

## 11.368 - Reaction Paper 5

I found it interesting to think about Taquino's hog farm article in the context of Laura Pulido's critique of environmental racism research. When I read Taquino's summary and saw that he found that "Race was the only variable that was consistently not found to be significant across all units," I thought that his conclusion was going to be that environmental racism did not exist in the placement of hog farms in Mississippi. After reading the whole article, I am not sure if this is the case. Taquino concludes that income, not race, is the most significant factor in determining the placement of hog farms. At first glance, this appears to refute the environmental racism hypothesis, but as Pulido highlights, income is often a function of race.

I am confused as to whether Taquino's analysis supersedes Pulido's point. Pulido makes several arguments which lead me to believe that it does not. Primarily, Pulido acknowledges that racial and income groups can be separated, but she states that this separation does not illuminate how racism may pervade the socioeconomic structure of society. Furthermore, Pulido warns that racism is too deeply entrenched and too difficult to identify for its effects to be completely recognized and isolated from other variables.

Yet, I was very impressed with the thoroughness of Taquino's study, and it led me to believe that he sufficiently separated race and economic class. I do not fully understand all of the statistical nuances of Taquino's statistical analysis, but my impression was that when considered by itself, racism was positively correlated to the siting of industrial hog farms. When other factors such as economics were taken into account, Taquino concludes

that race was not correlated to hog farm placement. Given the supposed statistical independence of race and economic class in Taquino's study, is it still possible that racism is responsible for the placement of hog farms?