• Steady state economics
  o Economists need to incorporate externalities into their models
  o Stay at/below earth's carrying capacity

• Government regulation:
  o Steps in where free market fails to protect environment
  o Often fail because industry:
    ➢ Changes behaviour in response to regulations
    ➢ Bands together to circumvent regulations
    ➢ Examples Volkswagen (faking tests)

• Growth drive plus international competition support corporate pressures on government for regulatory reform
  o Eg neoliberal restructuring: rolled back enviro/health/safety protection etc
  o Daniel Faber: “capitalizing on environmental injustice”

• Sins of: omission (private property), commission (interference)

• Film clip: Walter block [FM economists]
  o Pollution
  o Species extinction: tragedy of the commons (private property i.e. cows)
  o Plastic, paper ➞ cost of production and disposal (ownership of the garbage dumps) ➞ Rathje garbage analysis (the garbage project & the archaeology of us)

• Sociology of law

• Mark Galanter: “why the ‘haves’ come out ahead: speculations on the limits of legal change” (1974)
  o Key: “one shotters” vs “repeat players”
    ▪ “One shotters” [OS]:
      ➕ Only occasionally enter the legal system
      ➕ Usually individuals with limited resources
      ➕ Litigate for immediate outcomes
    ▪ “repeat players” [RP]:
      ➕ Repeatedly involved in similar litigations
      ➕ Tend to be institutions
      ➕ Are relatively wealthy
“They induce systematic and often irreversible harm, generally remain invisible, are based on causal interpretations, and thus initially only exist in terms of the (scientific or anti-scientific) knowledge about them. They can thus be changed, magnified, dramatized or minimized within knowledge, and to that extent they are particularly open to social definition and construction” (beck, 1992:22)

- Expert systems
  - Public needs ‘sensory organs of science’ to make hazards visible
  - Public vulnerable to:
    - Expert biases
    - Selective communication/interpretation (eg. Politics/media)
- Quantification of risk
  - Scientific risk assessment can neglect social and cultural aspects → fail to recognize actual risks
  - Eg:
    - “on average” standard
    - Failure to address multiple exposures
- Scientific vs social rationality
  - Risk assessments require social component
  - Eg: acceptable/not acceptable is a social consideration
  - Risk assessments often obscure social component with mathematical probabilities and rational claims
- Risk and class:
  - “some people are more affected than others by the distribution and growth of risk, that is, social risk positions spring up” (Beck, 1992:23)
  - 1) historical (entrench)
    - Risk distribution adheres to class patterns
    - Poverty = risk
    - Wealth (power/education) = safety from risk
  - 2) novel risk pattern: inescapability
    - Exponential growth in number, pervasiveness, magnitude, etc. Of risks make the universally inescapable
- Example: Walkerton, Ontario (2000)
  - E-coli outbreak from run off
  - Expert system (Walkerton public utilities commission) water is “OK”
  - 7 died, ½ town sick (2500)
  - Class-less risk
- Boomerang effect
  - Equalizing effect: risks are catching up with those who produce and profit from them
  - Beck: “poverty is hierarchic, smog is democratic” (36)
  - Risk positions: not entirely class positions
- Public becomes more concerned/critical of modernization risk → reflexive modernization
  - Reflexive modernization:
    - Scientific/technology redirected to reform (instead of increase) production
      - Examples: recycling facilities, scrubbers on smoke stack emissions
    - Not necessarily break with logic of capitalist development
      - Ie bottled water (products we use to avoid risk are big business) reflective modernized → using all the bottles to create products
- **Bloody bread is better than no bread**
- Bloody bread
  - Treating people unequally can sometimes help everyone
  - Benefits could outweigh cost
    - (eg jobs + taxes offset health risks)
- Equal protection argument
  - Unethical to force people to jeopardize their health, relative to others, to survive.
  - Politically/economically powerless are not ‘free’ to consent.
- Free informed consent
  - Principals: protection of individual autonomy and from harm
  - Conditions:
    - Risk imposer:
      - must disclose info re threat
    - Risk taker must:
      - Be competent to evaluate it
      - Understand it
      - Voluntarily accept it
- Ej in Canada
  - The term EJ is not as common as US
  - No distinct EJ movement
  - Still have EJ issues
    - Differences with us
      - Canada:
        - Less strong patterns of racial segregation
        - Social safety net
        - Multiculturalism
        - Different fed/provincial responsibilities
- 5 canadian EJ research themes
  1. Demographic and enviro risks
  2. Aboriginals
  3. Race as a feature in social landscape
  4. Health/safety plus work-class linkage
  5. Local enviro social issues and large scale economical processes