

- (1) Shareholder activities, particularly shareholder resolutions, are not a stand-alone strategy. The shareholder activities must be part of a broader community organizing strategy.
- (2) Communities must speak for themselves. No one but the community can speak for it.
- (3) Communities must determine their own organizing strategies, detailing the nature of the problems and the demands they wish to make of corporations. It should be recognized that while letter writing and meetings with corporate officials are always appropriate, some issues, in the present legal climate, may not lend themselves to shareholder resolutions. The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission has ruled consistently in the last few years that certain issues are “ordinary business” and, therefore, inappropriate for the shareholder resolution process.
- (4) Communities should seek to become shareholders as well as stakeholders in the targeted companies in an effort to somewhat level the playing field in discussions.
- (5) Alliances should be developed with other shareholders, including religious institutions, foundations and other groups that share concerns for social, economic and environmental justice.
- (6) Control of the shareholder activity must remain in the hands of the community. A division of labor for the shareholder process should be made clear between the community and the other groups involved before the process begins. Communication among all groups is essential, with the lead always residing in the hands of the community.
- (7) The role of the community is to insure that the corporation is accountable on the detailed issues of concern to the community.
- (8) The role of other shareholders is to make sure that the corporation is accountable to the community, in effect insuring that the corporation comes to the table with the community. Other shareholders should also organize the shareholder community to support the activities that are being directed by the community.
- (9) Shareholder activities should always be designed in ways that contribute to strengthening the community and its organizations.

According to a recent report, none of the major foundations (some of which have substantial holdings in many of the most environmentally irresponsible companies) have initiated shareholder resolutions. Only a handful of smaller, mostly progressive foundations such as the Rose Foundation and Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation (see description box, previous page) seriously utilize shareholder advocacy. Unlike the Ford Foundation, most foundations do not even routinely vote proxies (and when proxies are voted, they are usually voted by their money managers, and kept secret).⁵⁸

Program-Related Investments and Mission-Related Purchasing Practices in Support of Environmental Justice

Through investment and purchasing decisions, funders can support socially- and environmentally-responsible organizations and businesses controlled by people of color, women, and other traditionally bypassed groups. In addition, through Program-Related Investments (PRIs) and investments in community activities, foundations can also invest their assets in ways that support their grantmaking programs related to environmental justice. PRIs are loans, loan guarantees and equity investments that support a foundation's mission, and provide an alternative form of financing where grantmaking is inappropriate or insufficient. These purposes would include bridge financing, the construction of facilities, and land purchases. Although these investments must be repaid, foundations can record PRIs as grants or use them to supplement a grantmaking program. According to the Foundation Center, since 1994, 74 funders have disbursed or guaranteed PRIs totaling \$718.1 million. Nearly one-third of the total PRI amount (\$225 million) has been loaned or invested by the Ford Foundation, and close to another 10 percent (\$68.1 million) by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Close to two-fifths of PRI dollars and nearly an equal share of PRIs financed projects serve the economically disadvantaged. Approximately one-tenth of the PRI dollars went to projects serving racial or ethnic groups, while the share of PRI support for the environment doubled.⁵⁹

Organizational Support

Assistance in working through a program of "asset harmonization" can be obtained from investment managers committed to various forms of "social investing" and shareholder action. Other foundations that have gone through the process, such as the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation, can also prove helpful. For more information and/or services, contact:

As You Sow
530 Pacific Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94133
Tel (415) 391-3212
www.asyousow.org

Foundation Partnership on Corporate Responsibility
c/o Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility
457 Riverside Drive, Room 550
New York, NY 10115
Tel (212) 870-2295
E-Mail: info@iccr.org
www.foundationpartnership.org

Thomas W. Van Dyck
Senior Investment Management Consultant
Social Equity Investment Group
345 California Street, Suite 2200
San Francisco, CA 94104
Tel: (800) 295-1445
Tvandyck@56001.pjc.com

According to the Social Investment Forum, PRIs are part of a growing community investment trend. Assets held and invested locally by community development financial institutions (CDFIs) totaled \$5.4 billion, up from \$4 billion in 1997. This critically important capital is invested in community development banks, credit unions, loan funds and venture capital funds, and is focused on local development initiatives, affordable housing and small business lending in many of the neediest urban and rural areas of the country. Funders should be aware of partnership opportunities with the environmental justice movement where these types of investments may be appropriate.

Greening Philanthropic Activism

The philanthropic mission of the environmental justice-oriented grantmaking community in the United States can be enhanced by engaging in mission-related investing strategies and mission-related shareholder action, as well as [in certain instances] program-related investments and mission-related purchasing. Moreover, the initiatives could be employed on a much wider scale to support the organizing initiatives and campaigns of the movement. As these strategies gain greater acceptance by the larger funding community, and as the environmental justice movement continues to grow and evolve, these and other forms of philanthropic activism are likely to become more common. The invitation to grantmakers by the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation to join a shareholder advocacy network, the Foundation Partnership on Corporate Responsibility (see resource box), is an important step in this direction. A number of other organizations, such as the Corporate Accountability Program at *As You Sow* (see resource box), can provide invaluable investment and shareholder services to individual foundations.

We recommend that environmental grantmakers make better use of these strategies to support on-the-ground efforts by community-based organizations working for social justice and environmental protection. A large network of foundations coordinating around

Additional Organizational Support

Council on Economic Priorities
30 Irving Place, 9th Floor
New York, NY 10003
Tel: (800) 729-4237
www.cepnyc.org

Council of Institutional Investors
1730 Rhode Island Avenue, NW, Suite 512
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 822-0800

Consulting Group
George A. Dunn, Director
Salomon Smith Barney Inc.
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 225
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 861-5010

Investor Responsibility Research Center
1350 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 833-0700
www.irrc.org

Coalition for Environmentally Responsible
Economies (CERES)
11 Arlington Street, 6th Floor
Boston, MA 02116
Tel: (617) 247-0700
www.ceres.org

Social Investment Forum
1612 K Street NW, Suite 650
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 872-5319

shareholder resolutions and mission-related investing could wield enormous influence in support of grassroots organizing, advocacy, and litigation by local organizations, the strategic regional and national networks, and law centers which make up the environmental justice movement.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) *Philanthropic activism* is a process whereby grantmakers go beyond the traditional role of dispersing funds to undertake additional actions and responsibilities which further the mission of the foundation. There is a growing recognition that this institutional clout provides environmental funders with the ability, as well as the obligation, to support struggles for environmental protection and social justice beyond the awarding of grants. It is our recommendation that the political-economic power of the foundation community be wielded in a more strategic fashion by environmental grantmakers to bolster the work of their own grantees as well as the environmental justice movement as a whole;
- (2) Foundations should make better use of *mission-related investing strategies*, where investments which would otherwise support companies that engage in environmentally destructive and socially irresponsible business practices are screened-out.. Mission-related investing thus aligns the investment and asset management strategies with the overall mission of the foundation in support of environmental justice;
- (3) Foundations should make better use of *mission-related shareholder action*, where the power of stock ownership is utilized to promote social and environmental justice through company dialogue and the filing of shareholder resolutions. By engaging in a variety of shareholder actions, funders can leverage their economic power to support campaigns by their grantees (or other environmental justice organizations) which are attempting to reform the behavior of a specific company (or companies) in which the foundation holds stock;
- (4) In certain instances, foundations might also make better use of *program-related investments*. Through program-related investments (PRIs) and investments in community activities, foundations can invest their assets in ways that support their grantmaking programs related to environmental justice;
- (5) Foundations can also better utilize *mission-related purchasing practices* in their investment and purchasing decisions to support socially and environmentally responsible organizations and businesses controlled by people of color, women, and other traditionally bypassed groups.

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS HIGHLIGHTED IN RESOURCE BOXES

Introduction – Transforming Green Politics

Brownfields to Greenfields in Portland, Oregon	p.6
The National Environmental Justice Advisory Council	p.7

Section I – Deeper Shades of Green

Environmental Justice Fund	p.9
Southwest Organizing Project (SWOP)	p.11
Southern Organizing Committee for Economic and Social Justice (SOC)	p.11
People Organized in Defense of Earth and Her Resources (PODER)	p.12
Labor Occupational Health Program (LOHP)	p.13
Farmworker Network for Economic and Environmental Justice (FWNEEJ)	p.14
Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC)	p.15
Indigenous Environmental Network	p.16
Rural Coalition	p.17
Center for Health, Environment and Justice (CHEJ)	p.18
Community Coalition for Environmental Justice (CCEJ)	p.18
Communities for a Better Environment (CBE)	p.19
Environmental Health Coalition (EHC)	p.20
CorpWatch (formerly Transnational Resource and Action Center)	p.21
Southwest Network for Environmental and Economic Justice (SNEEJ)	p.22
EarthRights International (ERI)	p.23
Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN)	p.24
Minnesota Alliance for a Progressive Action (MAPA)	p.24
Southern Echo	p.25
West Harlem Environmental Action (WE ACT)	p.26
Northeast Environmental Justice Network (NEJN)	p.26
Alternatives for Community & Environment (ACE)	p.27
Urban Habitat Program	p.28
Louisiana Environmental Action Network (LEAN)	p.28
Louisiana Labor-Neighbor Project	p.28

Section II – Not Enough Green to Go Around

Total Giving to the Environmental Movement	p.30
Foundation Giving to the Environment	p.31
Foundation Giving to the Environmental Justice Movement	p.32
Sample of Top Foundation Supporters of the Environmental Justice Movement	p.34
Environmental Support Center	p.35
French American Charitable Trust	p.37

Resources on Regranting Initiatives	p.38
New World Foundation	
Tides Foundation	
Fund for Southern Communities	
Seventh Generation Fund	
Center for Health, Environment and Justice	
Honor the Earth	p.39
Data Center	p.39

Section III – Greener Giving

Strategic Trainings and Education for Power (STEP) Project	p.44
Strategic Press Information Network (SPIN) Project	p.45
Resource Guide on Exemplary Grantmaking Practices	p.46
National Network of Grantmakers report	
Veatch Program Checklist for Evaluating Environmental Justice Organizations	p.48

Section IV – Green of Another Color

Principles of Environmental Justice	p.55
Resources On Diversity and Philanthropy	p.58
Funders Forum on Environmental Education	
New York Regional Association of Grantmakers	
Council on Foundations	
Internship Opportunities for People of Color	p.59
The SEO Internship in Philanthropy	
Center for Public Policy at the Union Insitute	
Everett Public Service Internship Program	
Multicultural Fellowship Program at the San Francisco Foundation	p.60

Section V – The Greening of Philanthropic Activism

Resources on Philanthropic Activism	p.64
Program-Related Investments, Foundation Center	
Mission-Based Investing, KLD	
Financial Markets Center	
Philanthropy as Stewardship, Environmental Grantmakers Association	
Resources from the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation	
Corporate Accountability Program: A Project of <i>As You Sow</i>	p.66
Shareholder Action in Support of Environmental Justice	p.67
Suggested Guidelines by SWOP and Noyes for Community-Investor Relations	p.68
Organizational Support	p.69
As You Sow	
Foundation Partnership on Corporate Responsibility	
Social Equity Investment Group	
Additional Organizational Support	p.70

ENDNOTES

1. See Bunyan Bryant, "Summary," p.212, in B. Bryant (ed.), *Environmental Justice: Issues, Policies, and Solutions* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 1995).
2. See Pablo Eisenberg, "A Crisis in the Nonprofit Sector," *National Civic Review*, Vol.86, No.4 (Winter 1997: 331-341).
3. Putnam borrows the term "social capital" from the sociologist James Coleman, and has conducted exhaustive studies on the forces behind declining civic participation in American society. See Robert Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000), pp.1-541.
4. See Seth Borgos and Scott Douglas, "Community Organizing and Civic Renewal: A View from the South," *Social Policy* (Winter 1996: 18-28).
5. See William Shutkin, *The Land That Could Be: Environmentalism and Democracy in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000), pp.1-20.
6. See Mark Gerzon, "Reinventing Philanthropy: Foundations and the Renewal of Civil Society," *National Civic Review*, Vol.84, No.2-3 (Summer-Fall 1995: 188-95).
7. See David Mathews, "Changing Times in the Foundation World," *National Civic Review*, Vol.86, No.4 (Winter 1997: 275-280).
8. See Dana Alston (ed.), *We Speak for Ourselves: Social Justice, Race, and Environment* (Washington, DC: The Panos Institute, 1991).
9. See John Rodman, "Paradigm Change in Political Science: An Ecological Perspective," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol.24, No.1 (September-October 1980: 49-78).
10. For more information, visit the NEJAC website at <http://es.epa.gov/oeca/oej/nejac/mainpage.html>.
11. The document is available at: <http://www.epa.gov/permits> or by calling the RCRA/Superfund Hotline at 1-800-24-9346.
12. Held in Washington DC, the four-day summit was attended by more than 560 grassroots and national leaders from around the world. On September 27, 1991, delegates adopted 17 'Principles of Environmental Justice,' which now serve as a common guide for the movement. See Charles Lee, *Proceedings: The First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit* (New York: United Church of Christ Commission for Racial Justice, 1992); and Dana Alston, "Transforming a Movement: People of Color Unite at Summit Against Environmental Racism," *Sojourner*, Vol.21 (1992: 30-31).

13. See Ann Bastian and Dana Alston, "An Open Letter To Funding Colleagues: New Developments in the Environmental Justice Movement," New World Foundation and the Public Welfare Foundation (September 1993): pp.1-4.
14. Held in Washington DC, the four-day summit was attended by more than 560 grassroots and national leaders from around the world. On September 27, 1991, delegates adopted 17 'Principles of Environmental Justice,' which now serve as a common guide for the movement. See Charles Lee, *Proceedings: The First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit* (New York: United Church of Christ Commission for Racial Justice, 1992); and Dana Alston, "Transforming a Movement: People of Color Unite at Summit Against Environmental Racism," *Sojourner*, Vol.21 (1992: 30-31).
15. For a study which documents the disproportionate exposure to ecological hazards experienced by communities of color in comparison to white communities, see Daniel Faber and Eric Krieg, *Unequal Exposure to Ecological Hazards: A Preliminary Report on Environmental Injustices in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (Boston: Northeastern University, November 2000). See also Robert Bullard (ed.), *Unequal Protection: Environmental Justice and Communities of Color* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1994).
16. See Dana Alston, *We Speak for Ourselves: Social Justice, Race, and Environment* (Washington, D.C.: The Panos Institute, 1990).
17. See Benjamin F. Chavis, Jr., and Charles Lee, *Toxic Wastes and Race in the United States: A National Report on the Racial and Socioeconomic Characteristics of Communities Surrounding Hazardous Waste Sites* (New York: United Church of Christ Commission for Racial Justice, 1987). This study analyzed data on the number and type of hazardous waste facilities in the approximately 35,500 residential zip codes of the United States, along with data on percent minority population, mean household income, mean home value, number of uncontrolled toxic waste sites per 1000 persons, and pounds of hazardous waste generated per person.
18. See Benjamin Goldman and L. Fitton, *Toxic Waste and Race Revisited: An Update of the 1987 Report on the Racial and Socioeconomic Characteristics of Communities with Hazardous Waste Sites* (Washington, DC: Center for Alternatives, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the United Church of Christ Commission for Racial Justice, 1994).
19. See Marianne Lavelle and Marcia Coyle, "Unequal Protection: The Racial Divide in Environmental Law," *National Law Journal*, September 21, 1992, pp.2-12.
20. For studies of environmental racism, see Robert D. Bullard, *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1990); Robert D. Bullard, (ed.), *Unequal Protection: Environmental Justice and Communities of Color* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1994); and Bunyan Bryant and Paul Mohai, (eds.), *Race and the Incidence of Environmental Hazards: A Time for Discourse* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1992).

21. See Charles Levenstein and John Wooding, "Dying for a Living: Workers, Production, and the Environment," pp.60-80, in Daniel Faber (ed.), *The Struggle for Ecological Democracy: Environmental Justice Movements in the United States* (New York: Guilford, 1998)
22. See Ivette Perfecto, "Farm Workers, Pesticides, and the International Connection," in Paul Mohai and Bunyan Bryant (eds.), *Race and the Incidence of Environmental Hazards: A Time for Discourse* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1992), pp.177-203.
23. These tribally controlled land holdings, including 44 million acres of Native lands in Alaska, make up 4.2 percent of the entire United States (about the size of California).
24. See Winona LaDuke, *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life* (Boston: South End Press, 1999); Jane Weaver and Russell Means (eds), *Defending Mother Earth: Native American Perspectives on Environmental Justice* (Orbis Books, 1996); and Donald A. Grinde, Howard Zinn, and Bruce Elliott Johansen, *Ecocide of Native America: Environmental Destruction of Indian Lands and Peoples* (Clear Light Publishers, 1998).
25. See National Research Council, *Environmental Epidemiology: Public Health and Hazardous Wastes* (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1991).
26. For a review, see Environmental Research Foundation, *Rachel's Hazardous Waste News*, No.332, April 8, 1993, pp.1-2.
27. The 1998 Toxic Release Inventory data and background information on the TRI program are available at <http://www.epa.gov/tri/tri98>.
28. See Robert D. Bullard, *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1990); and Robert D. Bullard (ed.), *Unequal Protection: Environmental Justice and Communities of Color* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1994).
29. In the words of Lewis Regenstein, "the long history of inadequate enforcement of the RCRA (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act) helps defeat the purpose of not only this statute, but of other environmental laws as well." See Lewis Regenstein, *How to Survive in America the Poisoned* (Washington, DC: Acropolis Books, 1986), p.160.
30. See Daniel Faber, *Environment Under Fire: Imperialism and the Ecological Crisis in Central America* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1993).
31. See Barry Castleman and Vicente Navarro, "International Mobility of Hazardous Products, Industries, and Wastes," *Annual Review of Public Health*, Vol.8 (1987:1-19); and Joshua Karliner, *The Corporate Planet: Ecology and Politics in the Age of Globalization* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1997).
32. See Roberto A. Sanchez, "Health and Environmental Risks of the Maquiladora in Mexicali," *Natural Resources Journal*, Vol.30 (Winter 1990: 163-170).

33. See Daniel Faber, *Environment Under Fire: Imperialism and the Ecological Crisis in Central America* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1993).
34. See *Giving USA 2000: The Annual Report on Philanthropy for the Year 1999* (New York: AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy, 2000).
35. Independent foundations, including family foundations and private health care conversion foundations, comprise the vast majority of America's nearly 47,000 grantmaking foundations and account for most of the giving (having provided an estimated \$17.5 billion of the total \$22.8 billion in 1999). Some 2,022 corporate foundations gave an estimated \$2.99 billion in 1999 (a 22.2 percent increase of \$2.45 billion from 1998). Increases in total giving by 437 community foundations also remained strong, reaching an estimated \$1.68 billion in 1999, up from \$1.46 billion in 1998 and \$1.19 billion in 1997. In fact, since 1995, giving by community foundations has more than doubled. See Loren Renz and Steven Lawrence, *Foundation Growth and Giving Estimates: 1999 Preview* (New York, NY: The Foundation Center, 2000), p.3. A summary of the report can be accessed at <http://www.fdncenter.org>.
36. Funding for the environment amounted to more than five times the support provided for animals and wildlife. Within the environment category, natural resource conservation and protection accounted for more than three-fifths of grant dollars, followed by pollution control, botanical and horticultural programs, and policy, management, and information. See Steven Lawrence, Carlos Camposeco, and John Kendzior, *Foundation Giving Trends: Update on Funding Priorities* (New York, NY: The Foundation Center, 2000), p.8-19.
37. The Foundation Center estimates that total foundation giving to the environment (animals and wildlife included) may be as high as 6 percent in 1998-99.
38. The figures in this column come from Loren Renz and Steven Lawrence, *Foundation Growth and Giving Estimates: 1999 Preview* (Washington, DC: The Foundation Center, 2000), pp.3-4.
39. FC Search, Version 4.0, is available on CD-ROM from the Foundation Center. The *People of Color Environmental Groups Directory* is available from the C.S. Mott Foundation at 1-800-645-1766, or E-Mail at infocenter@mott.org. In addition to the major law centers, mainstream environmental organizations such as the Environmental Defense Fund and Sierra Club (which funds the environmental justice program internally) were deleted from the data.
40. Many of the smaller or foreign-based organizations funded by these twelve foundations are not found in the *People of Color 2000 Directory* produced by the EJRC.
41. See Mark Dowie, *Losing Ground: American Environmentalism at the Close of the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995), p.41.
42. See David Mathews, "Changing Times in the Foundation World," *National Civic Review*, Vol.86, No.4 (Winter 1997: 275-280).

43. See Dana Alston, *We Speak for Ourselves: Social Justice, Race, and Environment* (Washington, DC: The Panos Institute, 1990).
44. See Mark Gerzon, "Reinventing Philanthropy: Foundations and the Renewal of Civil Society," *National Civic Review* (Summer-Fall 1995: 188-195).
45. See Pablo Eisenberg, "A Crisis in the Nonprofit Sector," *National Civic Review*, Vol.86, No.4 (Winter 1997: 331-341).
46. See David Mathews, "Changing Times in the Foundation World," *National Civic Review*, Vol.86, No.4 (Winter 1997: 279).
47. See Ira Silver, "Constructing 'Social Change' Through Philanthropy: Boundary Framing and the Articulation of Vocabularies of Motives for Social Movement Participation," *Sociological Inquiry*, vol.67, No.4 (November 1997: 488-503).
48. For an excellent discussion of these claims, see Giovanna Di Chiro, Ch.4, "Environmental Justice from the Grassroots: Reflections on History, Gender, and Expertise," pp.104-136 in Daniel Faber (ed.), *The Struggle for Ecological Democracy: Environmental Justice Movements in the United States* (New York: Guilford Press, 1998).
49. See Ellen Furnari, Carol Mollner, Teresa Odendahl, and Aileen Shaw, *Exemplary Grantmaking Practices: Manual*, a report by the National Network of Grantmakers, 1997, p.33. Available from the NNG at 1717 Kettner Blvd., Suite 110, San Diego, CA 92101. Tel: (619) 231-1348. E-Mail: nng@nng.org
50. For a discussion of FACT's role in helping to create the Strategic Training and Education for Power Project, see *The French American Charitable Trust: Five Year Report 1995-1999*, available from FACT: Tel (415) 288-1305; or E-Mail fact@factservices.org
51. For a discussion of some earlier foundation efforts to address issues of diversity and environmental justice, see Melanie Beth Oliviero, *Minorities and the Environment: An Inquiry for Foundations* (A Report to the Nathan Cummings Foundation, January 1991), pp.1-41.
52. For instance, the Groot Foundation in St. Paul, Minnesota, has been funding grassroots organizations, especially in the Native American community, since its inception in 1964. Much of the foundation's services and supplies come from a variety of diverse vendors in the community, including *At Your Fingertips Office Products*, a Native owned operation.
53. See Mark Dowie, *Passive, Dissonant or Making a Difference: Which Way for Foundation Investing?*, a 2000 report available from Financial Markets Center, pp.1-16, at Finmktctr@aol.com.
54. Ibid, p2.
55. The ranks of socially responsible mutual funds continue to swell. The number of screened mutual funds increased to 175 in 1999 from 139 in 1997, and just 55 in 1995. Assets in screened

mutual funds grew by 60 percent from 1997 to 1999. Screened mutual fund assets expanded to \$154 billion in 1999 from \$96 billion in 1997, and up from just \$12 billion in 1995, according to the Social Investment Forum.

56. See *Philanthropy as Stewardship: Recommended Principles & Practices for Operating in an Environmentally Responsible Manner* (New York: Environmental Grantmakers Association, 2000). This booklet, as well as current updated information, resources and contacts, can be found at www.ega.org.

57. Excerpted from “President’s Essay,” by [then] President Steve Viederman (in collaboration with Louis Head and Jeanne Guana, Co-Director of SWOP), in *Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation 1997 Annual Report*, pp.9-12.

58. See Dowie (2000: 1-12).

59. See *Program-Related Investments: A Guide to Funders and Trends*, a 2000 report by the Foundation Center (available at http://fdncenter.org/grantmaker/trends/pri_high.html).