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Abstract

Equal access to transportation in the United States and in South Africa has been fraught for Black people. In both localities, there have been historic efforts to combat racist acts to shun Blacks from the right to ride public vehicles. I focus on the mobility hardships faced by Black people in New Orleans and Johannesburg. Because transportation plays a key role in Black people’s functioning, it is important for me to consider the effect of decision-makers as they relate to transit and access challenges.
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Introduction

Coretta Scott King said “Struggle is a never-ending process. Freedom is never really won, you earn it and win it in every generation” (Goods, 2020, para. 5). I will provide a historical lens into the transportation struggles faced by marginalized populations. For Black people, there have been some pivotal moments in the transportation history of the United States of America. For example, in the civil rights era, Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat to a White man. Mrs. Parks’ refusal was the spark for the Montgomery bus boycott, where African Americans did not ride city buses in the Deep South in opposition to segregated bus seating. These moments are well known and often told, but I want to dig deeper into the long history of Black people fighting for their right to mobility. Importantly, despite Black people’s well-earned victories for transportation freedom, there is still a necessary fight to ensure this right is not lost.

In addition to these milestones, there is a long history of segregation on public transit and efforts by Black people to fight for the right to use public transportation. In this paper, I explain the efforts of James Buffman and Frederick Douglas, Elizabeth Jennings Graham, Ida B. Wells, Homer Plessy, the Baton Rouge Bus Boycotters, the Bus Riders Union members, and the Johannesburg Bus Boycotters in their struggle for the right to mobility. Furthermore, I explore Black people’s lack of access to transit and highlight the deliberate and blunt racist acts throughout the history of transportation in the United States and South Africa. I will focus on New Orleans and Johannesburg because of the similar struggles faced by Blacks on public transit in these cities. This paper will broadly explain the role of transportation in the livelihoods of people, and it will show the impact of transportation decisions on Blacks and other people of color.
For this paper, there are three key definitions. First, transportation equity is “fairness in mobility and accessibility to meet the needs of all community members” (Federal Transit Administration, n.d., para. 1). Second, access is seen as “(…) peoples’ ability to use mobility options and to reach goods and services” (Patterson, 2020, p. 6). Third, Bus Rapid Transit is defined as: “a high-quality bus-based transit system that delivers fast and efficient service that may include dedicated lanes, busways, traffic signal priority, off-board fare collection, elevated platforms, and enhanced stations” (Federal Transit Administration, 2015, para. 1).

**Pattern and Momentum**

As Patterson (2020) notes, the method to control the mobility of African Americans was segregated transit. The progress for African Americans toward more mobility with public transit in the United States started in 1841 with James Buffman and Frederick Douglas. In what appears to be the first step in the road to integration in public transit, these two daringly entered a train car in Lynn, Massachusetts that was for Whites-only. When they were told to get off, they disobeyed that order. They were not the only ones who brazenly left a path for others to enter. In the summer of 1854, surprisingly thirteen years after Buffman’s and Douglas’ unprecedented move, Elizabeth Jennings Graham insisted on her right to ride a New York City horsecar and was forcibly removed from it because it was for Whites-only (Hipkins & Busch, n.d). At the root of Buffman’s, Douglas’, and Graham’s efforts for integration and toward more transportation equity for African Americans, there is a White person who decided whether Blacks could be granted access to public transit. We can also see the exclusion of Black people on public transportation occurred in various locations. Despite transportation racism in the past, the struggle for integration in transit and the push for transportation equity is not over.
Before Plessy v. Ferguson

To travel while Black meant that they were restricted and the institution of segregation. Before the Civil War (1861-1865), most Black passengers, mainly slaves, were deliberately placed in combination cars. These were cars connected behind the engine for both luggage and passengers. They were made explicitly for Black riders. Segregation on trains and streetcars did not begin in the South. Instead, in the 1840s and 1850s, segregation was instituted in the North as a means of controlling former slaves. The segregation of Black people on trains was due to policies. Policies also required African American streetcar passengers to ride on outdoor platforms even when the cars were not full on the inside. Emancipated African Americans and abolitionists protested these policies. Eventually, by the end of the Civil War, segregation on public transit in the North was prohibited in response to these protests (Kelley, 2010). However, segregated trains and streetcars after the war were “reimagined and revived” in the South (Kelley, 2010, p. 3). In the immediate aftermath of the Civil War, there were segregated rail lines in the South. Then, the federal government desegregated southern rail lines. Even with desegregated lines, White southerners wanted to consider former slaves as slaves. In the South, Black people were randomly denied the right to ride public transportation even without segregation laws in the states (Kelley, 2010).

There was unpredictability as far as racism faced by African Americans when they were attempting to travel whether by rail or streetcar. Black people’s access to transportation did not improve with legal protections. Moreover, Black travelers in the South still had to deal with chaos and confusion when traveling after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1875. Specifically, this federal act prohibited racial discrimination on public transportation.
In addition, because there was no interest in upholding this federal law, the states had variations in their rules and regulations (Kelley, 2010).

While there were legal protections against discrimination, ultimately, Black people’s right to public transit was in the hands of transportation conductors. The power to decide who does and does not have access to transportation was with the conductor. Utilizing their own discretion, conductors might choose to move Black riders to a smoker or eject them before arriving at their destination. There were even some conductors who did not want to disturb White riders by unseating Black riders (Kelley, 2010). Additionally, if a Black person matched the conductor’s “standards” of proper dress and behavior, then they would sometimes be granted admission into a “first class car” (Kelley, 2010, p. 36).

**Ida B. Wells**

Black people, such as Ida B. Wells, commingling with White people gradually threatened white supremacy. Some Whites did not like having African Americans on board with them on the streetcar, so they complained. After doing so, the railroads (presumably the conductor) would deny them equal or shared access to a car with a White person. White people did not like riding with Black people no matter the class (Kelley, 2010).

In 1883, the Supreme Court nullified the Civil Rights Act of 1875. This ruling, “opened the floodgates of both formal and informal discriminatory policies” and made Black people’s legal standing all the more tenuous or uncertain (Kelley, 2010, p. 35). In the fall of 1883, a schoolteacher and journalist, Ida B. Wells was asked to move to a different car, the “smoker,” a part of a train where people were allowed to smoke, despite the fact that she was always allowed to travel with White people (Kelley, 2010, p. 35). Wells often used the train to travel from Memphis to Woodstock Tennessee to get to the school where she
taught (Digital Public Library of America, n.d.). After being asked to move to the “smoker,” she refused to give up her seat. Kelley recalls: “Wells fought hard to stay in the car, biting the conductor’s hand and holding onto her seat for dear life just as Frederick Douglas had done forty years earlier.” It eventually took four people, including White male riders and the conductor, to “forcibly” get her out of the car. Wells sued the railroad company twice to challenge “inequitable racial practices.” She was not the only Black passenger to resist unequal treatment and take railroad companies to court for discriminatory actions. There was a rise in lawsuits from “offended” Black riders (Kelley, 2010, p. 35). This indicates that informal segregation was becoming more common, but these suits were rare (Kelley, 2010).

**Homer Plessy**

On June 7, 1892, Homer Plessy, a 30-year-old light-skinned man of African ancestry, boarded a Whites-only train car in New Orleans and refused to get off. There was an 1890 law on the books in Louisiana called Separate Car Act that “decreed ‘equal but separate accommodations for the white and colored races’ on Louisiana railway cars.” This law “implied that if a half-empty ‘white’ car was waiting, and even if only one Black passenger showed up, he or she would have to have a whole separate-but-equal vehicle made available” (Medley, n.d., para. 1). Plessy was imprisoned for disobeying the Separate Car Act. This sequence of events and this racist bill would ultimately lead to the United States Supreme Court case of Plessy v. Ferguson. The magnitude of this future case is important to note because the future of constitutional rights for African Americans would depend on this case (Medley, n.d.).
1953 Baton Rouge Bus Boycott

After Plessy’s refusal to be denied the right to ride in New Orleans, there were boycotters of the buses in Baton Rouge in 1953. In essence, the 1953 Baton Rouge bus boycott was about protesting non-integrated seats on city buses by thousands of people. There was a city ordinance that fundamentally allowed Blacks to sit in the empty sections of the bus that were for Whites. However, carrying out this city directive was at the bus driver's discretion. Many bus drivers refused to obey this order. There were also segregation laws in Louisiana. It was found that the ordinance was in direct violation of these state regulations. So, Reverend T. J. Jemison led the efforts with the Black community to boycott this city’s buses for eight days. Noteworthy, Dr. Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. discussed with Reverend Jemison the strategies used in the Baton Rouge boycott. In addition, King used those tactics to plan the Montgomery bus boycott (Melton, 2022; Hipkins & Busch, n.d.). Historians suggest that the Baton Rouge boycott was the first bus boycott that took place in the civil rights movement (Elliott, 2003). In order for people to travel, during the Baton Rouge boycott, the local community created a “‘free ride’ network or carpool,” which enabled this boycott to proceed (Hipkins & Busch, n.d., para. 39). There was a compromise formed to end the protest. The city council and bus drivers agreed without the Black community’s consent that: the front seats were for White people, the back row would be for Black people, and all other seats were seen as first-come-first-serve. Upon this agreement, on June 25, 1953, the Baton Rouge boycott was officially over.

The Bus Riders Union

The Bus Riders Union members were also fighters against racist actions. In 1992, the Bus Riders Union was established in Los Angeles by the Labor/Community Strategy Center
Significantly, BRU is considered the largest grassroots mass transportation advocacy group in the United States. The BRU agenda is progressive with varying issues. The key principles for BRU are unity and agreement among members (“Bus Riders Union,” 2017). One of the Bus Riders Union’s campaigns was “Billions for Buses” (Cong-Huyen, et al., n.d.). The purpose of the campaign was to fight against transportation racism (Cong-Huyen, et al., n.d.) in that the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority “raided” transportation funds away from the bus system, utilizing the funds instead for rail (Mann, 2013, para. 1). From the perspective of the Bus Riders Union, the MTA is committing “transit racism” by taking funds from buses that people of color and low income relied on the most (Mann, 2013, para. 1). The agency’s bus fleet was also “dilapidated and overcrowded” (Cong-Huyen, et al., n.d., para. 1). In my view, those funds that were used for rail as opposed to buses led to these horrible conditions. The daily bus riders in Los Angeles were 88% people of color (Cong-Huyen, et al., n.d.). So, this leads me to believe that there was transportation racism, or the agency was being discriminatory by deliberately allowing its largest ridership group to experience deplorable buses that were neglected and overfilled. The other purpose of the campaign was to replace those “dilapidated” buses with new clean-fuel buses and expand the bus fleet with more buses to reduce “overcrowding” (Mann, 2001, p. 265). As noted above, people of color were the most affected by the “dilapidated and overcrowded” conditions (Cong-Huyen, et al., n.d., para. 1). Also, the Bus Riders Union accused the transportation agency of violating Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act in that the agency was allocating federal funds in a discriminatory manner (Hipkins & Busch, n.d.).
Johannesburg Transport for Blacks and the Bus Boycotts

Similar to what I described above, in Johannesburg, there was the exclusion of Blacks on public transport. The Johannesburg regulations of 1897 did not permit Black people to ride with White-only public transport. However, Blacks were allowed to ride horse-drawn trams or omnibuses designed for Black-only. The 1897 regulations sanctioned by the Johannesburg government were initially a smallpox-prevention measure from the Johannesburg Sanitary Committee in 1892 (Pirie, 1989). 1906 regulations again altered Black people’s mobility. Moreover, these new rules only permitted Blacks to access tramcars if an alternative service was not available. As Wood (2023) notes, “legislation went back and forth reinforcing and reducing segregation abroad Johannesburg’s tramcars.” In 1927, Black people in Johannesburg were only granted access to “‘native’” tramcars (Wood, 2023, pp. 1027-1028). These 1927 by-laws meant that Black people were strictly allowed to travel in trams that were for them and not with their White counterparts.

In Johannesburg, Black people’s movement was not only restrained on tramcars but also on buses. In the 1940s, there were eight bus boycotts in Johannesburg, including five in Alexandra, over the attempted increase in the fare price. With every strike, the fare did not rise. In 1957, there was another bus boycott in Alexandra. During this time, Black mobility was severely hampered by racist laws, namely, “pass laws,” which were designed to alienate them from the city. “Pass laws” of 1866 presumed intent was to restrict Blacks’ mobility in South Africa (Wood, 2023, p. 1029). Additionally, “pass laws” forced Black people to settle in certain places so that White laborers could utilize the Blacks for work (“Pass Laws in South Africa 1800-1994,” n.d., para. 9). “The 1950s, not unlike today, Alexandra was overcrowded with informal tin shacks, inadequate services, deteriorating roads,
underperforming schools, and rampant crime,” Wood wrote (Wood, 2023, p. 1028). Boycotters refused to ride public transport in Alexandra in 1957 because of the declared fare rise. In protest, they walked several miles from Alexandra to Johannesburg. The protesters won. No fare increased. When the boycott happened, Black people did not have the right to vote, representation in city or national bodies, the right to assemble, and a way to consult with any authority. In the face of these challenges, Black people protested to be heard (Wood, 2023). As a result of the 1957 strike, there was a “rallying cry” against apartheid activities and a rise in a democratic political party (Wood, 2023, p.1029). From my point of view, the 1957 bus boycott was more successful than the 1940s bus strikes because this fight was a collective effort that was promulgated throughout the region.

**And so, we keep fighting.**

Despite all these historic efforts, there is still work to be done. In *Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity,* Bullard argues that there is transportation racism. It has been difficult for African Americans and other people of color to end transportation racism. From a historical vantage point, the challengers of transportation racism were Rosa Parks, the Montgomery and Baton Rouge bus boycotters, and Elizabeth Graham (Bullard, 2004). I encourage Black people to continue fighting, like those figures before us, for our basic right: transportation equity. In addition, people of color from all across the United States “are banding together to challenge unfair, unjust, and illegal transportation policies and practices that relegate them to the back of the bus” (Bullard, 2004, p. 2).

Public transit is invaluable and a critical issue. Transportation remains a civil rights issue in the United States. In this country, transportation inequality affects education, voting,
housing, personal health, and education. Additionally, there is discrimination at the junction of class, race, and space in transportation policy (Archer, 2021). American families spend more on transportation than anything else except for housing. So, transportation is essential for everyone. Public transit can help people get to where they need to go, including attending church, going to a doctor’s appointment, or visiting friends or family. Opportunities are possible when someone has access to transportation (Bullard, 2004).

**Issues of Accessibility to Transportation in the United States**

In spite of efforts in the past by Blacks to go against injustices, there is still a stark reality for minorities and accessibility to transportation services. Sanchez states, “Many past and current transportation policies have limited the life chances of minorities by preventing access to places and opportunities” (Sanchez et al., 2018, p. 1). Unfortunately, there are inequities built-in transportation policies in the United States that are disproportionately felt by the marginalized. Moreover, after World War II, automobile-oriented policies emphasized highway construction instead of public transit even though minorities and some lower-income people depend on public transit to travel due to not owning a car. So often people with lower incomes are minorities. These people are at an economic disadvantage or transportation inequities are the byproduct of transit policies toward car usage and dependence (Sanchez et al., 2018).

As Carter (2021) found, funding highways instead of public transportation has been more of a priority in the past. Upon examination of equity and inclusion of federal transportation policy in the United States, Rubin concluded that there has been more of a focus on building highways and car dependency and less attention on more equitable public transportation options. Consequently, the benefactors of this fact are those with higher
percentages of car ownership: White middle-class or wealthy households. Additionally, the part of the populace who benefit the least is Blacks and Latinos who have the United States’ lowest rates of car ownership (Carter, 2021). White people and wealthy groups utilize public transit less than their counterparts, which include communities of color and those with lower incomes. Specifically, 54 percent of public transit riders and 62 percent of bus users are Black and Latinx people. In contrast to White riders, Black riders are about six times as likely to take advantage of public transportation. This is especially true with respect to urban transit because metropolitan areas have over 88 percent of Black people. In an almost contrasting way, White riders have a higher likelihood of taking rail transportation while Black commuters have a higher chance of taking the bus as opposed to rail transit (Archer, 2021).

While they rely on public transit services, the marginalized population is worse off due to transportation insufficiencies. Upon reviewing transportation equity, Hamidi found that in 2017 minority neighborhoods, which are most dependent on public transit, in many United States cities had the lowest level of service depending on transit coverage and frequency (Powder, 2020). Moreover, the urban poor are also frequent public transit riders because of their limited car access and ownership (Kgatjepe & Ogra, 2016). Like in New Orleans, as I will explain below, minorities and people with lower incomes generally rely on public transit due to a lack of automobile ownership (Sanchez et al., 2018).

Furthermore, from a broader perspective, it has been shown that African Americans' experiences are far worse compared to others. Based on Patterson (2020), 20 percent of Black households and 33 percent of low-income Black households in the United States are without a car. In fact, no other race or ethnicity in America is higher than this. Because
mobility in the United States is largely dictated by access to a vehicle, these minorities are at a severe disadvantage as far as getting to work, receiving an education, and obtaining healthier foods, just to name a few. 10% of African Americans depend on public transportation in the United States to access their jobs. Black people’s average commute time via transit is by far the longest in comparison to others (Patterson, 2020).

**Transportation Decisions**

I would like to focus more on the impact of transportation decisions or policies. So often people of color get “poorly planned” transportation systems (Bullard, 2004, p. 3). Furthermore, some transportation decisions include choosing where to place freeways, bus stops, fueling stations, and train stations or deciding where to build highways, expressways, and beltways. In the United States, any of these transportation decisions determine or influence people’s opportunities and mobility and metropolitan areas and growth patterns. Additionally, these transportation policies have either helped or subsidized racial and economic inequities when looking at segregated housing and spatial layouts of central cities and suburbs. Even worse than that, there are neighborhoods with low-income and people of color residents that have been divided by federally subsidized infrastructure projects. Consequently, these projects separate low-income and people of color residents from their institutions and businesses, make their past communities unstable, and relocate successful businesses (Bullard, 2004). Congressman John Lewis, a prominent civil rights activist, adds that some transportation policies and practices in the United States today disrupt stable communities, leave people in deteriorating neighborhoods segregated and isolated, and do not supply communities with jobs and economic growth centers (Archer, 2021). On top of that, local economies have been destroyed and Black people’s communities have been
demolished, divided, and displaced as a result of highway construction (Patterson, 2020). As previously mentioned earlier in this paper, Black people did not participate in the decision-making during the negotiations to stop the 1953 Baton Rouge bus boycott. Similarly, highway construction is yet another example of excluding Black people from the decision-making, especially when the project impacts them. Moreover, there was very little community involvement from Blacks as it relates to highway construction. From a systemic view, transportation decisions and infrastructure projects have inflicted a burden on Black people and allowed for inequitable transportation systems (Patterson, 2020).

**The New Orleans Situation**

I will provide some background on New Orleans to demonstrate the need for transportation equity and better understand how to improve New Orleans' transportation network. According to the Data Center, a nonprofit dedicated to providing resources on Southeast Louisiana, the New Orleans population is still majority Black. The Black population in New Orleans in 2021 was 58 percent while in 2000 it was 67 percent (The Data Center, 2022). The City of New Orleans encompasses three large masses of water: the Mississippi River, the Gulf of Mexico, and Lake Pontchartrain. As for land elevations, the urban area range is from two to three feet above sea level to approximately two feet below sea level. In the Orleans Parish, dry land makes up 57% of the Parish’s landmass. As a result, the land development and transportation infrastructure (e.g. bridges, railways, ports, levees, and roads) are affected by the reduced landmass and water expansions (“Guideway Transit and Intermodalism,” 1995). It is also important to note that the second-highest cost for New Orleans families is transportation (City of New Orleans, 2019).
Berube and Raphael present five key findings on the more recent disparities in vehicle accessibility in New Orleans. First, there were approximately one and four people in New Orleans without a vehicle in 2000. Second, when looking at both White and Black households in the New Orleans metropolitan area, it was Blacks who were less likely to have automobiles. In addition, it was found that 27 percent of Black people in the New Orleans metropolitan area were without a car whereas 19 percent of Black people in the United States did not have a vehicle. Third, the poorer Black people in New Orleans face more significant transportation disadvantages than impoverished White people. The evidence showed a poor Black populace in New Orleans was 52 percent without a vehicle and a poor White populace was 17 percent with no access to a car. Fourth, children and older people in the New Orleans metropolitan area represented 38 percent of its population, but they were 48 percent of the residents without an automobile. Moreover, New Orleans households below or right above the poverty line were most of the people without vehicle access. Fifth, Blacks depended on public transportation, especially during emergencies (Berube & Raphael, 2005). Their research is problematic because it shows that some residents of New Orleans and Black and poorer people in the area in comparison to other races do not have vehicular mobility. There are some proposed solutions to address New Orleans’ transportation challenges. There should be a building of cooperation between the different Louisiana parishes and an enhancement of the transit network to improve access and movement within New Orleans' Central Business District (“Guideway Transit and Intermodalism,” 1995).
The Johannesburg Situation

In comparison to New Orleans, Johannesburg is positioned at 5,700 feet above sea level (“South Africa Geography,” n.d.). Also, when it comes to demographics, as of 2016, the Johannesburg Black African population is at 76.4 percent (“Johannesburg Population 2022/2023,” n.d.), which is similar to New Orleans.

When it comes to Johannesburg residents, their lives are not improved by using transportation services. The poor must deal with long journeys. Additionally, there are high costs from lengthy travel, which negatively impact the marginalized people’s incomes.

Similar to New Orleans, Johannesburg’s poorer residents are public transit-dependent due to the fact that their automobile ownership and access are limited. In the early 2000s in South Africa, transportation systems and patterns were made for automobile usage. As a byproduct, poorer groups had to rely on public transit, such as trains and taxis, for mobility needs because they could not afford a car (Kgatjepe & Ogra, 2016). Similar to what was discussed previously, these findings continue to show that accessibility, choice, and mobility are essential factors in their commute.

Johannesburg should consider Bus Rapid Transit to address issues. Public transportation in Johannesburg is “insufficient and ineffective” (Kgatjepe & Ogra, 2016, p. 358). It has been shown that Bus Rapid Transit can be effective and offer other benefits to the poorer population. According to researchers, Bus Rapid Transit is for lower-income individuals in many countries, including South Africa. For different cities, Bus Rapid Transit has reduced costs, created better quality mobility for remote localities, decreased travel times, saved costs, and lowered waiting times (Jennings, 2015). Bus Rapid Transit is a preferred option because it is flexible, and it can be realized rapidly and gradually.
(Marcantel, 2012). Bus Rapid Transit could fix car dependency, congestion, accessibility, and poor mobility throughout Johannesburg (Kgatjepe & Ogra, 2016). Not just that, it also emits less carbon dioxide than rail-based forms of rapid transit and could possibly create economic development if connected with neighboring land uses (Marcantel, 2012). More recently, Delta Built Environment Consultants was appointed to implement new Bus Rapid Transit stations in Johannesburg (Delta Group, 2021), and the consultants remark how these additions would provide marginalized areas “easier access” to economic hubs in Johannesburg (Delta Group, 2021, 0:43). With these new options, Bus Rapid Transit is also supposed to be cheaper (Delta Group, 2021).

Historically, Johannesburg's infrastructure has been utilized as a form of division and discipline. Roads, for instance, during the colonial and apartheid periods, separated Black and White communities. Moreover, questions of who could gain entry into Johannesburg and how they could move were managed or controlled by its transportation network. Conversely, in the post-apartheid period, transportation in Johannesburg allowed for opportunities for social and spatial changes. When crafting policy, policymakers are aware of these transformations. As for urban planners, they have beenremedying transportation inequalities since 1994 (Wood, 2023). Unfortunately, the legacy of apartheid spatial planning is the perception that Johannesburg is the “most unequal city in the world” coupled with the fact that it is “in the most unequal country in the world” (Abrahams & Everatt, 2019, p. 255).

**Conclusion**

From as early as the 1840s, Black people in the United States fought for the right to ride public transportation. Similarly, in an effort to have access to transit, there also were
people of color who spoke up in protest of transportation racism in South Africa. This paper encourages us to think about transportation equity and transportation as a continual civil rights matter. Access to public transit is essential, especially for Blacks. The impact of transportation decisions and policies has a ripple effect on the Black community. By shedding light on the current struggles faced by this population, we can begin to see the necessity to keep fighting for an equitable public transit future.
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