# UT Dubs Neg vs Strake NW

# 1NC

### 1

#### Interp and Violation: The affirmative must only defend that a just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike and may only garner offense from the hypothetical implementation of a topical plan – they don’t.

#### “Resolved” denotes a formal resolution.

**AWS ’13** [Army Writing Style; August 24th; Online resource dedicated to all major writing requirements in the Army; Army Writing Style, "Punctuation — The Colon and Semicolon," <https://armywritingstyle.com/punctuation-the-colon-and-semicolon/>]

The colon introduces the following:

a.  A list, but only after "as follows," "the following," or a noun for which the list is an appositive: Each scout will carry the following: (colon) meals for three days, a survival knife, and his sleeping bag. The company had four new officers: (colon) Bill Smith, Frank Tucker, Peter Fillmore, and Oliver Lewis.

b.  A long quotation (one or more paragraphs): In The Killer Angels Michael Shaara wrote: (colon) You may find it a different story from the one you learned in school. There have been many versions of that battle [Gettysburg] and that war [the Civil War]. (The quote continues for two more paragraphs.)

c.  A formal quotation or question: The President declared: (colon) "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." The question is: (colon) what can we do about it?

d.  A second independent clause which explains the first: Potter's motive is clear: (colon) he wants the assignment.

e.  After the introduction of a business letter: Dear Sirs: (colon) Dear Madam: (colon) f.  The details following an announcement For sale: (colon) large lakeside cabin with dock

g.  A formal resolution, after the word "resolved:". Resolved: (colon) That this council petition the mayor.

#### A just “government” must be a sovereign law-making body.

Merriam-Webster No Date, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/government> brett

Full Definition of government

1: the body of persons that constitutes the governing authority of a political unit or organization: such as

a: the officials comprising the governing body of a political unit and constituting the organization as an active agency

The government was slow to react to the crisis.

bcapitalized : the executive branch of the U.S. federal government

ccapitalized

: a small group of persons holding simultaneously the principal political executive offices of a nation or other political unit and being responsible for the direction and supervision of public affairs:

(1): ADMINISTRATION sense 4b

(2): such a group in a parliamentary system constituted by the cabinet or by the ministry

#### “Guarantee[ing]” the “right to strike” requires the law to be upheld or changed.

NLRB No Date, <https://www.nlrb.gov/strikes> brett

Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act states in part, “Employees shall have the right. . . to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.” Strikes are included among the concerted activities protected for employees by this section. Section 13 also concerns the right to strike. It reads as follows:

Nothing in this Act, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right.

It is clear from a reading of these two provisions that: the law not only guarantees the right of employees to strike, but also places limitations and qualifications on the exercise of that right. See for example, restrictions on strikes in health care institutions (set forth below).

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Fairness – post facto topic adjustment structurally favors the aff by manipulating the balance of prep. They can specialize in 1 area of literature for 4 years which gives them a huge edge over people switching topics every 2 months and locks us into a predictable null set of monolithic criticisms that are susceptible to the perm. Fairness is an impact - a] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is fundamentally a game and some level of competitive equity is necessary to sustain the activity which they’ve ceded validity to by participating, b] probability – individual ballots can’t alter subjectivity even if long term clash over a season can, but they can rectify skews which means the only immediate impact to a ballot is fairness and deciding who wins, c] it internal link turns every impact – a limited topic promotes in-depth research and engagement which is necessary to access all of their education

#### 2] Clash – argumentative testing along a stable tether and SSD are good – they force debaters to consider a controversial issue from multiple perspectives through nuanced 3rd and 4th level testing that only occurs alongside a stasis point for preparation. Non-T affs allow individuals to establish their own metrics for what they want to debate leading to ideological dogmatism – our argument is that the process of defending and answering proposals against a well-researched opponent is a benefit of engaging the topic regardless of the truth value of those proposals.

#### 3] TVA – Worker strikes are a means to form Asian American Alliances to resist exploitative corporations that thrive on immigrant labor

Mok 3-27 [Aaron Mok, 3-27-2021, "How the Asian American-led 1982 garment strike shaped three decades of labor activism," Prism, <https://prismreports.org/2021/06/08/how-the-asian-american-led-1982-garment-strike-shaped-three-decades-of-labor-activism/> [accessed 11-3-21] lydia

On June 24, 1982, 20,000 garment workers—predominantly Chinese immigrant women—flooded the streets of New York City’s Chinatown to demand fair wages, benefits, and worker conditions from their employers. When the workers reached Columbus Park, city councilmen and organizers delivered passionate speeches on the podium, urging employers to sign the newly revised International Ladies’ Garment Workers Union (ILGWU) contract. One by one, Chinese employers rushed to sign, and by early afternoon every manufacturer agreed, marking a major win for Chinatown’s garment workers. Nearly two decades later, the strike is still known as [one of the largest protests](https://www.history.com/news/garment-workers-strike-chinatown) in the history of Chinatown. The success of the strike, however, remains overlooked, or, at best, forgotten by the popular imagination, says May Chen, one of the core ILGWU organizers of the strike. There was little media coverage on Asian Americans at the time, rendering Asian American-led movements and activism “invisible up to the millennium.” With the recent surge of attacks against Asians Americans—the byproduct of [decades’ worth of systemic racism](https://www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/the-long-history-of-racism-against-asian-americans-in-the-u-s) and more recently, the racialization of COVID-19 as the “China Virus,”—a new wave of Asian American activism has emerged. While President Joe Biden signed the [COVID-19 Hate Crimes Act](https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/senate-bill/937/text), [more than 85](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/asian-america/why-over-85-asian-american-lgbtq-groups-opposed-anti-asian-n1267421) Asian American and LGBTQ+ groups criticized the legislation’s focus on law enforcement—which has a dubious record when it comes to the protecting Asian American communities to begin with—for failing to address any of the root causes of anti-Asian violence, including economic inequality. In in an [op-ed](https://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/asian-americans-economic-inequality-is-violence-too/) for The Seattle Times, professor Linh Thủy Nguyễn wrote: “We can name physical attacks and deaths as racist violence, why can’t we name the system of racial capitalism that produces the economic precarity of living paycheck to paycheck an issue of violence, as well?” Racial capitalism and economic precarity were at the heart of the 1982 ILGWU strike, which stands as a stark rebuke to the common misperception that Asian Americans are politically unengaged and largely unconcerned with issues like workers’ rights. It’s a story of how Asian American alliances and activism transformed the economic conditions of an industry that exploits marginalized immigrant women with lessons for activists to follow nearly 30 years later. And crucially, it’s an example that illuminates how racial violence manifests in more subtle ways beyond hate crimes and violence. Economic independence through the garment industry In 1963, Chinatown’s garment industry spanned 50 garment factories and employed a total of [2,000](https://ilgwu.ilr.cornell.edu/announcements/5.html) workers. But after the [Immigration and Naturalization Act](https://www.loc.gov/classroom-materials/immigration/chinese/a-new-community/) eliminated the racial quota system that gave preference to western European immigrants and “skilled” workers in 1965, a new wave of Chinese immigration doubled the Chinese American population within a decade. Twenty years later, garment manufacturers sold between $150 and $200 million in annual merchandise—ranging from zippers and waistbands for sportswear to patterned dresses—with $100 million dollars on the payroll. Chinatown’s garment industry boomed to include 500 garment manufacturers employing up to 25,000 workers, [80% of whom](https://www.history.com/news/garment-workers-strike-chinatown) were Chinese women. The garment industry was an avenue to economic independence for these non-English speaking immigrants and a means to supplement their husbands’ income. However, wages were low, hours were long, injury was common, and crowded, unhygienic, poorly ventilated facilities led to the spread of viral and gastrointestinal disease among garment workers. Jay Mazur, former manager of the Local 23-25 chapter of the ILGWU, called the demands of the workplace “[preposterous, unrealistic, and totally unacceptable](http://ilgwu.ilr.cornell.edu/announcements/5.html#:~:text=During%20the%20resultant%20negotiations%2C%20the,for%20what%20was%20to%20come%2C),” inspiring a new contract that called for higher pay, additional paid time off (holiday, sick leave, jury duty, etc.) and more robust health care and retirement benefits. Industries negotiated a contract with the union but Chinese manufacturers rejected it, fearing that their businesses would go bankrupt. ILGWU organizers like Chen decided to take matters to the streets, which culminated in the 1982 garment strike. “Many employers thought they could prey on the ethnic sympathies of the workers and just say ‘Look, we’re all Chinese. You don’t need the union, you can function without it,’” Chen said. “Thankfully, the workers and the union realized they would have a lot to lose if they gave it up.” Workers secured a more robust union contract and the strike galvanized Chinatown community members to be more politically active—Chen co-founded the [Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance](https://www.apalanet.org/), the first and only union for AAPI workers. The most significant impact of the strike, according to Chen, was how it transformed the cultural perception around Asian American women. Chinese women were once perceived as quiet, docile, and submissive; now they were seen speaking out against injustices in the workforce, actively participating in their union, and becoming leaders at local community organizations. Some women were even empowered to walk away from domestic violence. “Chinatown, especially when I was working in the union in the 80s and 90s, was still really male dominated and chauvinistic,” Chen said. “But the women of this community became much more outspoken … that was pretty amazing to me.” New time and location, same working conditions While the strike improved workplace conditions for Chinatown’s garment workers, the garment industry took a severe hit during the globalization wave in the early ‘90s. U.S.-based Chinese manufacturers moved their production overseas for cheaper labor, and new media companies gentrified remaining factories out of the neighborhood, shuttering up to 50 shops each year between 1998 and 2001. The 9/11 attacks were the final blow—the aftermath blocked off Chinatown and disrupted major commercial activity for weeks. Unable to financially recover, the last standing manufacturers closed shop, leaving 8,000 workers out of jobs over the next two years. Those with speciality skills (i.e., pattern making) found jobs at high-end American fashion stores; the rest transitioned out of the industry and turned to alternative jobs: elderly home care, food service (some women wrapped dumplings at Chinese restaurants), and other low-wage, service-oriented work. Nearly two decades later, California is now the epicenter of U.S. garment industry, employing [over 45,000](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/garment-workers-paid-piece-say-they-ll-keep-fighting-change-n1237810) garment workers, many of whom are undocumented Asian and Latino immigrants. And while the location of the industry has shifted, its working conditions remain unchanged. In 2016, the U.S. the Department of Labor detected violations such as wage theft and unsanitary conditions in [85% of the California factories](https://www.latimes.com/projects/la-fi-forever-21-factory-workers/) they visited. Furthermore, workers are paid through the piece-rate system, making as little as [$0.03 per garment](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/garment-workers-paid-piece-say-they-ll-keep-fighting-change-n1237810), or up to $300 dollars for a 75-hour week. The economic precarity of the industry was compounded by the recent pandemic—global supply chains were disrupted and consumer demand for clothing lowered so significantly that commercial western brands cancelled [$1.44 billion](http://www.workersrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Abandoned-Penn-State-WRC-Report-March-27-2020.pdf) in orders. To make up for lost revenue, [garment manufacturers switched](https://www.instyle.com/fashion/fashion-industry-garment-workers-making-ppe) to producing masks, hospital gowns, and other forms of personal protective equipment (PPE) at high volumes. But even though garment workers in the U.S. were classified as essential workers, they continued to toil in factories where bathroom breaks were limited and social distancing and face coverings [inadequately enforced](https://www.kqed.org/news/11858857/without-vaccines-las-garment-workers-are-hanging-by-a-thread). One of Los Angeles’ largest coronavirus outbreaks took place in an LA Apparel garment factory last summer, where [375 workers](https://www.nbclosangeles.com/news/local/la-apparel-outbreak-coronavirus-covid-19-workplace-work-jobs-los-angeles-county/2401819/) tested positive for COVID-19, resulting in four deaths. While [more than 234,000 Californian residents](https://covid19.ca.gov/vaccination-progress-data/#overview) are getting vaccinated every day, [undocumented workers](https://capitalandmain.com/why-californias-undocumented-immigrants-remain-vaccine-resistant-0426) remain hesitant, fearful of revealing their immigration status while getting vaccinated. Although Chen acknowledges the disparity between what essential workers are called and how they’re actually treated, she appreciates how the labor of garment workers is finally being recognized. “It’s very bittersweet,” Chen says. “I think it’s good that there’s finally a catchphrase that shows even the most minimal appreciation to workers who used to be completely invisible … And for Asians especially—we’ve been invisible for so long.” Labor lessons worth remembering While Chinatown’s garment industry is nearly nonexistent now, the lessons learned from the 1982 strike are still salient. Like the organizers who led the 1982 strike, garment workers in California are continuing to organize for fair wages and safe conditions in the workplace. At the end of last year, [California state Sen. Maria Elena Durazo](https://www.lamag.com/citythinkblog/garment-workers-sb-62/) introduced the [Garment Workers Protection Act](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB62) (GWPA or SB-62) to replace the piece-rate system with a minimum hourly wage and hold brands accountable for workplace abuse. With support from the Garment Worker Center, the Western Center On Law & Poverty, and Bet Tzedek Justice For All, the GWPA [passed](https://sourcingjournal.com/topics/labor/garment-worker-protection-act-california-sb62-wage-theft-durazo-275209/) the Senate Judiciary Committee in April, inching its way closer towards improving the lives of thousands of workers. What made the 1982 strike so successful, Chen says, boils down to two key factors: collective action under common goals, and the willingness for immigrants, especially women, to be unapologetically vocal about their concerns. “Garment workers recognized that Chinese workers, if they join together, can be an important force,” said Margaret Fung, the co-founder and executive director of the Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund in the documentary [We Are One](http://ilgwu.ilr.cornell.edu/archives/filmVideo/index.html). “They can exert some control over their lives, their working conditions, and their wages, but only if they work together and have a union.” For Asian Americans in particular, Chen is hopeful that transformative social change, whether that’s an end to unjust labor practices or the numerous cultural mythologies that render Asian American communities susceptible to all forms of violence, is possible. “Like the case of Vincent Chin, there have always been waves of anti-Asian violence,” Chen said. “But what’s good now is that more people are speaking up.”

#### AT topic bad

Not an arg – debate why its bad – deliberation valuable

Cards r awful – yes gilded age labor movements were racist – yes some American strikes are bad – how tf does that mean every topical plan ever is racist

#### 4] Institutional engagement – debate is imperfect, but only our interpretation can harness legal education to understand the law’s strategic reversibility paired with intellectual survival skills that help us navigate and contest violent structures. This is the most plausible internal link from debate to meaningful social and political agitation for social justice.

Archer 18 (Deborah N., Associate Professor of Clinical Law @ NYU School of Law, “POLITICAL LAWYERING FOR THE 21ST CENTURY,” draft, pp. 1-43) \*Edited\*

Many law students are overwhelmed by injustice. When faced with the reality of systemic inequities, even the most committed students may surrender to hopelessness, despair, and inaction. This is not because they have stopped caring about injustice, but because they cannot envision a path from injustice to justice. Many do not have the tools to navigate systemic injustice or respond to interwoven legal and social ills. This article contends that although clinical legal education provides an excellent opportunity to offer students the skills, experience, perspective, and confidence to grapple with today’s complex social justice issues, it has not sufficiently responded to the changing educational needs of our students by teaching law students how to most effectively utilize litigation alongside other tools of systemic reform advocacy. How can clinical education prepare law students to navigate issues of systemic discrimination and injustice? Clinical teaching’s signature pedagogical vehicle involves students providing direct representation of individual clients in straightforward, manageable cases in which students focus on discrete legal issues, take full ownership of the case, and see it through from beginning to end.1 These cases train students to be creative problem solvers for individual clients. However, this model does not effectively prepare students to address and combat structural or chronic inequality. The individualized model also provides relatively limited opportunities for students to address the intellectual and skills-based challenges of lawyering on a larger scale.2 Complex cases allow students to explore the complicated relationship between justice, law, and politics.3 They introduce students to many of the skills needed to integrate rebellious or political lawyering into their practice, including working with others to brainstorm, design, and execute an advocacy strategy; helping to build and participate in a coalition; engaging in integrated advocacy; and analyzing the outside forces that help shape outcomes, including organizational capacity, challenges of enforcement, and potential political backlash.4 There is a longstanding and ongoing debate within the clinical legal education community about the relative merits of small, individual cases versus larger impact advocacy matters.5 The parameters of this debate, coupled with an influential body of clinical scholarship criticizing impact litigation and the lawyers who bring it,6 have led the clinical teaching community to overreact to these critiques by moving farther away from impact advocacy and strategic litigation rather than working to reconcile the legitimate concerns with the critical importance of impact advocacy as a tool for both systemic social change and legal education. Law schools also face internal and external pressures that affect their willingness to engage students in strategic litigation. The result is that important benefits of impact advocacy and strategic litigation have gotten lost or minimized. Twenty years ago, social justice advocates rallied around political lawyering as a tool for more effective advocacy on behalf of marginalized communities.7 Political lawyering employs a systemic reform lens in case selection, advocacy strategy, and lawyering process, with a focus on legal work done in service to both individual and collective goals.8 While litigation is central to political lawyering, political lawyers recognize that litigation, interdisciplinary collaboration, policy reform, and community organization must to proceed together. Litigation is just one piece of a complex advocacy puzzle. However, clinical law professors have never fully grappled with how to employ this model.9 Law professors today seeking to train the next generation of social justice advocates should expose students to the transformational potential of integrated advocacy—strategic litigation, community organizing, direct action, media strategies, and interdisciplinary collaboration proceeding together—in the fight for social change. Political lawyering can serve as a model. The NAACP strategy of building comprehensive advocacy campaigns to challenge racial and economic injustice helped to launch the political lawyering movement in the last century.10 But political lawyering in the 21st century needs to do more. It needs to re-embrace and update the concept of integrated advocacy to help lawyers leverage a broad range of tools and perspectives to generate effective approaches to issues of injustice, both nascent and chronic. Charles Hamilton Houston, the architect of the strategy to challenge the racialized policy of “separate but equal,” whose life work challenged racial injustice in novel ways, famously explained that “a lawyer’s either a social engineer or he’s a parasite on society,” defining social engineer as a “highly skilled, perceptive, sensitive lawyer who understood the Constitution of the United States and knew how to explore its uses in the solving of problems of local communities and in bettering the conditions of the underprivileged citizens.”11 Law schools should set as an ambition teaching students to push boundaries in diagnosing and tackling the most pressing problems facing society. The Article proceeds in three parts. Part I discusses political lawyering and explores its potential to serve as a framework to teach students the legal and extra-legal advocacy skills necessary to tackle the complex challenges of systemic injustice and inequity. Part I also discusses the institutional barriers that limit the ability and willingness of legal educators to exploit the pedagogical potential of a political lawyering framework, including the idea that litigation is often harmful to the cause of justice because it puts the lawyer ahead of the community being served. Part I then examines whether the choice that clinical legal education makes to teach through small, single-issue cases rather than through more complex vehicles offers students sufficient opportunities to develop the array of skills needed for integrated advocacy. Part II describes the ways that clinical legal education can reframe political lawyering as political justice lawyering, both to adapt to the current environment—complicated by the current partisan political climate—and the contemporary challenges of social justice advocacy. It also explores pedagogic strategies that clinical legal educators can employ to train effective 21st century social justice lawyers. Finally, Part III presents a case study from my own teaching to elucidate the opportunities and challenges inherent in this approach to clinical teaching. I. POLITICAL LAWYERING AS A FRAMEWORK FOR LEGAL EDUCATION “Social vision is part of the operating ethos of self-conscious law practice. The fact that most law practice is not done self-consciously is simply a function of the degree to which most law practice serves the status quo. Self-conscious practice appears to be less important, and is always less destabilizing, when it serves what is, rather than what ought to be.” - Gary Bellow12 In 1996, the Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review published a symposium on “political lawyering”: a model of social justice advocacy that integrates legal advocacy and political mobilization by linking courtroom advocacy to community education, mobilization, and organizing.13 The symposium, honoring Gary Bellow, a leading political lawyer of the time and one of the architects of clinical legal education, explored the potential for political lawyering to respond to the social justice challenges of the moment.14 At the time of the symposium, progressive scholars and activists believed that America was in a period of retrenchment on civil rights and were in search of sources of hope.15 In the face of waning public support for the poor and disenfranchised, both financially and philosophically, one of the biggest dangers social justice advocates faced was despair about the possibility of progress.16 Bellow contended that the nation’s ideological reconfiguration created a potentially debilitating doubt among lawyer-activists who, faced with declining avenues for change, had “embraced a far too constricted definition of both the possible and desirable in law-oriented interventions than is, in fact, dictated by the rightward turn of national and local politics.”17 With victory harder to achieve, he insisted that lawyers who embraced and reimagined political lawyering would advance the fight for equality more effectively. The purpose of political lawyering is not to advance a particular partisan agenda: It is to represent disenfranchised communities against the forces of oppression.18 While difficult to define precisely, political lawyers take a politicized and value-oriented approach to legal work done in service to both individual and collective goals,19 embracing “politics” in the classical sense as a concern “with what it means to be human; what is the best life for a human being; and . . . the ways in which we can order our living together so that good human lives will emerge.”20 Practically, political lawyers use a systemic reform lens in decisions about case selection, advocacy strategy, and the lawyering process. Political lawyers think about the relationship between law, politics, and justice21 and use the law to animate fundamental change in society, to alter the allocation of power and opportunity, and to enable those individuals and communities with little power to claim and enjoy their rights.22 Political lawyers also take advantage of opportunities to influence the perceptions and behaviors of those in power.23 Finally, political lawyers empower individuals and communities by providing them with competent legal advocacy,24 but do not confine themselves to one mode of advocacy in their quest for structural change. Instead, political lawyers use integrated advocacy strategies, including litigation, legislative advocacy, public education, media, and social science research, assessing the efficacy and impact of each tool in service to a long-term visions of equality and solidarity.25 A. A ROLE FOR POLITICAL LAWYERING IN CLINICAL LEGAL EDUCATION In his essay, Gary Bellow described several examples of his experience as a political lawyer.26 He reflected that: Certainly, if one focuses on the strategies employed in these examples, few uniformities emerge. In some of the efforts, we sought rule changes or injunctive relief against a particular practice on behalf of an identified class. In other situations, we pursued aggregate results by filing large numbers of individual cases. Some strategies are carried out in the courts. At other times we ignored litigation entirely in favor of bureaucratic maneuvering and community and union organizing. Even when pursuing litigation, we often placed far greater emphasis on mobilizing and educating clients, or strengthening the entities and organizations that represented them, than on judicial outcomes. And always, we employed the lawsuit, whether pushed to conclusion or not, as a vehicle for gathering information, positioning adversaries, asserting bargaining leverage, and adding to the continuing process of definition and designation that occurs in any conflict.27 The parallels between the challenges social justice lawyers faced in the 1980s and 1990s and those that law students committed to social justice 28 face today are evident. As discussed earlier, law students’ own despair about the enormity of the fight for justice can compromise their ability to recognize and tackle chronic injustice. Like the earlier generation of political lawyers Bellow described, many law students today find it difficult to believe in the possibility of change let alone its likelihood. Inexperience challenging systemic legal problems exacerbates their skepticism. They recognize that the advocacy tools they have learned are insufficient to solve today’s problems, which fuels their sense of doubt. To help expand their understanding of what may be possible, law students, particularly those interested in continuing the fight for racial justice, should be taught to understand and embrace the goals, strategies, and tools of political lawyering—re-imagined for current times. Clinical professors need not adopt political lawyering wholesale as the only or primary approach to teaching lawyering skills and legal advocacy. Indeed, one of the challenges social justice advocates face is unnecessarily limiting the understanding of what it means to be a good lawyer. Rather, clinical professors should explore political lawyering as one framework they can use to help struggling law students find direction and inspiration, as well as to create a sense of connection to the work of the social justice lawyers who preceded them. As Gary Bellow wrote: Doubt and defeatism, the sense of overly pessimistic assessments of action possibilities, are recurrent experiences in oppositional politics, whomever the political actors may be. They require hard-headed assessments of what works and why; a willingness to relinquish strategies and goals born of different possibilities and particularities. . . . Doubt and defeatism produce powerful spirals that can only be broken by acts of will and leaps of faith.29 To be an effective political lawyer, an advocate must have a “profound willingness and ability to learn about and respond to the complexity of real human beings in ever-shifting legal, economic, and social worlds.”30 So, while political lawyering is certainly grounded in effective legal advocacy, it demands more than conventional legal skills. The political lawyer values deep personal involvement as a necessary component in addressing and tackling legal issues. That personal engagement can take many forms, but, at a minimum, involves countless conversations, collaborative brainstorming, comparing shared experiences, and adding empathy and commonality to enhance the legal analysis and political judgment.31 It also requires lawyers to advocate with a clear vision of what justice looks like because effective political lawyering “reache[s] not only across large numbers of people, but from the present into some altered version of the future.”32 Learning to combine savvy legal analysis with broad engagement, a deeper understanding of the complexity of the problems faced by impacted communities, and envisioning an altered and more just future can help lead to real solutions and overcome passivity and ~~paralysis~~.33 The Civil Rights Movement, with its blended advocacy strategies, pulling a variety of levers to enable immediate or systemic change, offers one example of political lawyering. Visionary leaders helped give voice to the frustrations and demands of the community, while other leaders acted as tacticians to devise, plan, and coordinate the strategy.34 There were sustained and strategic protests to draw public attention to injustices, demand change, and apply political pressure. The strategic use of litigation led gradually to the establishment of the building blocks for systemic change. Finally, civil rights lawyers worked to enshrine litigation victories in legislation.35 While the goal of political lawyering is to empower and advance the rights of disadvantaged communities, the lawyers who engage in it also reap significant benefits. One scholar effectively articulated some of these benefits utilizing religious terms, asserting that political lawyering can provide hope and direction to advocates by providing a “faith”—“a story, an account of a rational hope that provides people with an image and principles for realizing the sort of lives they ought to live.”36 Political lawyering can also provide what Christians refer to as a “gospel”—a story that explains and inspires.37 The faith and gospel of political lawyering can help lead law students who are overwhelmed by injustice to a place of deeper understanding and more effective advocacy. But law students must learn how to understand, articulate, and deploy that faith and gospel in service of others. B. INSTITUTIONAL CONSTRAINTS ON POLITICAL LAWYERING Complex social justice problems offer robust opportunities to teach students about the law and lawyering, and legal clinics serve as an important vehicle to bring that set of issues and experiences into the classroom.38 As law schools reevaluate the nature and function of legal education in light of market forces,39 they should also give attention to the role of justice in the curriculum and the potential for law school clinics to be centers for incubation of new and evolving models of lawyering. By embracing political lawyering and encouraging engagement on complex and novel social justice issues, clinical legal education can operate as a “generator of new visions for legal practice” on behalf of poor and marginalized communities.40 Of course, that choice is not without hurdles or concern. 1. Ideological, Financial, and Pedagogical Pressures When clinical and experiential learning programs have moved away from an access to justice model—with a focus on the immediate challenges facing individual clients—to a broader social justice model focused on systemic reform and community empowerment, they have often encountered criticism from inside and outside of the legal academy.41 First, critics have raised concerns that integrated advocacy in support of systemic reform may elevate the profile of faculty and law schools but detract from an appropriate focus on the educational goals of individual students.42 Others have identified the potential for violating the separation between pedagogy and partisan politics.43 And still other critics have identified a risk that faculty will impose their personal political perspectives on their students.44 As discussed in more detail below, integrated advocacy strategies can, in fact, serve as valuable clinical teaching tools that promote broader student learning and support important pedagogical goals. By contrast, exclusive reliance on individual representation offers limited opportunities to teach essential lawyering skills, including the skills critical to identifying and challenging systemic injustice.45 Every clinical program makes a political decision in deciding which cases to take or not to take, as each decision has political implications.46 Accepting cases in criminal justice, immigration, environmental justice, and international human rights, for example, involves political choices, regardless of whether the issues are addressed through individual representation or systemic reform efforts.47 Clinics will continue to represent individual clients who are the victims of poverty, discrimination, and disenfranchisement. These cases do not suddenly become inappropriate teaching tools because the lawyer aggregates those claims and utilizes complementary strategies to seek systemic, community-wide redress. Lawyers must be free to use all available means to challenge the marginalization of their clients, including strategic litigation, legislative advocacy, and other advocacy strategies designed to achieve systemic reform. If law schools intend to fulfill their promise to prepare law students to tackle urgent and pressing challenges, then they must teach students to identify and address interlocking legal and social problems. Still, while law schools have educational ambitions, they also face financial demands that might affect their educational choices. In fact, those financial realities may motivate schools to avoid disputes that expose them to financial risk and to a potential loss of good will that a clinic’s involvement in controversial cases might occasion.48 While that institutional concern certainly has merit, it is not unique to political lawyering on behalf of clients. Whenever a law school chooses to represent clients, there is the potential for someone to take issue with the school’s choice of side or client. Similarly, law schools may experience external pressures from government, private entities, donors, and alumni to prevent the use of law school resources to challenge powerful corporate or government interests.49 These critiques evoke the successful challenge to Legal Services Corporations engaging in class action litigation on behalf of their clients50 and the long history of efforts to limit the means through which clinics can represent their clients.51 History is replete with examples of external attacks on law schools’ clinical efforts. From the 1968 attack by state legislators on the clinical program at the University of Mississippi School of Law over its involvement in a school desegregation suit,52 to the early 1980s threats to limit the activities of the University of Connecticut’s criminal defense clinic after the clinic successfully challenged a provision of the state’s death penalty statute,53 to the 2017 decision of the University of North Carolina Board of Governors to defund the law school’s Center for Civil Rights’ work to challenge systemic and racialized barriers to equality, law schools have experienced public scrutiny and scorn for their client and case selection decisions. A clinical faculty member’s case selection decisions should not be without limits or guidelines. For example, limited resources and specific pedagogical objectives will necessarily dictate which cases will be considered appropriate. However, making case selection decisions on the basis of pedagogical choices differs fundamentally from decisions based on ideological pressure from outside forces. The latter raises fundamental questions of academic freedom and other professional responsibilities.54 Clinical faculty members must maintain some independence to choose cases and clients that meet that clinic’s educational and public service goals.55 2. The Anti-Litigation Bias Political lawyers have long embraced litigation’s potential to achieve “radical extensions of democracy, equality, and racial justice” in addition to structural and cultural change.56 Law reform and structural change are important aspects of political lawyering.57 Accordingly, impact litigation on behalf of marginalized people and communities has long been an important tool for political lawyers.58 Indeed, the NAACP’s fight against racial segregation and inequality in the 1940s and 1950s represents an early example of political lawyering that strategically deployed litigation as part of a comprehensive effort to resist oppression and advance equality.59 Political lawyering never embraced an exaggerated belief that litigation should be the centerpiece of the fight for equality.60 Instead, like the advocates at the heart of the NAACP’s desegregation strategy, political lawyers “recognized that litigation, interdisciplinary collaboration, and community organization had to proceed together.”61 In the late 1990s and early 2000s, political and cultural shifts affected the strategies many political lawyers employed. New federal restrictions on the use of impact litigation and legislative advocacy by legal services lawyers were a cause of significant concern.62 Where impact litigation remained a possibility, many political lawyers worried that litigation offered a dangerous path. Although federal courts, in particular, had proved supportive in the fight for racial justice in the 1960s, progressive lawyers in later years worried that a more conservative judiciary was just as likely, if not more inclined, to set back progressive movements.63 This concern proved correct, particularly in the area of racial justice. Decades of conservative appointments to the federal bench64 led to a series of legal setbacks65 that effectively limited the federal courts as a venue for the redress of illegal discrimination.66 Many advocates also believed that while progressive lawyers were toiling away in the courtroom and achieving only minor success, conservative advocacy groups had mastered the more efficacious strategy of building powerful grassroots constituencies.67 As courts increased their hostility to civil rights and racial justice, making victory and progress more difficult, political lawyers turned away from litigation and began focusing on alternative methods to fight for social change.68 While the labels have changed, the fundamental purpose of the work remained the same. Political lawyering gave way to rebellious lawyering, community lawyering, and movement lawyering.69 These models of advocacy embrace different visions of advocacy that may vary in the emphasis placed on the law’s comparative advantage relative to other strategic methodologies and tools.70 But, they all acknowledge the bond that joins client, community, and lawyer together in a common enterprise: empowering those without power and fighting for justice and equality. The de-emphasis on strategic litigation brought real benefits. It encouraged lawyers to work as members of a team, and challenged lawyers to ensure that those marginalized by injustice played a central role both as the focus of the advocacy and as participants in the advocacy, a positive turn regardless of the motivation.71 This evolution came at a cost. What began as a tactical de-emphasis on litigation evolved into a philosophical bias against litigation as a social justice advocacy tool.72 Initially, social justice lawyers turned away from impact litigation because they feared that an increasingly conservative judiciary would use these cases as an opportunity to further roll back prior gains. However, with time, the reluctance to pursue litigation became less a reaction to circumstance and more a matter of principle. Some writers argued that litigation is a tool through which lawyers usurp the authority of already marginalized clients by setting their priorities for them.73 And, they claimed that litigation disempowers communities because of the unbalanced power dynamics between social justice lawyers and marginalized clients.74 An example is the dialogue around rebellious lawyering, one of the most prominent models for social change advocacy. Gerald López conceptualized rebellious lawyering as an advocacy model that would empower poor clients through grassroots, community-based advocacy that was facilitated by lawyers.75 Rebellious lawyering emphasizes concepts of community organization, mobilization, and “deprofessionalization.”76 It calls on lawyers to reflect on critical elements of the attorney-client relationship that may further oppress members of marginalized communities.77 Through rebellious lawyering, Professor López advances the belief that although lawyers should help solve problems facing the poor, lawyers are not the preeminent problem solvers in that relationship and should defer to clients and communities.78 Gerald López prefers that lawyers focus on “teaching self-help and lay lawyering” to empower communities to help themselves.79 Professor López espoused his positive vision of rebellious lawyering as an alternative to what he calls regnant lawyering.80 Professor López asserts that regnant lawyers are convinced that they need to be the primary and active leaders in their representation of poor people. Regnant lawyers find community education and empowerment to be of only marginal importance.81 The result is that the regnant lawyer dominates the attorney-client relationship, giving little voice to the needs or concerns of the client. Finally, Professor López also believes that regnant lawyers have little practical understanding of legal, political, and social structures.82 Rebellious lawyering raised important questions about the role litigation should play in social justice movements. Gerald Lopez was certainly skeptical that “legal technicians” could make a meaningful contribution83 and questioned whether lawyers turned to litigation because it was best for the client or because the lawyer wanted to play “hero.”84 All political lawyers should ask themselves these questions when considering impact litigation as part of integrated advocacy on behalf of marginalized communities.85 But, over time, commentators began to equate regnant lawyering with impact litigation.86 Some social justice advocates argued that impact litigation perpetuated racism because white lawyers used it as a tool to impose their views on communities of color.87 Others advanced images of litigators as outsiders who used poor communities as guinea pigs in their social justice experiments, warning that “practicing law in the community is not a tourist adventure and, therefore, we must eschew the routine of the autonomous, interloping advocate who dreams up cases in the home office and then tests them on the community.”88 Litigation, and systemic reform litigation in particular, became synonymous with regnant lawyering: an “enemy” of social justice and not a tool fit for people committed to fighting for enduring social change. Derrick Bell advanced one of the most prominent and influential critiques of litigation.89 Although he acknowledged the success of the first decade of school desegregation litigation, Professor Bell questioned the lack of lawyer accountability to marginalized communities. According to Professor Bell, NAACP lawyers continued to employ an advocacy strategy that focused on structural school desegregation, even while many members of the Black community preferred a strategy that would have focused on building quality, though segregated, neighborhood schools.90 He cautioned that social justice advocates failed to acknowledge growing conflicts between what they believed were the long-range goals for their clients and the client’s evolving interests and needs.91 In the end, many members of the impacted community were left feeling marginalized. Professor Bell also suggested that “civil rights lawyers, like their more candid poverty law colleagues, are making decisions, setting priorities, and undertaking responsibilities that should be determined by their clients and shaped by the community.”92 Certainly, many lawyers who use litigation as a tool for social change are regnant and paternalistic, but these qualities are not inherent in litigators working with marginalized communities.93 Social justice advocates should have a healthy skepticism about the ability of the law, standing alone, to achieve lasting social change.94 They should always engage in advocacy that moves the client from the margins to the center.95 But, advocates should also resist pressure to narrow the definition of what it means to be a great lawyer. The discussion of social justice advocacy far too often collapses the framework not only of political lawyering, but all advocacy on behalf of poor and marginalized individuals and communities, into one that largely rejects the important role that strategic litigation has played and can continue to play in the fight for social justice. The ubiquity of the anti-litigation narrative encourages progressive law students—and many clinical law professors—to dismiss litigation and its potential for challenging bias and discrimination. Many progressive law students are afraid to become the professionals they envisioned they would be.96 They do not want to become the discrimination tourist derided in the literature. In response to the critique of social justice litigation, there is a growing body of scholarship supporting the conclusion that litigation is a key strategy for protecting and expanding the rights of marginalized communities.97 This body of scholarship acknowledges that litigation has played a critical role in the struggle for justice and equality, and that it continues to be “an imperfect but indispensable strategy of social change.”98 Finally, these scholars examine social justice litigation in the context of the tradeoffs of different forms of activism, evaluating its potential in relation to available alternatives and revealing a new understanding of the link between law and social justice reform.99 The demonization of strategic litigation that persists in many progressive lawyering circles not only contributes to student ~~paralysis~~, it gives them a false sense of what it means to engage in systemic reform litigation on behalf of clients and the community. Many prominent critiques of impact litigation neither provide an accurate depiction of the potential of that litigation, nor educate students on how to apply principles of political lawyering to that litigation. Indeed, while Derrick Bell prominently critiqued the role of strategic litigation in social justice movements, he also believed that litigation can be an important means of calling attention to perceived injustice; more important, . . . litigation presents opportunities for improving the weak economic and political position which renders the black community vulnerable to the specific injustices the litigation is intended to correct. Litigation can and should serve lawyer and client, as a community-organizing tool, an educational forum, a means of obtaining data, a method of exercising political leverage, and a rallying point for public support.100 Law students should be taught that lawyers who engage in systemic reform litigation, just like any other lawyer, can and should work with and on behalf of those victimized by discrimination. Indeed, despite the one- dimensional picture often painted for law students, not all progressive lawyers believe that “self-help” should be the focus of lawyering on behalf of poor or marginalized communities.101 Moreover, despite the image of the “interloping advocate who dreams up cases in the home office and then tests them on the community,” not all progressive lawyers believe that it is inappropriate for lawyers to independently analyze social justice issues and develop ideas about ways to use the law to bring society closer to justice. Indeed, “it is artificially constricting to conceive of lawyers as exclusively or primarily problem-solvers. [Lawyers] are not only social mechanics who wait in [their] shops for people to come to [them] with problems to be fixed. [Lawyers] should sometimes create problems. [Lawyers] should sometimes deliver problems by translating people’s anger and hurt and insistence on justice into political as well as legal action.”102 Many great advocacy ideas bubble up from the community, but equally valid ideas can come from advocates who have been working with and for those communities (or are members of the community themselves). Progressive advocates must be prepared to provide legal assistance to clients even when those clients do not wish to be active participants in the advocacy. That is embracing the core meaning of client-centered lawyering. Rather than being taught to avoid litigation at all costs, progressive law students need to learn how they can partner with victims of discrimination and be accountable to those victims in the context of litigation. They need to learn the skills of collaborative leadership in law.103 Advocates should also be careful about advancing a one-size-fits-all model of advocacy,104 lumping everything together under the “social justice advocacy” moniker or work on behalf of the “poor and disadvantaged” and assuming that one advocacy approach will work to solve all problems. Sometimes using “social justice” to refer to all of the work being done on behalf of poor and marginalized communities is the right thing to do—it unifies all of those who are fighting injustice on varying fronts. But, it can be harmful when discussing what advocacy tools will be most effective. Given the many forms that discrimination takes and the many communities subject to discrimination, law professors should caution students to be suspicious about broad generalizations about what clients always need or do not need, and what lawyers always should or should not do. There is no universal theory about how to represent disadvantaged or marginalized people. What works in the fight for economic justice may not be the best strategy to achieving racial justice.105 And what may be appropriate to help one victim of racial discrimination may not work for another. There is room for all types of advocates and advocacy.106 All advocates can be a part of the circle of human concern.107 3. The Preferred Model: Individual Representation Representing individual clients in small, manageable cases where students retain primary control has long been the preferred vehicle for teaching students to effectively address their clients’ legal problems.108 But many clinical programs focused on representing individual clients are not providing opportunities for students to learn how to utilize the law effectively to challenge systemic discrimination. In addition to teaching foundational lawyering skills like client interviewing, counseling, and fact investigation, clinics should also provide opportunities to teach complex and multi- dimensional lawyering skills.109 As this Section demonstrates, the clinical community’s disproportionate focus on micro-lawyering skills may be hampering the ability of students to focus on the political and social functions of the law and the structural dimensions of the problems facing client communities.110 The founding goals of clinical legal education were to provide law students the opportunity to learn the skills necessary to practice law and provide quality legal services to the poor.111 These origins closely shaped the development of clinical pedagogy and its current emphasis on individual representation.112 Small cases allow law students to have the primary relationship with the client, manage the case from beginning to end, and analyze relatively straightforward legal issues—all core principles of clinical pedagogy.113 The reliance on small cases also provides students with the invaluable opportunity to reflect deeply on the choices advocates make in creating and maintaining lawyer-client relationships.114 In the early years of the clinical legal education movement, most clinical law professors came from legal services organizations and brought with them a preference for the individual client representation that dominated legal services practice.115 Clinical professors embody their learning objectives in their case selection116 and must prioritize some lawyering skills over others because there are limits to what can be learned in a single clinical course.117 In focusing on small cases, early clinicians understandably prioritized the skills they knew to be critical to their own work on behalf of poor individuals. Today, clinical professors come to teaching from a broader array of professional backgrounds, and unsurprisingly want to bring their experiences into the classroom. They should be encouraged to make clinic design choices and set educational goals for their students based on the skills and knowledge they know to be necessary for success in their own practice areas. To many, the approaches clinical professors adopted at the beginning of the clinical legal education movement are not the answers to the questions and challenges our students face today. An exclusive reliance on small cases, though they are extremely valuable teaching tools, fails many students because small cases offer limited opportunities to teach a broad array of lawyering skills, including the skills critical to challenging systemic injustice.118 Of course, small cases have value—for the client and student both. But, in the new normal, they are often not enough to carry the weight of change. “Social justice work is rarely easy, clean, or pretty.”119 It can be downright messy and clinics should not shield students from its messiness. Working on larger, more complex cases exposes students to more of the skills necessary to fight for structural change.120 They can learn to exercise intellectual autonomy and to integrate conceptual thinking in their advocacy.121 They teach students how to achieve client objectives while also advancing broader social justice goals. Finally, in complex cases where litigation is a viable option, students are exposed to fundamental questions such as what claims to assert, where to file, who to represent, and who to sue. Students cannot be practice ready without some exposure to these skills. Some clinical legal educators have questioned the traditional model of clinical education, arguing instead for engaging in work with a broader social justice impact.122 One basis for this argument, for example, is that “case- centered clinics are primarily accountable to students and law school administrators, rather than clients, and fail to serve political collectives.”123 In this conception, clinics prioritize student interests over community interests by accepting only those cases over which students will have full responsibility and reject more complex cases where the students’ limited skills would make that impossible. This is done even when the communities’ interests—and thus the cause of social justice—would be better served by the more complex cases.124 While this critique is framed in terms of benefits to students versus losses to social justice, there is indeed a loss to students as well. Clinical legal educators who are teaching the next generation of social and racial justice advocates should help students understand the current legal framework for equality, and develop the ability to utilize that framework creatively on behalf of their clients. But, students also have to learn to transcend and reimagine current institutional frames, to conceptualize avenues for relief, create new narratives, and pull together the building blocks of a new legal framework to establish rights that did not exist before. Indeed, many of the challenges facing America today require reimagining justice from the ground up. Future social justice advocates must have social vision—“vision-making work is fundamental to the activist strategies political lawyering inevitably embodies.”125 Charles Hamilton Houston not only taught his law students to conceive that separate can never be equal, he taught them how to develop a legal theory in support of that idea and then to develop an integrated advocacy strategy, including complex litigation, to give that theory legal effect. “The process of linking strategy to political vision always requires adaptation and a detailed understanding of particular contexts for its effectiveness.”126 Moreover, as students move from theory to legal reality, they have to understand the skills required to genuinely engage the community. Indeed, “it is no simple matter to reconcile commitment to both clients and a larger social vision or to navigate the boundary between the insider and outsider communities in which political lawyers work.”127 There are, of course, trade-offs involved in engaging clinical students in impact advocacy, both for the student and the teacher.128 Many clinical faculty have expressed concerns that systemic reform work and complex vocacy matters require too high a cost to core pedagogical goals.129 There is a sense that “big cases” may achieve important social justice goals, but use student tuition to finance political goals without attendant benefits to the students’ education.130 According to this line of critique, if the fundamental goal of clinical legal education is the education of students, clinical education needs to continue to focus on small cases that allow for complete student ownership, with a student seeing the case through from beginning to end.131 Many clinicians believe that complete student ownership from beginning to end is critical to an effective clinical experience, and that this level of student ownership is not possible in big cases.132 The problem with this argument is that giving clinic students sole control of a case from beginning to end is not the only way to maximize student learning. Close collaboration with clinical educators, fellow students, clients, and other collaborators offers rich opportunities for student learning. Working with those collaborators to evaluate a complex problem, consider whether a litigation strategy is appropriate, and implementing that strategy, is precisely the kind of experience students will need to master in political lawyering practice. If clinical programs want to ensure that social justice students develop the skills and values necessary to be responsible and effective lawyers before they graduate, students should have the opportunity to be exposed to advocacy models beyond individual client representation. Otherwise, clinics are missing an opportunity to teach students to embrace and engage in social justice work broadly. II. REFRAMING POLITICAL LAWYERING FOR THE 21ST CENTURY Modern social problems present new challenges for political lawyers. As such, political lawyers must evaluate the tools an earlier generation of political lawyers used to determine how to employ them in light of changed conditions. Social justice advocates have destabilized the dominant understanding of lawyering.133 Modern political lawyering must continue that process of destabilization, exploring alternatives to the way lawyers marshal social and economic capital, make strategic decisions, and transgress current structures and constraints.134 Political lawyering advocates should also question attempts to constrict the understanding of what lawyering tools can be employed in service to communities and in furtherance of justice. A. Expanding the Advocacy Perspective At the core of Derrick Bell’s critique of the latter stages of the campaign to desegregate public education is the divergence he saw between the interests of NAACP lawyers and those of certain segments of the Black community that evolved after the launch of the school desegregation campaign.135 In many ways, this divergence was the result of a failure to communicate. To effectively engage in the integrated advocacy central to political lawyering, those engaged in individual representation, strategic litigation, legislative advocacy, community organizing, public education, direct action, and other forms of advocacy must remain in constant conversation. They must also use their work to facilitate a constant dialogue between the community, courts, government agencies, and legislatures at the local, state, and national levels. As part of this ongoing conversation, political justice lawyers must endeavor to expand the perspectives of the public, judges, politicians, and government administrators beyond dated conceptions of justice. Powerful narratives can break through opposition and resistance, shaping the way society views equality and justice. In Goldberg v. Kelly,136 advocates disrupted the stock story of greedy welfare recipients trying to take advantage of a fair and responsive bureaucracy by telling “human stories” that introduced the Court “to the day-to-day realities of the lives of poor people—struggling to provide a bare minimum of basic necessities for themselves and their children, while confronting an inefficient, unpredictable, and often hostile welfare bureaucracy.”137 Today’s political justice lawyers must focus on changing legal rules, but also inspiring political action, educating the public, publicizing injustice, and shaping public debate. Developing the ability to craft legal and factual narratives that are not only respectful and true to the client’s or communities’ experiences and demands for justice, but that can also persuade and influence others in a variety of contexts, is a critically important skill.138 Political justice lawyering must also account for the changing economic dynamics within otherwise marginalized communities. Growing income inequality within communities of color mirrors the growing wealth gap within American society as a whole.139 Not only may the experience of race or gender discrimination, for example, differ for people of varying wealth, the advocacy strategies needed to engage those communities may be different as well, depending on the structural barriers to engagement created or exacerbated by economic inequality. Political justice lawyers must wrestle with the complicated economic dynamics within communities of color, remain mindful that widening economic inequality can impact collectivity, and authentically engage with the full breadth of those communities if their advocacy is to be effective. Modern political justice lawyering must also include strategies to support and harness the “disruptive power”140 of widespread youth-led movements, collective action, and protest. Many justice movements seek to harness disruption or provoke unrest to redistribute power or force reforms.141 While disruption through protest has been essential in bringing light and voice to modern social justice issues such as police brutality (through, for example, the Black Lives Matter movement) and economic inequality (through, for example, Occupy Wall Street), protests standing alone may not be enough to lead to structural reform or transformational change. Without a viable replacement to fill the void left by a disrupted system, a clear demand for meaningful change, and a plan for implementing that change, the disruptive power may never translate to justice. Finally, modern political justice lawyers must be able to integrate both positive and negative conceptions of equality into their advocacy. Many modern social justice problems are difficult or impossible to fully resolve through court orders.142 Moreover, courts have shown a growing reluctance to issue sweeping injunctive relief that leaves school systems or police departments under the management of courts or court-appointed special masters.143 While utilizing courts to prohibit or limit actions that infringe on individual rights, advocates should be able to articulate a positive vision of what stakeholders can or should do to better promote, protect, and respect those rights. In the context of police reform, for example, victory may take the form of a judicial finding that a police officer used excessive force or an award of money damages. However, even the broadest injunctive relief may struggle to translate into systemic reform—a positive conception of just and effective policing. B. Expanding the Lawyer’s Toolbox In order to effect systemic change, lawyers need to understand what levers are available to achieve that change, and when, where, and how to pull each lever. Political justice lawyers must be skilled at integrated advocacy, using individual and strategic litigation to establish and protect rights, traditional and social media engagement to shape and promote the narrative, community organizing to mobilize effected communities and their allies, and interdisciplinary collaborations to bring the work of other disciplines to bear on creating policies and practices to replace illegal and repressive practices. An effective political justice lawyer has many tools in her toolbox, and knows when and how to use each one. In addition to these tools, political lawyers must learn to break systemic problems into their smaller components; identify advocacy alternatives and evaluate the costs and benefits of each approach; and resolve instances in which an attorney’s own social justice values and vision collide. 1. Breaking Apart Systemic Issues Political justice lawyers must be able to break apart a systemic problem into manageable components. The complexity of social problems, can cause law students, and even experienced political lawyers, to become overwhelmed. In describing his work challenging United States military and economic interventions abroad, civil rights advocate and law professor Jules Lobel wrote of this process: “Our foreign-policy litigation became a sort of Sisyphean quest as we maneuvered through a hazy maze cluttered with gates. Each gate we unlocked led to yet another that blocked our path, with the elusive goal of judicial relief always shrouded in the twilight mist of the never-ending maze.”144 Pulling apart a larger, systemic problem into its smaller components can help elucidate options for advocacy. An instructive example is the use of excessive force by police officers against people of color. Every week seems to bring a new video featuring graphic police violence against Black men and women. Law students are frequently outraged by these incidents. But the sheer frequency of these videos and lack of repercussions for perpetrators overwhelm those students just as often. What can be done about a problem so big and so pervasive? To move toward justice, advocates must be able to break apart the forces that came together to lead to that moment: intentional discrimination, implicit bias, ineffective training, racial segregation, lack of economic opportunity, the over-policing of minority communities, and the failure to invest in non-criminal justice interventions that adequately respond to homelessness, mental illness, and drug addiction. None of these component problems are easily addressed, but breaking them apart is more manageable—and more realistic—than acting as though there is a single lever that will solve the problem. After identifying the component problems, advocates can select one and repeat the process of breaking down that problem until they get to a point of entry for their advocacy. 2. Identifying Advocacy Alternatives As discussed earlier, political justice lawyering embraces litigation, community organizing, interdisciplinary collaboration, legislative reform, public education, direct action, and other forms of advocacy to achieve social change. After parsing the underlying issues, lawyers need to identify what a lawyer can and should do on behalf of impacted communities and individuals, and this includes determining the most effective advocacy approach. Advocates must also strategize about what can be achieved in the short term versus the long term. The fight for justice is a marathon, not a sprint. Many law students experience frustration with advocacy because they expect immediate justice now. They have read the opinion in Brown v. Board of Education, but forget that the decision was the result of a decades-long advocacy strategy.145 Indeed, the decision itself was no magic wand, as the country continues to work to give full effect to the decision 70 years hence. Advocates cannot only fight for change they will see in their lifetime, they must also fight for the future.146 Change did not happen over night in Brown and lasting change cannot happen over night today. Small victories can be building blocks for systemic reform, and advocates must learn to see the benefit of short-term responsiveness as a component of long-term advocacy. Many lawyers subscribe to the American culture of success, with its uncompromising focus on immediate accomplishments and victories.147 However, those interested in social justice must adjust their expectations. Many pivotal civil rights victories were made possible by the seemingly hopeless cases that were brought, and lost, before them.148 In the fight for justice, “success inheres in the creation of a tradition, of a commitment to struggle, of a narrative of resistance that can inspire others similarly to resist.”149 Again, Professor Lobel’s words are instructive: “the current commitment of civil rights groups, women’s groups, and gay and lesbian groups to a legal discourse to legal activism to protect their rights stems in part from the willingness of activists in political and social movements in the nineteenth century to fight for rights, even when they realized the courts would be unsympathetic.”150 Professor Lobel also wrote about Helmuth James Von Moltke, who served as legal advisor to the German Armed Services until he was executed in 1945 by Nazis: “In battle after losing legal battle to protect the rights of Poles, to save Jews, and to oppose German troops’ war crimes, he made it clear that he struggled not just to win in the moment but to build a future.”151 3. Creating a Hierarchy of Values Advocates challenging complex social justice problems can find it difficult to identify the correct solution when one of their social justice values is in conflict with another. A simple example: a social justice lawyer’s demands for swift justice for the victim of police brutality may conflict with the lawyer’s belief in the officer’s fundamental right to due process and a fair trial. While social justice lawyers regularly face these dilemmas, law students are not often forced to struggle through them to resolution in real world scenarios—to make difficult decisions and manage the fallout from the choices they make in resolving the conflict. Engaging in complex cases can force students to work through conflicts, helping them to articulate and sharpen their beliefs and goals, forcing them to clearly define what justice means broadly and in the specific context presented. Lawyers advocating in the tradition of political lawyering anticipate the inevitable conflict between rights, and must seek to resolve these conflicts through a “hierarchy of values.”152 Moreover, in creating the hierarchy, the perspectives of those directly impacted and marginalized should be elevated “because it is in listening to and standing with the victims of injustice that the need for critical thinking and action become clear.”153 One articulation of a hierarchy of values asserts “people must be valued more than property. Human rights must be valued more than property rights. Minimum standards of living must be valued more than the privileged liberty of accumulated political, social and economic power. Finally, the goal of increasing the political, social, and economic power of those who are left out of the current arrangements must be valued more than the preservation of the existing order that created and maintains unjust privilege.”154 C. Rethinking the Role of the Clinical Law Professor: Moving From Expert to Colleague Law students can learn a new dimension of lawyering by watching their clinical law professor work through innovative social justice challenges alongside them, as colleagues. This is an opportunity not often presented in work on small cases where the clinical professor is so deeply steeped in the doctrine and process, the case is largely routine to her and she can predict what is to come and adjust supervision strategies accordingly.155 However, when engaged in political lawyering on complex and novel legal issues, both the student and the teacher may be on new ground that transforms the nature of the student-teacher relationship. A colleague often speaks about acknowledging the persona professors take on when they teach and how that persona embodies who they want to be in the classroom—essentially, whenever law professors teach they establish a character. The persona that a clinical professor adopts can have a profound effect on the students, because the character is the means by which the teacher subtly models for the student—without necessarily ever saying so— the professional the teacher holds herself to be and the student may yet become. In working on complex matters where the advocacy strategy is unclear, the clinical professor makes himself vulnerable by inviting students to witness his struggles as they work together to develop the most effective strategy. By making clear that he does not have all of the answers, partnering with his students to discover the answers, and sharing his own missteps along the way, a clinical law professor can reclaim opportunities to model how an experienced attorney acquires new knowledge and takes on new challenges that may be lost in smaller case representation.156 Clinical law faculty who wholeheartedly subscribe to the belief that professors fail to optimize student learning if students do not have primary control of a matter from beginning to end may view a decision to work in true partnership with students on a matter as a failure of clinical legal education. Indeed, this partnership model will inevitably impact student autonomy and ownership of the case.157 But, there is a unique value to a professor working with her student as a colleague and partner to navigate subject matter new to both student and professor.158 In this relationship, the professor can model how to exercise judgment and how to learn from practice: to independently learn new areas of law; to consult with outside colleagues, experts in the field, and community members without divulging confidential information; and to advise a client in the midst of ones own learning process.159 III. A Pedagogical Course Correction “If it offends your sense of justice, there’s a cause of action.” - Florence Roisman, Professor, Indiana University School of Law160 In response to the shifts in my students’ perspectives on racism and systemic discrimination, their reluctance to tackle systemic problems, their conditioned belief that strategic litigation should be a tool of last resort, and my own discomfort with reliance on small cases in my clinical teaching, I took a step back in my own practice. How could I better teach my students to be champions for justice even when they are overwhelmed by society’s injustice; to challenge the complex and systemic discrimination strangling minority communities, and to approach their work in the tradition of political lawyering. I reflected not only on my teaching, but also on my experiences as a civil rights litigator, to focus on what has helped me to continue doing the work despite the frustrations and difficulties. I realized I was spending too much time teaching my students foundational lawyering skills, and too little time focused on the broader array of skills I knew to be critical in the fight for racial justice. We regularly discussed systemic racism during my clinic seminars in order to place the students’ work on behalf of their clients within a larger context. But by relying on carefully curated small cases I was inadvertently desensitizing my students to a lawyer’s responsibility to challenge these systemic problems, and sending the message that the law operates independently from this background and context. I have an obligation to move beyond teaching my students to be “good soldiers for the status quo” to ensuring that the next generation is truly prepared to fight for justice.161 And, if my teaching methods are encouraging the reproduction of the status quo it is my obligation to develop new interventions.162 Jane Aiken’s work on “justice readiness” is instructive on this point. To graduate lawyers who better understand their role in advancing justice, Jane Aiken believes clinics should move beyond providing opportunities for students to have a social justice experience to promoting a desire and ability to do justice.163 She suggests creating disorienting moments by selecting cases where students have no outside authority on which to rely, requiring that they draw from their own knowledge base and values to develop a legal theory.164 Disorienting moments give students: experiences that surprise them because they did not expect to experience what they experienced. This can be as simple as learning that the maximum monthly welfare benefit for a family of four is about $350. Or they can read a [ ] Supreme Court case that upheld Charles Carlisle’s conviction because a wyer missed a deadline by one day even though the district court found there was insufficient evidence to prove his guilt. These facts are often disorienting. They require the student to step back and examine why they thought that the benefit amount would be so much more, or that innocence would always result in release. That is an amazing teaching moment. It is at this moment that we can ask students to examine their own privilege, how it has made them assume that the world operated differently, allowing them to be oblivious to the indignities and injustices that occur every day.165 Giving students an opportunity to “face the fact that they cannot rely on ‘the way things are’ and meet the needs of their clients” is a powerful approach to teaching and engaging students.166 But, complex problems call for larger and more sustained disorienting moments. Working with students on impact advocacy in the model of political lawyering provides a range of opportunities to immerse students in disorienting moments. A. Immersing Students in “Disorienting Moments”: Race, Poverty, and Pregnancy Today, I try to immerse my students in disorienting moments to make them justice ready and move them in the direction of political lawyering. My clinic docket has always included a small number of impact litigation matters. However, in the past these cases were carefully screened to ensure that they involved discrete legal issues and client groups. In addition, our representation always began after our outside co-counsel had already conducted an initial factual investigation, identified the core legal issues, and developed an overall advocacy strategy, freeing my students from these responsibilities. Now, my clinic takes on impact matters at earlier stages where the strategies are less clear and the legal questions are multifaceted and ill- defined. This mirrors the experiences of practicing social justice lawyers, who faced with an injustice, must discover the facts, identify the legal claims, develop strategy, cultivate allies, and ultimately determine what can be done—with the knowledge that “nothing” is not an option. This approach provides students with the space to wrestle with larger, systemic issues in a structured and supportive educational environment, taking on cases that seem difficult to resolve and working to bring some justice to that situation. They are also gaining experience in many of the fundamentals of political lawyering advocacy. Recently, my students began work on a new case. Several public and private hospitals in low-income New York City neighborhoods are drug testing pregnant women or new mothers without their knowledge or informed consent. This practice reflects a disturbing convergence between racial and economic disparities, and can have a profound impact on the lives of the poor women of color being tested at precisely the time when they are most in need of support. We began our work when a community organization reached out to the clinic and spoke to us about complaints that hospitals around New York City were regularly testing pregnant women—almost exclusively women of color—for drug use during prenatal check ups, during the chaos and stress of labor and delivery, or during post-delivery. The hospitals report positive test results to the City’s Administration for Children’s Services (“ACS”), which is responsible for protecting children from abuse and neglect, for further action.167 Most of the positive tests are for marijuana use. After a report is made, ACS commences an investigation to determine whether child abuse or neglect has taken place, and these investigations trigger inquiries into every aspect of a family’s life. They can lead to the institution of child neglect proceedings, and potentially to the temporary or permanent removal of children from the household. Even where that extreme result is avoided, an ACS investigation can open the door to the City’s continued, and potentially unwelcome, involvement in the lives of these families. These policies reflect deeply inequitable practices. Investigating a family after a positive drug test is not necessarily a bad thing. After all, ACS offers a number of supportive services that can help stabilize and strengthen vulnerable families. And of course, where children’s safety is at risk, removal may sometimes be the appropriate result. However, hospitals do not conduct regular drug tests of mothers in all New York City communities. Private hospitals in wealthy areas rarely test pregnant women or new mothers for drug misuse. In contrast, at hospitals serving poor women, drug testing is routine. Race and class should not determine whether such testing, and the consequences that result, take place. Investigating the New York City drug-testing program immersed the students in disorienting moments at every stage of their work. During our conversations, the students regularly expressed surprise and discomfort with the hospitals’ practices. They were disturbed that public hospitals— institutions on which poor women and women of color rely for something as essential as health care—would use these women’s pregnancy as a point of entry to control their lives.168 They struggled to explain how the simple act of seeking medical care from a hospital serving predominantly poor communities could deprive patients of the respect, privacy, and legal protections enjoyed by pregnant women in other parts of the City. And, they were shocked by the way institutions conditioned poor women to unquestioningly submit to authority.169 Many of the women did not know that they were drug tested until the hospital told them about the positive result and referred them to ACS. Still, these women were not surprised: that kind of disregard, marginalization, and lack of consent were a regular aspect of their lives as poor women of color. These women were more concerned about not upsetting ACS than they were about the drug testing. That so many of these women could be resigned to such a gross violation of their rights was entirely foreign to most of my students. B. Advocacy in the Face of Systemic Injustice Although the students are still in the early stages of their work, they have already engaged in many aspects of political justice lawyering. They approached their advocacy focused on the essence of political lawyering— enabling poor, pregnant women of color who enjoy little power or respect to claim and enjoy their rights, and altering the allocation of power from government agencies and institutions back into the hands of these women. They questioned whose interests these policies and practices were designed to serve, and have grounded their work in a vision of an alternative societal construct in which their clients and the community are respected and supported. The clinic students were given an opportunity to learn about social, legal, and administrative systems as they simultaneously explored opportunities to change those systems. The students worked to identify the short and long term goals of the impacted women as well the goals of the larger community, and to think strategically about the means best suited to accomplish these goals. And, importantly, while collaborating with partners from the community and legal advocacy organizations, the students always tried to keep these women centered in their advocacy. In breaking down the problem of drug testing poor women of color, the students worked through an issue that lives at the intersection of reproductive freedom, family law, racial justice, economic inequality, access to health care, and the war on drugs. In their factual investigation, which included interviews of impacted women, advocates, and hospital personnel, and the review of records obtained through Freedom of Information Law requests, the students began to break down this complex problem. They explored the disparate treatment of poor women and women of color by health care providers and government entities, implicit and explicit bias in healthcare, the disproportionate referral of women of color to ACS, the challenges of providing medical services to underserved communities, the meaning of informed consent, the diminished rights of people who rely on public services, and the criminalization of poverty. The students found that list almost as overwhelming as the initial problem itself, but identifying the components allowed the students to dig deeper and focus on possible avenues of challenge and advocacy. It was also critically important to make the invisible forces visible, even if the law currently does not provide a remedy. Working on this case also gave the students and me the opportunity to work through more nuanced applications of some of the lawyering concepts that were introduced in their smaller cases, including client-centered lawyering when working on behalf of the community; large-scale fact investigation; transferring their “social justice knowledge” to different contexts; crafting legal and factual narratives that are not only true to the communities’ experience, but can persuade and influence others; and how to develop an integrated advocacy plan. The students frequently asked whether we should even pursue the matter, questioning whether this work was client- centered when it was no longer the most pressing concern for many of the women we met. These doubts opened the door to many rich discussions: can we achieve meaningful social change if we only address immediate crises; can we progress on larger social justice issues without challenging their root causes; how do we recognize and address assumptions advocates may have about what is best for a client; and how can we keep past, present, and future victims centered in our advocacy? The work on the case also forced the clinic students to work through their own understanding of a hierarchy of values. They struggled with their desire to support these community hospitals and the public servants who work there under difficult circumstances on the one hand, and their desire to protect women, potentially through litigation, from discriminatory practices. They also struggled to reconcile their belief that hospitals should take all reasonable steps to protect the health and safety of children, as well as their emotional reaction to pregnant mothers putting their unborn children in harms way by using illegal drugs against the privacy rights of poor and marginalized women. They were forced to pause and think deeply about what justice would look like for those mothers, children, and communities. CONCLUSION America continues to grapple with systemic injustice. Political justice lawyering offers powerful strategies to advance the cause of justice—through integrated advocacy comprising the full array of tools available to social justice advocates, including strategic systemic reform litigation. It is the job of legal education to prepare law students to become effective lawyers. For those aspiring to social justice that should include training students to utilize the tools of political justice lawyers. Clinical legal offers a tremendous opportunity to teach the next generation of racial and social justice advocates how to advance equality in the face of structural inequality, if only it will embrace the full array of available tools to do so. In doing so, clinical legal education will not only prepare lawyers to enact social change, they can inspire lawyers overwhelmed by the challenges of change. In order to provide transformative learning experiences, clinical education must supplement traditional pedagogical tools and should consider political lawyering’s potential to empower law students and communities.

#### Use competing interps – topicality is question of models of debate which they should have to proactively justify and we’ll win reasonability links to our offense.

#### They can’t weigh the case—lack of preround prep means their truth claims are untested which you should presume false—they’re also only winning case because we couldn’t engage with it

#### No impact turns—exclusions are inevitable because we only have 45 minutes so it’s best to draw those exclusions along reciprocal lines to ensure a role for the negative

### 2

#### To cope with the crisis of collapsing modernity, subjects engage in self-actualization that abandons collective faith in norms and institutions in favor of emancipatory performance that necessitates a right-wing politics of exclusion. Their attempt to disrupt a social system or debate creates a safety valve for capitalism’s fundamental contradiction.

Bluhdorn 07 – (May 2007, Ingolfur, PhD, Reader in Politics/Political Sociology, University of Bath, “Self-description, Self-deception, Simulation: A Systems-theoretical Perspective on Contemporary Discourses of Radical Change,” Social Movement Studies, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1–20, May 2007, google scholar)

Yet the **established patterns of self-construction, which** thus **have to be defended and** further **developed** at any price, **have fundamental problems** attached to them: ﬁrstly, **the attempt to constitute, on the basis of** product choices and acts of **consumption, a Self and identity** that are **distinct from and autonomous vis-a`-vis the market is a contradiction in terms**. Secondly, **late-modern society’s established patterns of consumption are known to be socially exclusive and environmentally destructive**. Despite all hopes for ecological modernization and revolutionary improvements in resource efﬁciency (e.g. Weizsa¨cker et al., 1998; Hawkenet al., 1999; Lomborg, 2001), **physical environmental limits imply that the lifestyles and established patterns of consumption** cherished by advanced modern societies **cannot even be extended to all residents of the richest countries**, let alone to the populations of the developing world. For the sake of the (re)construction of an ever elusive Self, **in their struggle against self-referentiality** and in pursuit of the regeneration of difference, **late-modern societies are** thus **locked into the imperative of maintaining** and further developing the principle of **exclusion** (Blu¨hdorn, 2002, 2003). At any price they have to, and indeed do, defend **a lifestyle that requires ever increasing social inequality, environmental degradation, predatory resource wars, and the tight policing of potential internal and external enemies**.14 For this effort, **military and surveillance technology provide ever more sophisticated and efﬁcient means**. Nevertheless, the principle of **exclusion is ultimately still unsustainable, not only because of spiralling ‘security’ expenses but also because it** directly **contradicts the** modernist **notion of the free and autonomous individual** that late-modern society desperately aims to sustain. For this reason, late-modern society is confronted with the task of having to sustain both the late-modern principle of exclusion as well as its opposite, i.e. the modernist principle of inclusion. Very importantly, the conﬂict between the principles of exclusion and inclusion is not simply one between different individuals, political actors or sections of society. Instead, it is a politically irresolvable conﬂict that resides right within the late-modern individual, the late-modern economy and late-modern politics. And if, as Touraine notes, late-modern society no longer believes in nor even desires political transcendence, the particular challenge is that the two principles can also no longer be attributed to different dimensions of time, i.e. the former to the present, and the latter to some future society. Instead, late-modern society needs to represent and reproduce itself and its opposite at the same time. If considered **within this framework** of this analysis, the function of Luhmann’s system of protest communication, or in the terms of this article, **the signiﬁcance of** late-modern societies’ **discourses of radical change becomes immediately evident**. **At a stage when the possibility** and desirability **of transcending** the principle of **exclusion has been pulled into** radical **doubt but when**, at the same time, the principle of **inclusion is vitally important**, **these discourses simulate the validity of the latter as a social ideal**. In other words, **latemodern society reconciles the tension between the** cherished but exclusive **status quo** – for which there is no alternative – **and the non-existent** inclusive **alternative** – on whose existence it depends – **by means of simulation**. The analysis of Luhmann’s work has demonstrated how the societal self-descriptions produced by the system of protest communication, or late-modern society’s discourses of radical change, fulﬁl this function exactly. **They are** an **indispensable** function system not so much because they help to resolve late-modern society’s problems of mal-coordination, but because by performing the possibility of the alternative they help to cope with the fundamental problem of self-referentiality. In this sense, late-modern society’s discourses of sustainability, democratic renewal, social inclusion or global justice, to name but a few, suggest that advanced modern society is working towards an environmentally and socially inclusive alternative – genuinely modern – society, but they do not deny the fact that the big utopia and project of late-modern society is the reproduction and further enhancement of the status quo, i.e. the sustainability of the principle of exclusion. Protest movements as networks of physical actors and actions complement the purely communicative **discourses of radical change** in that they bring their narrative and societal selfdescription to life. Whilst the declarations of institutionalized mainstream politics cannot escape the generalized suspicion that they are purely rhetorical, social movements **provide an arena for** the physical expression and **experience of the authenticity and reality of the alternative**, or at least of the reality of its possibility and the authenticity of the commitment to its realization. For late-modern individuals who seek to find their elusive identity in ever new acts of consumption, protest movements offer an opportunity to experience themselves as autonomous, as subjects, as actors, as distinct from and opposed to the all-embracing market. Social movements and the more or less institutionalized discourses of radical change thus transmute from germ cells of the alternative society into reserves of alterity, or theme-parks for simulated alterity (Blu¨hdorn, 2005a). This interpretation reflects Luhmann’s suggestion that contemporary discourses of radical change are not so much about the actual implementation of radical social change as about the ‘symbolism of the alternative’. And it nowappears that the societal self-descriptions they generate fulfil a vital function not in so far as they increase the reflexivity of late-modern society but in so far as they are arenas for the experience of simulated subjectivity, duality and modernity. They provide an opportunity to reconcile the cherished but exclusive status quo with the equally cherished but unsustainable belief in the inclusive alternative. Protest movements and discourses of radical change are the implantation of the alternative into the system itself, or the simulated reproduction of alterity fromthe system’s own resources. As the real alternatives to the system are utterly unattractive, disappearing fast, and indeed resisted and annihilated at any price, this internal simulation of alterity is becoming late-modern society’s only remaining way of coping with the threat of self-referentiality.

#### Cap causes extinction – war, disease, climate, inequality, and econ

* human rights, healthcare crises, climate change, structural racism, econ, vtl
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The COVID19 pandemic has exposed a strange anomaly in the global economy. If it doesn’t keep growing endlessly, it just breaks. Grow, or die.

But there’s a deeper problem. New scientific research confirms that capitalism’s structural obsession with endless growth is destroying the very conditions for human survival on planet Earth.

A landmark study in the journal Nature Communications, “Scientists’ warning on affluence” — by scientists in Australia, Switzerland and the UK — concludes that the most fundamental driver of environmental destruction is the overconsumption of the super-rich.

This factor lies over and above other factors like fossil fuel consumption, industrial agriculture and deforestation: because it is overconsumption by the super-rich which is the chief driver of these other factors breaching key planetary boundaries.

The paper notes that the richest 10 percent of people are responsible for up to 43 percent of destructive global environmental impacts.

In contrast, the poorest 10 percent in the world are responsible just around 5 percent of these environmental impacts:

The new paper is authored by Thomas Wiedmann of UNSW Sydney’s School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Manfred Lenzen of the University of Sydney’s School of Physics, Lorenz T. Keysser of ETH Zürich’s Department of Environmental Systems Science, and Julia K. Steinberger of Leeds University’s School of Earth and Environment.

It confirms that global structural inequalities in the distribution of wealth are intimately related to an escalating environmental crisis threatening the very existence of human societies.

Synthesising knowledge from across the scientific community, the paper identifies capitalism as the main cause behind “alarming trends of environmental degradation” which now pose “existential threats to natural systems, economies and societies.” The paper concludes:

“It is clear that prevailing capitalist, growth-driven economic systems have not only increased affluence since World War II, but have led to enormous increases in inequality, financial instability, resource consumption and environmental pressures on vital earth support systems.”

Capitalism and the pandemic

Thanks to the way capitalism works, the paper shows, the super-rich are incentivised to keep getting richer — at the expense of the health of our societies and the planet overall.

The research provides an important scientific context for how we can understand many earlier scientific studies revealing that industrial expansion has hugely increased the risks of new disease outbreaks.

Just last April, a paper in Landscape Ecology found that deforestation driven by increased demand for consumption of agricultural commodities or beef have increased the probability of ‘zoonotic’ diseases (exotic diseases circulating amongst animals) jumping to humans. This is because industrial expansion, driven by capitalist pressures, has intensified the encroachment of human activities on wildlife and natural ecosystems.

Two years ago, another study in Frontiers of Microbiology concluded presciently that accelerating deforestation due to “demographic growth” and the associated expansion of “farming, logging, and hunting”, is dangerously transforming rural environments. More bat species carrying exotic viruses have ended up next to human dwellings, the study said. This is increasing “the risk of transmission of viruses through direct contact, domestic animal infection, or contamination by urine or faeces.”

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the COVID19 pandemic thus emerged directly from these rapidly growing impacts of human activities. As the new paper in Nature Communications confirms, these impacts have accelerated in the context of the fundamental operations of industrial capitalism.

Eroding the ‘safe operating space’

The result is that capitalism is causing human societies to increasingly breach key planetary boundaries, such as land-use change, biosphere integrity and climate change.

Remaining within these boundaries is essential to maintain what scientists describe as a “safe operating space” for human civilization. If those key ecosystems are disrupted, that “safe operating space” will begin to erode. The global impacts of the COVID19 pandemic are yet another clear indication that this process of erosion has already begun.

“The evidence is clear,” write Weidmann and his co-authors.

“Long-term and concurrent human and planetary wellbeing will not be achieved in the Anthropocene if affluent overconsumption continues, spurred by economic systems that exploit nature and humans. We find that, to a large extent, the affluent lifestyles of the world’s rich determine and drive global environmental and social impact. Moreover, international trade mechanisms allow the rich world to displace its impact to the global poor.”

The new scientific research thus confirms that the normal functioning of capitalism is eroding the ‘safe space’ by which human civilisation is able to survive.

The structures

The paper also sets out how this is happening in some detail. The super-rich basically end up driving this destructive system forward in three key ways.

Firstly, they are directly responsible for “biophysical resource use… through high consumption.”

Secondly, they are “members of powerful factions of the capitalist class.”

Thirdly, due to that positioning, they end up “driving consumption norms across the population.”

But perhaps the most important insight of the paper is not that this is purely because the super-rich are especially evil or terrible compared to the rest of the population — but because of the systemic pressures produced by capitalist structures.

The authors point out that: “Growth imperatives are active at multiple levels, making the pursuit of economic growth (net investment, i.e. investment above depreciation) a necessity for different actors and leading to social and economic instability in the absence of it.”

At the core of capitalism, the paper observes, is a fundamental social relationship defining the way working people are systemically marginalised from access to the productive resources of the earth, along with the mechanisms used to extract these resources and produce goods and services.

This means that to survive economically in this system, certain behavioural patterns become not just normalised, but seemingly entirely rational — at least from a limited perspective that ignores wider societal and environmental consequences. In the words of the authors:

“In capitalism, workers are separated from the means of production, implying that they must compete in labour markets to sell their labour power to capitalists in order to earn a living.”

Meanwhile, firms which own and control these means of production “need to compete in the market, leading to a necessity to reinvest profits into more efficient production processes to minimise costs (e.g. through replacing human labour power with machines and positive returns to scale), innovation of new products and/or advertising to convince consumers to buy more.”

If a firm fails to remain competitive through such behaviours, “it either goes bankrupt or is taken over by a more successful business. Under normal economic conditions, this capitalist competition is expected to lead to aggregate growth dynamics.”

The irony is that, as the paper also shows, the “affluence” accumulated by the super-rich isn’t correlated with happiness or well-being.

Restructure

The “hegemonic” dominance of global capitalism, then, is the principal obstacle to the systemic transformation needed to reduce overconsumption. So it’s not enough to simply try to “green” current consumption through technologies like renewable energy — we need to actually reduce our environmental impacts by changing our behaviours with a focus on cutting back our use of planetary resources:

“Not only can a sufficient decoupling of environmental and detrimental social impacts from economic growth not be achieved by technological innovation alone, but also the profit-driven mechanism of prevailing economic systems prevents the necessary reduction of impacts and resource utilisation per se.”

The good news is that it doesn’t have to be this way.

The paper reviews a range of “bottom-up studies” showing that dramatic reductions in our material footprint are perfectly possible while still maintaining good material living standards.

In India, Brazil and South Africa, “decent living standards” can be supported “with around 90 percent less per-capita energy use than currently consumed in affluent countries.” Similar possible reductions are feasible for modern industrial economies such as Australia and the US.

By becoming aware of how the wider economic system incentivises behaviour that is destructive of human societies and planetary ecosystems critical for human survival, both ordinary workers and more wealthy sectors — including the super-rich — can work toward rewriting the global economic operating system.

This can be done by restructuring ownership in firms, equalising relations with workers, and intentionally reorganising the way decisions are made about investment priorities.

The paper points out that citizens and communities have a crucial role to play in getting organised, upgrading efforts for public education about these key issues, and experimenting with new ways to work together in bringing about “social tipping points” — points at which social action can catalyse mass change.

While a sense of doom and apathy about the prospects for such change is understandable, mounting evidence based on systems science suggests that global capitalism as we know it is in a state of protracted crisis and collapse that began some decades ago. This research strongly supports the view that as industrial civilization reaches the last stages of its systemic life-cycle, there is unprecedented and increasing opportunity for small-scale actions and efforts to have large system-wide impacts.

The new paper shows that the need for joined-up action is paramount: structural racism, environmental crisis, global inequalities are not really separate crises — but different facets of human civilization’s broken relationship with nature.

Yet, of course, the biggest takeaway is that those who bear most responsibility for environmental destruction — those who hold the most wealth in our societies — urgently need to wake up to how their narrow models of life are, quite literally, destroying the foundations for human survival over the coming decades.

#### The alternative is to build racial and class solidarity around a new socialist movement focused on making concrete demands and progress that can transform American society. That vision is necessary to propel movements to challenge Trump, dismantle racist political formations, and save lives – worst effects of neolib aren’t inevitable
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The Democratic Socialists of America (DSA) has 25,000 members. Its growth over the past year has been massive — tripling in size — and no doubt a product of the increasing rejection of a bipartisan neoliberal consensus that has visited severe economic insecurity on the vast majority, particularly among young workers. No socialist organization has been this large in decades. The possibilities for transforming American politics are exhilarating. In considering how to make such a transformation happen, we might be tempted to usher those ranks of new socialists into existing vehicles for social change: community organizations, trade unions, or electoral campaigns — organizations more likely to win immediate victories for the workers that are at the center of our vision. Why not put our energy and hone our skills where they seem to be needed the most? Workers’ needs are incredibly urgent; shouldn’t we drop everything and join in these existing struggles right now? While it’s crucial to be deeply involved in such struggles as socialists, we also have something unique to offer the working class, harnessing a logic that supports but is different from the one that organizers for those existing vehicles operate under. Here’s a sketch of a practical approach rooted in that vision that can win support for democratic social change in the short run and a majority for socialist transformation in the long run. Fighting for “Non-Reformist Reforms” For socialists, theory and practice must be joined at the hip. Socialists work for reforms that weaken the power of capital and enhance the power of working people, with the aim of winning further demands — what André Gorz called “non-reformist reforms.” We want to move towards a complete break with the capitalist system. Socialists, unlike single-issue activists, know that democratic victories must be followed by more democratic victories, or they will be rolled back. Single-payer health care is a classic example of a “non-reformist” reform, one that would pry our health system free from capital’s iron grip and empower the working class by nationalizing the private health insurance industry. But socialists conceive of this struggle differently than single-issue advocates of Medicare for All. Socialists understand that single payer alone cannot deal with the cost spiral driven by for-profit hospital and pharmaceutical companies. If we do achieve a national (or state-level) single-payer system, the fight wouldn’t be over; socialists would then fight for nationalization of the pharmaceutical industry. A truly socialized health care system (as in Britain and Sweden) would nationalize hospitals and clinics staffed by well-paid, unionized health care workers. Socialists can and should be at the forefront of fights like this today. To do so, we must gain the skills needed to define who holds power in a given sector and how to organize those who have a stake in taking it away from them. But we can’t simply be the best activists in mass struggles. Single-issue groups too often attack a few particularly bad corporate actors without also arguing that a given crisis cannot be solved without curtailing capitalist power. Socialists not only have to be the most competent organizers in struggle, but they have to offer an analysis that reveals the systemic roots of a particular crisis and offer reforms that challenge the logic of capitalism. Building a Majority As socialists, our analysis of capitalism leads us to not just a moral and ethical critique of the system, but to seeing workers as the central agents of winning change. This isn’t a random fetishizing of workers — it’s based on their structural position in the economy. Workers have the ability to disrupt production and exchange, and they have an interest in banding together and articulating collective demands. This makes them the key agents of change under capitalism. This view can be caricatured as ignoring struggles for racial justice, immigrant rights, reproductive freedom, and more. But nothing could be further from the truth. The working class is majority women and disproportionately brown and black and immigrant; fighting for the working class means fighting on precisely these issues,

as well as for the rights of children, the elderly, and all those who cannot participate in the paid labor market. Socialists must also fight on the ideological front. We must combat the dominant ideology of market individualism with a compelling vision of democracy and freedom, and show how only in a society characterized by democratic decision-making and universal political, civil, and social rights can individuals truly flourish. If socialist activists cannot articulate an attractive vision of socialist freedom, we will not be able to overcome popular suspicion that socialism would be a drab, pseudo-egalitarian, authoritarian society. Thus we must model in our own socialist organizations the democratic debate, peaceful conflict, and social solidarity that would characterize a socialist world. A democratic socialist organization that doesn’t have a rich and accessible internal educational life will not develop an activist core who can be public tribunes for socialism. Activists don’t stay committed to building a socialist organization unless they can articulate to themselves and others why even a reformed capitalism remains a flawed, undemocratic society. The Power of a Minority But socialists must also be front and center in struggles to win the short-term victories that empower people and lead them to demand more. Socialists today are a minority building and pushing forward a potential, progressive anti-corporate majority. We have no illusions that the dominant wing of the Democrats are our friends. Of course, most levels of government are now run by Republicans well to the right of them. But taking on neoliberal Democrats must be part of a strategy to defeat the far right. Take the Democrats, who are showing what woeful supposed leaders of “the resistance” they are every day. Contrary to the party leadership’s single-note insistence, the Russians did not steal the election for Trump; rather, a tepid Democratic candidate who ran on expertise and competence lost because her corporate ties precluded her articulation of a program that would aid the working class — a $15 minimum wage, Medicare for All, free public higher education. Clinton failed to gain enough working-class votes of all races to win the key states in the former industrial heartland; she ended up losing to the most disliked, buffoonish presidential candidate in history. If we remain enthralled to Democratic politics-as-usual, we’re going to continue being stuck with cretins like Donald Trump. Of course, progressive and socialist candidates who openly reject the neoliberal mainstream Democratic agenda may choose for pragmatic reasons to use the Democratic Party ballot line in partisan races. But whatever ballot line the movement chooses to use, we must always be working to increase the independent power of labor and the Left. Sanders provides an example: it’s hard to imagine him offering a radical opening to using the “s” word in American politics for his openly independent campaign if he had run on an independent line. Bernie also showed the strength of socialists using coalition politics to build a short-term progressive majority and to win people over to a social-democratic program and, sometimes, to socialism. Sanders gained the support of six major unions; if we had real social movement unionism in this country, he would have carried the banner of the entire organized working-class movement. Bernie’s weaker performance than Clinton among voters of color — though not among millennials of color — derived mostly from his being a less known commodity. But it also demonstrated that socialists need deeper social roots among older women and communities of color. That means developing the organizing strategies that will better implant us in the labor movement and working-class communities, as well as struggles for racial justice and gender and sexual emancipation. Socialists have the incumbent obligation to broaden out the post-Sanders, anti-corporate trend in US politics into a working-class “rainbow coalition.” We must also fight our government’s imperialist foreign policy and push to massively cut wasteful “defense” spending. We should be involved in multiracial coalitions, fighting for reforms like equitable public education and affordable housing. Democratic socialists can be the glue that brings together disparate social movement that share an interest in democratizing corporate power. We can see the class relations that pervade society and how they offer common avenues of struggle. But at 25,000 members, we can’t substitute ourselves for the broader currents needed to break the power of both far-right nativist Republicans and pro-corporate neoliberal Democrats. We have to work together with broader movements that may not be anti-capitalist but remain committed to reforms. These movements have the potential to win material improvements for workers’ lives. If we stay isolated from them, we will slide into sectarian irrelevance. Of course, socialists should endeavor to build their own organizational strength and to operate as an independent political force. We cannot mute our criticism against business unionist trends in the labor movement and the middle-class professional leadership of many advocacy groups. But in the here and now, we must also help win those victories that will empower workers to conceive of more radical democratic gains. Our members are disproportionately highly educated, young, male, and white. To win victories, we must pursue a strategy and orientation that makes us more representative of the working class. Grasping the Moment In the final analysis, socialists must be both tribunes for socialism and the best organizers. That’s how the Communist Party grew rapidly from 1935-1939. They set themselves up as the left wing of the CIO and of the New Deal coalition, and grew from twenty thousand to one hundred thousand members during that period. The Socialist Party, on the other hand, condemned the New Deal as “a restoration of capitalism.” In saying so they were partly right: the New Deal was in part about saving capitalism from itself. But such a stance was also profoundly wrong in that it distanced the Socialist Party from popular struggles from below, including those for workers’ rights and racial equality that forced capital to make important concessions. This rejection was rooted in a concern that those struggles were “reformist”; it led the SP to fall from twenty thousand members in 1935 to three thousand in 1939. Of course, there are also negative lessons to be learned from the Communist growth during the Popular Front period. They hid their socialist identity in an attempt to appeal to the broadest swath of Americans possible. When forced to reveal it, they referred to an authoritarian Soviet Union as their model. And by following Moscow’s line on the Hitler-Stalin Pact and then the no-strike pledge during World War II, the party abandoned the most militant sectors of the working class. Thus, the Communists put themselves in a position that prevented them from ever winning hegemony within the US working-class movement from liberal forces. Still, the Popular Front was the last time socialism had any mass presence in the United States — in part because, in its own way, the Communists rooted their struggles for democracy within US political culture while trying to build a truly multiracial working-class movement. The road to DSA becoming a real working-class organization runs through us becoming the openly socialist wing of a mass movement opposed to a bipartisan neoliberal consensus. If we only become better organizers, with more practical skills in door-knocking and phone-banking and one-on-one conversations, we will likely see the defection of many of our most skilled organizers who will take those skills and get jobs doing “mass work” in reformist organizations. Such a defection bedeviled DSA in the 1980s, leading to a “donut” phenomenon — thousands of members embedded in mass movements, but few building the center of DSA as an organization. We must avoid this. Simultaneously, if we don’t relate politically to social forces bigger than our own, DSA could devolve into merely a large socialist sect or subculture. The choice to adopt a strategy that would move us towards becoming a mass socialist organization with working-class roots is ours. This is the most promising moment for the socialist left in decades. If we take advantage of it, we can make our own history.

## Case

#### The role of the ballot is to determine if the aff’s a good idea—anything else is self-serving, arbitrary and begs the question of the rest of the debate.

#### No solvency – vote neg on presumption

#### A. Creating new subjectivities and histories in debate will do nothing to resolve the imposition of the model minority myth in other structures or the fact that people are socialized outside of this space i.e. from their parents or the media

#### B. Bringing this in to debate only encourages people to want to react with framework – competition makes your project of change obsolete

#### C. Systems – the 1AC argues that material events and institutions create the social realities that replicate violence but ceding the state refuses to alter these conditions

#### D. Nothing about debate leads to the model minority – you can read affs that critique the myth and reforms in the community solve as per 1AC CX

#### The aff bites into it’s own criticism of assimilatory complacency – wow you read ONE LINE of your aff in a foreign language good for you! The other 5 minutes and 50 seconds were rehashings of tricks, lingo from afropessimism, and countless other tactical inclusions that are anything but radical. Their desire for the ballot will always subsume any attempt to genuinely change aspects of the activity PROVEN by their aff which means 1. Their linguistic resistance is capped at 0 solvency within debate 2. The aff is a double turn with itself and uses feel good solutions like their one line of resistance to continue oppressive structures while judges pat themselves on the back

#### Perfcons aren’t good – their ev says contradicting dominant ideologies is good, not that reading 2 contradictory methods or resistance strats is good

#### Subverting individual academic norms feeds a reactive cycle of liberal denunciation that mystifies power relations

Ruti 15 [Mari, professor of Critical Theory at the University of Toronto, *Between Levinas and Lacan: Self, Other, Ethics*, Bloomsbury Publishing, pg. 180-184]

In Chapter 2, I pointed out that Butler's attempt to have it both ways—to denounce the Enlightenment while simultaneously using its resources—leads to conceptual contradictions that cannot easily be resolved. The matter is worth revisiting here in greater detail because it highlights my major disagreement with Butler, namely that her wholesale vilification of autonomy reaches the kinds of hyperbolic ideological heights that cannot be theoretically defended. Indeed, it is in part the predictability of Butler's stance on this issue that explains why I have been so critical of her in this book: that I always know ahead of time how the argument is going to go—autonomy, sovereignty, rationality, normative limits bad; antinormativity, no matter how far-fetched, good—makes me feel the same way I do when I am grading yet another graduate student paper that undertakes the task of "deconstructing" the humanist subject. In the latter instance, it takes all the pedagogical willpower I can conjure up to not write in the margin, "Didn't we already do this circa 1975?" In Butler's case, I suppose I would like some explanation for why the monotonous disparagement of autonomy and related concepts is so important to her.

"This question is worth asking because the problematic of the subject—the question of the proper way to theorize the relationship between autonomy and subjection, agency and abjection, accountability and social determination—has been one of the most divisive issues of contemporary theory. I have already outlined my own position, which is that either-or solutions to this problematic are too one-dimensional, that if human beings are not entirely autonomous, they are not entirely subjected either, which is why we need to theorize both poles of the dichotomy simultaneously. This, refreshingly, is what Allen tries to do, which is one reason I have found her arguments so convincing. Allen explains that her goal "is to offer an analysis of power in all its depth and complexity, including an analysis of subjection that explicates how power works at the intrasubjective level to shape and constitute our very subjectivity, and an account of autonomy that captures the constituted subject's capacity for critical reflection and self-transformation, its capacity to be self-constituting" (PS 2-3). Without an account of subjection, Allen adds, critical theory cannot grasp "the real-world relations of power and subordination along lines of gender, race, and sexuality that it must illuminate if it is to be truly critical"; but without a satisfactory account of autonomy, critical theory "cannot envision possible paths of social transformation" {PS 3). This is why it is important to understand how we can be constituted by power yet capable of constituting ourselves, how we can be limited by our social context yet capable of critical reflection and self-transformation beyond this context.

Undoubtedly even our capacity for critical reflection and self-transformation is socially constituted , so that it would be possible to posit—with Zizek—that this capacity merely renders our subordination more livable. In Zizek's skeptical reading (and this is a possibility I touched on in Chapter 4), what the system wants is precisely that we rebel against it—that we strive for the kind of self transformation that gives us the illusion of being able to distance ourselves from it—because, in the final analysis, our attempts to defy its power merely consolidate this power; as Zizek maintains, in one of his more Foucaultian moments, power thrives on our action of disidentification because it "can reproduce itself only through some form of self-distance, by relying on the obscene disavowed rules and practices that are in conflict with its public norms."2 Yet it is also the case—as Zizek himself repeatedly stresses—that without the capacity for critical reflection and self-transformation our relationship to the big Other would be one of utter subjection.