### 1

#### Interp and Violation: The affirmative must only defend that the appropriation of outer space from private entities is unjust from the hypothetical implementation of a topical plan OR solely gain offense from defense of the resolution as a value statement – 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.

#### 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 – Legal argumentation can be repurposed to help attend to and even remediate spirit murder – striking in demand of institutional change of antiblack practices in the work place is valuable

Nash, 19—Professor of Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies at Duke University (Jennifer, “love in the time of death,” *Black Feminism Reimagined: After Intersectionality*, Chapter 4, 121-126, dml)

While critical race theorists offered critical interrogations of law’s imagined progress, treating it as evidence of US self-interest rather than a genuine investment in racial redress, they also routinely offered ways of imagining law otherwise, refashioning antidiscrimination law, conceptions of evidence, property, and contract. They imagined a form of law that eschewed color blindness and argued that any legal regime that sought to contend with American racial violence had to be deeply color-conscious to exact meaningful remedies. They advanced new methods—narrative, parable, allegory, speculative fiction, storytelling—in an effort to jam the fictions of objectivity and neutrality and to expose that law is itself a racial project, never removed from the racial regimes it purports to disrupt. In other words, they sought to use their locations in the legal academy and in the legal profession to radically remake law, to push the boundaries of how legal doctrine could be written, imagined, and enacted. They aspired to make law into something unrecognizable and unimaginable, to push at its very parameters in the pursuit of a “jurisprudence of generosity.”34

My entry point for thinking through law as a site of black feminist love-politics is through the work of Patricia J. Williams. Her book The Alchemy of Race and Rights is complex in its form and its argument—it is memoir, “diary,” legal treatise, and critical theory at once. Williams presents herself as professor, consumer, daughter, granddaughter, train rider, and “crazy” black woman exhausted from the ordinary and spectacular raced and gendered brutalities of American life and the project of teaching law at a historically white law school. The project, then, is a rumination on the felt life of racial and gendered violence, and a critical analysis of the myriad spaces where this violence unfolds, from the media onslaught against Tawana Brawley to the experiences of being a black female faculty member at a law school.

Williams’s inquiry, though, is not simply about documenting the ubiquity of racial and gendered violence but also about engaging and describing the lived experience of racialized and gendered vulnerability, what she terms “spirit murder.” For Williams, “spirit murder” is the psychic and spiritual wounding that unfolds as a result of racial violence. “Spirit murder” describes the wounds left on the flesh, psyche, and even soul of those who experience violence and the wounds, often invisible, that haunt perpetrators of violence, including a willingness to accept, and to render unseen, those who are dispossessed. Williams’s task, then, is to imagine what law could look and feel like if it accounted for “spirit murder,” a form of violence that she argues includes “cultural obliteration, prostitution, abandonment of the elderly and the homeless, and genocide. . . . What I call spirit murder—disregard for others whose lives qualitatively depend on our regard—is that it produces a system of formalized distortions of thought.”35 Williams argues that “we need to elevate spirit murder to the conceptual—if not punitive— level of a capital moral offense. . . . We need to eradicate its numbing pathology before it wipes out what precious little humanity we have left.”36 Williams’s conception of “spirit murder” imagines law’s capacity to remedy forms of violence against the psyche and soul, a terrain that has been unimaginable to law precisely because of its commitment to remedying only visible and legible harms, and law’s ability to be mobilized “conceptually”— but not punitively—to respond to violence. In other words, the endeavor of the text is to imagine a legal project capacious and creative enough to attend to what it has always ignored: the violence inflicted on the psyche. Williams effectively invites us to imagine how we might feel differently toward each other, and toward law itself, if we had legal obligations toward mutual regard, if we knew that law took seriously spirit murder.

If Williams seeks to use law to exceed what it aspires to do, to respond to the “cultural cancer” of spirit murder, her book also contains a resounding, and even surprising, redemption of rights as a key strategy for reforming law. An embrace of rights might sound like a deeply conventional strategy, mobilizing law to do what it has long claimed to do on behalf of racialized and gendered minorities: confer rights. Despite her lengthy engagement with state violence, her exacting critique of how law permits rather than redresses spirit murder, Williams ends not with an abandonment of the state but with a deep affection for what rights could accomplish. She writes:

The task is to expand private property rights into a conception of civil rights, into the right to expect civility from others. . . . Instead, society must give them [rights] away. Unlock them from reification by giving them to slaves. Give them to trees. Give them to cows. Give them to history. Give them to rivers and rocks. Give to all of society’s objects and untouchables the rights of privacy, integrity and self-assertion; give them distance and respect. Flood them with the animating spirit that rights mythology fires in this country’s most oppressed psyches, and wash away the shroud of inanimate-object-status, so that we may say not that we own gold but that a luminous golden spirit owns us.37

If critical legal studies called for the abandonment of investment in rights, treating rights as relatively unsuccessful in securing social change and as promoting problematic conceptions of individualism, Williams makes a plea for a dramatic expansion of rights and a surprising reconceptualization of the labor of rights. Rights, she argues, should not be the purview of those who can explicitly and legibly name harm. Cows, history, and rocks should have rights, including rights to “privacy, integrity and self-assertion.” Rights should not be “reified” but generously bestowed upon everyone and everything; rights should not be used to shore up ideas of property and ownership, to allow us to claim that “we own gold,” but instead to ensure a deep spiritual connection between us. In so doing, law could remake “society,” transforming its investments in rights as something that protects property holders into rights as something that can ensure our mutual accountability, and reminds us of the “luminous golden spirit [that] owns us” all.

It is easy to read Williams as optimistically rehabilitating rights from the critical legal studies’ critique of rights, and problematically investing in precisely the doctrinal formulation that has consistently failed minoritarian subjects. In this reading, Williams is imagined as paradoxically investing in precisely the site of violence she carefully documents with far too little explanation for how rights can circumvent the problems of racism and sexism she delineates. Yet I read Williams’s visionary account of rights differently. For her, law can be mobilized not to produce new causes of action, to simply make visible new wounded subjects who can make appeals to redress, but to imagine new and radical vulnerabilities. As it is currently structured, property deeply organizes sociality, and law operates to protect property from trespass and theft. Thus, law operates to create categories like property holder (owner) and trespasser (thief), and to organize the social world around proximities to ownership. Williams uses her capacious conception of rights to imagine another way of organizing sociality: around vulnerability. Indeed, Williams asks: How are we bound up with others? What is our responsibility to ensuring the vital “spirit” of others, and to demanding the protection of our own “spirits”? What happens when we harm things that can’t articulate injuries (trees, rocks, rivers) but can only make that injury visible and oftentimes in ways that we refuse to recognize, or that might even make that injury visible in another time, in decades or centuries when we are not even here to be accountable? What happens when we take responsibility for our capacity to wound and for the histories of wounding and violence that have unfolded, often in our names? And what happens when law becomes a critical tool in making visible mutual vulnerability, in insisting that we recognize that we can “undo each other,” and in demanding that we take seriously our indebtedness to each other? For Williams, then, expanding rights becomes a strategy for transforming law to be a space that enshrines a vision of interdependence and shared vulnerability.

I begin my investigation of the possibility of rooting black feminist lovepolitics in law with Williams’s visionary work because it reveals the potential of black feminist legal scholarship that fundamentally reorients law around ethics of vulnerability. This is work that expresses a fundamental faith in law’s capacity to perform different kinds of justice work, even as it recognizes how law is often mobilized as an agent of inequality and injustice. Like Williams’s radical remaking of rights, Crenshaw’s conception of intersectionality tugs at the seams of law, working within its confines to radically unleash its transformative capacity. As I explained earlier in the book, intersectionality is primarily remembered for its now widely circulating accident metaphor, where discrimination is imagined as traffic flowing through an intersection. It can move in one direction, another direction, or both, and an “accident” can occur on either street or in the intersection. According to this logic, discrimination can be race-based, gender-based, or race-and-gender-based, yet the possibility of raced and gendered discrimination is rendered impossible by antidiscrimination law that actively refuses to account for this form of violence. As Crenshaw notes, “Judicial decisions which premise intersectional relief on a showing that Black women are specifically recognized as a class are analogous to a doctor’s decision at the scene of an accident to treat an accident victim only if the injury is recognized by medical insurance.”38 Intersectionality, then, spotlights law’s refusal to see black women’s race- and gender-based injuries.

Many have envisioned intersectionality’s mandate as the insertion of black women into existing antidiscrimination law, as a call for antidiscrimination law to abandon its race or gender logic and instead embrace a race and gender logic. Yet, as Crenshaw’s second metaphor reveals, antidiscrimination law is constructed around leaving the multiply marginalized in the proverbial basement. Put differently, antidiscrimination law itself is constructed around remedying only certain forms of discriminatory activity and is designed to refuse to recognize and redress discrimination against the most vulnerable. Intersectionality, then, is not a call for inserting black women into a preexisting legal regime, precisely because that regime is designed to refuse to see black women. Instead, it is a tactic of making visible black women’s status as witnesses who can name and describe the basement, which is not merely a social location but a space produced by law’s doctrinal failures.

#### 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

#### CP Text: We affirm global orbital counter-operations against appropriation of outer space by private entities except for Space-Based Solar Power. Companies investing in Space-Based Solar Power should commit to at least 40% of the Energy Produced to be distributed to black communities

#### Space-Based Solar Power constitutes Appropriation.

Matignon 19 Louis De Gouyon Matignon 4-15-2019 "THE LEGAL STATUS OF CHINESE SPACE-BASED SOLAR POWER STATIONS" <https://www.spacelegalissues.com/the-legal-status-of-chinese-space-based-solar-power-stations/> (PhD in space law)//Elmer

Near-Earth space is formed of different orbital layers. Terrestrial orbits are limited common resources and inherently repugnant to any appropriation: they are not property in the sense of law. Orbits and frequencies are res communis (a Latin term derived from Roman law that preceded today’s concepts of the commons and common heritage of mankind; it has relevance in international law and common law). It’s the first-come, first-served principle that applies to orbital positioning, which without any formal acquisition of sovereignty, records a promptness behaviour to which it grants an exclusive grabbing effect of the space concerned. Geostationary orbit is a limited but permanent resource: this de facto appropriation by the first-comers – the developed countries – of the orbit and the frequencies is protected by Space Law and the International Telecommunications Law. The challenge by developing countries of grabbing these resources is therefore unjustified on the basis of existing law. Denying new entrants geostationary-access or making access more difficult does not constitute appropriation; it simply results from the traditional system of distribution of access rights. The practice of developed States is based on free access and priority given to the first satellites placed in geostationary orbit. The geostationary orbit is part of outer space and, as such, the customary principle of non-appropriation and the 1967 Space Treaty apply to it. The equatorial countries have claimed sovereignty, then preferential rights over this space. These claims are contrary to the 1967 Treaty and customary law. However, they testify to the concern of the equatorial countries, shared by developing countries, in the face of saturation and seizure of geostationary positions by developed countries. The regime of res communis of outer space in Space Law (free access and non-appropriation) does not meet the demand of the developing countries that their possibilities of future access to the geostationary orbit and associated radio frequencies are guaranteed. New rules appear necessary and have been envisaged to ensure the access of all States to these positions and frequencies. As a conclusion, we may say that those Chinese space-based solar power stations would be considered space objects, the solar energy they would be exploiting would be free of use, and the orbital position they would occupy would have to obey the first-come, first-served principle that applies to orbital positioning. Concerning Article I of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, which imposes that “The exploration and use of outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development, and shall be the province of all mankind”, “the benefit and in the interests of all countries” doesn’t prohibit private exploitation, as it is the case with satellite navigation, satellite television and commercial satellite imagery for example.

#### Chinese Private Companies are pursuing Space-Based Solar Power.

McKirdy and Fang 19 Euan McKirdy and Nanlin Fang 3-3-2019 "Space power plant and a mission to Mars: China’s new plans to conquer the final frontier" <https://www.cnn.com/2019/03/03/asia/china-plans-solar-power-in-space-intl/index.html> (Journalists at CNN)//Elmer

China Aerospace Science and Technology Corporation plans to launch small solar satellites that can harness energy in space as soon as 2021. Then it will test larger plants capable of advanced functions, such as beaming energy back to Earth via lasers. A receiving station will be built in Xian, around 500 miles northeast of the Chinese city of Chongqing. The city is a regional space hub where a facility to develop the solar power farms has been founded. By 2050, the company plans that a full-sized space-based solar plant would be ready for commercial use, the Chinese media report said.

#### Space-Based Solar Power solves Paris Goals that checks back Warming.

Ravisetti 21 Monisha Ravisetti 11-8-2021 "Harvesting energy with space solar panels could power the Earth 24/7" <https://www.cnet.com/news/harvesting-energy-with-space-solar-panels-could-power-the-earth-247/> (Science Writer at CNet)//Elmer

Solar power has been a key part of humanity's clean energy repertoire. We spread masses of sunlight-harvesting panels on solar fields, and many people power their homes by decorating their roofs with the rectangles. But there's a caveat to this wonderful power source. Solar panels can't collect energy at night. To work at peak efficiency, they need as much sunlight as possible. So to maximize these sun catchers' performance, researchers are toying with a plan to send them to a place where the sun never sets: outer space. Theoretically, if a bunch of solar panels were blasted into orbit, they'd soak up the sun even on the foggiest days and the darkest nights, storing an enormous amount of power. If that power were wirelessly beamed down to Earth, our planet could breathe in renewable clean energy, 24/7. That would significantly reduce our carbon footprint. Against the backdrop of a worsening climate crisis, the success of space-based solar power could be more important than ever. The state of the climate is in the spotlight right now as world leaders gather in Glasgow, Scotland, for the COP26 summit, which has been called the "world's best last chance" to get the crisis under control. CNET Science is highlighting a few futuristic strategies intended to aid countries in cutting back on human-generated carbon emissions. Next-generation tech like space-based solar power can't solve our climate problems -- we still need to rapidly decarbonize our energy systems -- but green innovation could help achieve the goals of the Paris Agreement: Limit global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit) by the end of the century. An unlimited supply of renewable energy from the sun might help us do that.

#### Warming causes Extinction

Kareiva 18, Peter, and Valerie Carranza. "Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back." Futures 102 (2018): 39-50. (Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA)//Re-cut by Elmer

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (**climate change**, global **freshwater** cycle, **and** ocean **acidification**) do **pose existential risks**. This is **because of** intrinsic **positive feedback loops**, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all **directly connected to** the provision of **food and water**, and **shortages** of food and water can **create conflict** and social unrest. Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields). Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. **Ample clean water** is not a luxury—it **is essential for human survival**. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease. Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms. A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people. 4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes **Humans** are remarkably ingenious, and **have adapted** to crises **throughout** their **history**. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). **However**, the many **stories** **of** human ingenuity **successfully** **addressing** **existential risks** such as global famine or extreme air pollution **represent** environmental c**hallenges that are** largely **linear**, have immediate consequences, **and operate without positive feedbacks**. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm. In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, **the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops**. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that **very warming can cause more CO2 release** which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios. Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002). Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that **forest fires will become more frequent** and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This **catastrophic fire** embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that **could catch humanity off-guard and produce a** true **apocalyptic event.** Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming. Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967). Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009). The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that **runaway climate change,** and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks **portends** even greater **existential risks**. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

#### SPSB is the only thing capable of ending Energy Poverty – just one country getting to it would have universal benefits.

Aleksey Shtivelman 12, Boston JD, “Solar Power Satellites: The Right To A Spot In The World's Highest Parking Lot,” https://www.bu.edu/jostl/files/2015/02/Shtivelman\_web.pdf

\*\*\*edited for gendered language

Rather than spending millions on land-based solar power projects, it would be much more profitable if these nations invested in SBSP satellites for two reasons. First, although SBSP satellites are much more expensive at the outset, the cost of initial investment is returned in a period of time comparable to what it would take to recoup the investment cost of a land-based solar farm. 113 Second, SBSP satellites generate about eight to ten times as much power as land-based solar farms."l 4 This means that after one and a half years, SBSP satellites would generate eight to ten times the revenue of a land-based solar farm. As a result, countries that currently rely on coal, nuclear or other types of non-clean, non-renewable energy may look to SBSP for their energy needs, and consequently generate a significant spike in demand for orbital locations on the GSO. This increased demand will raise two issues: (1) whether a GSO orbital slot can be owned, and, (2) if not, whether there is a way to allocate the right to access GSO orbital slots for a period of time. A viable legal framework could address both of these issues in a clear and precise manner. The ITU currently allocates slots for telecommunications satellites, but the increased demand for slots in GSO for SBSP satellites may force countries to reevaluate ITU's authority to regulate SBSP satellites. An unsuccessful attempt to appropriate GSO slots The ITU allocation is one way to solve the problem, but given the physical limitations of the GSO, there is an underlying conflict between the goals of fair and equitable access on one side and the GSO's efficient use on the other.' 5 The conflict arises when developed countries receive priority to access the GSO because they have the demand, infrastructure, and funding to put satellites into orbit, while developing countries without viable satellites also want access the GSO. 116 This a posteriori approach to GSO property rights favors those who are first to apply for frequency and orbital slots and protects those applicants from interference by later users."17 At the same time, developing countries do not favor such a "free-market-approach" to GSO access; on the contrary, they would like a multilateral approach that distributes access to the GSO equitably among all nations. 118 "As feared by the developing States, this a posteriori system [has] provided a few industrialized and rich States with the opportunity of temporarily unlimited use of registered frequencies and orbit positions."' "19 Developing countries feel that they should have equal access to these frequencies and orbital slots. 120 These countries have tried to gain leverage over the GSO resource by advocating for the creation of an administrative agency that would allocate a part of the GSO to each country. In 1976, eight developing countries above the equator claimed sovereign right over the parts of the GSO lying over their territories and called for the administration of the rest of the GSO. 12 ' The Declaration of the First Meeting of Equatorial Countries (the "Bogota Declaration") asserted that these countries had the right to parts of the GSO because the orbit should be considered part of the earth and not outer space. 22 These countries argued that the gravitational force that produces the GSO was defived from their land.' 23 Both developed and developing countries rejected the Bogota Declaration's arguments because its claims were weak: the gravity that produces the orbit (1) is produced by the entire earth, not just these eight nations, and (2) produces all orbits, not just the GSO.124 Another of the arguments in the Bogota Declaration was that there is no legally defined boundary as to where an atmosphere ends and space begins. 125 Furthermore, the Bogota Declaration declared that even the Outer Space Treaty, which provides the basic outline for the peaceful exploration and use of outer space, does not address the issue. 126 While there is no definition that all countries in the world accept regarding the boundary of space, the International Aeronautic Federation recognizes the Karman Line as the edge of the atmosphere and the beginning of space.' 27 The International Aeronautic Federation is a non-governmental organization founded in 1905, for the purpose of encouraging aeronautical and astronautical activities worldwide. 28 It has 100 member countries, including the United States, United Kingdom, Spain, Sweden, South Africa, Mongolia, Korea, Israel, Iran, as well as many others.1 29 For the preceding reasons, the International Aeronautic Federation portrays a widely held view concerning the definition of space. The Karman line is one hundred kilometers above sea level, and that is where the atmosphere becomes so thin that an airplane cannot fly and a spaceship is needed for flight.' 30 The GSO lies more than 35,000 kilometers above sea level, which is approximately 34,900 kilometers higher than the Karman line. Therefore, GSO is well above the demarcation of space that is internationally recognized. For this reason and others, most countries did not accept the Bogota Declaration. Accordingly, the Bogota Declaration was an unsuccessful attempt to appropriate GSO slots. Space law must allow appropriation of space for the good of everyone The Bogota Declaration was ultimately a failure because it violated internationally accepted principles. According to the Outer Space Treaty of 1967, GSO orbital positions and frequencies cannot be appropriated because no country can appropriate or own space. 31 Ninety-one states have signed this treaty, including the United States, the United Kingdom, Ukraine, Japan, Greece, Denmark, Spain, Uganda, Afghanistan, Iraq and many others. 32 The treaty specifies that outer space is the "province of mankind" and that all activity should be done for the benefit of all of humanity. 133 It would then seem that no country could have exclusive ownership over an orbital position in the GSO or any orbit. 134 Even if the Outer Space Treaty of 1967 prohibits countries from owning orbital slots in the GSO, the slots should still be allocated to countries that will use them, on a first-come, first-served basis. SBSP has so much potential to benefit all of [hu]mankind that if even a single country uses a GSO slot to gather power, the advantage of developing the technology of SBSP may outweigh the argument that all nations should have equal access to space.'3 5 Countries like Tonga that have no capability of sending satellites into orbit should not be able to claim GSO slots because this would prohibit developed countries from placing satellites into orbit that can benefit the whole world.136 The Outer Space Treaty of 1967 likely permits the allocation of GSO slots to individual countries on the condition that the slots are used for SBSP satellites that benefit all mankind. Countries with orbiting SBSP satellites could meet such conditional requirements in three ways. First, they could be required to provide power to less developed countries. Second, launching countries can help decrease global warming because SBSP satellites provide clean energy. Third, launching countries can lower the cost of solar power systems as they become cheaper and more affordable with time so that many less developed countries around the world will be able to access solar power from space. By satisfying any of these conditions, deployment of SBSP satellites would qualify under the treaty as "use of outer space ... carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries."'137 The universal benefits provided by SBSP satellites would therefore be consistent with the treaty's requirement that the use of outer space "shall be the province of all mankind." 138 Thus, while the Outer Space Treaty of 1967 may prohibit ownership of GSO slots, the temporary allocation of GSO slots for the use of SBSP satellites would be compatible with the goals of the treaty. ." As a result of the need to allow SBSP to have access to the GSO, there will need to be some sort of regulatory structure to GSO slot allocation. If a regulatory organization, such as the ITU, allows licensees to use a particular GSO position and microwave frequency, for a limited period of time, this would appear to satisfy the current international regime under the Outer Space Treaty of 1967. In order to comply with the treaty, countries would not have to surrender their slot or frequency, as they could simply allow other countries to lease the power satellites from them for a period of time. SBSP satellites in GSO would fall within the "province of mankind" requirement of the Outer Space Treaty of 1967 because SBSP can decrease global warming and help less developed countries by providing them with electricity in areas lacking infrastructure. Furthermore, SBSP satellites in GSO would satisfy the "peaceful purposes" requirement of the Outer Space Treaty of 1967 because the satellites are used for commercial power production and cannot be converted into weapons. 139

#### CP solves the Case – their indicting things like Exploration and Colonization which have no benefits other than Accumulation. Space-Based Solar Power occupies just one section of Space, doesn’t expand, and the CP has distributive effects that avoids Space as a “playground” or “colonial romanticism” BUT rather uses it as a tool to combat material issues like Warming and Energy Poverty.

### 3

#### Their attempt to disrupt a social system or debate through self-actualization creates a safety valve for capitalism’s fundamental contradiction and necessitates a right-wing politics of exclusion

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

Ahmed 20 (Nafeez Ahmed -- Visiting Research Fellow at the Global Sustainability Institute at Anglia Ruskin University's Faculty of Science & Technology + M.A. in contemporary war & peace studies + DPhil (April 2009) in international relations from the School of Global Studies @ Sussex University, “Capitalism is Destroying ‘Safe Operating Space’ for Humanity, Warn Scientists”, https://www.resilience.org/stories/2020-06-24/capitalism-is-destroying-safe-operating-space-for-humanity-warn-scientists/, 24 June 2020, EmmieeM)

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 theorize through Marxist Materialism, which contests the political efficacy and descriptive accuracy of the 1AC by returning to the conceptual tools long central to the American black radical tradition

Ferguson ‘15 (Stephen C., Assoc. Prof. in Liberal Studies @ North Carolina A & T State U., *Philosophy of African American Studies: Nothing Left of Blackness*, p. 7-14)

Marxism in Ebony Materialist Philosophical Inquiry and Black Studies In any academic discipline, there exist varying, oftentimes even conflicting, conceptual frameworks, theoretical approaches, and methods. Black Studies is no different. In light of the theoretical works prominent today, however, a number of students in AAS might easily conclude that philosophical idealism is the only school of thought. To the contrary, Black Leftist activists were significant players during the early period of Black Studies. The first introductory textbooks in African American Studies were written by Marxist/socialist scholars and activists; for instance, Peoples College's Introduction to Afro-American Studies and Clarence Munford's Production Relations, Class and Black Liberation: A Marxist Perspective in Afro-American Studies. Communist like Jack O'Dell and Robert Rhodes taught African American Studies courses at the Antioch College branch campus in Washington, D. C. And pioneering Black historian and "antibourgeois gadfly" Earl Thorpe - chair of the history department at North Carolina College - was recruited to teach courses on "Marxism and Black Liberation" for the Black Studies program at Duke University.23 However, today, Leftist thought is marginal to the politics and philosophy of Black Studies. Socialism and Marxism-Leninism are integral parts of African American history and culture. Of course, Marxist scholar/activists contributed to African American intellectual history and culture long before what is, in more formal terms, considered the advent of Black Studies during the late 1960s. In the tradition of Hubert Harrison, Susie Revels Cayton, Maude White Katz, Richard B. Moore, Paul Robeson, Oliver Cox, Eugene Holmes, Abram Harris, Claudia Jones, Walter Rodney, Angela Davis, and John McClendon, there is a need to bring the Black working-class-men and women-back into AAS. A materialist philosophy inquiry into Black Studies is grounded on three presuppositions. A materialist conception of epistemology and ontology presumes that there is a reality independent of our consciousness. A materialist ontology asserts the primacy of material reality over consciousness. And a materialist epistemology posits that this reality is knowable and knowledge or what is cognitive (social consciousness) corresponds to and thus ideally approximates this material reality. Lastly, a materialist philosophy presupposes that the social world is a stratified ontology of which class relations (i.e., social relations of production) form the ground for understanding social processes. The call for a materialist conception of science and epistemology should not be seen as a call for an essentialist ascription of AAS, wherein it is viewed only as a social scientific enterprise devoid of cultural studies. The current popularity of cultural studies, often in collaboration with various species of historicism and postmodernist trends, fosters a separation between cultural studies and social relations of production. As a school of thought, it gives less attention to the material conditions that give rise to African American culture and relativizes the objective character of the Black experience. In my estimation, the Black working-class has become lost in the whirlwind of cultural idealism. Contemporary Black cultural theory – under the spell of poststructuralism and Afrocentricity – has declared: class is dead! All that exists is intersectionality and a "matrix of domination," in which everyone is oppressed – women, men, capitalist, workers, children, ad infinitum. And there is a tendency in Black Studies to transform the Black workingclass into some obscure gray matter known as the consumer, the multitude, or – my favorite from the "friends of the poor" – the Black underclass.24 The relevance and importance of the Black working-class must be brought to the forefront of Black Studies.25 This would entail discarding analytical notions such as "cultural deprivation," "human capital," "culture of poverty," "nihilism," "feminization of poverty," "intersectionality," "underclass," "cultural pathology," and "menticide" that have served to explain the contemporary and historical crisis that confronts the Black working-class. We must discard the cultural idealism of Maulana Karenga, Corne! West, Jawanza Kunjufu, Marimba Ani, Patricia Hill Collins, Molefi Asante, and William Julius Wilson who perceive the "Negro Question'' as an ideological or axiological crisis, for example, as alienation from ancient African values, the loss of a "love ethic," or the lack of human capital. When we view the “Negro Question” as preeminently ideological, moral, or cultural, we ultimately discount the determinate role of material contradictions rooted in class contradictions. As Robert Allen astutely noted, " ... the question is not politics or no politics; rather it is which politics? Whom will Black Studies serve? Will it be truly democratic in its intellectual and political vision, or will it become 'apolitical' and acquiesce to a narrow, elitist and bourgeois view of education?"26 Black Studies and the Question of Western Civilization Revisited C. L. R. James wrote what could be considered a Marxist manifesto for Black Studies in 1969. Speaking at Federal City College, James argues, at the level of theory, that Black Studies should be anti-racist and anti-imperialist in character, but not anti-white. From James's perspective, there is no intellectual space in Black Studies for philosophies of Blackness in which ancient African civilizations, values, and cultural perspectives constitute a "presuppositionless beginning" for Black Studies.27 He parts company with Black nationalists and their contemporary progeny (e.g., Afrocentrists) who argue that every culture rests on a metaphysical, permanent substratum that gives rise to a particular system of thought. He cogently proclaims: We need a careful systematic building up of historical, economic, political, literary ideas, knowledge and information, on the Negro question ... Because it is only where we have Bolshevik ideas, Marxist ideas, Marxist knowledge, Marxist history, Marxist perspectives, that you are certain to drive out bourgeois ideas, bourgeois history, bourgeois perspectives which are so powerful on the question of the races in the United States.28 [Italics Added] For James, the antithesis between bourgeois ideology and proletarian ideology is essential to the development, direction, and aim of Black Studies. James is often viewed as someone who was head-over-heels in love with Western culture and/or civilization. Yet, it is important to note that dialectical and historical materialism (or Marxism-Leninism) constitutes the conceptual and theoretical framework for his assessment of "The Fate of Humanity." In a 1939 article, "Revolution and the Negro" James boldly avows, "What we as Marxists have to see is the tremendous role played by Negroes in the transformation of Western civilization from feudalism to capitalism. It is only from this vantage-point that we shall be able to appreciate (and prepare for) the still greater role they must of necessity play in the transition from capitalism to socialism."29 James's classic works such as *The Black ]acobins* and *A History of Pan-African Revolt* are ardently attentive to the fact that slavery, colonialism, and imperialism are part and parcel of capitalism.

## Case

#### Humanism is Good - Blackness isn’t historically calcified and their reading runs counter to the Black radical tradition – vote Negative to align yourself with Black Humanist Movements.

Kelley 17 Gary B. Nash Professor of American History at UCLA (Robin D.G., “Robin D.G. Kelley & Fred Moten In Conversation,” transcribed from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fP-2F9MXjRE, 1:57:36-2:02:56, dml)//re-cut by Elmer

KELLEY: Um, Fred—Fred will take most of these questions. So that's why I'm going to begin first because he's gonna, he's gonna—he's gonna end it because he, he, he has the answer to all these questions ‘cause I turn to him for these questions. On the specific, on the first question, I just want to make sure I understand it because I'm, you know, I don't always recognize, uh, it may be because I'm just old, but I don't always recognize, uh, that black politics, black [unclear—maybe “guys”] work politics have been structured or defined by white supremacy. I mean, white supremacy is there. And I guess maybe because I'm such a student of Cedric Robinson, you know, not everything is about, or in response to, white supremacy. And in fact, one of the critiques coming out of doing Southern history was this idea that race relations framework, that race relations defines, uh, African-American history or Black history. And it's simply not true because much of what people do in terms of, of **social formation**, community building, um, is, is, is what Raymond Williams might call alternative cultures. In other words, it **may be structured in dominance** in some ways, **but not defined** by it. And Cedric's **Black Marxism**, you know, really made this point. He **talks about** the **ontological totality**, you know, the, this sense of being and making ourselves whole, in that we come out of an experience, again, **structured by** white supremacy, structured by **violence**, structured by enslavement and dispossession, but, **but** one in **which** western hegemony didn't work, you know, that modes of thinking wasn't defined by Enlightenment modes of thinking. In other words, that, that part of the **Black radical tradition is** a **refusal to be property**, to even admit that human beings could be property. You know, so **we** sometimes **give white supremacy** way **too much credit**, and maybe I misunderstood the question. And so I think that there's lots of things that happen outside of joy and survival, and survival is important, but survival is not the end all, you know. So I think, and I'll give you one very, very specific example, and now I'm not gonna say anything else after this. The way we have tended to more recently **treat** **slavery, Jim Crow and mass incarceration** as a piece, **as** the reinstantiation of **the same thing,** the continuation, that denies the fact that **these** systems **are** actually **distinct**, that they are historically specific, and in fact they’re **responses** to, in many ways, **to the weakness of** this as **a racial regime**. So if you think of like the whole idea of the new Jim Crow to me is very, very problematic. Um, although that book by Michelle Alexander is very, very powerful and very useful in terms of educating people about prisons. Jim Crow was not the continuation of slavery. It was not. **Jim Crow** was a **response to** the **Black Democratic**, uh, **upsurge** after slavery. It was a revolution of Reconstruction. It was a way to try to suppress that. The fact that, that, you know, there was this incredible response. That's why there's a, there's a huge gap between 1877 at the official end of Reconstruction and the rise of Jim Crow, which is the 1890s, disfranchisement, lynching. That's because you've had 13, 14, 15, 20, 25 years of a democratic possibility and struggle. The same thing with mass **incarceration**—yes, we've had incarceration, but it's, but that, that, that, that upward swing **has** a lot **to do with**, again, responses to the struggles in the 1960s, the assault on the Keynesian welfare-warfare state, the fact that you know the, the war on political, the **formation of political prisoners**, those struggles in fact was the state's response to opposition. And so if we don't acknowledge that, then what we end up doing is thinking that somehow there's a structure of white supremacy that's unchanging, fixed, and so powerful we can't do anything about it when in fact it's the opposite. White supremacy is fragile. White supremacy is weak. **Racial regimes** actually are always having to **shore themselves up** precisely **because they're unstable**. We can see that. We can't see it because the whole system of hegemony is to give us the impression that it is so powerful, there's no space out. And yet it’s working overtime to, to respond to our opposition. Right. That may not answer your question, but that's sort of a way I think about it. Maybe it’s not satisfactory, but yeah.