

New Civil Rights Movement DA

Social movements are essential to bring lasting change to society. Recent protests have allowed for social movements to reemerge as agents for change. Movements are essential to solve society's major problems including racism, violence, gender oppression, climate change, war, etc. This disadvantage addresses the consequences of federal government action on the momentum and strength of social movements. General social movement theory concludes that government action by Congress, courts, president etc. takes away social movement momentum. The public feels that the issues the movement is addressing are being solved. The public pays less attention to the issues being address and the movement ultimately loses its ability to have an impact on society.

The disadvantage arguments that currently social movements have the influence to address major society problems. The link is that the affirmative plan is a minor government action that will be perceived by the public that the issue is being addressed. Although legal action is usually necessary lasting change happens though social persuasion. The impact to the disadvantage is that the plan undermines social movement protections for democracy which results in denial of rights, oppression, violence etc. The file includes general links, and specific links for policing and the death penalty.

This is the more "advanced" novice file. My aim is to have a variety of ways you can approach this disadvantage. You can focus on how movements solve affirmative impacts with democracy/human rights net benefit. In this sense, the DA functions as a status quo counterplan. If you are a policy team that enjoys big impacts the file includes hegemony and war impacts. If you are a team that prefer structural violence impacts, the file includes those arguments as well.

The affirmative answers including arguments why movements will inevitably weaken, how movements fail, and a few link turns for specific affirmatives. To supplement affirmative answers in this file, you should use arguments like "fed action good" "law good" "reform good" that will help to justify your aff over the DA.

Although there is an adequate amount of arguments in the file, you will need to do work to make the file tournament ready. Read through the file, work with your coach and/or a more experienced debater to highlight the evidence and prepare blocks for your debates. If you have any questions about the argument feel free to contact me. The evidence was mostly processed by myself, but I was aided by evidence from Cal National Debate Institute, Gonzaga Debate Institute, Michigan National Debate Institute, Spartan Debate Institute, and the National Urban Debate League.

Thanks,

Donny Peters

Peters@damien-hs.edu

1NC

New Civil Rights Movement DA

A. Uniqueness We are on the brink of a new civil rights area where social movements will be essential to shape policy

Fayyad 20 [Abdallah, staff writer, Boston Globe, "Welcome to the new civil rights era: If elected, Joe Biden will have to answer to an antiracist movement that isn't going away" July 10, <https://www.bostonglobe.com/2020/07/10/opinion/welcome-new-civil-rights-era>

But the seemingly pragmatic argument against more ambitious policy proposals — that they are too aggressive to garner broad congressional support and are therefore an unrealistic pursuit — missed a significant trend: Over the past decade, a surge in activism and a corresponding leftward lurch in the Democratic Party hinted that **America was on the brink of a mass social movement, one that could bring on a new civil-rights era that would make bold, antiracist policies**, including reparations, **a tenable goal**.

In other words, the Floyd protests are not a fleeting moment; rather, they have ushered America into a new era that requires a different approach to politics — one that looks to movements, not lobbyists, to ask what legislation is politically viable. Now Biden ought to take heed of the protesters' most urgent demands to advance racial equality and begin drafting an epoch-making, antiracist agenda.

Some Democrats already agree. "You're literally having judges come in front of the Judiciary Committee who won't even say that *Brown v. Board of Education* was rightly decided," New Jersey Senator Cory Booker told me last year, when he was still running for president. "We're seeing voting rights under attack now, we're seeing civil rights under attack right now, and we're seeing institutions like mass incarceration do such damage to Black and brown communities. We have to talk about these issues and the urgency to do something about them."

It's important to note that this moment didn't come out of nowhere; it's been decades in the making. Last year, long before the Floyd protests began, the Rev. William Barber of North Carolina, a civil rights activist, said America was in the midst of what he called a Third Reconstruction. That's in part because the United States government had failed to live up to the promise of its own civil rights-era laws, and instead of eradicating racial inequality, the country has reaffirmed its caste system: Black families were hit particularly hard by the Great Recession, and lost much of their wealth in the housing market collapse; metro areas across the country have been resegregating since the 1970s; and policies that contributed to mass incarceration — or the New Jim Crow — have stifled economic growth in Black and brown communities. In fact, according to a 2017 study by the Institute for Policy Studies, median Black household wealth is projected to dip to zero dollars by 2053.

Add to that the Trump administration's accelerated rollback of civil rights, the coronavirus pandemic and the ensuing economic collapse, and a video showing a white cop killing a Black man by kneeling on his neck for nine minutes, and an already restive resistance movement has become more enraged, kicking off what looks like a consequential revolt.

"We are in the midst of a new civil-rights era because we're in a renewed era of white supremacy," the Rev. Jesse Jackson, the civil rights activist who ran for president in 1984 and 1988, told me last year. "We're facing a fast headwind by this unusually strong, militarized white nationalist, race supremacy. And yet in spite of that, we're increasing our numbers in Congress," he said of Black and brown people. "We're fighting the headwind!"

B. Link We need revolution not reform as the aff calls for. The aff places a band aid over a major womb, this stifles the possibility for meaningful change.

Fayyad 20 [Abdallah, staff writer, Boston Globe, "Welcome to the new civil rights era: If elected, Joe Biden will have to answer to an antiracist movement that isn't going away" July 10, <https://www.bostonglobe.com/2020/07/10/opinion/welcome-new-civil-rights-era>

Since Black Lives Matter was founded in 2013 in response to the killing of Trayvon Martin — and even dating back to the first Occupy Wall Street protests in 2011 — social movements have only been growing. “We are in a really serious and critical moment right now, and we are in a full-on resistance movement, from Black Lives Matter to #MeToo to the Women’s March to the March for our Lives,” Patrisse Cullors, one of the founders of Black Lives Matter, said before the Floyd protests.

Indeed, the scale of these movements can’t be ignored: The Women’s March in 2017, which confronted issues pertaining to racism and racial inequality in addition to women’s rights, was the largest protest in Washington, D.C., since the Vietnam War. The demonstrations around the country that day may have drawn more participants than any other single-day protest in American history. And the recent police brutality protests have drawn millions of demonstrators across the country for what is shaping up to be the biggest social movement since the nation’s founding.

After decades of deteriorating social conditions in some communities and activism brewing below the surface, the killing of Floyd caused the movement to boil over. So if he’s elected president in November, Joe Biden will likely preside over one of the more consequential moments in American history, and he should be ready to answer to a forceful antiracist movement that doesn’t appear to be going away anytime soon.

“Movements can change what politicians tend to do,” said Barber, who leads the Poor People’s Campaign. “Lyndon Baines Johnson didn’t intend to ever be the one to sign the Voting Rights Act, but the movement forced that. And it forced it in a non-election year, too.” He warns that campaigning against ideas just because they seem unrealistic can be deeply damaging to the movement for equality.

That’s why Democrats, and Biden in particular, should prepare for a presidency that doesn’t just slap Band-Aids on gun wounds, but one that begins to implement bold, transformative policies. America doesn’t need minor touch-ups — it needs to fundamentally change the way it polices its neighborhoods; it needs laws like a new Fair Housing Act to promote desegregation or a new Voting Rights Act to eradicate voter suppression; it needs to provide its citizens with the right to free health care and higher education. Put simply, it needs a whole lot more antiracist and anti-poverty laws if it is to become a “more perfect” union.

“If you can’t take on those who would call you a socialist just because you want to have living wages, then we are in a sad place as a nation,” Barber said. “We are producing people who judge their rightness by the polls of the moment, and with that kind of political calculation, we would never have had

women's suffrage, we would never have had a civil rights movement, and we would never have had any of the progressive things that we ever achieved."

One vice presidential hopeful who might help Biden seize the moment is Massachusetts Senator Elizabeth Warren. "We can't just stand back," she told me at one of the D.C. Black Lives Matter protests last month. "I want to see us attack systemic racism head-on everywhere. It's about how the police treat Black men and women, but it's also about systemic racism in education, in health, in the Black-white wealth gap, and in housing. We need, as a country, to have a serious, heartfelt conversation about what is wrong, what has been wrong now for centuries, and what we can do to change."

C. Internal link: A strong movement is key to democracy

Springer 20 [Dens, educator and freelance writer, MENAFN, "The need for a vibrant civil society" August 2, <https://menafn.com/1100578511/The-need-for-a-vibrant-civil-society>

A democratic state and government cannot be stable unless it is effective and legitimate with the respect and support of its citizens. Therefore, civil society is a check, a monitor but also a vital partner in the quest for this kind of positive relationship. Assessing the Scholte (2007) is of the view that, 'the first usage describes a collective human consciousness in which people relate to each other on the basis of non-violence, tolerance and respect'.

In essence, civil societies form an organized third sector alongside government and market forces. As human beings, we do not have to be taught when our rights are being infringed upon. It is by faculty of our thoughts, expectations, instincts, and intellect that triggers acting on to labour standard, human rights - justified actions.

From such a structure a social movement can emerge which is less opaque than that of a civil society although room does exist for ambiguity. I, therefore, hasten to add that social movement will be defined here as a group of people with a common ideology or belief system, consciously acting together to cause a change in thoughts, between political or social relationships.

Therefore, I have concluded that we now need this third force in Saint Lucia, separate from political affiliation but keen on the country's development. A social movement of caring Saint Lucians.

An example of this is the thought of the privatization of the Owen King European Union (OKEU) hospital donated by the European Union for the benefit of every Saint Lucian. This is made more prevalent with the coronavirus epidemic and the opening of the tourism industry to the US marketplace, adverse to another more secure marketplace like Canada.

Therefore, civil societies and social movement organization should entrench themselves to coordinate support make the state at all levels more accountable, responsive, and effective in bringing about stability and equity.

D. Impact: Movements are essential to promote world democracy leading, decreasing oppression, sustaining peace and restoring U.S. hegemony

Murphy 20 [Chris, US Senator for Connecticut and member of US Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Foreign Affairs, "A New Civil Rights Movement Is a Foreign Policy Win: This Is What Democracy Looks Like" June 12, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2020-06-12/new-civil-rights-movement-foreign-policy-win>

The attraction of a democracy is the ability of ordinary people to decide their future and for those same ordinary people to join with one another in collective action to right long-standing wrongs. In the United States, the power of the status quo is such that successful instances of major, grassroots-led change are few and far between. But when change does occur—as happened during the first civil rights movement—it reminds the world of the awesome power of the United States and its model of governance. The signs held aloft at the 1968 Democratic convention read: “The Whole World Is Watching,” and indeed it was. As the civil rights movement of the 1960s scored victories, the propaganda efforts of the Soviet Union lost steam. Americans’ ability to candidly wrestle with Jim Crow undermined the Soviet critiques of their country and weakened global communism.

Further, these moments of collective mobilization for civil rights act as earthquakes, sending shock waves all over the world. Shen Tong, one of the leaders of China’s 1989 democracy protests, named Martin Luther King, Jr., as his inspiration. Patrick Lekota, a major figure in the antiapartheid movement in South Africa, said the American civil rights movement was “highly studied material.” Polish Solidarity leaders invited U.S. civil rights leaders to instruct them on the tactics of nonviolent action. When Americans stand up successfully for their own rights as human beings, it gives inspiration and confidence to others, alighting the world in civil rights and democratic activism.

Finally, just as Lippmann argued in 1957, taking action to address long-standing racial inequality will also neutralize a key propaganda argument by foreign adversaries. Authoritarian governments, such as China and Russia, seize on existing racial divisions to argue that the United States doesn’t live up to its own ideals. They did not create these divisions but relish in exacerbating them—and do so using increasingly sophisticated social media tools and strategies. But everyday American citizens can flip that argument on its head by demonstrating their capacity to bring about meaningful, systemic change through collective action.

It is too early to tell if the Black Lives Matter movement will end up being as enduring, significant, or successful as the movement that resulted in forced desegregation, the Civil Rights Act, and the Voting Rights Act. But maybe the country is at the dawn of a second civil rights movement that will prompt fundamental reforms to its systems of law enforcement, criminal justice, housing, and school finance. Could it also be that Americans’ ability to squarely confront their demons and use the tools of democracy to profoundly alter the status quo will relight the country’s torch in the eyes of the world? Might simmering human rights campaigns and democracy movements around the world find new strength, watching millions of ordinary Americans, powerless on their own, move a nation to long-overdue action through collective strength?

Three and a half years of Donald Trump serving as the face of the United States have done incalculable damage to the country's standing in the world. It will take a truly exceptional turn of events to reverse this downward slide of American reputation and influence. But what has happened in our imperfect, always-correcting nation over the past two weeks is truly exceptional. And maybe—just maybe—the country's second civil rights movement will be its best chance to reset its image and influence around the world.

2NC/1NR

Uniqueness

General

Social movements are coming together to solve major societal problems in the status quo

Akbar 20 [Amna, law professor and social movement scholar, NY Times, "The left is remaking the world: 'Defund the police' and 'cancel rent' aren't reforms, but paths to revolution" July 11, <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/11/opinion/sunday/defund-police-cancel-rent.html>]

The uprisings in response to the killing of George Floyd are far different from anything that has come before. Not just because they may be the largest in our history, or that seven weeks in, people are still in the streets (even if the news media has largely moved on). But also because, for the last few years, organizers have been thinking boldly.

They have been pushing demands — from “defund the police” to “cancel rent” to “pass the Green New Deal” — that would upend the status quo and redistribute power from elites to the working class. And now ordinary people are, too; social movements have helped spread these demands to a public mobilized by the pandemic and the protests.

These movements are in conversation with one another, cross-endorsing demands as they expand their grass-roots bases. Cancel the rent campaigns have joined the call to defund the police. This month, racial, climate and economic justice organizations are hosting a four-day crash course on defunding the police.

Each demand demonstrates a new attitude among leftist social movements. They don't want to reduce police violence, or sidestep our environmentally unsustainable global supply chain, or create grace periods for late rent. These are the responses of reformers and policy elites.

Instead, the people making these demands want a new society. They want a break from prisons and the police, from carbon and rent. They want counselors in place of cops, housing for all and a jobs guarantee. While many may find this naïve, polls, participation in protests and growing membership in social movement organizations show these demands are drawing larger and larger parts of the public toward a fundamental critique of the status quo and a radical vision for the future.

Consider the appeal to defund and dismantle the police, championed by almost every major social movement organization on the left, from the Black Visions Collective to Mijente to the Sunrise Movement, and echoed on the streets.

Defunding, part of a strategy to eventually abolish the police, challenges the prevailing logic of police reform: the idea that police brutality is caused by individual bad apples acting without sufficient oversight and training. This idea undergirds the familiar panoply of reforms: body cameras, community policing, implicit bias workshops. If officers are properly equipped and controlled, there will be less violence, its proponents argue — despite no significant evidence to back that up.

Defunding suggests the problem is not isolated, nor is it a result of a few officers' attitudes. It challenges the power, the resources and the enormous scope of the police. Whether they are responding to a mental health emergency or deployed to a protest, their training and tools are geared toward violence.

The demand for defunding suggests, as the police and prison abolitionist Rachel Herzing often says, that the only way to reduce police violence is to reduce police officers' opportunities for contact with the public. The protests have forced us to rethink state-sanctioned violence as our default response to social problems, to reconsider the hundreds of billions of dollars we have spent on prisons and the salaries of more than 800,000 sworn law enforcement officers.

The uprisings have also expanded the space for a reckoning with the failures of liberal reforms and with the possibility of doing things in radically different ways. Tinkering and training cannot fix our reliance on police officers to deal with routine social problems through violence and the threat of it.

The demand for defunding calls into question the fundamental premise of policing: that it produces safety. It urges us to take collective responsibility for collective care, repair and redress. It shifts our vantage point on persistent problems: for example, to guarantee housing for all rather than to continue to arrest and cage this country's more than 567,000 homeless people.

The call to defund the police is often accompanied by a call to shift resources elsewhere, to education, housing and health care. The pandemic has put on display the spectacular contradiction such appeals reveal. We have no guaranteed health care, wages, housing or food; we can't even provide personal protective equipment. These failures have devastated Black communities in particular.

But then, in response to Black Lives Matter protests, the police show up in high-tech gear and military-style vehicles to arrest, gas and bludgeon protesters, demonstrating where our tax dollars have gone instead. The demand for defunding shifts power and our imaginations away from the police and toward a society rooted in collective care for ordinary people. It brings into sharp relief who we have allowed ourselves to become and offers a vision for who we could be.

Taking money away from the police is not the sole demand. Consider the push to cancel rent. It asks the state to abolish tenants' obligations to pay their landlords each month. But rent is the product of a private contract about private property: the foundation of our social, economic and political order.

So when organizers make the demand to cancel rent, they are conjuring up a state whose primary allegiance is to people's needs instead of profit. The demand raises the possibility of a world where housing is an entitlement rather than a commodity. It aims to shift power from landlords to tenants, in the service of visions of housing for all.

Or consider the environment. The Green New Deal does not merely call for less pollution. It requires that we restructure our economy so we can move to clean, renewable energy sources and net-zero greenhouse gas emissions.

To get there, the Green New Deal calls for enormous investments in public transit, universal health care, free public college tuition and millions of high-wage green jobs. It emphasizes that everyone ought to carry out its projects, with a central role for working-class people of color. The bill's vision is so counter to the actual practices of the state, and to the talking points of the Democratic and Republican Parties, you have to stretch your imagination to understand it. And that is the point.

Organizers often call these demands "non-reformist reforms," a term coined in the 1960s by the French socialist André Gorz. Reform on its own is a tired continuation of liberal politics and legalism, expert-driven and elite-centered. Even now, policing experts are grasping to turn the energy around 'defund' toward the same old reforms, and mayors are endorsing superficial budget cuts, diluting the bold demands.

The way to respond is to stay focused on building mass movements of ordinary people who are serious about restoring and redistributing social wealth, as the Red Nation's Red Deal puts it, to those who created it: "workers, the poor, Indigenous peoples, the global South, women, migrants, caretakers of the land, and the land itself." Here, too, you see the connections — among Indigenous resistance, environmental justice and more.

Leftist movements today see our crises as intersectional. Police violence, global warming and unaffordable housing are not disconnected, discrete problems; instead, they emerge from colonialism and capitalism. Organizers recall these histories, and tell stories of freedom struggles.

And whatever you think of their demands, you have to be in awe of how they inaugurate a new political moment, as the left offers not just a searing critique, but practical ladders to radical visions. These

capacious demands create the grounds for multiracial mass movements, our only hope for a more just future.

New Civil Rights

The New Civil Rights Movement is strong and capable of solving oppression In America

Jackson 20 [Jesse, Significant civil rights leader, Chicago Sun Times, "A new generation of protests holds great promise for America" July 13, <https://chicago.suntimes.com/columnists/2020/7/13/21323169/black-lives-matter-civil-rights-movement-segregation-separate-but-equal-racism-jesse-jackson>

Now a new generation is emerging to challenge these injustices. The demonstrations in the aftermath of George Floyd's murder have been the largest in our history.

On opinion surveys, a stunning 15 million to 26 million Americans report that they have participated in demonstrations for Black lives in 2,500 places from small towns to big cities. Forty percent of the counties in the country have witnessed protests. White participation has far exceeded that in the first civil rights movement.

And already politicians have begun to respond — reforming police practices, banning choke holds. Mississippi legislators voted to retire the state flag with its Confederate battle emblem.

This new generation of protest holds great promise for America. Despite its breadth and depth, it will face great resistance — and not simply from a Donald Trump desperate to discredit it for his political purposes. Entrenched interests will resist change. The movement is focused on reforming areas — criminal injustice, economic inequalities, basic economic and political rights — that threaten the privileged and the powerful.

Yet what we learned 60 years ago is that when people move, change is possible. Then the powerful forces of segregation that seemed overwhelming could not withstand the moral force of a generation not willing to put up with glaring injustice silently. Now this generation has an opportunity to make America better, and the lives and options of millions are at stake in their struggle. This is a time for anyone with a conscience and a pulse to join this extraordinary movement.

Abolition

Abolition Democracy has been growing to challenge oppressive social structures like the police.

V. Noah **Gimbel** and Craig **Muhammad** 2020 (“Are Police Obsolete? Breaking Cycles of Violence Through Abolition Democracy.” V. Noah Gimbel is a lawyer and earned his JD from Georgetown University. Craig Muhammad is an abolition activist who spent thirty-six years in prison and then earned a B.S. degree from Coppin State University.) <http://cardozolawreview.com/are-police-obsolete-police-abolition/>

On February 5, 2018, Baltimore activists organized a successful “cease-fire weekend,” during which no one was killed—and the cops were not to thank. Indeed, as community anti-violence organizers worked to cool hot feuds in order to prove that endless violence was not their destiny, the Baltimore Police Department was sinking ever-deeper into perhaps the most shocking police corruption scandal of the twenty-first century. The stark contrast between ordinary city residents risking their safety to fight against violence in their community and a corrupt police force committing and propagating acts of violence in the microcosmic streets of Baltimore raises what may appear at first blush an absurdly radical question: are police obsolete? When Angela Y. Davis asked the same of prisons in her seminal 2003 prison-abolitionist manifesto, Are Prisons Obsolete?, the “prison-industrial complex” was only beginning to enter the lexicon of scholars and activists taking on what was then the fairly recent phenomenon of mass incarceration. Since then, the very foundations of the U.S. criminal legal system have been shaken by a mass awakening to its racist origins and ends. Today, a new abolitionism is on the rise in the tradition of what W. E. B. DuBois called “abolition democracy”—the project of building up radical community-powered institutions to supplant oppressive social structures inherited from the legacy of chattel slavery.

Grassroots movements for felon re-enfranchisement are strong now.

Tierra **Bradford** et al 2020 (“Zero Disenfranchisement: The Movement to Restore Voting Rights” Tierra Bradford joined the national office of Common Cause in August 2018 as a legal fellow doing research and writing for Election Protection, the Voting Rights Program, and later the Mass Incarceration Project. Tierra completed her undergraduate studies at Hampton University and went on to receive a Juris Doctorate degree from University of Pittsburgh School of Law.) <https://www.commoncause.org/page/zero-disenfranchisement/>

The Restoration of Voting Rights Movement — a movement of activists, nonprofits, and other organizations— is gaining great momentum in the fight to restrict and end the use of felony disenfranchisement laws throughout the U.S. In 2019, felony disenfranchisement is finally a major topic in the media and among presidential candidates. Many activists, advocates, and grassroots and community organizers have been tackling this issue for years; however, until now, felony disenfranchisement has taken a back seat to other issues in the media. In the latest surge of progress, about 130 bills restoring voting rights were introduced in 30 state legislatures this year, and at least four of those states considered allowing incarcerated people to vote. Thus, it has become more difficult for politicians to avoid taking a position on the issue.

Policing

Protests will further police abolition now – slow change happening now.

Mariame **Kaba '20**. Organizer, June 12, “Yes, We Mean Literally Abolish the Police,” THE NEW YORK TIMES, <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/12/opinion/sunday/floyd-abolish-defund-police.html>

People like me who want to abolish prisons and police, however, have a vision of a different society, built on cooperation instead of individualism, on mutual aid instead of self-preservation. What would the country look like if it had billions of extra dollars to spend on housing, food and education for all? This change in society wouldn't happen immediately, **but the protests show that many people are ready to embrace a different vision of safety and justice.**

Current grassroots movements are shift away from policing reform toward community programs.

McHarris 12/02/2019 (“COMMUNITY POLICING IS NOT THE ANSWER.” Philip V. McHarris is a writer, activist, and PhD candidate in Sociology and African American Studies at Yale University.) <https://theappeal.org/community-policing-is-not-the-answer/>

Grassroots organizations across the country are fighting to divest from policing and reinvest in community programs. Take, for example, No Cop Academy in Chicago, the Agenda to Build Black Futures by BYP100—an activist organization whose New York City chapter I helped found—and invest-divest campaigns such as Liberate MKE in Milwaukee. In North Carolina, organizers with the Durham Beyond Policing coalition successfully organized to divert funds for additional police personnel toward community-based safety and wellness initiatives.

Links

Link-Criminal Justice Reform

Grassroots movements now are key to sustainable improvements in criminal justice --- “quick wins” like the plan undercut it.

Jones and Sayegh 19 (Lorenzo Jones is co-executive directors of the Katal Center for Health, Equity, and Justice, Gabriel Sayegh is co-executive directors of the Katal Center for Health, Equity, and Justice, “Grassroots Movements Are Needed To End Mass Incarceration,” <https://www.katalcenter.org/grassrootsnyc/>, //mrul)

History shows that achieving meaningful change against systemic racism and injustice requires the work of social movements built from the ground up. Too many people – overwhelmingly Black and brown people, and poor people — are caught in the racialized system of criminalization and mass incarceration. Over the last 20 years, a growing grassroots movement – national in scope and local in character – has made reform mainstream while winning policy and political changes inside of local neighborhoods, city councils, and state legislatures around the country. Earlier this year in New York, legislators, working closely with the grassroots movement, passed one of the most significant criminal justice reform packages in the nation, including urgently needed bail reform — a huge victory resulting from years of relentless organizing.

But increasingly in New York and around the country, grassroots groups are at risk of being marginalized by monied interests seeking quick wins. Such wins often come through watered-down, insider deals which require sidelining the pesky local groups who are doing the sometimes slower work of building consensus and power with their members in the community and demanding transparency and systemic change. Quick wins can be appealing: sometimes they free people, and that is never a small thing. But such wins have proven transient when the political winds shift and the money that won them isn’t there to defend them against backlash. Policy changes can be won through many avenues, but only grassroots movements make them durable.

After the historic justice reforms won by grassroots groups earlier this year, the next steps for tackling mass incarceration in New York are clear: ending solitary confinement; enacting parole reform to free elders, speed up the parole process, and stopping the cycle of reincarceration for technical violations; restoring voting rights and access to higher education to people in prisons; holding police accountable for misconduct; legalizing marijuana the right way; expanding alternatives to incarceration; expunging records; closing more prisons and local jails like Rikers Island; investing in community needs like housing; and more.

These are just a portion of the robust agenda developed by the grassroots movement to end mass incarceration and win real structural change. For legislators gathering this week in Westchester: dig into the issues. Take any opportunity to learn, especially when visiting the prison. Look for principled openings to strengthen longstanding fights for justice. And don’t let the glitz and glam of billionaires and celebrities distract us from the path to change carved for so long by the local groups building the grassroots movement in our state. Because when it comes to securing justice, money is good, but the people are always better.

Incremental and unsuccessful reforms coopt social movements--only movements towards abolition able to resolve the root cause of police violence

AMUCHIE, MOHAPATRA, Raven et al. 6-19

(Leila Raven is a queer mama and organizer working to build safety without prisons or police. She is the former Director of Collective Action for Safe Spaces (CASS), a grassroots organization developing community-based solutions for interrupting racialized gender violence.) (Mon Mohapatra is a queer South Asian organizer and artist working to end the era of mass incarceration in NYC.) (Nnennaya Amuchie is a diehard Black left genderqueer feminist and abolitionist, communist, organizer with Black Youth Project 100, published writer on police violence, and an attorney working to build movement lawyering infrastructure. They believe in a joyful and pleasurable future without police and prisons, where reproductive justice is actualized.) ("Reforms Won't Save Us. Abolishing the Police Will," them.) (<https://www.them.us/story/reforms-wont-save-us-abolishing-the-police-will>) accessed 6-29-2020 cyang

In this op-ed, organizers from the #8ToAbolition campaign discuss the insufficiency of incremental reforms as a means of ending the epidemic of racist police brutality, proposing eight radical ideas for how to transform our communities instead. Since colonizers first landed on what would become the “United States of America,” enslaving Africans, massacring indigenous peoples, and exploiting resources across the world, Black people have resisted oppression. This resistance has taken the form of direct actions by abolitionists like Harriet Tubman, Nat Turner, and, more recently, organizers and agitators with groups like the Black Visions Collective in Minneapolis. Yet time and again — from the Attica Prison Uprising in 1971 to the protests taking place now to demand justice for Breonna Taylor, George Floyd, Tony McDade, Rayshard Brooks, and others — this fight has been co-opted by those seeking incremental reforms that bolster the system, further marginalizing grassroots movements working toward transformative change. Larger nonprofit organizations, including mainstream LGBTQ+ NGOs, have repeatedly sought to water down demands for a world without prisons and police by pushing for policy changes that empower courts, cops, and jails. These reformist efforts seek assimilation for the most privileged trans, queer, and gender-nonconforming people at the expense of those at the margins — specifically Black trans, queer, and gender nonconforming people who most severely experience interpersonal violence, hate violence, and state violence. In response, we created #8ToAbolition, an education and organizing tool detailing eight abolitionist demands. As a group of abolitionist organizers, we seek a 100% eradication of the state-sanctioned violence terrorizing our communities. **The only way to end police violence is to begin by defunding the police and end by abolishing it altogether.** To grasp the urgency of the policies covered in #8ToAbolition, one must understand the particular systemic issues we’re organizing against. The prison system is the historical successor of slavery in the United States, extended through an exception in the 13th Amendment that permits slavery “as a punishment for crime.” With the resulting boom of the prison industrial complex throughout the 20th Century and especially during the Clinton presidency, Black feminists like Angela Davis and Ruth Wilson Gilmore began to theorize around modern-day abolition, leading to the formation of abolitionist organizations like INCITE! and Critical Resistance. #8ToAbolition is based on the premise that our collective liberation is dependent on putting those at the margins of our communities at the center of our advocacy As Critical Resistance outlines, “Abolition is a political vision, with the goal of eliminating imprisonment, policing, and surveillance and creating lasting alternatives” for building safety. **Reformist reforms, according to Critical Resistance, strengthen the state through increased funding and resources for law enforcement and carceral systems, whereas abolitionist reforms move us closer to a world without prisons or policing. With #8ToAbolition, the steps we introduce seek to do the latter: Move our collective needle on the things our communities need, such as better public health, housing, transit, and education, in order to thrive and live well without relying on police or prisons.** Prisons, jails, and policing have long been sites of violence for trans and queer people in the United States and across the world. Last summer, Layleen Cubilette-Polanco, an Afro-Latina transgender woman, died while incarcerated in New York City’s Rikers Island jail at the hands of uncaring prison staff. Young people of color who are LGBTQ+ and homeless

are disproportionately likely to be criminalized and enter the juvenile punishment system; many trade sex to access housing and survive. In January 2020, Tony McDade, a Black trans man, was murdered by police. From a lack of housing and healthcare, to targeted harassment from police, to their very bodies being criminalized, Black queer and trans people have long been on the frontlines of fighting police violence. (The first Pride, after all, was catalyzed by a riot against police raids.) Reformist solutions to address the needs of queer and trans people have not made our lives demonstrably safer. Mainstream LGBTQ+ advocacy has focused on securing rights to assimilate, like marriage equality, while rates of homelessness, violence, and incarceration of our communities remain high. Assimilationist strategies put forward by well-funded LGBTQ+ organizations have secured exclusionary, short-term victories for more privileged subsets of trans and queer communities, especially those who are white and wealthy, while leaving those at the margins behind. A particularly brazen example was the response of the Human Rights Campaign and the National LGBTQ Task Force to the Trump Administration's ban on trans folks serving in the military. Rather than aligning themselves with anti-war activists and radical veterans speaking out against U.S. imperialism and its devastating impact on trans and queer folks in the global south, these predominantly white and wealthy organizations prioritized allowing folks' access to participation in American empire. We see the same kinds of reformist solutions applied to the crisis of police brutality in this country. For decades, local and national governments have poured resources into proposals to increase training or add new protocols to police departments that only exacerbate or sustain the problem by directing more resources toward policing. Police chokeholds had already been banned in New York City before Eric Garner was killed by one. Now, in recent weeks, the New York State Assembly has passed the Eric Garner Anti-Chokehold Act, which creates criminal penalties for officers who use chokeholds or similar restraints. This counterproductive reformist policy will channel more people into the prisons we seek to dismantle and rely on a historically evasive system to indict itself. Instead, #8ToAbolition is based on the premise that our collective liberation is dependent on putting those at the margins of our communities at the center of our advocacy. Our platform proposes defunding the police as a strategy to move us toward abolition. By immediately firing officers with complaints against them for excessive use of force, and making a commitment to not hire new officers, cities can constrain the power of police to harm communities, freeing up resources for meeting people's actual needs. In doing so, we can build a world where there are zero police murders because there are zero police, not because police are better trained or better regulated in continuing to uphold systems designed to oppress our communities. The policies offered in the #8ToAbolition platform are broad-ranging and applicable across many city-based campaigns. Recognizing the need for clear, actionable steps, we brainstormed specific demands from the areas where we live and organize: End the criminalization of survival, including decriminalizing sex work and anti-homeless ordinances; end the deadly exchanges between U.S. police departments and other repressive governments such as Israel; and more that aim to shrink the police state. We also provided a guide — not exhaustive by any means — for where money should go instead, known as a divest/invest strategy. Public resources should be used to provide safe and accessible housing, youth programs that don't involve the police, and community-based interventions for building safety. In summary, our eight core points are: Defund the police; demilitarize communities; remove police from schools; free people from jails and prisons; repeal laws that criminalize survival; invest in community self-governance; provide safe housing for everyone; and invest in care, not cops. We recognize that there isn't one blueprint for abolition, but #8ToAbolition hopes to offer a tangible start for expanding our collective imagination as to what policies minimizing police and prison power can look like. As people yell "Defund!" in the streets, it's critical they also recognize the kind of state violence taking place behind their local jails, ICE detention centers, and inside city courts. For many prisoners and people in the "system," violence at the hands of the state is a daily occurrence. It's similarly critical that people understand abolition expansively, from changing the way we respond to interpersonal conflict to ending the US military industrial complex, which acts as a global, imperialist police force. The domestic police's role to harass, terrorize, arrest, and kill Black, Indigenous and other poor and working class people is directly connected to the role of the U.S. military in Black and brown countries worldwide. We are entering the fourth month of a global pandemic that has shut down schools, workplaces, and public life as we once knew it. Mass uprisings in defense of Black lives are raging in cities across the world. We must not miss this opportunity to dramatically transform the way we live, the way we work, and the way we care for each other. Prison abolitionist writer Ruth Wilson Gilmore says, "Abolition is deliberately everything-ist; it's about the entirety of human-environmental relations." It's about challenging the presence of riot police at Standing Rock as people ask for clean water. It's about asking why Flint, Michigan has \$26 million planned in their budget for police, but less than half that for making their water drinkable. It's about asking why trans and queer people without homes and survivors of domestic violence are sent to jail, while fossil fuel polluters and killer cops from Darren Wilson to Timothy Loehmann, Brian Encinia to Royce Ruby, Jonathan Mattingly, Brett Hankison and Myles Cosgrove, to the still-unidentified officer who killed Tony McDade, can destroy lives and communities with impunity. These are just a handful of the questions abolition urges us to ask. For us, there's one answer: never police and never jails.

Link-Death Penalty

The Courts are a hollow hope --- they are controlled by the right and deplete movement resources that are more useful in other venues

McElwee, 18 --- writer and researcher based in New York City and a co-founder of Data for Progress (10/25/18, Sean, "The Fight For The Supreme Court Is Just Beginning," https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/opinion-supreme-court-progressives_us_5bd09cd4e4b0a8f17ef34d1c, accessed on 12/19/18, JMP)

Brett Kavanaugh is an associate justice of the Supreme Court, his confirmation solidifying a five-vote majority for the court's extreme conservatives. Progressives are bracing themselves for the effects of a fully empowered right-wing court, and so they should. Yet most Americans are unaware of how deeply the court has already damaged American society, even without a conservative majority.

Over the past two decades, the extremist court has resegregated schools, made it easier for abusive cops to avoid punishment, weakened protections for survivors, poisoned children, empowered racist vote suppressors and even thrown elections — including the presidency — to the Republican Party. Now, the limited restraints offered by Justice Anthony Kennedy have disappeared, and **the threat is even greater.**

There is, however, one difference between the past two decades and now: Progressives are finally paying attention.

The Supreme **Court has rarely been a force for progress.** In its most famous and popular decisions — such as Brown, Griswold and Obergefell — the court largely hedged its bets and **acted after social movements had already paved the way.** It has rarely acted, much less acted effectively, without support from the legislative and executive branches. Of course, the court can and sometimes does promote progressive change, but it's a narrower avenue for change than many people assume. And **pursuing that change in court often means investing less in other tactics because lawsuits are costly and resources are limited.**

Nonetheless, progressives have waged their battles primarily before the court — clinging to what Gerald Rosenberg called The Hollow Hope — **instead of taking issues directly to voters.** Measures like Amendment 4 in Florida to restore voting rights, automatic voter registration in Alaska and right-to-work repeal in Missouri suggest that taking our issues directly to voters is effective. **Across the country, direct democracy and organizing have reaped rewards, while the courts** — and in particular the Supreme Court — have remained a "hollow hope."

The costs of over-investing in this uphill legal strategy have been immense but largely unseen. Money that pays high-priced lawyers can't fund canvassers and signature collectors. And talented progressives who go to law school generally don't become organizers; many, burdened by student debt, get stuck on the corporate track, where they may well perpetuate injustice by defending corporate interests.

Meanwhile, **the right**, knowing that its agenda is deeply unpopular, has **turned to the courts to override the popular will**, aggressively filing lawsuits that will be ruled on by radical right-wing judges. And while the right has recruited and empowered armies of political operatives to wage war on behalf of Trumpist judges and judicial nominees, the left has relied largely on members of the academy. When soldiers battle scholars, the soldiers win.

Independently, the death penalty spotlights systemic problems with the criminal justice system --- abolition will undermine progressive transformations

Steiker & Steiker, 20 --- *Professor at Harvard Law, AND **Professor of Law at University of Texas School of Law (January 2020, Carol S. Steiker and Jordan M. Steiker, “The Rise, Fall, and Afterlife of the Death Penalty in the United States,” <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/full/10.1146/annurev-criminol-011518-024721>, accessed on 6/1/2020, JMP)

But pessimistic possibilities are not confined simply to tempering the hopes of optimists. **Abolition** of the death penalty **might** actually **impede** (as opposed to only marginally advance) **progressive reform in the larger criminal justice system**. **The end of capital punishment in the United States would eliminate the powerful spotlight that capital cases shine on the workings of the criminal justice system. The severity and irrevocability of death naturally evoke heightened concerns about the possibility of unfairness and miscarriages of justice in capital cases. Combine these concerns with the high drama of death penalty cases, from initial crime reporting through trial and execution, and the result is public and media attention on problems in the criminal justice system that might otherwise fly below the radar.** Courts, too, **currently give disproportionate consideration to generally applicable legal issues in the context of capital cases—issues that might not otherwise make it onto their noncapital dockets. Thus, far from catalyzing reform of the noncapital criminal justice system, the end of the death penalty might simply make reforms seem less necessary and injustices less dramatic and disturbing** (Steiker & Steiker 2016).

It would be ideal if abolition of the American death penalty, should it occur, also engendered advances in the broader criminal justice system, but there are reasons to be skeptical about the most optimistic predictions. Consequently, the case for ending the American death penalty must stand or fall on its own merits. That case is an increasingly powerful one. The United States is exceptional in its retention and use of the death penalty, a position that puts it at odds with most of the developed, democratic world. American retention appears to be tied in part to its distinctive history of racial subordination and injustice. And by every measure, the American death penalty is withering, reflecting its increasing tension with contemporary moral standards and undercutting its ability to serve any penological purpose (such as deterrence or retribution) necessary to justify its retention.

Abolition will reduce attention and pressure to resolve remaining problems in criminal justice system

Steiker & Steiker, 19 --- Professors of Law at Harvard and University of Texas respectively (Carol S. & Jordan M., “19. Global abolition of capital punishment: contributors, challenges and conundrums,” In *Comparative Capital Punishment Law*, ed. CS Steiker, JM Steiker, <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/10.4337/9781786433251.00030>, pp.409-10, JMP)

But the end of the death penalty might also **diminish attention toward domestic criminal justice practices. No other criminal justice practice currently generates as much critical engagement, and concerns about arbitrariness and error in the administration of criminal law have been traceable in part to the presence of the death penalty.** Novak suggests that the use of empirical scholarship to evaluate criminal justice practices will be an important legacy of the death penalty abolition effort,¹²⁹ but it is also possible that empirical engagement will suffer when the target of the death penalty is removed. **Global abolition might paradoxically relieve the pressure to adopt fair and reliable procedures in criminal cases, because the absence of the death penalty minimizes the human rights dimension of the underlying criminal proceedings.**

Now is the a unique time that the ADP has the influence to end the death penalty once and for all

Lowe 18 [Marnie, BA UC Berkeley, Charlene Conrad Liebau Library Prize for Undergraduate Research, "Resonance, Radicalism, and the Death Penalty: A Framing Analysis of the Anti-Death Penalty Movement, 1965-2014" April 1. <https://escholarship.org/content/qt9sg5t66n/qt9sg5t66n.pdf>

The theoretical implications recounted here are of particular relevance to those concerned with the potential for the ADP movement to reach continued and greater success in shaping public policy. As public support for capital punishment has waxed and waned over the decades, the ADP movement has adapted its framing with only limited success. Most notably, the movement's much-discussed turn to instrumental frames in the 1980s did not appear to capture the public's sympathies, despite these frames' ostensibly greater cultural resonance. Furthermore, the movement's 21st-century turn to greater frame diversity, including a return to regular use of moral frames, has coincided with a steady turn in public opinion toward the movement's stance. As Figure 8 shows, public support has fallen even further since 2014, the end of this study period, marking its lowest levels since the 1960s. The ADP movement is facing a rare opportunity to capitalize on public sympathies and drive lasting policy changes, making their strategic decisions at this juncture even more critical. While the ultimate impact of movement framing choices on public opinion is impossible to determine from this data, this correlation is as strong of empirical evidence as is available to ground framing decisions. As such, movement participants concerned with attracting widespread public support for the end of capital punishment would do well to persist in a heterogeneous framing approach that does not neglect moral rationales, in the hopes of appealing to a broad, diverse audience.

Public awareness is key change public opinion and abolishing the death penalty for good

Gates 19 [Maddy, Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review, "Drawing back the curtain: Executions and the First Amendment" Oct. 24, <https://harvardcrcl.org/drawing-back-the-curtain-executions-and-the-first-amendment/>

News outlets in Virginia are currently bringing a similar suit, claiming that the state's execution procedures violate the first amendment because certain activities (like the insertion of the IV line) are done behind a curtain. Increased transparency in the capital punishment process is crucial to raising public awareness. These kinds of lawsuits may be instrumental in bringing about the end of the death penalty, not only by uncovering instances where executions go wrong, but also by making the public aware of the routine brutality of capital punishment. If public sentiment about the death penalty changes, a constitutional challenge to it may become viable and the death penalty could eventually be abolished.

Striking down the death penalty historically has generated a backlash that increased public support for the death penalty.

Rosenberg 9 — Gerald Rosenberg, Gerald N. Rosenberg, associate professor of political science and lecturer of law at the University of Chicago, recipient of the Llewellyn John & Harriet Manchester Quantrell Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching from the University of Chicago, JD from University of Michigan, Ph.D. in Political Science from Yale University, M.A. in Politics and Philosophy from Oxford. The first edition of *The Hollow Hope* was awarded the Gordon J. Laing Award from the University of Chicago Press in 1993 for a book published by a University of Chicago faculty member that brings the greatest distinction to the Press, and the Wadsworth Award by the Law-Courts section of the American Political Science Association, 2009 ("Romancing the Court," *Boston University Law Review*, April, Vol. 89, No. 2, p. 574-575)

A good example of this flawed approach to understanding the role of the Court involves the death penalty. Guinier points to Justice Stevens's concurrence in *Baze v. Rees*,⁹⁸ dealing with a constitutional challenge to the use of a three-chemical injection as a method of execution.⁹⁹ Guinier describes the concurrence as "profoundly demosprudential," an opinion that aims to "generate debate about the merits of capital punishment."¹⁰⁰ But Americans have been debating the death penalty and pollsters have been measuring its popular support for decades.¹⁰¹ For almost all of this time majorities have supported the death penalty, with support climbing as high as eighty percent in September 1994.¹⁰² This occurred despite numerous powerful dissents from Justices Brennan and Marshall.¹⁰³ When in the 1970s the Court intervened by invalidating the death penalty as then practiced,¹⁰⁴ **there was a backlash that increased public support for it.**¹⁰⁵ As of November 2008, Gallup finds that nearly two-thirds of Americans support the death penalty while less than one-third oppose it.¹⁰⁶ In addition, "nearly half (48%) believe it is not imposed often enough. Only 21% of Americans say it is imposed too often."¹⁰⁷ Finally, over half of Americans believe the death penalty is applied fairly.¹⁰⁸ Given the decades-long debate about the death penalty, and the enduring support Americans express for it, it is fantastical to expect a concurring opinion, however demosprudential, to generate a debate that does not already exist.

Link-Law

Policies contingent on legal reform will always fail and perpetuate racism

Butler 16 [Paul, prof of law at Georgetown, "The system is working the way it is supposed to: The limits of criminal justice reform" Georgetown Law Journal August, 104 (6)]

Critical race theorists assert that the law "constructs race" by separating people into groups, assigning social meaning to these groups, and instituting hierarchical arrangements. 138 Racial inequalities persist because race informs all areas of the law-"not only obvious ones like civil rights, immigration law, and federal Indian law, but also property law, contracts law, criminal law, and even [corporate law]." 139 As Ian Haney L6pez has powerfully argued, "law constructs race." 140 Legal institutions like "legislatures and courts have served not only to fix the boundaries of race in the forms we recognize today, but also to define the content of racial identities and to specify their relative privilege or disadvantage in U.S. society." 141 For example, Haney L6pez cites a series of Supreme Court decisions from the late 1800s and early 1900s in which the Court defined various groups as white or nonwhite, a determination that carried important consequences for naturalization and citizenship. 142 Racial beliefs „were quickly translated into exclusionary immigration laws." 143

The law often reinforces white supremacy without explicitly mentioning race. A number of legal scholars-beyond those who self-identify as critical race theorists-have recognized the racial consequences of policies like the death penalty 144 and housing programs.

At the same time, critical race theorists recognize that race is socially constructed and constantly changing. 146 For example, until the twentieth century, "[w]hite in this country meant Anglo-Saxon and the color line explicitly excluded other European groups, including the Irish, the Jews, and all Southern and Eastern Europeans." 147 Racial categories are best understood as fluid rather than immutable. Therefore, while critical race theorists understand the centrality of race in determining allocations of societal resources, they also deny that racial identity is "stable, ahistoric, [or] essential." ' 148

Instead, critical race theorists (crits) assert a .'.historicized' view of social relations," in which "there is no objective or natural necessity to the way groups, identities, and social meanings have been structured." 149 Crits built on the arguments of black nationalists like the Black Panthers and others who felt that allegedly neutral goals like integration were actually imprinted with white cultural practices. 150 As a result, so-called objective tests that rely on the determination of what a "reasonable person" would do could prove problematic, given the "rhetoric of rationality and objectivity that the powerful use to justify their domination generally." 15 1 These insights loom large in the criminal justice context because the Supreme Court's adoption of reasonableness standards for stop-and-frisk and the use of deadly force have enabled police violence against African-Americans.

Link-Policing

Community Policing adds another barrier to abolition activists by injecting police more intimately into everyday life.

The Abolition Research Group 10/08/2017 (“The Problem with Community Policing” The Abolition Research Group is a project launched by students and activists at the City University of New York in 2015.) <http://aworldwithoutpolice.org/2017/10/08/the-problem-with-community-policing/>

By now **the problems with the community policing paradigm should be clear.** The paradigm aims to shore up the legitimacy of police department in periods of crisis. **It displaces social problems without solving them. It grows the carceral state and extends police powers more intimately into everyday life. Activists today face a big challenge: we not only have to beat back the “law and order” reaction of the Trump regime, but we also have to discredit police reform efforts that offer false alternatives.** We must continue to build a struggle that aims beyond community policing and works instead to solve the social problems created by capitalism, and ultimately to abolish police and prisons. The authors of this pamphlet foresee two sets of strategies that could help achieve these goals. One set of strategies could aim to undermine the formation of a new popular consensus around the police. **Community policing efforts draw together specific sections of society—business owners, homeowners, landlords, religious organizations, and nonprofit and city staff—to legitimate the harassment and repression of the poor and people of color.** Activists can prevent these blocs from cohering by injecting resistance and controversy into the process. This could happen through speakouts at police-community forums, copwatch patrols focused on community policing officers, and public critiques of nonprofit organizations that partner with the police. It could also entail critiquing the contribution of criminologists and other academics to pro-policing initiatives.

Reforms on police militarization is an attempt to fix a working system that prosecutes people of color and suppresses movements

Abel **Shifferaw** 2018 ("Abolish the Police Now!" an interview with Mohammed Shehk, Director of media and communications for Critical Resistance, a penal abolition movement.) <https://www.okayafrica.com/how-to-abolish-police-prisons/>

OkayAfrica: Let's get straight into it. Abolish the police. Abolish prisons. That's going to come off as a very radical statement for most people, as perhaps saying "abolish slavery" was a radical statement 200 years ago. Why abolish and not reform? "It's a few bad apples, the police are doing brave and necessary work," many will say. Mohamed Shehk: We work to abolish policing, imprisonment, and the rest of the prison industrial complex because we believe that they are fundamentally violent and racist. **While some might argue that we can fix the prison industrial complex by getting rid of the "few bad apples" or improving it through reform, we actually don't believe that it is broken, but that it is rather working as intended—to control, repress, disappear, and kill people. Our work as abolitionists is not to improve a war machine built to target Black and Brown people, but to chip away and disempower policing and imprisonment so that they have less power to function, with the ultimate goal of shrinking them into nonexistence.** Let's start off with the police. Can you speak to the true function of the police. If you ask most anyone, they would respond with the usual, "to stop crime, protect people from criminals, theft, violence, etc." To "protect and serve." Though I'm no expert, it seems, from what I've read, the police don't actually do that. Almost ever. There's also my personal experience, and that of family and friends, of police literally never helping or being available in the moments where I've been a victim of a crime. They'll arrive two hours later, file a report, and that's that. In addition to studies, the consensus seems that the police are woefully inadequate as a means to stopping crime, on the local, day to day level for ordinary citizens. It rather seems that the police are armed bureaucrats, bringing violence and guns to situations that they are not needed in. Traffic citations, etc. I would argue that the police are there to protect the interests of elites, particularly their wealth from the masses of people, to ensure that capitalism functions without resistance. And when that resistance is found, in the form of protests let's say, then they come down in riot gear to make sure private property isn't threatened. **Thoughts?** From its origins being closely linked to patrols capturing Black people escaping slavery to the crushing of labor struggles, the role of modern policing has been to uphold and enforce social control, white supremacy, and the interests of those in power. Put simply, **policing is the front line of defense for racial capitalism. And whenever communities organize to resist their oppression and demand power, policing, as well as imprisonment and surveillance, are used to repress movements and efforts for self-determination.** On a more practical level, why are the police the first responders, or even responders at all, to people having mental health crises, getting into an accident, or to people committing the unthinkable "crime" of being homeless? **At best, cops show up and do nothing, often escalating the situation or obstructing the person in need from receiving care; at worst, they harm and kill. The state and those invested in social control have prioritized policing at the expense of funding and political will for resources that might actually respond to and address situations productively.**

Police Reform distracts for more comprehensive attempts to resolve systems of oppression

Butler 16 [Paul, prof of law at Georgetown, "The system is working the way it is supposed to: The limits of criminal justice reform" Georgetown Law Journal August, 104 (6)]

The radicals, on the other hand, have more systemic critiques and argue for broader forms of relief. Coates, for example, is a prominent advocate for reparations for African-Americans. 105 The Movement for Black Lives website states, "[w]e believe that we can achieve, and will seek nothing less, than a complete transformation of the current systems, which make it impossible for many of us to breathe." 106 While liberals think reform is sufficient, radicals believe that until there is fundamental change in the

structure of society in the United States, the problems will persist. Both proponents of the police-community relations and the white supremacy frames have looked to the law, among other things, to help achieve their agenda.^{10 7} In Ferguson, for example, people allied with the Movement for Black Lives were among the strongest voices for prosecution of Officer Wilson and for the intervention of the U.S. Department of Justice in the police department.^{10 8} The question I turn to now is whether the law can actually help, for either the reform that the liberals seek or the transformation that the radicals desire. Amna Akbar has observed: "The [Black Lives Matter] movement exposes to the mainstream what black communities have argued-and black freedom struggles have organized against-for centuries: Law is not fair, it does not treat people equally, and its violence is lethal and routine."^{1 09}

Single-issue legal action can tank momentum – police are just one part of the challenge

Emily **VanDerWerff '20**, Jun 8, 2020, the Critic at Large for Vox. Before that, she was the TV Editor for The A.V. Club. Before that, she worked at a bunch of newspapers, "The narrative power of "abolish the police", <https://www.vox.com/culture/2020/6/8/21281069/abolish-the-police-black-lives-matter-george-floyd-protests-minneapolis-new-york>

But more mainstream liberals too often read a statement like "abolish the police" and think it's meant as a singular, literal solution rather than a larger, farther-reaching goal. This confusion stems, I think, from the way that modern liberal discourse is steeped in an earnest belief that at some point, the best policy will win out. And I get it. I used to really, really believe in the power of good policy, too. But recent history has perhaps shown us that this is not the case. (The Affordable Care Act, for instance, is much better than the health care system America had in place before it, but it still has gigantic holes in its safety net that millions of people fall through, especially if the administration in power isn't particularly inclined to patch those holes.)

If I could be slightly too reductive, I would say most leftists hear "abolish the police" and understand it to mean "[work to] abolish the police [in their current form by taking several well-planned steps to reform the existing justice system]," while more mainstream liberals hear that phrase and understand it to mean, "abolish the police [first, and then something something something]," where "something something something" is a host of unforeseen consequences that will sweep in without more incremental change.

But "abolish the police" isn't a solution. It's a statement of intent. It's saying, "Sweeping police reform is our goal. We are people who want to accomplish that goal. Are you with us?" It's shifting the storytelling frame we use to think of the police, who are usually depicted in American popular and political culture as hard-working heroes with well-deserved authority, to one that better reflects how they are perceived by those who are too frequently the targets of aggressive policing.

Thus, the surface-level debate over "abolish the police" is not a matter of policy; it's a matter of political discourse. And it's already bearing fruit, if the moves made by local governments throughout the country — Minneapolis's pledge to dismantle its own police department is an obvious example — are any indication. Even if you vehemently disagree with the idea of abolishing the police, just the statement of the phrase shifts the Overton window and makes you rethink what is possible within American politics.

The resurgence of leftism in the US is directly tied to how much better leftists are at framing political narratives

One reason leftists may be so resurgent within American political discourse is that they're better at telling these kinds of political stories than those in the center-left who have dominated what amounts to the American liberal agenda for roughly 50 years.

The irony is that essentially everyone in Hollywood, the world's foremost storytelling factory, is part of that center-left. And yet the mainstream Democratic Party is pretty lousy at coming up with clear, concrete goals to advocate. Of recent mainstream Democrats, Barack Obama was the most skilled at narrative-friendly goal-setting, but the goals he most famously campaigned on ("Change we can believe in," for instance) were sort of empty in the end. (Relatedly, the brief sense many people had that Elizabeth Warren might unite the party's left and moderate wings may have emerged from the way she blended concrete goals — end corruption! — with extensive potential solutions in her many, many plans.)

The modern Republican Party is pretty good at telling these sorts of stories, even if they're functionally meaningless. "Make America great again" is a goal, but not one that even hints at what a solution might look like beyond a vague sense of dragging everyone bodily back to an imagined 1950s. Regardless, when Donald Trump, who had a slogan and not a lot else, ran against Hillary Clinton, who had a whole bunch of policy ideas and no unifying story, the slogan (barely) won.

The core theme behind much mainstream liberal politics coalesces around a vague sense of the Democratic Party as the smartest people in the room, crafting the smartest policies. But that's not a narrative, because it's structured more as an aspiration than a goal. Don't you want to be one of the smartest people in the room? Someone who believes in science and loves diversity? Someone who wants to make sure the ideals you support are both well-designed and at least somewhat fiscally responsible?

I'm not going to say those ideals are worthless. I believe in science and I love diversity and so on. But the whole persona feels like an attempt to define a political self as a photo negative of something else — a non-Republican, more or less. And that constantly keeps the Democratic Party at a disadvantage when it comes to establishing an overarching story. The hope, I guess, is that narrative will follow good policy, that success will speak for itself. But the results of the 2016 election show how electorally shaky that theme is as a winning proposition.

What the broader left in the US must always remember is that policy almost always follows narrative, not the other way around. Narrative establishes extremely clear moral stakes. It forces everybody involved in the discussion to occupy your story, rather than you winding up in somebody else's. And if nothing else, "abolish the police" more than sets clear moral stakes in a way just about anybody can understand immediately. That's why it's such an effective political statement.

Link-Race

Race Based pedagogy undermines movements

Adeleke, Pf African American Studies, The University of Montana-Missoula, **02**

[Tunde, Globalization And the Challenges of Race-based Pedagogy, <http://globalization.icaap.org/content/v2.2/adeleke.html>]

Globalization requires that people from all racial and ethnic backgrounds will need to come to grips with radically new complexities and complementarities of the human experience. Such awareness will not be advanced by a pedagogy that emphasizes race and ethnic exclusivity. Race has historically mandated awareness of distinctiveness, whether in a hegemonic or subordinate context. It emphasizes dichotomy, conflict and negative historical encounters; often elevating those negative encounters into absolute constructs of human encounters (i.e., black-white as absolute and incompatible), thereby foreclosing possibilities of discovering and appreciating commonalities. Each of the phases in the human historical drama of black America---Slavery, Emancipation, Reconstruction, Jim Crow, Civil Rights and Post-Civil Rights--- represents complex historical dramas that engaged personalities from different racial backgrounds. Furthermore, each represents aspects of a complex global experience of encounters and interactions at different historical times and spaces. In all these historical epochs, an absolute and essentialist affirmation of race would foreclose the possibility of discovering and highlighting first, the complexity of the encounters, and second, the very artificiality of race itself as a defining construct. Take slavery in the United States for example, undoubtedly one of the most racially configured in history, yet, many whites were implicated in several efforts to undermine the institution. The same could be said of Jim Crow. Although race again was the defining essence of Jim Crow, if the entire episode is viewed as part of a historical continuum, rather than an isolated phase, race becomes problematic as a distinguishing element. Many whites were involved in the struggle to end Jim Crow in the United States. The same applies to the Civil rights movement. The martyrdom of Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner, and the efforts and sacrifices of several other white students in the freedom rides and marches underscore the problematic of an essentialist projection of race. Globalization undoubtedly has its problems. On a more general level, there is the openly expressed concern over, and at times violent reactions to, the economic implications of globalization; that is, the domineering status of wealthy nations, and multi-nationals, relative to the disadvantaged position of smaller and weaker nations. The specific issue, however, for the Afrocentrists is the perception of globalization as a vehicle for Eurocentric cultural hegemony. But there are those who see in the drama of 'unequal encounters,' and discoveries that globalization entails, positive elements that would facilitate understanding and appreciation of the cross cultural, and interactive nature of the human historical experience; resulting in the acquisition of better knowledge of each other, and greater appreciation for each other. The adoption of a race-based pedagogy would only impose unnecessary limits on the possibility of participating actively in, and benefiting from, the expansive parameters of human encounters. There is no doubt that many of the atrocities and manifestations of 'man's inhumanity to man' that currently inform human encounters, may likely be tampered by a global context that facilitates greater mutual appreciation and respect among humanity.

Link-Reform

A. Link: The aff is a piecemeal reform that stunts the momentum of movements like prison abolitionism.

Crimethinc 15 (Crimethinc, 2015. WHY WE DON'T MAKE DEMANDS, <https://crimethinc.com/2015/05/05/feature-why-we-dont-make-demands>)

At the beginning of a movement, when the participants have not yet had a chance to get a sense of their collective power, they may not be able to recognize how thoroughgoing the changes they want really are. **To frame demands at this point in the trajectory of a movement can stunt it, limiting the ambitions and imagination of the participants**. Likewise, setting a precedent at the beginning for narrowing or watering down its goals only increases the likelihood that this will happen again and again. Imagine if the Occupy movement had agreed on concrete demands at the very beginning—would it still have served as an open space in which so many people could meet, develop their analysis, and become radicalized? Or would it have ended up as a single protest encampment concerned only with corporate personhood, budget cuts, and perhaps the Federal Reserve? It is better for the objectives of a movement to develop as the movement itself develops, in proportion to its capacity. **Making demands establishes some people as representatives of the movement, establishing an internal hierarchy and giving them an incentive to control the other participants**. In practice, unifying a movement behind specific demands usually means designating spokespeople to negotiate on its behalf. Even if these are chosen “democratically,” on the basis of their commitment and experience, they can’t help but develop different interests from the other participants as a consequence of playing this role. **In order to maintain credibility in their role as negotiators, spokespeople must be able to pacify or isolate anyone that is not willing to go along with the bargains they strike. This gives aspiring leaders an incentive to demonstrate that they can reign in the movement**, in hopes of earning a seat at the negotiating table. The same courageous souls whose uncompromising actions won the movement its leverage in the first place suddenly find career activists who joined afterwards telling them what to do—or denying that they are part of the movement at all. This drama played out in Ferguson in August 2014, where the locals who got the movement off the ground by standing up to the police were slandered by politicians and public figures as outsiders taking advantage of the movement to engage in criminal activity. The exact opposite was true: outsiders were seeking to hijack a movement initiated by honorable illegal activity, in order to re-legitimize the institutions of authority. In the long run, this sort of pacification can only contribute to a movement’s demise. That explains the ambiguous relation most leaders have with the movements they represent: to be of use to the authorities, they have to be capable of subduing their comrades, but their services would not be required at all if the movement did not pose some kind of threat. Hence the strange admixture of militant rhetoric and practical obstruction that often characterizes such figures: they must ride the storm, yet hold it at bay. **Sometimes the worst thing that can happen to a movement is for its demands to be met. Reform serves to stabilize and preserve the status quo, killing the momentum of social movements, ensuring that more thoroughgoing change does not take place. Granting small demands can serve to divide a powerful movement, persuading the less committed participants to go home** or turn a blind eye to the repression of those who will not compromise. **Such small victories are only granted because the authorities consider them the best way to avoid bigger changes**. In times of upheaval, when everything is up for grabs, one way to defuse a burgeoning revolt is to grant its demands before it has time to escalate. Sometimes this looks like a real victory—as **in Slovenia in 2013, when two months of protest toppled the presiding government. This put an end to the unrest before it could address the systemic problems that gave rise to it, which ran much deeper than which politicians were in office. Another government came to power while the demonstrators were still dazed at their own success—and business as usual resumed**.

Internal link

Coalition

Opportunities and threats bring coalitions together

Dyke and Amos 17 [Nella and Bryan, both professors at University of California-Merced, Sociology Compass, "Social movements coalitions: Formation, longevity, and success" Vol 11(7) March]

Some find a combination of political threats and opportunities inspire coalition formation (Almeida, 2010; Juska & Edwards, 2005; Kay, 2005; Reese, Giedraitis, & Vega, 2006; Staggenborg, 1986; Stillerman, 2003; Zippel, 2004). Staggenborg (1986) finds that pro-choice organizations came not only to work in coalition when they faced threats to their goals, such as potential cuts to Medicaid funding of abortions, but also to take advantage of new opportunities, such as when states cut their anti-abortion laws. Almeida (2010), in his study of coalitions in five Latin American countries, demonstrates threats associated with government austerity programs combined with opportunities for mobilization created by democratization to inspire the formation of new alliances. Scholars studying labor coalitions opposed to NAFTA argue international organizations and agreements create threats that bring groups together across national boundaries while also creating opportunities by providing an arena for the presentation of grievances (Kay, 2005; Stillerman, 2003). The European Union similarly provides an international body for whom advocacy groups can present their grievances while also generating grievances through its policy making (Ruzza, 2004; Tarrow, 2005; Zippel, 2004).

Global impact

U.S. movements spill over internationally

Blain 20 [Keisha, assoc. prof of History at Pitt, Foreign Affairs, "Civil Rights International: The fight against racism has always been global" Sept/Oct <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-08-11/racism-civil-rights-international>]

In June 13, 2020, Black Lives Matter (BLM) activists gathered in London's Trafalgar Square to call for the eradication of racism and white supremacy. With their fists raised high, the activists, mostly dressed in black, chanted, "Black power!" Were it not for the face masks, which they wore to help stop the spread of COVID-19, the scene could have been taken straight from the 1960s. In that earlier era, activists around the world connected their own struggles to those of African Americans who challenged segregation, disenfranchisement, poverty, and police brutality—just as their successors do today. Meanwhile, Black American activists agitated for human rights and called attention to the devaluation of Black lives not only in the United States but all over the world, including in places under colonial rule.

Many tend to think of that era's push for civil rights and Black power as a distinctly American phenomenon. It was, in fact, a global movement—and so is BLM today. By linking national concerns to global ones, BLM activists are building on a long history of Black internationalism. Indeed, Black Americans have always connected their struggle for rights to fight for freedom in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, and elsewhere.

Although surges of Black internationalism have often been led from the top—through the efforts of politicians and diplomats—some of the most dynamic and enduring movements have developed at the grassroots, often led by Black women and involving working-class and impoverished Black people. During the twentieth century, Black internationalists organized on the local level, frequently in urban centers, to give voice to the concerns of ordinary people. Utilizing diverse strategies and tactics, they articulated global visions of freedom by working collaboratively and in solidarity with Black people and other people of color across the world. BLM activists have carried on this tradition, often using social media as a vehicle to forge transnational alliances.

Although much has changed since the 1960s, racism continues to shape every aspect of Black life in the United States. The troubling pattern of police killings of unarmed Black Americans sparked the current uprisings, but it represents only part of the problem; such killings, horrific though they may be, are merely symptoms of the deeper diseases of anti-Black racism and white supremacy. As BLM activists have emphasized, these problems are not contained within the borders of the United States: they are global scourges, and addressing them requires a global effort.

Human Rights

Social movements are critical building lasting change centered around defending of human dignity

Halpin and Cook 10(John Halpin Senior Fellow; Co-Director, Politics and Elections and Marta Cook Research Assistant, 2010, " Social Movements and Progressivism," Center for American Progress, https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2010/04/pdf/progressive_social_movements.pdf, accessed 7-6-2020//mrul)

Social movements for equality rest squarely on America's most cherished principles. They draw heavily from religious teachings about human dignity and solidarity, Enlightenment thought about human autonomy, and formative political documents such as the Declaration of Independence. The most complete and cumulative expression of these values in modern times was expressed in Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood."

Given the deep foundations of these beliefs, it is not surprising that social movements designed to correct injustices associated with legal and societal oppression have been some of the most passionate and hard fought in American history. From abolition and women's suffrage to civil rights movements for African Americans, immigrants, and gays and lesbians, **progressives have been at the forefront of defending human liberty and equality against efforts to treat certain groups of people as second-class citizens.** Their combined efforts helped make America a more diverse, tolerant, and socially mobile nation.

Movements are key to restore US human rights.

Thompson 8 (R.J. Thompson is an attorney at the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender Community Center in New York City., 2008, "Human Rights: The Key to Progressive Cross-Movement Building in the United States," <https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1068&context=hrbrief>, accessed 6-30-2020//mrul)

The time is now for the lesbian, gay, bisexual & transgender liberation movement, along with all other social justice movements in the United States, to understand our struggles as human rights struggles, our organizations as human rights organizations and envision a world where all human rights of all peoples are respected, protected and promoted. **A progressive, people-centered human rights movement has true revolutionary potential** in the context of the United States. Popular education around human rights has the potential to transform the mainstream culture of the United States. Human rights frameworks, language, messaging and strategies are needed for the individual and collective liberation of our communities. Activists in the United States can no longer afford the luxury of geographic, issue-based or identity-based isolationism and must no longer unwittingly mirror the exceptionalism of our own government. Human rights are universal, interdependent, indivisible, inalienable and intersectional. The human rights framework demands that rights be protected, promoted and respected, and that violations of rights be addressed proactively, not just retroactively. The human rights framework understands that for any scheme of rights protection and promotion, those most directly impacted must have a place at the table at all levels of policy creation, implementation and enforcement. Finally, a people-centered human rights framework teaches that both the state and non-state actors have affirmative obligations to

respect, protect and promote civil, political, economic, social, cultural, sexual, environmental and developmental rights. U.S.-based activists are understanding and implementing human rights domestically more and more with each passing day. Our challenge is to continue to educate ourselves and our colleagues about the revolutionary potential of a human rights vision and agenda; and to simultaneously craft our public messaging, media campaigns, and legal arguments in the language and principles of human rights as part of a long-term movement building and culture shifting effort, so that one day the masses in this country demand government accountability for human rights obligations and expect that the full spectrum of their human rights be respected, protected, and promoted by all segments of society.

Legal Reform

Social movements are critical to legal reform; setting agenda, developing momentum

Cummings 18 [Scott, Law & Society Inquiry, "The Social Movement turn in law" <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9mz9t9dg>

The lines of intellectual development within the legal academy were notable in their scope and speed. At the apex, in the field of constitutional law, progressive social movements emerged as important lawmaking actors, reshaping politics and norms in ways that sparked "constitutional revolutions" (Ackerman 1991). Closer to practice, in the study of lawyers and lawyering,

2 social movement organizations

began to appear as important client groups in the struggle for progressive reform, setting the social change agenda and thus shifting attention away from foundational concerns about lawyer accountability to vulnerable individual clients or diffuse classes (see, for example, Alfieri 2007, Ashar 2007, Cummings 2015, Gordon 2007, Freeman 2015, NeJaime 2011). In a surprising turnabout, social movements achieved privileged positions in both fields: presented in laudatory terms as the engines of progressive transformation. How did this happen? And why?

This article argues that social movements have been elevated to prominence within contemporary legal scholarship as a response to the fundamental problem of progressive legal thought (Kennedy 2006, Hovencamp 1995) over the past century: how to harness law as a force for progressive social change within American democracy while still maintaining a distinction between law and politics. This "law-politics" problem emerged during the Progressive era and erupted as an intellectual crisis after *Brown v. Board of Education*, which changed the political calculus for progressives: forced to justify why it was acceptable for courts and lawyers to intervene against the majoritarianism of Southern Jim Crow. As the democratic aims of political liberalism dimmed with the rise of conservatism, *Brown* came to stand for a new, and controversial, ideology: legal liberalism.

Public Opinion

Movements have a strong influence on public opinion

Amenta and Polletta 19 [Edwin and Francesca, prof. dept. of sociology University of California Irvine, Annual Review of Sociology "The Cultural Impacts of Social Movements" 9:18, April 16]

Movements may have an impact on public opinion in the longer term by how the movement is remembered. Survey respondents who spontaneously identified episodes from the civil rights movement as significant historical events were more likely to espouse racially liberal views (Griffin & Bollen 2009). Activists have some power to shape the movement events that are remembered. For example, gay rights activists were successful in winning recognition for the 1969 riot at the Stonewall Inn as the founding moment of gay liberation (although it was not) by connecting the event to a media-friendly and popular parade (Armstrong & Cragg 2006). Yet, despite activists' best efforts, collective memories of movements tend to be marked by themes of collective acclamation and progress rather than contention and unachieved goals (Eyerman 2015, Polletta 1998). Alongside ideological constraints on activists' abilities to craft memories of the movement are institutional constraints, such as the Congressional routines that determine when politicians can talk about movements (Polletta 1998), the settings that privilege some voices in reconstructing movement events (Cunningham et al. 2010), and the possibility that state actors may already have a monopoly on the memory of famous activists (Jansen 2007).

Policy

Through discourse, movements have the ability to influence policy agendas

Gaby and Caren 16 [Sarah, Doctor Candidate at University of North Carolina, Neal, professor of Sociology University of North Carolina, Mobilization: An International Quarterly, "The Rise of Inequality: How Social Movements Shape Discursive Fields" 21(4)]

Even in cases where movements themselves are harmed by the coverage, radical movements may have long-term influences on discourse. Radical movements can put issues on the public and political agenda that outlive the movement and have a broader influence. For instance, movements may have a longer-term effect on language (Goodwin and Jasper 1999), and shape public discourse through coverage of their frames (Ferree 2003; Ferree, Gamson, Gerhards and Rucht 2002) and by constructing meaning (Gamson 1992; Gamson and Modigliani 1989). These outcomes can extend influence beyond the direct involvement of the movement.

By gaining coverage of an issue, movements can also bring powerful actors and political elites into the conversation. Movement actors may temporarily gain standing by receiving coverage, but media reporters primarily seek sources that are influential and command authority, which often do not coincide with movement representatives (Andrews and Caren 2010; Corbett 1998). Instead, political elites are frequently given automatic standing and have the capacity to control a significant amount of media coverage (Gitlin 1980). Typically, media practices dictate unbiased coverage that includes both liberal and conservative viewpoints (Sobieraj 2010). As a result, nonmovement actors may enter the conversation on a particular issue as it enters the discourse, and, by gaining media coverage, may bring in additional actors that help to centralize the discourse further into the mainstream (Rhodes 2007). Radical movement actors, however, are unlikely to control discourse around an issue once it enters the media. Still, for movements, and particularly radical movements, placing an issue on the discursive agenda can be an important source of influence, which can extend beyond the movement to influence the public and political agenda.

Impact

Cap. Bad

Criminal justice reform papers over the capitalism and white supremacy that drives the inherent oppression of the legal and criminal system – the plan gets coopted to reinforce the worst features of the system

Karakatsanis, 19 --- JD from Harvard Law, founder of Civil Rights Corps (11/9/2019, Alice Speri interview of Alec Karakatsanis, “THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IS NOT BROKEN. IT’S DOING WHAT IT WAS DESIGNED TO DO,” <https://theintercept.com/2019/11/09/criminal-justice-mass-incarceration-book/?comments=1>, accessed on 3/17/20, JMP)

ALEC KARAKATSANIS’S “Usual Cruelty: The Complicity of Lawyers in the Criminal Injustice System” should be assigned reading for every first-year law student. Published last month by The New Press, the book is an unusually blunt takedown of a system the author never once refers to as a criminal “justice” system. Litigated with the intellectual vigor of someone who has won a number of landmark fights in federal court, “Usual Cruelty” clearly lays out a case for why our criminal legal system is not broken, but doing exactly what it was designed to do.

At a time when talk of justice reform has become mainstream but risks becoming hollow, and phrases like “progressive prosecutor” contribute to the deception that we are, in fact, making progress, Karakatsanis is clear-eyed about the bigger picture. But while “Usual Cruelty” is ultimately an abolitionist book that calls on people to imagine a world with fewer laws and in which jails and prisons aren’t the default response to all social problems, Karakatsanis is also keenly aware of how lawyers can use the law’s tools to fight the law’s harm. At Civil Rights Corps, the nonprofit he founded, Karakatsanis takes on cases challenging systemic injustices in the legal system — like cash bail and the systems of fines and fees that keep poor people in jail — which he says have become so “normalized and entrenched” they barely give us pause.

This interview was edited for length and clarity.

Who is this book for?

Much of the book is written for people who don’t know a lot about our criminal punishment bureaucracy and who generally care about issues of social justice, but don’t know much about how the criminal system works, and especially all the pain that it constantly inflicts for no good reason. But it also has a lot of deep analysis and reflection for people who have been working in the system, whether they’re public defenders or social workers or prosecutors or judges.

It’s really meant to touch anyone who’s worked in the system and get them to reevaluate, come to the system with fresh eyes and see, here’s what we’ve been doing to people and their families and their bodies. Let’s ask ourselves some really hard questions about why we’ve been inflicting so much pain. This book is also meant to be an acknowledgement of the real failure of lawyers in our vision, in our understanding of politics, our understanding of organizing, **our understanding of power, the way that we’ve tried to use the legal system to change what is really a problem of capitalism and white supremacy in power.** And it’s meant to reach out and say **we actually need a really different approach: a mass power-building movement that lawyers should not be leading.**

Some people go to law school with these grand ideas about changing the world. But your book makes a strong case that it’s not through lawyering that things are going to change.

The American legal system has never been an institution of radical social change. To the contrary, it has been an instrument of ruling class oppression. **The legal system, from its founding, was about preserving distributions of wealth and property and white supremacy.** If you go back and read old Supreme Court cases, you'll see in every era the Supreme Court and the federal courts and the state courts are reproducing the sort of power dynamics of that era into what's called legal decision-making, and passing it off as legal reasoning.

We need to build a movement that changes the power dynamics so that our society demands that our legal system create different rules. The best example of this might be Brown v. Board of Education, maybe the most celebrated legal decision in American Supreme Court history. Sixty years after Brown, you have schools that are just as segregated, if not more segregated, in some parts of the country than they were before Brown. Why? Because **if you don't attack the underlying systems of oppression that lead to a problem, a court ruling isn't going to solve them.**

A contrary example might be same-sex marriage. Very smart lawyers brought those cases 40 years ago, and they essentially lost everywhere, including in the U.S. Supreme Court. Then years after that, other lawyers, and actually some of the same lawyers, using the same words, challenged same-sex marriage bans again. This time, they prevailed. It wasn't because the 14th Amendment changed, or because they became better lawyers. It was because there had been a movement in our society that changed the way we think about same-sex marriage. What **we in the criminal system** need to understand is that we **need to be part of a social movement that changes the way we think about human caging.** And until we are part of that movement, I don't suspect that the courts are fundamentally going to alter this architecture of mass incarceration.

You write about the need for lawyers to remain "human" and to find creative ways to re-sensitize themselves. How do you stay human when working in a system that is designed to dehumanize daily, and on a mass scale?

We often find ourselves using the language of a bureaucracy as opposed to the language of humanity when we're in court. The things that we write, the arguments that we make, it's almost like reading from police reports; we use words like "suspect," "defendant." And **we use propagandistic terms like the "Department of Justice" or the "criminal justice system."** We even use the word "hold" to describe someone who's in a cage, which is such a strange thing to say. You hold someone you love; holding is a term of care. Or we use terms like "law enforcement," which make it seem like we enforce all laws against all people, when in fact **law enforcement in this country just enforces some laws against some people.** The language that we use is really important.

As a lawyer, you can also change the narratives that are presented in a courtroom. I would always ask my clients to be unshackled while in court, and I would ask the U.S. marshals to allow my clients' children to come hug them before sentencing. Little acts like these may not be significant in the broader sense, in the sense that they're not taking down capitalism or white supremacy, but they change the way that this mass assembly-line bureaucracy is able to process human beings: It slows it down, it makes everybody a little bit more sensitized to the cruelty that they're about to inflict on a child or on a parent, on a human being.

I found that the sentences started to get lower when we did those things. I think lawyers can be doing this throughout every aspect of a case: help to create space for their clients to tell their stories. Our punishment bureaucracy is only able to do what it's doing because the pain that it's causing has not been sufficiently explored in the popular consciousness.

We prosecute and incarcerate so many people that it becomes impossible to give each a fair process, so we end up with shortcuts like the mass plea bargaining system. You write that we created a system that would collapse were it to offer “too much justice.”

Anyone who observes court in the U.S. or works in the system understands that there is simply no way to process two million human beings from their families, homes, jobs, communities and into cages without coming up with shortcuts at every single step in the process. It’s just a really significant bureaucratic achievement to transfer that many people and their bodies and their lives into government-run cages. And to do that, the system basically has to ignore the main constitutional rights that are provided for in the Bill of Rights, because those documents were not written with a world of mass incarceration in mind. In fact, they were written precisely to avoid mass human caging.

You write about defendants appearing in court in Roxbury being made to stand behind glass cages — and people only realizing how dehumanizing that is when a bunch of white baseball fans were arrested after the Red Sox won the World Series. Do we tolerate the cruelty of the system because of the people it usually affects?

There is no way that much of what happens in the punishment bureaucracy would be tolerated if it were happening to people who looked different or had more power. The idea of drug laws being enforced on Yale’s campus, for example, in the same way that they are enforced down the street in the rest of New Haven would be laughable. And this goes for virtually any law you can think of. **The way that law is enforced reflects distributions of power in our society.** It’s the same way that people are routinely arrested and jailed for street gambling, but it’s totally acceptable to gamble over international currencies and global supply of wheat, even though gambling over the global supply of wheat has caused starvation for tens of millions of people. These same activities, depending on who’s doing them, are seen as morally culpable or morally praiseworthy, even.

I think even those who don’t work closely with the criminal justice system have some sense, by now, that it actually doesn’t have much to do with justice. Why is it that ideas like “the rule of law” and “justice” itself continue to wield incredible power?

I think that **there are very powerful forces in our society that benefit from people having faith in what’s thought of as “the rule of law.”** I always use that term in quotes because it’s a joke. Those forces have invested a great deal into a kind of propaganda about what our legal system is about. We’re told that our legal system is about public safety and human flourishing, but if you think that our legal system is really about creating a society of equality and justice and liberty and public safety, all you have to do is look around to understand that it’s failing miserably at that. That’s why you hear so many people, from all over the spectrum, saying the criminal justice system is “broken.”

But it’s only broken if you think that those are its purposes. If you actually think that its purpose is controlling certain populations, oppressing certain people, conserving the hierarchies of wealth and power, then it’s actually functioning very well. And the people who’ve been running our criminal legal system for decades aren’t stupid. They weren’t trying to do one thing but woefully failed, they were trying to do what the system has been doing, which is to keep certain people controlled.

Which brings me to the question of criminal justice “reform.” What is wrong with criminal justice reform?

I think **we are at a very dangerous moment in what’s called the criminal justice reform movement. There is some popular energy, meaningful energy, to change the criminal punishment system, and the people**

who created and profited from the punishment bureaucracy understand that and they're trying to **co-op that reform**. What's at stake now is whether we will actually make big changes to dismantle mass incarceration, or whether we'll make little tiny tweaks that curb off some of its most grotesque flourishes but preserve the architecture of the punishment bureaucracy and of mass human caging.

There are a lot of people with a lot at stake in this, whether it's police and correctional unions or prosecutors and the elite class that benefits from keeping people controlled, the private companies at every stage of the process — from those that make all of the handcuffs and the Tasers and the guns to the private probation companies, the bail bond companies, the private prison companies, all of the companies that contract for health care and telephones and video calling in jails. And of course, all of the defense lawyers and judges and probation officers. **It's a massive bureaucracy, and what do bureaucracies do? They try to expand and preserve themselves.**

I'm really interested in reorienting our discussion about what our criminal punishment system should look like to the question of whether we should have one, and whether it should look anything like what we have now, and how do we build the power that's necessary to demand that our society **do something drastically different**.

Community Policing is a piecemeal reform that perpetuates capitalist inequality and state violence through the conversion of social problems into police problems.

The Abolition Research Group 10/08/2017 (“The Problem with Community Policing” The Abolition Research Group is a project launched by students and activists at the City University of New York in 2015.) <http://aworldwithoutpolice.org/2017/10/08/the-problem-with-community-policing/>

We see the same dynamic at work in the Mayor's Action Plan for Neighborhood Safety, which brings NYPD officials together with city agencies, tenants councils, churches and businesses to address crime in public housing facilities. The plan include a \$139 million investment in security systems such as lights, cameras, and door locks. Its NYC Ceasefire program addresses gun violence through collaboration with social service agencies such as New York Foundling, the Brownsville Community Justice Center, and Community Solutions. Under Ceasefire, cops approach young people at meetings with NGOs and community representatives, threatening them with arrests while also directing them to social services. These programs are widely supported by liberal politicians and community groups, yet they do nothing to improve the low-wage labor market in which many public housing residents are trapped, nor the budget crisis that is plunging public housing itself into disrepair. And when the programs don't work, the NYPD has more repressive methods: militarized gang raids targeting youth of color, dozens of which have been executed in New York City public housing in recent years. But by far, the bureau's flagship effort is its Neighborhood Policing initiative. This project began with a pilot program in the summer of 2015, and has since expanded citywide. Under this strategy, a cadre of “neighborhood coordination officers” (NCOs) are devoted to specific sectors in each precinct. For part of their workday, these officers set aside responding to 911 calls, and instead develop relationships with local community leaders and organizations, and identify ongoing problems. Their efforts are overseen by specific community policing officers, who have access to CompStat data on the local level through smartphones and iPads. NCOs host periodic “safety summits” throughout the year at community centers or churches in the area. These meetings draw attendees from the relationships officers have established, and provide a forum to them to air grievances to the police. In turn, the police use the meetings to gather information about areas or people in the neighborhood they should target, and craft interventions that will meet with the support of the stakeholders they have selected. In practice, neighborhood policing works to extend NYPD surveillance deeper into poor and working class communities. It broadens NYPD contact with neighborhood social networks, beyond the few homeowners, small businessmen, church officials and senior citizens who already attend community meetings at the precinct houses themselves. It encourages neighbors to inform on each other, and expands data collection about local residents. And as with all community policing programs, **it does not solve the problems of capitalist inequality. Instead, it expands police presence in daily life, and**

turns social problems into police problems—which may then be met with state violence. Behind the new names, the NYPD’s most recent turn to community policing still rests on the power to detain, arrest, harm and kill. When right wing critics claimed the new program would reduce police officers to social workers, then-Commissioner Bratton assured them this was not the case.

The pilot program, he pointed out, had already led to a successful case of snitching and arrest in the 34th precinct: “learning who are the right informants, getting people to give you leads on where criminals may be, where weapons may be. Doesn’t sound like social work to me,” he said, “sounds like policing.”⁵ He was absolutely right.

China

Addressing racism is key to challenge Chinese hegemony. History proves

Beinart 20 [Peter, prof of Journalism and political science at the City University of New York, The Atlantic, "The protesters are upholding America's moral authority abroad: As during the cold war, the fight against racism at home strengthens the country's hand in the world" June 12 <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/06/civil-rights-protests-expand-americas-global-power/612976/>

In linking America's racism at home to its ideological competition abroad, King was drawing a connection that has been largely absent since the killing of George Floyd. In the United States today, the debate over America's intensifying rivalry with China is, for the most part, occurring independently from the debate over police violence. But separating the two is a mistake. King's words offer a reminder that the best way for the United States to regain some of its shattered moral authority overseas, and credibly argue that its political system is superior to Beijing's, is to ensure that the movement sparked by Floyd's death succeeds.

In the first two decades of America's Cold War with the Soviet Union, African American leaders insisted again and again that only by confronting its own racism could the United States appeal to people emerging from colonial racism in the developing world. In 1954, when the Supreme Court ruled school segregation unconstitutional, an African American newspaper, The Pittsburgh Courier, exulted that the decision would "stun and silence America's communist traducers behind the Iron Curtain" and "impress upon millions of colored peoples in Asia and Africa that idealism and social morality can and do prevail in the US." Conversely, when an all-white jury acquitted the murderers of Emmett Till the following year, the chair of the NAACP said the jurors deserved "a medal from the Kremlin for meritorious service in communism's war against democracy."

Many in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations also linked progress on civil rights to success in America's struggle against Soviet Communism. And after the passage of the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act, the United States Information Agency—which worked to burnish America's reputation abroad—claimed that "we have crossed some sort of watershed in foreign judgments and perspectives on the racial issue in the US." That was a huge overstatement. The urban unrest of the late 1960s showed foreign observers that white supremacy in the United States was alive and well. And the Vietnam War showed them that racism shaped not just domestic policy but foreign policy too.

Nevertheless, the civil-rights movement—alongside other factors—helped America win the Cold War. In part because of that movement, by 1977 a racially progressive white southerner, Jimmy Carter, was president, and a former lieutenant to King, Andrew Young, was his ambassador to the United Nations. The timing was fortuitous because, as the University of Nebraska's Thomas Borstelmann details in his book *The 1970s: A New Global History*, the decade witnessed a new global focus on human rights. In the 1975 Helsinki Accords, both the United States and the Soviet Union pledged to respect "human rights and fundamental freedoms." That pledge, the historian Vladislav Zubok has argued, "proved to be a time bomb under the Soviet regime." By 1980, Polish steelworkers had launched the Solidarity movement, which would help bring down the Soviet empire. The Helsinki pledge proved less of a time bomb in the U.S. because, despite America's ongoing racism, it had given African Americans the vote.

Today's competition between the U.S. and China is less ideological than America's struggle with the U.S.S.R. Beijing's primary selling point is its ability to generate economic growth. Unlike their 20th-century Soviet counterparts, China's leaders aren't launching an ideological challenge to liberal

democracy and offering their own system as a global alternative. They're simply arguing that, at least in the United States, democracy doesn't work. And from the 2008 financial crisis to repeated government shutdowns to the Trump administration's response to COVID-19, America's leaders have been making China's argument easier. Across the world, people still overwhelmingly support democracy as a concept. But when the Pew Research Center in 2017 asked non-Americans whether they like "American ideas about democracy," a plurality said no. From 2003 to 2018, according to Pew, the percentage of respondents who said "The government of the United States respects the personal freedoms of its people" dropped 46 points in Germany, 40 points in France, 37 points in Canada, 34 points in Australia, and 19 points in Japan. In a recent study of different nations' "soft power"—the power to attract, rather than coerce—the United States ranked first in cultural production and high-tech ingenuity but 21st in the quality of its political institutions.

Many factors have undermined the appeal of America's political system: gun violence, partisan polarization, inadequate health care, income inequality. But they're all linked to racism. And—as during the civil-rights movement—America's moral authority abroad is intimately tied to its willingness to confront that racism. That's a big part of the reason why, in the year Barack Obama became president, approval of the United States jumped 33 points in Germany and France, 26 points in Indonesia, and 22 points in Mexico.

Right now the Americans putting themselves at risk to protest racism are inspiring the world. They've sparked copycat demonstrations in Australia, Hungary, Japan, and other countries. Earlier this month, the fans of a Korean boy band raised more than \$1 million to support Black Lives Matter. The more America's leaders repress or ignore this mass movement against racism, the more they confirm international suspicions that America's political system is broken. But if the movement accomplishes tangible change—a sweeping new federal law overseeing police conduct, for instance, or a substantial shift of local resources from police to social services—some of its moral authority will infuse America's political system itself.

That won't change the fact that China's economic clout is rising and America's is falling. It won't help American policy makers respond to the Chinese firm Huawei's dominance in 5G network equipment or Beijing's fortifications in the South China Sea. But combatting racism against black people will enhance America's stature—and mark a welcome shift from President Donald Trump's approach to China, which has amplified anti-Asian racism. As King understood, self-improvement is a far more productive and ethical way to approach global competition than jingoistic self-righteousness.

As in 1956, both the United States and its main global foe face movements demanding human rights. Given the repressive nature of its empire in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union could not permit freedom in Hungary. Given the repressive nature of Communist Party rule, China cannot permit freedom in Hong Kong. But if America's renewed civil-rights movement succeeds, it will reinvigorate American democracy. And, in so doing, it will reinvigorate the deepest source of American power for the global competition ahead.

Chinese hegemony will result in international conflict and global war

Kitfield 18 (James Kitfield a senior fellow at the Center for the Study of the Presidency & Congress and a Defense One contributor. He is a former senior correspondent for National Journal and has written on defense, national security and foreign policy issues from Washington, D.C. for more than two decades, "The US & China: A Colder Peace or Thucydides' Trap?" 12/12/18, <https://breakingdefense.com/2018/12/the-us-china-a-colder-peace-or-thucydides-trap/>, sg)

In late October, Southeast Asian navies held their first-ever joint exercises with their Chinese counterparts. The hope was to ease years of tensions over disputed islands in the South China Sea. Instead, **the exercises gave an alarming preview of how Chinese hegemony would work.** (Wikimedia Commons) The “nine-dash line” describing Chinese claims to the South China Sea During a briefing for officers from the 10-country Association of South East Asian Nations, the chief of China’s Southern Theater Command presented a map including the “nine-dash line” border long used by Beijing to claim dominion over nearly the entire South China Sea — claims the ASEAN members do not recognize. Despite an international tribunal declaring in 2016 that the nine-dash demarcation had “no legal basis” in international law, the Chinese official insisted to his ASEAN counterparts not only that the 9-dash line delineated Chinese sovereignty, but that as head of Southern Theater Command, he was responsible for enforcing those boundaries. According to U.S. officials, the **ASEAN naval leaders were outraged** — though not surprised — **by what seemed like a deliberately insulting provocation by the Chinese.** **China** has done much more than talk, of course. It **has built seven artificial islands on shallow reefs in the South China Sea, all in areas claimed by other countries, and claimed exclusive maritime zones around them in contradiction to international law.** As recently as October, a Chinese destroyer nearly collided with the USS Decatur as it was conducting a routine “freedom of navigation” patrol in international waters near the Spratly Islands, prompting Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis to cancel a scheduled trip to China. Back in 2015, Chinese President Xi **Jinping tried to calm regional nerves by publicly promising not to “militarize” the man-made islands.** Earlier this year, **however, U.S. surveillance confirmed the islands now boast military airstrips** and facilities and are bristling with anti-ship and surface-to-air (SAM) missiles. “What my predecessor called a ‘Great Wall of Sand’ three years ago is now a ‘Great Wall of SAMs,’ giving the People’s Republic of China the ability to exert national control over international water and airspace over which \$3 trillion in goods travel every year,” said Admiral Philip Davidson. (Davidson, new head of the recently renamed U.S. Indo-Pacific Command, spoke last week via video link to a CSIS conference on China). **“The PRC says it’s militarizing these islands in order to defend Chinese ‘sovereignty,’ but in doing so they are violating the sovereignty of every other nation to fly, sail, trade and operate in accordance with international law.”** CSIS image China’s new airstrip built over Fiery Cross Reef in the South China Sea (CSIS image) **“The intensifying competition between the United States and China is not just driven by the traditional power politics between an established power and an emerging power,** but rather I believe **we are facing something much more serious,**” Davidson said, in some of the most blunt and pointed rhetoric heard from a four-star theater commander since the Cold War. **“I see a fundamental divergence of values that leads to two incomparable visions of the future. I think those two incomparable visions are between China and the rules-based international order.”** SPONSORED 50 Years of Innovation: 10 Key Milestones For a half century, DRS has provided military forces around the world with advanced technologies and capabilities to meet their mission needs. Here are some highlights. From LEONARDO DRS **“China is looking to change the world order to one in which national power is more important than international law, reflecting a system in which ‘the strong do what they will, and the weak do what they must.’”** said Davidson, quoting the ancient historian Thucydides. **What’s needed,** many experts argue, **is a more muscular U.S. strategy towards China** — a strategy informed by the same kind of hard-nosed realism that drove U.S. policy towards the Soviet Union during the Cold War. **The United States was able to check Soviet expansionism with a close web of alliances;** a combined conventional and nuclear deterrent that matched Soviet capabilities and resisted coercion; **and assertive propaganda** — what today is called “information operations” — **that broadcast the benefits of democracy over tyranny** to the oppressed peoples of the eastern bloc. Despite the unavoidable tensions in such a strategy, the United States continued to engage with Moscow on arms control and other areas of possible cooperation., Most crucially, **despite proxy wars** in Korea, Vietnam, and Afghanistan, **the strategy avoided direct conflict between great powers through four decades of the Cold War.** CSIS AMTI graphic Chinese aircraft, missile, and radar ranges over the South China Sea. (Graphic by Center for Strategic & International Studies) (Click to expand) Accommodation Has Failed Even before the Trump administration initiated a trade war with China involving hundreds of billions of dollars in punitive tariffs, there were signs of a fundamental, strategic divergence that echoes the Cold War. The U.S. had hoped that, by integrating China into a rules-based international order, exposure to Western values and increasing economic prosperity — including a nine-fold increase in GDP since joining the World Trade Organization in 2001 — would moderate the Communist Party’s authoritarian and mercantilist impulses. But a growing number of U.S. national security and foreign affairs experts have concluded that **the decades-old strategy of accommodation and engagement with China has simply failed.** Chinese President Xi Jinping inspects PLA troops Instead, **the party has used China’s rapidly accumulating power to crack down on dissent at home, bully its neighbors, and challenge the United States in Asia and worldwide.** Engagement with the US has not stopped Beijing from persistently bending the rules of international trade in service to China’s voracious mercantilism, erecting steep tariffs, forcing corporations to surrender intellectual property or compromise their ethics for the privilege of accessing the

Chinese market, and outright stealing proprietary technology from U.S. corporations through cyber espionage. Benefiting from other countries' free markets has not stopped China from launching a 10-year plan to use government subsidies, state-controlled firms, and "military-civil fusion" between the armed forces and private companies to pursue dominance in high-tech sectors from electric cars to artificial intelligence. Entering the global economy has not stopped China from exercising "debt diplomacy" with its "One Belt, One Road" project, loaning hundreds of billions of dollars to often corrupt government officials in underdeveloped nations in order to bind them to Beijing. Exposure to liberal values has not stopped President Xi Jinping from centralizing power, extending his term of office, or – in an alarming echo of the Cultural Revolution – interning a reported one million Muslim Uighurs and other minorities in "re-education camps." Recommended US, Allies Getting Larger Airborne Network With New JTRS Radios The software defined radios will make F/A-18E/F and F-22 aircraft communications nodes in a coalition network. By BARRY ROSENBERG "What's happening in west China is a moral atrocity that only adds to Xi Jinping's abysmal human rights record, even as **Beijing is systematically trying to undermine U.S. alliances and expand an illiberal sphere of influence that is already taking root throughout Asia, accelerating a decline of democracy around the world.**" said Ely Ratner, a former China expert at the State Department and the National Security Council. "The end result of these trends is a United States that is less secure and less able to exert influence in Asia. So the stakes are extremely high."

Democracy

Impact: Democratic backsliding will shatter the international order—we assess every single impact

Kendall-Taylor 16

(Andrea Kendall-Taylor is a deputy national intelligence officer for Russia and Eurasia at the National Intelligence Council and a nonresident senior associate in the Human Rights Initiative at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, D.C., 7-15-16, “How Democracy’s Decline Would Undermine the International Order”, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/how-democracy%E2%80%99s-decline-would-undermine-international-order>, accessed 11-20-18, DFY)

It is rare that policymakers, analysts, and academics agree. But there is an emerging consensus in the world of foreign policy: threats to the stability of the current international order are rising. The norms, values, laws, and institutions that have undergirded the international system and governed relationships between nations are being gradually dismantled. The most discussed sources of this pressure are the ascent of China and other non-Western countries, Russia’s assertive foreign policy, and the diffusion of power from traditional nation-states to nonstate actors, such as nongovernmental organizations, multinational corporations, and technology-empowered individuals. Largely missing from these discussions, however, is the specter of widespread democratic decline. Rising challenges to democratic governance across the globe are a major strain on the international system, but they receive far less attention in discussions of the shifting world order.

In the 70 years since the end of World War II, the United States has fostered a global order dominated by states that are liberal, capitalist, and democratic. The United States has promoted the spread of democracy to strengthen global norms and rules that constitute the foundation of our current international system.

However, despite the steady rise of democracy since the end of the Cold War, over the last 10 years we have seen dramatic reversals in respect for democratic principles across the globe. A 2015 Freedom House report stated that the “acceptance of democracy as the world’s dominant form of government—and of an international system built on democratic ideals—is under greater threat than at any point in the last 25 years.”

Although the number of democracies in the world is at an all-time high, there are a number of key trends that are working to undermine democracy. The rollback of democracy in a few influential states or even in a number of less consequential ones would almost certainly accelerate meaningful changes in today’s global order.

Democratic decline would weaken U.S. partnerships and erode an important foundation for U.S. cooperation abroad. Research demonstrates that domestic politics are a key determinant of the international behavior of states. In particular, democracies are more likely to form alliances and cooperate more fully with other democracies than with autocracies. Similarly, authoritarian countries have established mechanisms for cooperation and sharing of “worst practices.” An increase in authoritarian countries, then, would provide a broader platform for coordination that could enable these countries to overcome their divergent histories, values, and interests—factors that are frequently cited as obstacles to the formation of a cohesive challenge to the U.S.-led international system.

Recent examples support the empirical data. Democratic backsliding in Hungary and the hardening of Egypt’s autocracy under Abdel Fattah el-Sisi have led to enhanced relations between these countries and Russia. Likewise, democratic decline in Bangladesh has led Sheikh Hasina Wazed and her ruling Awami League to seek closer relations with China and Russia, in part to mitigate Western pressure and bolster the regime’s domestic standing.

Although none of these burgeoning relationships has developed into a highly unified partnership, democratic backsliding in these countries has provided a basis for cooperation where it did not previously exist. And while the United States certainly finds common cause with authoritarian partners on specific issues, the depth and reliability of such cooperation is limited. Consequently, further democratic decline could seriously compromise the United States’ ability to form

the kinds of deep partnerships that will be required to confront today's increasingly complex challenges. Global issues such as climate change, migration, and violent extremism demand the coordination and cooperation that democratic backsliding would put in peril. Put simply, **the United States is a less effective and influential actor if it loses its ability to rely on its partnerships with other democratic nations.**

A slide toward authoritarianism could also challenge the current global order by diluting U.S. influence in critical international institutions, including the United Nations, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Democratic decline would weaken Western efforts within these institutions to advance issues such as Internet freedom and the responsibility to protect. In the case of Internet governance, for example, Western democracies support an open, largely private, global Internet. Autocracies, in contrast, promote state control over the Internet, including laws and other mechanisms that facilitate their ability to censor and persecute dissidents. Already many autocracies, including Belarus, China, Iran, and Zimbabwe, have coalesced in the "Likeminded Group of Developing Countries" within the United Nations to advocate their interests.

Within the IMF and World Bank, autocracies—along with other developing nations—seek to water down conditionality or the reforms that lenders require in exchange for financial support. If successful, diminished conditionality would enfeeble an important incentive for governance reforms. In a more extreme scenario, the rising influence of autocracies could enable these countries to bypass the IMF and World Bank all together. For example, the Chinese-created Asian Infrastructure and Investment Bank and the BRICS Bank—which includes Russia, China, and an increasingly authoritarian South Africa—provide countries with the potential to bypass existing global financial institutions when it suits their interests. **Authoritarian-led alternatives pose the risk that global economic governance will become fragmented and less effective.**

Violence and instability would also likely increase if more democracies give way to autocracy. International relations literature tells us that democracies are less likely to fight wars against other democracies, suggesting that **interstate wars would rise as the number of democracies declines.** Moreover, within countries that are already autocratic, additional movement away from democracy, or an "authoritarian hardening," would increase global instability. Highly repressive autocracies are the most likely to experience state failure, as was the case in the Central African Republic, Libya, Somalia, Syria, and Yemen. In this way, **democratic decline would significantly strain the international order because rising levels of instability would exceed the West's ability to respond to the tremendous costs of peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, and refugee flows.**

Finally, widespread democratic decline would contribute to rising anti-U.S. sentiment that could fuel a global order that is increasingly antagonistic to the United States and its values. Most autocracies are highly suspicious of U.S. intentions and view the creation of an external enemy as an effective means for boosting their own public support. Russian president Vladimir Putin, Venezuelan president Nicolas Maduro, and Bolivian president Evo Morales regularly accuse the United States of fomenting instability and supporting regime change. This vilification of the United States is a convenient way of distracting their publics from regime shortcomings and fostering public support for strongman tactics.

Since 9/11, and particularly in the wake of the Arab Spring, Western enthusiasm for democracy support has waned. Rising levels of instability, including in Ukraine and the Middle East, fragile governance in Afghanistan and Iraq, and sustained threats from terrorist groups such as ISIL have increased Western focus on security and stability. U.S. preoccupation with intelligence sharing, basing and overflight rights, along with the perception that autocracy equates with stability, are trumping democracy and human rights considerations.

While rising levels of global instability explain part of Washington's shift from an historical commitment to democracy, the nature of the policy process itself is a less appreciated factor. Policy discussions tend to occur on a country-by-country basis—leading to choices that weigh the costs and benefits of democracy support within the confines of a single country. From this perspective, the benefits of counterterrorism cooperation or access to natural resources are regularly judged to outweigh the perceived costs of supporting human rights. A serious problem arises, however, when this process is replicated across countries. The bilateral focus rarely incorporates the risks to the U.S.-led global order that arise from widespread democratic decline across multiple countries.

Many of the threats to the current global order, such as China's rise or the diffusion of power, are driven by factors that the United States and West more generally have little leverage to influence or control. Democracy, however, is an area where Western actions can affect outcomes. Factoring in the risks that arise from a global democratic decline into policy discussions is a vital step to building a comprehensive approach to democracy support. Bringing this perspective to the table may not lead to dramatic shifts in foreign policy, but it would ensure that we are having the right conversation.

Democracy solves a laundry list of impacts---economic growth, public goods, alliances, and war---the US is key.

Lee '18 (Carrie; is an assistant professor at the U.S. Air War College and a Security Fellow with Truman National Security Project. Any views expressed are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. government, the Department of Defense, Air University, or Truman National Security Project; *The Truman Project*; September 10th; "Why Democracy Promotion is in the Strategic Interest of the United States"; <https://medium.com/truman-doctrine-blog/why-democracy-promotion-is-in-the-strategic-interest-of-the-united-states-ae959c111b2f>; accessed 7/9/19; ME)

However, reducing the United States' emphasis on a values-driven foreign policy is wrong, and contrary to the strategic interests of the United States. **Democracy promotion** in particular serves a **key role in safeguarding U.S. interests** and promoting global, long-term growth in ways fundamentally compatible with U.S. strategic interests. After all, **democracies protect private property** in important ways, **invest in public goods**, are more politically stable, make for **more dependable allies**, and empirically **do not go to war with one another**. Ultimately, a world full of democratic governments is safer, more prosperous, and more stable — all states of being that the United States has an interest in promoting.

Democracy guarantees that the public has a stake in its own institutions and government, which leads to **investor confidence and growth**. Since elected politicians are accountable to property owners and are held in check by an independent judiciary, democracies tend to have better mechanisms for **protecting private property** than their autocratic counterparts. This makes democracies a **particularly attractive type of country for investors** — both public and private — because checks and balances make it difficult for the state to nationalize industries. Further, private property rights protected by the legal system **encourage entrepreneurship and small business development**, both of which are **key to a growing and modernizing economy**. As a result, democracies tend to be wealthier and more economically stable than their autocratic counterparts. This is fundamentally in the interest of the United States in that both private and public investors have an interest in seeing returns on their investments, thereby potentially making **countries less willing to go to war if that would require severing economic ties**. Democratic institutions ensure that citizens with both economic and political power are heard.

Democracies also **invest in public goods at much higher rates than autocratic governments**. Because politicians must cater to the median voter, they **approve policies that invest in public education and healthcare**, both of which promote long-term growth and development. Public education invests in a country's human capital, setting the stage for long-term innovation, adaptability, and advancement. Public healthcare, meanwhile, has been shown to **increase overall societal productivity** and well-being as people take fewer sick days, citizens are able to afford their healthcare without going bankrupt, and ultimately, the overall **costs of healthcare are driven down** as citizens become healthier. Productive, innovative societies are also better for the United States — innovation around the world improves global quality of life, results in more educational and vocational opportunities for Americans (both because other universities and jobs become more attractive to Americans who want to go abroad and because

potential immigrants are more likely to want to stay in their own country, opening up opportunities for U.S. citizens at home), and may reduce friction between countries over resources and labor.

Democracies are also generally more politically stable because regular election cycles ensure an established process for the habitual and peaceful removal of leaders from power. Elections ensure the non-violent transition of power and reduce the need for mass protest, rioting, and revolution — which **makes countries more politically stable.** Further, when citizens are granted rights and protections from government abuse, enforced by an independent judiciary, they have fewer grievances against the government and are thus less able to mobilize large numbers of people to violently overthrow the regime. Revolution, while not always violent, often leads to political instability, challenges to growth, **increased incentives for diversionary war and conflict,** and oftentimes civil war. The externalities of civil war and international conflict then put pressure on the United States to intervene, protect human rights, and otherwise expend resources on other countries' issues. Further, civil wars are highly destructive to institutions, human capital, and resources, and can have significant security spillover effects, increasing global risk of political instability and **violent extremism.**

This political stability, in addition to institutional checks and balances, makes **democracies better international partners and allies in the long-term.** Treaties ratified by multiple branches of government are more durable than executive agreements signed by a single leader who may be replaced within a short period of time. While democracies may be more reluctant to commit to alliances and formal security pacts, once a party to them, they are more dependable than other states with concentrated power at the executive level. **These kind of durable commitments are of interest to the United States as it seeks to preserve the liberal world order;** it is far more effective to ally with partners whose institutions make withdrawal from the alliance costly.

Finally, it has been empirically observed that **democracies do not go to war with one another.** While there is a robust debate around the exact nature of the so-called “democratic peace,” it appears that there are qualities particular to democracies that make war between them particularly unlikely: a **dovish public constrains leaders' ability to wage war,** competitive elections and a free press make it **easier to credibly communicate resolve to potential adversaries,** consolidated democracies tend to be **more wealthy and economically interdependent,** like-minded people are more hesitant to wage war against one another, and so on. Regardless of the precise mechanisms, however, a world of democracies is inherently safer, more prosperous, and less likely to initiate a war against the United States — a key factor in protecting American security and interests.

Hegemony

Social movement democratic participation key to hegemony

Artz 19 [Lee, prof. at Purdue University, Third World Quarterly, "A political economy for social movements and revolution: popular media, access, power and cultural hegemony" pg. 13888-1405

One key marker of mass social movements transitioning to participatory democratic governance is popular media access. This essay argues that democratic media access by public constituencies becomes a site for constructing social revolution and simultaneously a manifest empirical measure of the extent of democratic participation in the production, distribution, and use of communication with new cultural possibilities. The participatory production practices (with citizens producing and hosting their own programs) and the democratic content (of oral histories, local issues, critiques of government and business, and everyday vernacular) reflect the hegemony of emerging 'Bolivarian' twenty-first century socialism expressed as popular participation in media production. Bolstered by constitutional changes and public funding, popular social movements of civil society, indigenous, women, and working class organizations have gained revolutionary ground by securing in practice the right of media production. Findings indicate that public and community media (that move beyond alternative sites of local expression and concerns) provide a startling revolutionary contrast to the commercial media operations in every nation. Popular media constructions suggest a new radically democratic cultural hegemony based on human solidarity with collective, participatory decision-making and cooperation offering real possibilities and experiences for increased equality and social justice.

U.S. hegemony key to prevent global war

Kagan 17 – Robert Kagan, Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy, Project on International Order and Strategy, Brookings Institution, "The twilight of the liberal world order," 1/24/17, <https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-twilight-of-the-liberal-world-order/>

However, it is the two great powers, China and Russia, that pose the greatest challenge to the relatively peaceful and prosperous international order created and sustained by the United States. If they were to accomplish their aims of establishing hegemony in their desired spheres of influence, the world would return to the condition it was in at the end of the 19th century, with competing great powers clashing over inevitably intersecting and overlapping spheres of interest. These were the unsettled, disordered conditions that produced the fertile ground for the two destructive world wars of the first half of the 20th century. The collapse of the British-dominated world order on the oceans, the disruption of the uneasy balance of power on the European continent due to the rise of a powerful unified Germany, combined with the rise of Japanese power in East Asia all contributed to a highly competitive international environment in which dissatisfied great powers took the opportunity to pursue their ambitions in the absence of any power or group of powers to unite in checking them. The result was an unprecedented global calamity. It has been the great accomplishment of the U.S.-led world order in the 70 years since the end of the Second World War that this kind of competition has been held in check and great power conflicts have been avoided.

The role of the United States, however, has been critical. Until recently, the dissatisfied great and medium-size powers have faced considerable and indeed almost insuperable obstacles to achieving their objectives. The chief obstacle has been the power and coherence of the order itself and of its principal promoter and defender. The American-led system of political and military alliances, especially in the two critical regions of Europe and East Asia, has presented China and Russia with what Dean Acheson once referred to as "situations of strength" in their regions that have required them to pursue their ambitions cautiously and in most respects to defer serious efforts to disrupt the international system. The system has served as a check on their ambitions in both positive and negative ways. They have been participants in and for the most part beneficiaries of the open international economic system the United States created and helped sustain and, so long as that system was functioning, have had more to gain by playing in it than by challenging and overturning it. The same cannot be said of the political and strategic aspects of the order, both of which have worked to their detriment. The growth and vibrancy of democratic government in the two decades following the collapse of Soviet

communism have posed a continual threat to the ability of rulers in Beijing and Moscow to maintain control, and since the end of the Cold War they have regarded every advance of democratic institutions, including especially the geographical advance close to their borders, as an existential threat—and with reason. The continual threat to the basis of their rule posed by the U.S.-supported order has made them hostile both to the order and to the United States. However, it has also been a source of weakness and vulnerability. Chinese rulers in particular have had to worry about what an unsuccessful confrontation with the United States might do to their sources of legitimacy at home. And although Vladimir Putin has to some extent used a calculated foreign adventurism to maintain his hold on domestic power, he has taken a more cautious approach when met with determined U.S. and European opposition, as in the case of Ukraine, and pushed forward, as in Syria, only when invited to do so by U.S. and Western passivity. Autocratic rulers in a liberal democratic world have had to be careful.

The greatest check on Chinese and Russian ambitions, however, has come from the combined military power of the United States and its allies in Europe and Asia. China, although increasingly powerful itself, has had to contemplate facing the combined military strength of the world's superpower and some very formidable regional powers linked by alliance or common strategic interest, including Japan, India, and South Korea, as well as smaller but still potent nations like Vietnam and Australia. Russia has had to face the United States and its NATO allies. When united, these military powers present a daunting challenge to a revisionist power that can call on no allies of its own for assistance. Even were the Chinese to score an early victory in a conflict, they would have to contend over time with the combined industrial productive capacities of some of the world's richest and most technologically advanced nations. A weaker Russia would face an even greater challenge.

Faced with these obstacles, the two great powers, as well as the lesser dissatisfied powers, have had to hope for or if possible engineer a weakening of the U.S.-supported world order from within. This could come about either by separating the United States from its allies, raising doubts about the U.S. commitment to defend its allies militarily in the event of a conflict, or by various means wooing American allies out from within the liberal world order's strategic structure. For most of the past decade, the reaction of American allies to greater aggressiveness on the part of China and Russia in their respective regions, and to Iran in the Middle East, has been to seek more reassurance from the United States. Russian actions in Georgia, Ukraine, and Syria; Chinese actions in the East and South China seas; Iranian actions in Syria, Iraq, and along the littoral of the Persian Gulf—all have led to calls by American allies and partners for a greater commitment. In this respect, the system has worked as it was supposed to. What the political scientist William Wohlforth once described as the inherent stability of the unipolar order reflected this dynamic—as dissatisfied regional powers sought to challenge the status quo, their alarmed neighbors turned to the distant American superpower to contain their ambitions.

The system has depended, however, on will, capacity, and coherence at the heart of the liberal world order. The United States had to be willing and able to play its part as the principal guarantor of the order, especially in the military and strategic realm. The order's ideological and economic core—the democracies of Europe and East Asia and the Pacific—had to remain relatively healthy and relatively confident. In such circumstances, the combined political, economic, and military power of the liberal world would be too great to be seriously challenged by the great powers, much less by the smaller dissatisfied powers.

Oppression

Criminal justice movements are critical to create structural change that also addresses racism, sexism, religious discrimination, LGBTQ discrimination, environment and international peace

Enid 17 (Enid O., 12-13-2017, "The U.S. Criminal Justice System: A Role for Radical Social Work," from Taylor & Francis via umich libraries, accessed 6-24-2020//mrul) ***RSW = Radical Social Work

Linking criminal justice action organizations to RSW efforts

Fortunately, many CJ action organizations have stated goals and action programs congruent with structural change and RSW. The examples below include selected faith-based organizations, organizations that use legal approaches, and emerging grassroots youth-based organizations.

Faith-based organizations, grounded in the civil rights movement, define spirituality as inclusive (without discrimination against religions worldwide) and see work for peace and social justice as an integral aspect of their faith. Such organizations are very important to current movement building, particularly in light of the present-day promotion of exclusive religious beliefs and religious discrimination. Specifically, this growing movement acknowledges the need for a revolution of values against racism (and discrimination against other oppressed groups), materialism, and militarism.

An excellent example of such an organization is the Spirit House Project, which is a national organization that uses the arts, research, education, action, and spirituality to bring diverse peoples together to work for racial, economic, and social justice, as well as spirituality. This program and the Chicago Freedom School share goals and strategies in youth education. Youth are encouraged to (a) analyze personal experiences in the context of the larger social structure, (b) learn about the history of social movements, and (c) visualize possible future-change movements. Additionally, they promote civic engagement and provide training in leadership skills.

The American Civil Liberties Union, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the National Friends Service Committee, supplemented by other organizations that provide legal advocacy on targeted issues, compose one of the most powerful groups of resistance and change. Currently, the issues of increasing criminalization of poverty, homelessness, and undocumented immigrants are acute. Many social workers are directly serving persons threatened by these changes. Policies that support carrying out street sweeps, confiscating personal property (e.g., bedding, clothes, papers, and medications), criminalizing groups feeding homeless people, and ordinances enforcing hygiene are flourishing (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2014).

Numerous social justice action organizations developed by young activists are addressing CJ issues as an integral part of their overall goals. Many of these organizations include opportunities for the training of young people for leadership in social justice movements. These organizations are composed of young people from diverse backgrounds. The connection to the arts and music is a constant theme; hundreds of young (and some old) social justice-oriented musicians, poets, and painters have joined these movements. Saul Williams, a poet, filmmaker, and musician, has contributed much to political consciousness and hope. The Peace Poets have become a voice for and to many prisoners. Mainstream, Lady Gaga has a constant stream of social justice support in her work (e.g., her albums Born This Way and Angel Down, in reference to the tragic death of Trayvon Martin). Such work educates and inspires (see Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, n.d.). The movement #BlackLivesMatter continues to expand its support base to address police-related abuse and deaths focused on Black people as well as

aggressive policing of minority and/or poverty areas and militarization of the domestic police force. **This movement has also expanded its agenda to include not only racism throughout the CJS but also the many social justice issues seeking change in the larger political economic system** (see Black Lives Matter, n.d.; Jones, 2016).

The Sanders-inspired Our Revolution represents a social justice action group that has goals suggesting the **economic justice (including the right to health care, a living wage, education, etc.) of a democratic socialism**. Their agenda is inclusive and aims to end racism, sexism, religious discrimination, and discrimination against persons in the LGBTQ population, immigrants, and other oppressed populations. Additionally, they are actively supporting other groups with similar goals and continue to expand their base in an effort to be part of a growing mass movement. Many long-term national and international economic and social justice organizations and groups that support people in prison, community corrections, or released and their families are also actively focused on such linkages. The struggle for a safe environment and for international peace is also a central issue. These movements and many smaller related movements, such as the Million Hoodies Movement for Justice (available from millionhoodies.net/about) and Sistas and Brothas United (available from youthorganizingdc.wikifoundry.com/page/Sistas+and+Brothas=United+-+Fighting+for+Change!), provide a strong base for the work of RSWs trying to address injustice within the CJS and connect these efforts to the need for structural change.

Social movements are essential to solve many areas of oppression

Maruna 17 [Shadd, professor of Criminology at University of Manchester, Irish Probation Journal, "Desistance as a social movement" vol. `14 October]

Social movements, of course, are powerful forces that by their nature tend to take societies in surprising new directions. The remarkable achievements of the Civil Rights movement in the United States are a well-known example. Yet it is still shocking to realise that it was only in 1955 that Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on a segregated bus, and in 2008, Barack Obama was elected President of the United States. To move from 'back of the bus' to the first African American president within the lifetime of a single generation would seem unthinkable, except when one realises the phenomenal mobilisation and civil rights organising that took place during those five decades.

The struggle for LGBT rights in Ireland tells a similar story. Until 1993, same-sex sexual activity was a criminal offence in Ireland, yet in 2015, the Irish public voted overwhelmingly to legalise same-sex marriage

in a historic referendum, and the country currently has an openly gay Taoiseach. Again, the speed of this shift in public opinion can only be explained as a result of a sweeping social movement for LGBT rights, led by members of the LGBT community: members themselves emerging 'out of the closet' and finding their voice on the public stage.

Similar social movements have transformed the fields of mental health and addiction recovery, where formerly stigmatised groups have collectively organised for their rights. Sometimes referred to as the 'recovery movement' (Best and Lubman, 2012), groups of advocates for 'service users' and 'disability rights' have played crucial roles in advocating for patient rights in the health care system, working to reduce discrimination against individuals struggling with a variety of health issues, but especially humanising individuals with formerly stigmatised health needs. In a transformative essay calling for the development of a 'recovery movement', William White (2000) wrote:

The central message of this new movement is not that 'alcoholism is a disease' or that 'treatment works' but rather that permanent recovery from alcohol and other drug-related problems is not only possible but a reality in the lives of hundreds of thousands of individuals and families.

As a result of this organising, there has been a discernible backlash against professionalised, pathologising medical treatments in favour of support for grassroots mutual-aid recovery communities (see e.g. Barrett et al., 2014).

Social movements are essential to solve major cultural problems

Amenta and Polletta 19 [Edwin and Francesca, prof. dept. of sociology University of California Irvine, Annual Review of Sociology "The Cultural Impacts of Social Movements" 9:18, April 16]

The enduring impacts of social movements are often cultural. Movements change the way we live and work. They make some behaviors socially inappropriate and others newly appealing. They create new collective actors, alter lines of social cleavage, and transform what counts as expertise. Indeed, the policy changes that have been the subject of considerable sociological investigation have often depended on broad changes in public attitudes. For example, American public opinion changed dramatically before marriage equality was ratified by the Supreme Court (Fetner 2016). In contrast, in the absence of favorable public opinion, Supreme Court rulings won by movements for school desegregation (Bonastia 2012) and abortion (Halfmann 2011, Luker 1984) produced little in the way of immediate change in the first case and backlash in both cases. Yet, with the exception of a few books and articles (Earl 2004, Eyerman & Jamison 1991, Rochon 1998, Van Dyke & Taylor 2018), there has been little systematic effort to account for movements' cultural impacts. The relative lack of attention is understandable. Movements' impacts are often difficult to isolate from the changes in policies, values, and behaviors that would have occurred in the absence of those movements. And the sheer variety of movements' cultural impacts—from shifts in public opinion to the creation of new genres of art to the inclusion of new groups in policy—presents challenges that ascertaining political impacts does not. Undoubtedly, different things are going on when a movement leads a broad swathe of the public to adopt a new term like “Ms.” than when the same movement leads a much smaller group of activists to reject mainstream gender roles entirely. A single theory of cultural change cannot apply to the many potential sites of cultural impact. Moreover, while policy changes typically are well documented, cultural changes often are not. In addition, most sociologists of culture favor a definition of culture that encompasses everyday practices as well as beliefs, making it impossible to rely on opinion surveys to capture the sum total of social movements' cultural influence.

These challenges notwithstanding, several recent developments have provided resources for theorizing movements' cultural impacts. Scholars have made headway in isolating movements' political influence from the influence of other contemporaneous developments (Amenta et al. 2010). Moreover, recognizing that movements often target institutions other than states, scholars have begun to theorize the conditions for movements' impacts on formally nonpolitical institutions

such as education, science, and especially business (Arthur 2011, Epstein 2016, King & Pearce 2010). At the same time, scholars who study movements targeting states have come to recognize the cultural dimensions of movements' emergence, trajectories, and impacts (Polletta 2008).

Finally, theoretical approaches both within and outside of sociology can profitably be adapted, and sometimes have been adapted, to account for movements' cultural impacts. For example, institutionalist perspectives in organizational theory have put culture front and center in accounting for organizational change (Schneiberg & Lounsbury 2017). Political scientists and political

sociologists provide material for treating movements as carriers of ideas that reorient policymaking (Béland 2005, Hall 1993, Stone 1989) and as operationalizing concepts such as equality or

discrimination once policy has been adopted (Dobbin 2009, Zippel 2006). Scholars of political communication and public opinion have explored how audiences receive and respond to different

kinds of political messages (Chong & Druckman 2007, Earl & Garrett 2017). Science and technology scholars have studied how mobilized disease sufferers challenge what counts as knowledge

(Epstein 2016). Media studies scholars have traced activists' impacts on the content of television

and film (Lopez 2016). Together, these materials offer tools for accounting for movements' cultural impacts.

Racism

The movement is essential to challenge racism

Ginzburg 20 [Lyubov, editorial assistant, UN Chronicle, "The Virus of Racism: An enduring dilemma for humanity" Aug. 7 <https://www.un.org/en/un-chronicle/virus-racism-enduring-dilemma-humanity>

Reforms mandated by legislative and judicial actions are important and have often been effective in combatting prejudices, as *Brown v. Board of Education* suggests. But, as a writer Caryll **Phillips notes**, "we can't legislate what is in people's hearts,"²¹ which, he admits, places additional responsibility upon all of us, including teachers, parents, community organizers, public figures and, of course, international civil servants. In the same vein, widespread urban unrest may not be smothered even by dislodging federal forces. Instead, these measures, as it has become obvious in recent days in a number of American cities, caused protests to swell, embracing other groups such as mothers and veterans. Demonstrators return to the streets, driven by the same "sense of justice and deep concern for all people and problems"²² that drove Ralph Bunche to address an enormous crowd at the legendary 1963 March on Washington, just before Martin Luther King delivered his memorable speech, and later to join the Reverend Dr. King in Alabama in the front line of the March on Montgomery from Selma.

Sixty-five years later, and two thousand miles from Selma, a new generation of activists are drawing inspiration from a civil rights history that "exposed segregation's endemic violence" and resulted in the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Led by Ms. Patrisse Cullors, an African American artist, activist, public speaker and co-founder of the Black Lives Matter movement, a coalition of reformers in Los Angeles is harnessing the power of the vote through a ballot measure designed to "stop Sheriff violence and abuse in jails".²³ As is often the case, dedicated humanitarians, their legacies, intentions and influences are destined to converge at some point. Had the world not shuddered with horror in the wake of the senseless killing of a Black man in Minneapolis last spring, it may have remained widely unnoticed that Ms. Cullors received the Ralph Bunche Humanitarian of the Year Award. A Los Angeles native on the frontlines of criminal justice reform for more than twenty years, she was recognized for her service to the African American community. Weeks later, the movement that she helped found gained a new level of prominence. It urged the world to accelerate common efforts in search of a cure for "the dangerous virus of racism", which continues to strip human beings of their inherent empathy and compassion, and intoxicate the afflicted with the savage pleasure of brutal aggression.

Racism causes significant physical and psychological health problems including death

Firestone 20 (Dr. Lisa, Director of Research and Education for the Glendon Association, "The Trauma of Racism." *Psychology Today*, 6/4/20, <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/compassion-matters/202006/the-trauma-racism>, Accessed 7/17/20, GDI – AW)

In the United States, many black people are born into a life of trauma. It is a trauma informed by a long history of brutal inhumanity, repression, violence, and injustice that continues to firmly grip black men and women each and every day.

This trauma is not something any of us who have not had the experience of being black in America can speak to in the same way as someone who has. Yet, acknowledging this trauma and casting it in a broad, unflickering light is all of our responsibility.

Countless studies have shown the adverse physical and psychological effects of racism. "Racism is considered a fundamental cause of adverse health outcomes for racial/ethnic minorities and racial/ethnic inequities in health" (Williams, Lawrence, & Davis, 2019). The experience of individual, institutional, and cultural racism has been found to be uniquely predictive of post-traumatic stress symptoms (Facemire, 2018).

Racial trauma can involve a "negative, sudden, and uncontrollable experience or crisis." Alternately, it can involve an "ongoing physical or psychological threat that produces feelings of fear, anxiety, depression, helplessness, and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)" (Ponds, 2013).

When you witness the kind of grotesque violence against a man like George Floyd, knowing that this could happen to you or someone close to you simply based on your skin color, how can you not feel threatened, afraid, anxious, depressed, helpless?

Yet, as we all know, for many African Americans this trauma didn't start with George Floyd. Trauma, in general, can be defined as any significant negative event or incident that shaped us and can emerge from any impactful instance that made us feel bad, scared, hurt, or ashamed. "Acts of aggression are not only examples of interpersonal trauma but also the trauma of racism, which is examined through the lens of intergenerational trauma, racist incident-based trauma, and complex trauma" (Bryant-Davis, Adams, Alejandre, & Gray, 2017).

A black child does not even have to directly experience racism to be influenced. A 2017 systematic review of 30 studies looked at how children's health might be affected by indirectly experienced racism. Researchers concluded that "socioemotional and mental health outcomes were most commonly reported with statistically significant associations with vicarious racism" (Heard-Garris, Cale, Camaj, Hamati, & Dominguez, 2018).

Families living in racially and economically segregated communities must also cope with the effects of historical trauma and intergenerational racism. Additionally, they face specific barriers to obtaining needed services. ("Complex Trauma," 2010)

Another study that looked at how exposure to racism and other Adverse Childhood Experiences affected perinatal women with moderate to severe mental illness, found that "black women were significantly more likely to report conventional and expanded ACEs including experiencing racism and witnessing violence." The study concluded that "childhood exposure to racism and environmental trauma are important risk categories for perinatal mental illness" (Kim, Kuendig, Prasad, & Sexter, 2020).

Research on the impact of ACEs has left no doubt that early trauma, especially unresolved trauma, impacts the development of emotional regulation skills and distress tolerance. It can lead to "disrupted neurodevelopment and social, emotional and cognitive impairment" (Aaltonen, 2019). ACEs have further been linked with all the leading causes of death, including illnesses such as heart disease, stroke, obesity, diabetes, and cancer, in addition to mental health concerns like depression, anxiety, substance abuse, and suicide.

The physical and emotional wounds of racial trauma can be reopened throughout one's lifetime. It's a trauma reawakened when a person is afraid to walk down the street or is pulled over by the police. It is a trauma reignited by disturbing videos of violence and tragedies like the murder of George Floyd. These events can be triggering on a level that is both deeply personal and broadly shared.

Solves policy

New civil rights movement is fighting oppression at all levels

Daniels 20 [Eugene, reporter, Politico, "The new social justice movement feels different. That's because it is" July 17, <https://www.politico.com/news/2020/07/17/black-lives-matter-social-racial-justice-368436>

In the months after the killing of George Floyd at the hands of a police officer, the movement for racial justice in this country has taken up most of the nation's headspace. But for those that see this movement as a continuation or offshoot of the Civil Rights Movement of the 60s, it can get confusing.

The new iteration of that movement for racial justice does not look or feel the same. And that's by design. There's no one or two true leaders of the movement, they are less willing to work within the system, they are looking at more than just policy change and they are looking past politicians as they push for change.

Organizers see this as fighting against a system that is ingrained in every aspect of this country: it's past policy changes or meetings with elected officials. "The forces that hold people back are deeply interrelated," Rashad Robinson, the president of Color of Change said. "That a racist criminal justice system requires a racist media culture to keep it alive. That economic inequality goes hand in hand with political inequality. These things all sort of work together."

Social movements are essential to ensure to the effective implementation of legal reforms

Amenta and Polletta 19 [Edwin and Francesca, prof. dept. of sociology University of California Irvine, Annual Review of Sociology "The Cultural Impacts of Social Movements" 9:18, April 16]

Outside of public opinion as measured by surveys, movements influence the beliefs, identities, and behaviors that shape people's everyday lives. However, ascertaining movements' roles, separate from other contemporaneous developments, is often difficult. For example, the movements of the 1960s undoubtedly affected norms around sex and intimacy (Yankelovich 1974), but those movements were also coterminous with the growing use of the birth control pill and the spread of postmaterialist values (Inglehart et al. 2003) that possibly spurred both activism and new sexual norms. It is easier to see changes in everyday behavior in the wake of movement-influenced legal rulings or legislation. For example, contrary to the concern that the 2015 Supreme Court decision legalizing same sex marriage would lead lesbians and gay men to embrace a narrow heterosexual understanding of romantic relationships, the ruling at once encouraged people to explore legal recognition for other forms of nonmarital relationships (Bernstein 2018) and was perceived by lesbians and gay men as insufficient legal protection for their families (Baumle & Compton 2017).

We may also be able to identify the conditions for the impact of a particular movement's strategies: for example, the LGBT movement's encouragement of people to stop concealing their sexual identity and instead come out as gay. Supporting Allport and associates' (1954) group contact hypothesis, research has shown that heterosexuals who know someone who is homosexual are more likely to support LGBT rights (Fetner 2016). But research also suggests that the effects of intergroup contact are mediated by intensified public dialogue about homosexuality (Powell et al. 2010) and by the partisan cueing we

discuss above (Dyck & Pearson-Merkowitz 2014). The creation of movement identities may be another mechanism of influence on everyday behavior. Simply alerting subjects to the environmental impact of their past behavior led them to engage in subsequent positive environmental behaviors (Cornelissen et al. 2008), which may have been due to their new self-perception as environmentalist [and see Brown et al. (2004) on the power of the politicized collective illness identity, Taylor (1996) on the postpartum depression movement and gender identity, and Ghaziani et al. (2016) on LGBT identities].

Movements are essential to ensure policies are effectively implemented

Amenta and Polletta 19 [Edwin and Francesca, prof. dept. of sociology University of California Irvine, Annual Review of Sociology "The Cultural Impacts of Social Movements" 9:18, April 16]

In addition, once a policy commitment has been adopted, activists—acting more as experts than as challengers—may help to define vague concepts like equality or access. For example, Zippel (2006) argues that the legal regulatory path of anti–sexual harassment measures in the United States allowed laws to be shaped by the experiences of victims and feminist legal experts in a way that was not true in Germany, which pursued a corporatist-statutory path. The result was that sexual harassment policy in the United States is in some ways more feminist than that in Germany. Feminists in governments in Europe, Australia, Peru, and South Korea were effective only insofar as they were able to persuade policymakers to act on an understanding of women as both equal to men and more than mothers (Coe 2012, Eisenstein 1996, Jenson 2009, Suh 2011).

Movement groups may also play roles in defining the groups to whom policies apply. Research suggests, however, that movements may be more influential in defining the first group included than in defining those that are subsequently added. This was true of affirmative action, which was originally developed in response to the northern urban riots and targeted African Americans. Native Americans and Hispanics were added to the policy without any petitioning on their part, women were added only after two years' worth of advocacy, and white ethnics were never added despite advocacy on their behalf. Groups' inclusion depended less on their own actions than on how similar to African Americans they were perceived as being by federal bureaucrats (Skrentny 2006). When legislation against hate crimes was being crafted, movement groups initially and successfully pressed for the inclusion of religion, race, and color, while efforts by members of Congress to include union members and the elderly were rejected; later, the disabled were added without

any direct demands by disability activists (Jenness & Grattet 2001). Women activists, inside and outside government, pressed for the inclusion of women in biomedical research studies, and they invited members of the Black Congressional Caucus to join them in proposing legislation, leading to the addition of racial minorities. Other ethnic groups were later included by administrative fiat as agencies adopted the census categories for reporting (Epstein 2007).

Activists may also target and alter the very logics that are used to include or exclude groups from policy. Advocates for research on diseases like breast cancer and autism not only secured federal funding but also changed the reigning view that the primary beneficiaries of funding were scientists and the public and that funding should go where scientists had the best chance of impact (Best 2012). In the new logic, diseases whose sufferers were more morally deserving were entitled to more funding.

The policy ideas behind a given program may determine the lines along which it will advance in the future as well as its vulnerability to retrenchment. Cognitively bounded path dependence may be as important as policies' bureaucratic backing and the provision of material incentives to recipients and related advocacy organizations (Adams et al. 2005, pp. 36–37). The ideas and justifications behind programs may aid in preventing their retrenchment, just as those administering and benefiting from a program will fight cutbacks. For example, the establishment of Social Security produced an adept bureaucracy and bolstered political interest organizations seeking to protect it (Béland 2005). But the program's symbolic legacy of security and insurance was also critical in preventing it from being associated with the "unworthy" poor at a time when other social programs were under attack as being welfare (Béland 2009).

Movements also help to create collective actors and political categories that must be accommodated afterward in routine political processes. Movements in the early twentieth century helped to create the consumer as a relevant political actor (Rao 1998). Mobilization around the Townsend Plan led to old age as a political issue and to the elderly becoming a new political category (Amenta 2006). LGBTQ movements created a diversified gay identity that could be unified to pursue interest group politics (Armstrong 2002). Other collective identities and entities identified by

movements—including Christians, taxpayers, and the environment, to name a few—have affected politics and policymaking in lasting ways (Baumgartner & Mahoney 2005, Martin 2013). In each case, the category was adopted by key political actors outside the movement and featured prominently in the media, in new policy, or both. Future research should identify the conditions in which movements' collective identities (Polletta & Jasper 2001) are adopted by national policymakers. Movements may also help to create new political forms, such as when workers, farmers, and women employed the forms of nonpolitical organizations to help create modern interest groups (Clemens 1997), or when European left parties adopted the participatory democratic forms favored by progressive movements (Bennett et al. 2018). In both cases, however, the new forms may not have benefited movement constituents in the long run.

Structural Violence

Piecemeal reforms legitimize structural violence and curb broader systemic change.

Crimethinc 15 (Crimethinc, 2015. WHY WE DON'T MAKE DEMANDS, <https://crimethinc.com/2015/05/05/feature-why-we-dont-make-demands>)

Forcing a diverse movement to reduce its agenda to a few specific demands inevitably consolidates power in the hands of a minority. For who decides which demands to prioritize? Usually, it is the same sort of people who hold disproportionate power elsewhere in our society: wealthy, predominantly white professionals well versed in the workings of institutional power and the corporate media.

The marginalized are marginalized again within their own movements, in the name of efficacy. Yet this rarely serves to make a movement more effective. A movement with space for difference can grow; a movement premised on unanimity contracts. A movement that includes a variety of agendas is flexible, unpredictable; it is difficult to buy it off, difficult to trick the participants into relinquishing their autonomy in return for a few concessions. A movement that prizes reductive uniformity is bound to alienate one demographic after another as it subordinates their needs and concerns. A movement that incorporates a variety of perspectives and critiques can develop more comprehensive and multifaceted strategies than a single-issue campaign. Forcing everyone to line up behind one set of demands is bad strategy: even when it works, it doesn't work. Limiting a movement to specific demands undermines its longevity. Nowadays, as history moves faster and faster, demands are often rendered obsolete before a campaign can even get off the ground. In response to the murder of Michael Brown, reformists demanded that police wear body cameras—but before this campaign could get fully underway, a grand jury announced that the officer who murdered Eric Garner would not be tried, either, even though Garner's murder had been caught on camera. Movements premised on specific demands will collapse as soon as those demands are outpaced by events, while the problems that they set out to address persist. Even from a reformist perspective, it makes more sense to build movements around the issues they address, rather than any particular solution. **Limiting a movement to specific demands can give the false impression that there are easy solutions to problems that are actually extremely complex.**

“OK, you have a lot of complaints—who doesn't? But tell us, what solution do you propose?” **The demand for concrete particulars is understandable.**

There's no use in simply letting off steam; the point is to change the world. **But meaningful change will take a lot more than whatever minor adjustments the authorities might readily grant. When we speak as though there are simple solutions for the problems we face, hurrying to present ourselves as no less “practical” than government policy experts, we set the stage for failure** whether our demands are granted or not. This will give rise to disappointment and apathy long before we have developed the collective capacity to get to the root of things. Especially for those of us who believe that **the fundamental problem is the unequal distribution of power and agency in our society, rather than the need for this or that policy adjustment,** it is a mistake to promise easy remedies in a vain attempt to legitimize ourselves. It's not our job to present ready-made solutions that the masses can applaud from the sidelines; leave that to demagogues.

Our challenge, rather, is to create spaces where people can discuss and implement solutions directly, on an ongoing and collective basis. Rather than proposing quick fixes, we should be spreading new practices. We don't need blueprints, but points of departure.

NO CORPORATE INITIATIVE IS GOING TO HALT CLIMATE CHANGE; NO GOVERNMENT AGENCY IS GOING TO STOP SPYING ON THE POPULACE; NO POLICE FORCE IS GOING TO ABOLISH WHITE PRIVILEGE.

Making demands presumes that you want things that your adversary can grant. On the contrary, it's doubtful whether the prevailing institutions could grant most of the things we want even if our rulers had hearts of gold.

No corporate initiative is going to halt climate change; no government agency is going to stop spying on the populace; no police force is going to abolish white privilege. Only NGO organizers still cling to the illusion that these things are possible—probably because their jobs depend on it. A strong enough movement could strike blows against industrial pollution, state surveillance, and institutionalized white supremacy, but only if it didn't limit itself to mere petitioning. **Demand-based politics limits the entire scope of change to reforms that can be made within the logic of the existing order, sidelining us and deferring real change forever beyond the horizon.**

There's no use in asking the authorities for things they can't grant and wouldn't grant if they could. **Nor should we give them an excuse to acquire even more power than they already have, on the pretext that they need it to be able to fulfill our demands. Making demands of the authorities legitimizes their power, centralizing agency in their hands.**

It is a time-honored tradition for nonprofit organizations and leftist coalitions to present demands that they know will never be granted: don't invade Iraq, stop defunding education, bail out people not banks, make the police stop killing black people. In return for brief audiences with bureaucrats who answer to much shrewder players, they water down their politics and try to get their less complaisant colleagues to behave themselves. This is what they call pragmatism. REFORMS THAT ACHIEVE SHORT-TERM GAINS OFTEN SET THE STAGE FOR LONG-TERM PROBLEMS. THE SAME COURT SYSTEM THAT RULED FOR DESEGREGATION IMPRISONS A MILLION BLACK PEOPLE TODAY; THE SAME NATIONAL GUARD THAT OVERSAW INTEGRATION IN THE SOUTH IS MOBILIZED TO REPRESS DEMONSTRATORS IN FERGUSON AND

BALTIMORE. **EVEN WHEN SUCH INSTITUTIONS CAN BE COMPELLED TO FULFILL SPECIFIC DEMANDS, THIS ONLY LEGITIMIZES TOOLS THAT ARE MORE OFTEN USED AGAINST US.** Such efforts may not achieve their express purpose, but they do accomplish something: **they frame a narrative in which the existing institutions are the only conceivable protagonists of change. This, in turn, paves the way for additional fruitless campaigns, additional electoral spectacles in which new candidates for office hoodwink young idealists,**

Despite antidiscrimination law, African-Americans continue to suffer from racial injustice in all aspects of life

Butler 16 [Paul, prof of law at Georgetown, "The system is working the way it is supposed to: The limits of criminal justice reform" Georgetown Law Journal August, 104 (6)]

African-Americans experience these deprivations despite constitutional and legislative prohibitions against race discrimination. Indeed, there is widespread evidence that African-Americans still experience discrimination.¹¹⁹ A 2012 study by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development found that while the most blatant forms of housing discrimination, such as refusing to meet with a minority home-seeker, have declined, other forms of discrimination still exist. ¹²⁰ African-Americans who want to rent an apartment are informed about 11.4% fewer units and shown 4.2% fewer units than white renters. ¹²¹ Blacks who try to purchase homes are told about 17% fewer homes and shown 17.7% fewer homes than their white counterparts. ¹²² African-Americans also encounter discrimination on the travel website Airbnb. The Twitter hashtag "#AirbnbWhileBlack" chronicles incidents where black travelers were initially denied a rental because of their profile picture or their "African American sounding name," but were subsequently granted a rental after changing their picture or name. ¹²³ A study conducted by Harvard Business School provided statistical backing to this phenomenon. ¹²⁴ Inquiries by guests with white-sounding names were approved by the renter roughly 50% of the time. ¹²⁵ However, inquiries by guests with black-sounding names were approved by the renter roughly 42% of the time. ¹²⁶ There was a 16% negative disparity in the acceptance rate for guests with black-sounding names. ¹²⁷ Black applicants for employment are less likely to get callbacks than white applicants. A 2003 study found that applicants with white-sounding names needed to submit ten resumes to receive one callback and applicants with black-sounding names needed to submit fifteen resumes to receive one callback. ¹²⁸ A study released in 2014 that used additional metrics to separate data by the prestige of the applicant's degree found similar results. ¹²⁹ White applicants from elite universities received responses 17.5% of the time and similarly situated black applicants received responses 12.9% of the time. ¹³⁰ White applicants from less selective universities received responses 11.4% of the time and similarly situated black applicants received responses 6.5% of the time. The disparity continued for salaries, with black applicants receiving offers of approximately \$3,000 less than white applicants. ¹³¹

A study by the University of Chicago Booth School of Business found that loan requests from a profile with a black person in the profile picture were 25 to 35% less likely to receive a loan than a profile with a white person in the profile picture, even with similar credit profiles. ¹³² African-Americans even encounter bias in a transaction as mundane as selling a used iPod. A 2013 study found that black sellers received fewer and lower offers for iPods when utilizing local, online classified advertisements. ¹³³ Black sellers, compared to white sellers, received 13% fewer responses, 18% fewer offers, and offers that were \$5.72 (11%) lower.¹³⁴ In conducting the experiment, the photograph used in the advertisement was one of an iPod being held by either a black hand or a white hand. ¹³⁵

Because there has not been more progress, there is a surprisingly robust debate about exactly what good the Civil Rights Movement did African Americans. 136 Why has the law, especially civil rights and antidiscrimination law, not worked better to remedy these problems? How much should we expect the law to remedy racial injustice? To answer these questions, and to explain why there has not been more progress in racial justice, critical race theorists have asserted certain claims about law and race. Other schools like feminist jurisprudence, critical legal theory, and queer theory have made analogous claims. The purpose of this section is to set out these claims rather than to prove them. 137 Examining these claims' truth is one of the objectives of critical race theory. This Article's contribution to that project is to see how they might inform the project of police reform.

Community Policing will increase arrests and violence against Black people under the guise of “partnerships”

McHarris 12/02/2019 (“COMMUNITY POLICING IS NOT THE ANSWER.” Philip V. Mcharris is a writer, activist, and PhD candidate in Sociology and African American Studies at Yale University.) <https://theappeal.org/community-policing-is-not-the-answer/>

As a Ph.D. candidate at Yale, my dissertation examines safety, poverty, and policing in a high-rise housing project in Brooklyn. I find that residents have to deal with police harassment, deployments into the building, and the stress and anxiety that come with constant police presence. **Heightened presence and contact are often disguised under the umbrella of community-oriented policing efforts,** such as the addition of officers often called beat cops to continuously patrol the building and area throughout the day and night. The NYPD argues that community, or neighborhood, policing will increase trust and cohesion between police and communities. On its website, the department states: “Neighborhood Policing greatly increases connectivity and engagement with the community without diminishing, and, in fact, improving the NYPD’s crime-fighting capabilities. The NYPD has long encouraged officers to strengthen bonds with the communities they patrol.” But the disconnect is palpable, and police appear more as an occupying force, surveilling the residence as opposed to protecting it. Structural racism and poverty also force people to employ strategies that are often criminalized in order to navigate incredibly difficult and complex situations, such as with fare evasion. Thus, as long as poverty and racial inequality exist, policing will always expose Black people, and other marginalized communities, to higher rates of surveillance, arrest, and violence. Community policing creates the false idea that police can solve structural issues through building partnerships, but policing has only made those issues worse.

War

Social movements can prevent war

Social Problems 12 ["Preventing War and Stopping Terrorism" August 9. <https://open.lib.umn.edu/socialproblems/chapter/16-4-preventing-war-and-stopping-terrorism/>]

Beyond these two essential strategies, the roots of war must also be addressed. As discussed earlier, war is a social, not biological, phenomenon and arises from decisions by political and military leaders to go to war. There is ample evidence that deceit accompanies many of these decisions, as leaders go to many wars for less than noble purposes. To the extent this is true, citizens must always be ready to question any rationales given for war, and a free press in a democracy must exercise eternal vigilance in reporting on these rationales. According to critics, the press and the public were far too acquiescent in the decision to go to war in Iraq in 2003, just as they had been acquiescent a generation earlier when the Vietnam War began being waged (Solomon, 2006). To prevent war, then, the press and the public must always be ready to question assumptions about the necessity of war. The same readiness should occur in regard to militarism and the size of the military budget.

In this regard, history shows that social movements can help prevent or end armament and war and limit the unchecked use of military power once war has begun (Breyman, 2001; Staggenborg, 2010). While activism is no guarantee of success, responsible nonviolent protest against war and militarism provides an important vehicle for preventing war or for more quickly ending a war once it has begun.

Escalating hybrid wars mean small conventional wars escalate to nuclear war

Trenin 18 (Dmitri Trenin, chairs the research council and the Foreign and Security Policy Program; "AVOIDING U.S.-RUSSIA MILITARY ESCALATION DURING THE HYBRID WAR"; Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; January 2018; https://carnegieendowment.org/files/Trenin_Hybrid_War_web.pdf kp)

Although Gerasimov was referring to a hybrid war when discussing new means and methods of warfare, this analysis uses the newly fashionable term to describe the current U.S.- Russia confrontation. Unlike its Cold War predecessor, this conflict is asymmetrical. At least since the 1970s, the Soviet Union was the United States' equal in terms of both nuclear and conventional military power. Even beyond its own vast land mass and immediate sphere of influence in Eastern Europe, it wielded considerable ideological power in many Western countries and in the Third World and presided over a system of alliances in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East. The Russian Federation, by contrast, has few formal allies, no satellite states, and a handful of protectorates, if one includes the self-proclaimed states of Abkhazia, Donbas, South Ossetia, and Transnistria. It has no ideology to compare with the comprehensive dogma of Marxism-Leninism, and although it is still a nuclear superpower, it lags far behind the United States in non-nuclear military capabilities. Economically, Russia—with its estimated 1.5 percent of the global gross domestic product—is a dwarf. Neither the balance nor the correlation of forces, however, will determine the outcome of this confrontation. Despite the glaring asymmetries in the national power of the two sides of the conflict, the course of events is not predetermined. As a nonlinear, highly asymmetrical conflict, the outcome likely will result from domestic developments in Russia or the United States or both. Both countries are facing serious problems that could prove decisive in the final calculations of the Hybrid War. The United States is going through a triple crisis of its political system, exemplified but not caused by the arrival of President Donald Trump and the virulent domestic

opposition to him and his policies. A crisis of social values lies beneath this political crisis and points to a widening gap between the more liberal and the largely conservative parts of the country. At the same time, the United States faces a crisis within its own foreign policy as it struggles to reconcile the conflict between the more inward-looking U.S. national interest and the international liberal order of the U.S.-led global system. Russia, though outwardly stable, is approaching its own major crisis as the political regime created by Putin faces an uncertain future after the eventual departure of its figurehead. Putin's Kremlin is already working on a political transition that would rejuvenate the elite and improve its competence and performance, but, at the same time, Russian society is also changing and Putin's heirs cannot take its support for granted. Gross inequality, sluggish economic growth, low vertical mobility, and high-level corruption will present a range of serious challenges to the future Russian leadership. The eventual outcome of the Hybrid War could be reminiscent of the downfall of the Soviet Union, which was far less the result of the U.S.-Soviet Cold War than of a misguided effort to reform the Soviet Union itself. Russia might break down and break up again, or it might decide on a foreign policy more geared toward its economic needs than to a certain concept of world order. As for the United States, it might decide to limit its global commitments and redesign its international role as the world's preeminent but no longer dominant state. Yet, in doing so, it will need to accept that its change in status will come with a certain price and that it will not be able to take advantage of the benefits of the position it once enjoyed. Asymmetries in power lead to asymmetric actions, which as Gerasimov suggested are intended to "neutralize the enemy's superiority in warfare" or "identify and exploit the enemy's vulnerabilities."⁷ By an order of magnitude—or more—Russia is outgunned, outmanned, and outspent by the combined forces of the United States and its allies. To stay in the fight, it must rely on its few comparative advantages and seek to use them to maximum effect. These advantages include the geographical proximity of some of the main theaters of operation, such as Crimea and eastern Ukraine, where Russia has escalation dominance; the Russian political system, which allows for secretive, swift, and decisive action; and Moscow's willingness to take much higher risks in view of the disproportionately higher stakes involved for the Russian leadership, and a national culture that historically has tolerated higher losses in defense or protection of the Motherland. Through swift decisions and actions, made without prior warning, Russia is capable of surprising its adversaries and keeping them off-balance. This situation promises an uncertain, hard-to-predict, and risky environment, where miscalculation can lead to incidents or collisions that, in turn, lead to escalation. Granted, these incidents would be of a different kind than the tank standoff at Berlin's Checkpoint Charlie in late October 1961 or the Cuban Missile Crisis barely a year later. Escalation resulting from miscalculation would not be automatic, but the wider damage it could cause needs to be taken seriously.

Responses to Aff's arguments

Now is key

Now is the critical time for the civil rights movement to address structural racism in the U.S.

Ralph 20 [Laurance, Foreign Affairs, "to protect and serve: Global lessons in police reform" July 30 <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-07-30/police-reform-global-lessons>

Public outcry over the murders of Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, and George Floyd earlier this year has ignited mass demonstrations against structural racism and police violence in the United States. The protests have reached every American state and spread to countries around the world; they arguably constitute the most broad-based civil rights movement in American history. Protests against the brutalization of communities of color by the U.S. criminal justice system have been growing for years, but the explosive scale of the uprising this spring and summer makes it clear that the United States has reached a national reckoning.

Most Americans now understand that their country needs a radical transformation: polls conducted in early June found that a majority of U.S. citizens support sweeping national law enforcement reforms. But as Americans embark on an urgent public conversation about policing, bias, and the use of force, they should remember that theirs is not the first or the only country to grapple with these policy questions. Many reform advocates and researchers have already begun to look overseas, pointing to countries where police training looks vastly different than it does in the United States: countries where police departments take far different approaches to the use of force or have even disarmed entirely, where criminal justice systems have adopted alternative sentencing programs, and where authorities have experimented with innovative approaches to de-escalation.

Some of these ideas could be adapted for use in the United States. For too long, a culture of American exceptionalism has been a barrier to the implementation of policies that have improved public safety around the globe. Now, the United States' capacity to heal as a nation could very well depend on its willingness to listen and learn from the rest of the world.

Answer to Movement decreasing

Despite a lack of media attention protests remain throughout the country

Cineas 20 [Fabiola, Vox.com, "Protests for Black lives are still happening" July 16 <https://www.vox.com/2020/7/16/21325275/black-lives-matter-protests-are-still-happening>

In the weeks following the police killing of George Floyd, millions of Americans marched in the streets. Many had never attended a protest before, and some lived in historically conservative towns. At the peak of the protests — around June 6, according to publicly collected data from the Crowd Counting Consortium — people across all 50 states and dozens of cities around the world had participated in demonstrations that called for racial justice and an end to police violence.

But with the protests came a nonstop news cycle that seemed to fixate on burning cars and buildings, and clashes between police officers and protesters. As long as there were riots and looting, television news helicopters descended upon their respective cities, with organizers lamenting online that the media wasn't interested in stories beyond those of broken windows, pepper spray, and vandalized storefronts.

And now, almost two months after the first protests erupted, national news cameras have fled, which makes it hard for the general public to recognize that protests are still going strong in cities and towns across America.

In Louisville, hundreds of protesters continue in their mission to bring to justice the police officers involved in Breonna Taylor's death. Protesters have engaged in a number of large-scale public actions, from converging on the steps of the state's capitol building to disrupting a mayoral press conference and hosting "blackout" marches.

On Tuesday, which marked day 48 of protests in the city, activists traveled to the home of Kentucky Attorney General Daniel Cameron, where they sat on his lawn and demanded he bring criminal charges against the officers. More than 100 people were reportedly detained at the demonstration for trespassing, according to organizer Tamika D. Mallory, co-founder of the social justice organization Until Freedom. Even Wanda Cooper-Jones, the mother of Ahmaud Arbery, traveled to Louisville to advocate on Taylor's behalf. (She also spoke to local reporter Senait Gebregiorgis while she was there.)

The momentum is similar in other cities across the country, such as Minneapolis and New York, where multiple demonstrations happen every day. However, mainstream news stories about the protests seem to only emerge now in the event of isolated violence (including multiple instances of suspected or avowed white nationalists running their vehicles into protesters) or protester clashes (like the recent spat between "Blue Lives Matter" protesters and counter protesters in Bay Ridge, Brooklyn).

Local activists say the waning media attention is expected, but the work must continue. “We are in the biggest social movement this country has ever seen,” said activist Oluchi Omeoga, co-founder of the Black liberation nonprofit Black Visions Collective based in Minnesota. “When we say this is what will be written in the history books, it’s not an exaggeration. The folks calling for change in this moment are the folks who are going to be on the right side of history.”

protests are durable

ALEX S. **VITALE ‘20** and Micah Uetracht interviewing 06.08.2020, professor of sociology and coordinator of the Policing and Social Justice Project at Brooklyn College INTERVIEW BY Micah Uetracht, “Policing Is Fundamentally a Tool of Social Control to Facilitate Our Exploitation” <https://jacobinmag.com/2020/06/alex-vitale-police-reform-defund-protests>

MU

I’ve been going through this ritual every night since these protests started. I start scrolling through Twitter at 10 or 11 PM, and everything I see is the most horrifying police violence imaginable. Each city has some new level of barbarism from the police that I find hard to believe that human beings are engaged in.

This is depressing, obviously. But last week, I went to a protest that started in downtown Chicago. To get there, I biked by army humvees that were deployed by Illinois’s Democratic governor, J.B. Pritzker. Actual soldiers in fatigues were in the streets. And all of these average people with cardboard signs were walking past these soldiers, obviously knowing the soldiers could, at the drop of a hat, mow them all down and end their lives.

These people had surely seen those videos I watch every night, too, and probably experienced that brutal crackdown themselves. And yet they were still coming out in the streets to make these demands.

That was such a hopeful experience for me, because it seemed to indicate that no matter the level of police militarization, no matter the fact that there were actual soldiers in fatigues in the streets, people were still showing up, refusing to be cowed. It’s an incredible testament to the resiliency of people at these protests, and a reminder that no matter how big the guns are that these cops are outfitted with, no matter what kind of insane weapons they have, the police have been unable to stop the snowballing of a mass movement.

AV

You left out the risks with COVID–19 that you’d think would keep people at home. Yet people are ready to fight. People are not going to put up with this, and if Trump tries to further militarize the situation, I think that will just make the protests dramatically larger.

Answer to Aff solves impact

We have faced 4 decades of failed government action to curb racial oppression. Only movements can solve

Orfield 18 [Gary, prof of education, law and political science at UCLA, Learning Policy Institute, "Time for a new Civil Rights Movement" May 24 <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/blog/time-new-civil-rights-movement>]

Over the past four decades, we have seen steady conservative pressure to dismantle civil rights in spite of evidence that those policies open doors to opportunity and help build bridges across racial difference. Opponents argue that race-conscious plans are unnecessary or illegal because systemic racial unfairness no longer exists and that the appropriate policy for fighting segregation is to put pressure on institutions and individuals of color to change. Since 1991, the federal courts have dismantled systemic integration policies. Nine states have prohibited affirmative action. Compensatory social and educational policies have also been cut. As inequality deepens because of these policies, the idea that we are a colorblind society in the time of Trump and Black Lives Matter is absurd.

Because there has not been a presidential commission, a major new Supreme Court decision, or a major law expanding racial integration in generations, there has been almost no coherent response to the radical transformation of the nation's population. We have failed to address the educational needs of the changed society and great financial need among the nation's young.

Now we have two very large and seriously excluded groups, most living in families too poor to pay for school lunches, in a society with a massive increase in economic inequality. Now we live with a level of incarceration among minorities that is hugely disproportionate and destructive. The ambitious housing, education, urban policy, and antipoverty efforts of the 1960s have been long since abandoned. We are now dealing with head-on attacks on what remains of civil rights policy under a president who rose to power on racial demagoguery.

We are now, in key ways, in the worst situation for racial justice in more than a half-century. Almost all the school integration progress of the past half-century has been lost, and the gaps in college access have actually increased. Our president has reinforced racial fears and stereotypes, and we see many state legislatures undermining voting rights, school integration, and college affirmative action. The Trump administration is gutting civil rights agencies and suspending policies intended to protect equality, including those addressing housing and education. The administration has fostered hatred of immigrants and devastated Latino communities and schools with deportation raids.

The cohesion of our society is at risk. Much was accomplished by the civil rights revolution and we have good evidence about policies that would advance equal opportunity. Much more explicit and sustained efforts are needed. Serious work in the 1960s created a powerful agenda for that time. We need a new agenda now for a much more complex society, more segregated and unequal in some critical ways, and a

new vision of integration in a century where we will all soon be minorities and have to depend on each other.

Answer to Courts

Social movements solve better than courts

Cummings 18 [Scott, Law & Society Inquiry, "The Social Movement turn in law" <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9mz9t9dg>

Over the past decade, a new and powerful answer has emerged: social movements. In constitutional law, social movements have been presented as a response to the countermajoritarian problem: because movements are the critical actors that create new norms, reshape politics, and shift public opinion,⁴ the role of courts (and especially the Supreme Court) is viewed as confirming an already developed social consensus rather than shaping a new one. Courts, in this model, lag behind social movements, rather than lead them—and in so doing, ultimately validate the new majority that social movements forge. Similarly, within the lawyering scholarship, social movements have been presented as a response to the professionalism problem: because movements drive the social change agenda, with movement organizations headed by nonlawyers in charge of defining strategy and tactics, lawyers can advance progressive change by representing movement organizational clients in a conventional lawyer-client relationship. Lawyers, in this model, also lag rather than lead—reinforcing their role as zealous client advocates while minimizing the risk of client domination. In neither account is law viewed as strongly instrumental—a means to an end (Tamanaha 2006)—but rather as decidedly constrained.

As this suggests, a critical feature of this new social movement literature in law is that it draws heavily on longstanding social science and sociolegal empirical research traditions on the role of lawyers, courts, and social movements in producing (and sometimes undermining) democratic change. In this sense, the social movement turn reflects an important conjuncture of law and social science “translation” (Mertz 2016, see also Erlanger et al. 2005) in which legal scholars are mining qualitative and quantitative empirical research in order to make claims

about how legal change may best contribute to enduring social reform. The new social movement literature in law thus reflects the broader process of interdisciplinary engagement associated with the rise of New Legal Realism—a revival and extension of the law-and-society movement that seeks to advance “theory-driven empirical research about law-in-action” (McCann 2016). And, as this article will discuss, it raises the particular challenges of interdisciplinary translation as legal scholars borrow empirical insights about court decision making and social movement mobilization to make normative points about the appropriate role that legal and nonlegal actors should play in broader social change processes. Significantly, the social movement turn in legal scholarship reflects and reproduces essential normative fault lines within progressive legal thought about whether, and to what degree, lawyers and courts should play prominent roles in social reform. Thus, one of the critical insights of this project is to highlight how, as legal scholars turn to social movements, they are using findings and concepts from social science and sociolegal studies not simply to add empirical depth to legal scholarship, but to take sides in a long-standing theoretical debate.

Sequencing

Sequencing matters – top-down single issue reforms inevitably fail unless proceeded by broad based reexaminations of the carceral state spurred by grassroots movements.

Platt 19 (Tony Platt is a Distinguished Affiliated Scholar at the Center for the Study of Law & Society, University of California, Berkeley., 3-31-2019, "The Perils of Criminal Justice Reform," No Publication, <http://historynewsnetwork.org/article/171611>, accessed 7-4-2020//mrul)

Historically, the overwhelming majority of reforms are top-down, state-engineering initiatives that are never intended or designed to expand the rights or improve the well being of their recipients. One of the earliest examples was the Progressive Era's child-saving movement that formally did away with due process for juvenile delinquents. It recruited social workers, public health personnel, police, and urban reformers to send thousands of European immigrant youth to punitive reformatories, and Native American youth to boarding schools where they were punished for "speaking Indian." In the 1940s, the Preston School of Industry in California was "organized like the military," a former prisoner recalled. "We marched everywhere, and were always on 'Silence'."

The child-saving movement was a model for many other government reforms that, in the words of historian Lisa McGirr, came loaded with "strong doses of coercive moral absolutes," such as forcing the children of Jehovah's Witnesses to salute the flag during World War I in the name of spreading patriotism, and then criminalizing their parents when they refused. In the 1920s, the federal Prohibition Bureau, with five times more staff than the FBI, saved the drinking poor from the scourge of alcohol by arresting them, while the wealthy drank in private clubs or bribed their way out of arrest. Between the world wars, government agencies compelled the sterilization of some 60,000 working class women in the name of purifying motherhood. Similarly, in the 1950s, "protecting the family" supposedly justified purging gay men from government jobs and subjecting them to the kind of systematic harassment by police that young African American men routinely experience.

We see the same kind of coercive benevolence at work today when local governments and professional functionaries invoke civility codes to tear down homeless encampments and in cities such as Irvine, California, run beggars out of town in order to "keep our streets safe."

The second type of reform has a democratic impetus and is intended to expand the rights of the disenfranchised and improve people's everyday lives. Pursuing this kind of grassroots initiative requires the stamina of a marathon runner, for there is a long history of trying to substantially reform criminal injustice operations that typically does not end well.

Take, for example, the 1963 U. S. Supreme Court decision in Gideon v. Wainright that required states to provide attorneys to defendants in criminal cases if they cannot afford counsel; and the bail reform movement that achieved passage of the Federal Bail Reform Act of 1966 that granted release on own recognizances (OR) to federal defendants in noncapital cases.

The Gideon case represented a victory for activists who had struggled for decades to bring some balance to an adversary system of criminal justice that is heavily weighted in favor of the prosecution.

"Thousands of innocent victims," wrote W. E. B. Du Bois in 1951, "are in jail today because they had neither money, experience nor friends to help them." The provision of government-funded defense lawyers was supposed to rectify this wrong.

However, the underfunding and understaffing of public defenders, and pressures from criminal court bureaucracies to process cases expediently resulted not in more trials and more pleas of innocence, but in a decline of trials and increase in guilty pleas. How can clients get a “reasonably effective defense” in Louisiana, for example, if a single public defender is expected to carry a caseload of 194 felony cases? “No majesty here, no wood paneling, no carpeting or cushioned seats,” writes James Forman, Jr. about his experience as a public defender in Washington, D. C. It wasn’t unusual for him to want to cry in frustration at the railroading of his clients. “Sometimes the only thing that stopped the tears,” he says, “was another case or client who needed me right then.”

The Federal Reform Bail Act met a similar fate. Much of the legislation’s provisions were destroyed by the Nixon and Reagan governments as new legislation eliminated OR for dangerous defendants, a proviso that ultimately included people arrested on drug-related and non-violent behavior, meaning just about everybody. Today, more than sixty percent of people confined in the misery of local jails are there because they are unable to make bail and do dead time, a travesty of “presumed innocent.”

Too often **when progressive reforms are passed, they stand alone as single issues** and are generally ineffective because **they lack sustained and wide support**, or they are whittled away to the point of ineffectiveness. A similar process is at work with the recent First Step Act, Congress’ tame effort at federal prison reform. This legislation originated in the efforts of reformers during the Obama presidency to dramatically reduce mass incarceration nationwide. By the time of the Trump presidency, the libertarian Right dominated the politics of reform and put their stamp on the Act: no relief for people doing time for immigration or abortion or violence-related crimes; the privileging of religious over secular programs; and a boost for the electronic shackling industry.

Too often, substantial reform proposals end up politically compromised and require us to make a Sophie’s choice: release some “non-violent offenders” and abandon the rest, including tens of thousands of men who used a gun during a robbery when they were in their 20s. Or give public welfare relief only to carefully screened “worthy recipients,” while subjecting millions of women and children to malign neglect. Or, potentially, provide the immigrant Dreamers with a path to citizenship while making their parents and relatives fair game for ICE.

It’s not for lack of trying that substantial reforms are so difficult to achieve. There are structural, multifaceted reasons that undermine our effectiveness. “America is famously ahistorical,” a sardonic Barack Obama observed in 2015. “That’s one of our strengths – we forget things.” In the case of efforts to reform prisons and police, we remember the experiences of Malcolm X, George Jackson, Attica, and the Black Panther Party, but then amnesia sets in.

We need to reconnect with the writers, poets, artists, activists, and visionaries who generations earlier took on the carceral state and forged deep connections between the free and un-free. Let’s remember Austin Reed, a young African-American incarcerated in ante-bellum New York, who told us what it was like to “pass through the iron gates of sorrow.” And the Socialist and labor leader Gene Debs, imprisoned many times for his activism, who made sure his comrades in the 1920s knew that his fellow nonpolitical prisoners were “not the irretrievably vicious and depraved element they are commonly believed to be, but upon average they are like ourselves.” And the young Native American women and men, forcibly removed to boarding schools, who reminded us of their resistance, as in the words of a Navaho boy: “Maybe you think I believe you/ But always my thoughts stay with me/ My own way.”

Revisiting this long historical tradition is important, not out of nostalgia for what might have been or to search for a lost blueprint of radical change, but rather to learn from past reform efforts and help us to

understand the immense challenges we face – to “bring this thing out into the light,” as the civil rights leader Fannie Lou Hamer used to say.

In addition to a deep history, we also need a wide vision in order to see that state prisons and urban policing are components of a much larger and more complex private and public social control apparatus that plays a critical role in preserving and reproducing inequality, and in enforcing injustices. No wonder that structural reforms are so difficult to achieve and sustain when carceral institutions are sustained by private police, public housing and education, the political system, immigration enforcement, and a vast corporate security industry that stokes what Étienne Balibar calls the “insecurity syndrome.”

Struggles for equality in the United States have usually been uneven and precarious, with improvements in rights and quality of life for one group often coming at the expense of others – not consciously, but in effect. Our challenge is to rebuild a social and political movement that bridges the divide between a panoply of activists in the same way that post-World War II civil rights and black liberation organizations incorporated prisoners and victims of brutal policing into the Movement. Important single-issue campaigns – to eliminate cash bail, to restore voting rights to millions of former prisoners, and to make American prisons comply with global human rights standards – will have a better chance of success if backed by a multi-issue, grassroots campaign.

We should not give up on big ideas and structural reforms. We never know when a spark will light a fire and energize a movement. Let's remember that it was protests against a police killing in a place like Ferguson that led to the Black Lives Matter movement and compelled a meeting with the president; and it was a high school student protests for gun reform in Florida that prompted a former Supreme Court Justice to call for the abolition of the 2nd Amendment.

The Right has been extraordinarily effective in promoting a dystopia that anchors and propels its law and order policies. We need a comparably progressive vision. In this moment of resistance and defense, to articulate an ideal of social justice might seem like pie-in-the-sky and a waste of energy. But to get support for progressive policies will require widespread endorsement, and this will only happen if we speak to people's deeply held anxieties and aspirations. Without a movement and long-term vision that engages people, good policies wither.

It will take nothing short of a broad-based movement, a revitalized imagination, and reckoning with a historical legacy that bleeds into the present to make the criminalized human again and end the tragedy of the carceral state

Status quo protests must be allowed to flower into next-gen movements

Angela **Davis and Goodman '20**. JULY 03, 2020, legendary scholar and activity, Interview by Amy Goodman, “Angela Davis on Abolition, Calls to Defund Police, Toppled Racist Statues & Voting in 2020 Election,” DEMOCRACY NOW, https://www.democracynow.org/2020/7/3/angela_davis_on_abolition_calls_to

AMY GOODMAN: We turn now to look at the uprising against police brutality and racism, following the police killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis on May 25th. The protests have helped dramatically shift public opinion on policing and systemic racism, as “defund the police” becomes a rallying cry of the movement.

Well, for more on this historic moment, we turn to the legendary activist and scholar Angela Davis, professor emerita at the University of California, Santa Cruz. For half a century, Angela Davis has been one of the most influential activists and intellectuals in the United States and an icon of the Black liberation movement. I interviewed her in early June and asked her if she thought this moment is truly a turning point.

ANGELA DAVIS: This is an extraordinary moment. I have never experienced anything like the conditions we are currently experiencing, the conjuncture created by the COVID-19 pandemic and the recognition of the systemic racism that has been rendered visible under these conditions because of the disproportionate deaths in Black and Latinx communities. And this is a moment I don't know whether I ever expected to experience.

When the protests began, of course, around the murder of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor and Ahmaud Arbery and Tony McDade and many others who have lost their lives to racist state violence and vigilante violence — when these protests erupted, I remembered something that I've said many times to encourage activists, who often feel that the work that they do is not leading to tangible results. I often ask them to consider the very long trajectory of Black struggles. And what has been most important is the forging of legacies, the new arenas of struggle that can be handed down to younger generations. Movement action must come first. If courts act before movements it will undermine social change

Cummings 18 [Scott, Law & Society Inquiry, "The Social Movement turn in law" <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9mz9t9dg>

At bottom, this article therefore seeks to make an intervention about the pathway of intellectual arbitrage in law that serves as a window into broader processes of interdisciplinary scholarly production that illuminates potential risks and identifies opportunities for deeper exchange. Toward that end, its method is to review and synthesize the contemporary social movement literature in law to illuminate the particular role that social movements have come to play. Doing so reveals how movement liberalism—the idea that social movement activism from below can redeem progressive politics without compromising law—trades upon insights from sociolegal and social movement studies in order to respond to fundamental theoretical problems that have split progressive legal scholars since Brown. Specifically, by relinking theories of deferential judicial review with support for redistributive policy and the protection of minority rights, movement liberalism aspires to achieve the jurisprudential equipoise disrupted by the Warren Court. And by conjoining the ideology of advocacy with cause lawyering,

movement liberalism reestablishes the professional harmony undercut by the rise of public interest law. At a moment when America is more polarized than it has ever been over fundamental values, movement liberalism therefore promises a way for legal scholars to reaffirm a commitment to democratic pluralism without giving up the fight for transformative political change. It does so by making the empirical claim that movements are most likely to succeed when they mobilize politics first, and law only secondarily. This empirical claim then supports movement liberalism's implicit normative claim that courts and lawyers should defer to movements, because by doing so, better and more sustained progressive change will occur.

The article provides a critical analysis of movement liberalism that appraises its conceptual and empirical foundations, showing how the new social movement turn in legal scholarship links theoretical debates about the legitimacy of law as a tool for social change with empirical insights about law's potential and limits. The article begins with a descriptive overview that sets forth the critical debate spurred by legal liberalism about the limits of law and then traces the parallel conversations in sociolegal studies and social science about the tradeoffs of legal and political mobilization in advancing progressive change. Drawing on this scholarly foundation, the article next synthesizes the key insights of the movement liberal model in the two key scholarly fields where it has evolved: constitutional law and lawyering scholarship. As it argues, social movements in this model are positioned empirically as bottom-up leaders of progressive legal reform in ways that promise to reclaim the transformative potential of law while preserving traditional roles for courts and lawyers. The article delineates and analyzes the features of this model, framed around two essential concepts, majoritarian courts and movement lawyering, each of which respond to the critiques of earlier periods. The article shows how these concepts build on social science to present a picture of social change through political mobilization that advances legal reform without undercutting the legitimacy of law. This picture fuses critical analyses of impact

litigation and judicial impact coming out of political science (Gould & Barclay 2012) with accounts of legal mobilization and the “indirect effects” of court decisions that have become the hallmarks of sociolegal approaches to law and social movements (Handler 1978a).

Aff

2AC

Non-Unique

Movement collapse inevitable—activist disunity proves

Charlotte **Alter**, 5-30-2020, (Charlotte Alter is a national correspondent for TIME, covering the 2016, 2018, and 2020 campaigns, youth social movements, and women in politics.) "Black Lives Matter Activists Want to End Police Violence. But They Disagree on How to Do It.," Time, <https://time.com/5848318/black-lives-matter-activists-tactics/>

The activists who have flooded city streets since the death of George Floyd all broadly agree on the systemic injustice that has caused the nationwide uprising. They all want to end mass incarceration, dismantle structural racism and end the police killings of black men and women across the country. But tactical differences have emerged between different camps of activists in the seven years since Black Lives Matter first became a national rallying cry. Some activists have adopted a reformist approach, pushing successfully to equip cops with body cameras, require implicit-bias training and encourage community policing. Others, seeing those measures fail to reduce the number of black deaths at the hands of police, are pushing for more aggressive strategies that weaken or eliminate police altogether. All these activists are committed to the same ends, but they don't all agree on the means. **There are three broad and overlapping camps within the vast, decentralized network of activists that make up the movement for racial justice in America**. The first advocates for a series of reforms to create more accountability for police departments and strictly regulate the use of force, informed by what has and has not worked in the past. The second is increasingly focused on defunding police departments, directing taxpayer money away from law enforcement and towards social services that benefit black communities. The last also aims to redirect funding away from police departments, but considers it a step towards an ultimate goal of abolishing policing altogether. Some of the leaders in the reform camp banded together after the Ferguson protests to form organizations like Campaign Zero. "In 2014, we were in the early stage of learning the solutions. We knew to protest, but we didn't know the answers," says Deray Mckesson, civil-rights activist and co-founder of Campaign Zero. "We knew things that had worked here and there, but we didn't know what could be a scaled solution." Over the last six years, Mckesson says, Campaign Zero has learned what doesn't work. More body cameras, community policing, mental health support for officers, implicit bias training, and having more police officers of color are all reforms that have been tried in various departments. But they don't actually result in fewer people being killed by police, Mckesson says. "I think that there was a period of time where people thought training might be helpful, community policing might be helpful," he says. "There is a consensus now that those things don't work." Instead, Mckesson says, Campaign Zero is focused on strategies that both "reduce the power" and "shrink the role" of existing police departments. One step is getting rid of police-union contracts, he says, which often protect bad cops and prevent police chiefs and mayors from making significant reforms. A 2018 study from the University of Chicago found that after Florida sheriffs' offices were allowed to unionize, violent misconduct such as use-of-force incidents increased 40% (off a very low base, the researchers said). University of Chicago law professor Dhammika Dharmapala, who co-authored the study, said that the findings suggested "a large proportionate increase once an agency has the right to unionize." RELATED STORIES Minneapolis Approves Plan to Disband Police Colorado Governor Orders New Probe Into Elijah McClain's Death Campaign Zero has identified a set of eight specific use-of-force policies that, when taken together, could reduce police violence by more than 70%, according to the group. They include banning chokeholds and strangleholds; requiring de-escalation; requiring officers to issue a warning before shooting; exhausting all other means before shooting; requiring officers to intervene and stop excessive force by other officers and report them immediately; banning shooting at moving vehicles; developing regulations governing when force can be used; and requiring officers to file reports every time they use force. Already, the hashtag #8CantWait has gone viral on social media, as activists call their local leaders to demand these specific reforms. Celebrities like Oprah Winfrey and Jack Dorsey have come out in support, and Campaign Zero says it has heard from government officials in San Antonio, Houston, and Los Angeles. Advocates of this approach note that unlike long fights over budget cuts, many of these policies can be implemented immediately. "The police are here today," Mckesson says. "And today they can have less power." **But other activists are skeptical that reforms will be enough to stem the violence**. Some have pointed out that versions of some of these policies have been implemented in cities across the country, and yet black people continue to die. There's a growing sense inside much of the movement that police are inherently violent and racist, that no amount of reform will ever solve the problem, and that a true solution requires rethinking policing altogether. Instead, these activists say, police departments need to be either significantly defunded or even abolished altogether. The taxpayer dollars spent on policing, they argue, need to be redirected to social programs that could strengthen black communities or stop violence before it starts. Alicia Garza, founder of the Black Futures Lab and one of the women who coined the phrase #BlackLivesMatter, says that even after 26 criminal-justice reform laws passed in 40 states since 2013, "not much has changed." About a thousand people are killed at the hands of police every year, according to MappingPoliceViolence.org, and the victims are still disproportionately black. That's why Garza believes true change entails stemming the flow of taxpayer money to police. "Overwhelmingly, the largest percentage of most city budgets and state budgets is relating to policing and militarism," says Garza. "Every machine that you see on the

streets costs hundreds of thousands of dollars that could be used for affordable housing, coronavirus testing and resilience support.” The law-enforcement presence at the nationwide protests has showcased the immense resources funneled to local police departments, even as doctors and nurses were left to fight COVID-19 without enough equipment or supplies. To that end, activists and major institutions have been calling for major reductions in police funding in city budgets. The ACLU recently called to defund law enforcement and reinvest in communities of color. After pushing for raises for police officers, Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti now says he plans to make cuts to the police budget. In New York, activists are calling on Mayor Bill de Blasio to slash the NYPD’s \$6 billion budget. Some of the activists calling for defunding police departments see it as a step towards the ultimate goal of abolishing police altogether. “There shouldn’t even be a moderate Democrat right now who doesn’t believe that we should be taking resources from police departments and reinvesting them in building black futures,” says Jessica Byrd, founder of ThreePoint Strategies, who leads the electoral-justice project at the Movement for Black Lives. Ending police violence, Byrd says, will require a “radical shift in policing—not a little bit, not reform, not body cams, not new training,” she says, but rather “a radical shift in the way we think about protecting our communities and public safety.” “It’s enraging that this is radical,” Byrd adds. “Me saying that taxpayer dollars should not fund those helicopters is radical.” Even though abolishing the police may be politically impossible right now, experts say the movement is laying the groundwork for a longterm shift in how best to keep people safe. **“No one is in a position to say ‘tomorrow we flip a magic switch and there are no police,’”** says Alex Vitale, a professor of sociology at Brooklyn College and author of *The End of Policing*. But he points to other areas of society where consensus has developed that police are not the solution: in rich white communities, for example, when a teenager is caught with drugs, they are usually sent to rehab and not jail. **“People are demanding that we have a bigger conversation about the kind of society that we have that requires so much policing and prisons,”** Vitale says. **“And trying to begin a conversation about what a world without that would look like.”**

Movements Fail

Movements fail-their action is circumvented

Ice Cube 20 [award-winning musician, actor, director, producer, civil rights activist, and CEO and founder of the BIG3 basketball league. The Hill, With an energized civil rights movement on the streets, Ice Cube demands concrete results with his Contract with Black America July29 <https://thehill.com/changing-america/opinion/509563-with-an-energized-civil-rights-movement-on-the-streets-ice-cube>

It is great that people are in the streets; we are rightfully angry and hurt. But recent history shows that protests are not enough. The 1960s civil rights movement brought landmark legislation, yes. But those laws were circumvented. Revered leaders were assassinated. Then came Richard Nixon, promising “law and order.” And Ronald Reagan, saying “Let’s make America great again.” Sound familiar? The injustices didn’t end. The beating of Rodney King brought Americans into the streets, again, but as I and others warned in “Straight Outta Compton,” racial injustice rolled on.

Sure, there have been achievements. The Martin Luther King holiday. Our first Black president. But instead of throwing us bones, we need systemic change. A reckoning involves recognition of the unequal treatment Black Americans have endured from all who are complicit — from hard-core conservatives to limousine liberals. President Trump is not the cause. He is a symptom of a nation that tolerates inequality and tells Black citizens to be happy with the progress we have made — as if progress toward equal treatment is the same as equality among human beings. Do we actually believe Biden and the Democrats will make real differences unless we make them commit to wholesale change? MLK himself doubted the political will of the White liberal. The objective is not handouts to assuage white guilt, nor do we want White’s equality diminished either. We need White’s to look within and be honest about how they benefit from white privilege, and always will, unless our society reimagines what America should have looked like in the beginning and does the hard work of reform to get our country where it should be.

Movements fail—manifestation of performative activism proves

Thabi **Myeni, 6-5-2020,** (“Black Lives Matter and Thabi Myeni is a South African law student, freelance writer and co-founder of Womxn Without Chains. She writes about African and black feminist politics.) “the trap of performative activism,” 6-5-2020, <https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/black-lives-matter-trap-performative-activism-200619101229767.html>

Once again, we are grieving the senseless killing of an African American man at the hands of the state. Only this time, because the events causing his death were captured on video and broadcast on social media, George Floyd has ruptured the silence surrounding racism, not only in the United States, but also in parts of Africa, Europe and Asia. There is a long history of Black people being killed at the hands of the state in every part of the world. But until recently, oceans and borders between us had prevented our interconnected struggles from meeting. Social media changed this. Even the often-passive African Union came out strongly against the killing of George Floyd, and issued a statement calling on the US “to intensify their efforts to ensure the total elimination of all forms of discrimination based on race or ethnic origin”. **This was an unusual turn of events, and perhaps** a testament to the global impact of the Black Lives Matter movement. But could **there be more to it?** Watching the global community stand up for the Black Lives Matter movement from South Africa, where in April, Collins Khoza was killed by security forces in front of his family and Robyn Montsumi was found hanging in a police cell, gives me a sense of dread and detachment. The world did not stand up for Khoza and Montsumi. There was no palpable outrage for them. No government or international body issued a single statement demanding accountability for their deaths. If the African Union - and the rest of the global community - is only grieving with America, who is grieving with us? The power of social media as an outlet to organise and build transnational movements for social and political change is undeniable. However, there is still more work to do to build real, effective transnational solidarity. We rushed to globalise the Black Lives Matter with what I can only describe as a lack of foresight to harness the

momentum generated by the movement into legislative and permanent cultural change in our own countries. This could be a consequence of many around the world seeing support for Black Lives Matter as an act of charity or goodwill towards African Americans specifically, **instead of an admission of a global cultural reality**. The same military tanks that pose a threat to Black bodies in America, however, are policing protesters in Coyah, Guinea, as we speak. Perhaps another obstacle to transnational solidarity is the fact that while the fusion of social media and social justice has become more prevalent, we still heavily rely on Western media to deem what issue, tragedy or calamity is worthy of social outrage. Speaking at a youth symposium at Johns Hopkins University, activist DeRay Mckesson said, **"People of colour are always facing issues of erasure, and erasure operates in two ways - the story is either never told, or it is told by everyone but us."** Too often, **transnational efforts to affect change fail because stories outside the US are rarely told on a global scale.** Another dilemma presents itself in the form of corporations and brands co-opting the cause for profit. In an article for The Conversation, Bree Hurst, insists that by expressing their support for the Black Lives Matter movement or similar sentiments, brands like Nike and Netflix are somehow showing leadership, writing, "It's easy to dismiss these statements as low-cost tokenism or politically correct wokism" when in fact, brands are taking up "political corporate social responsibility". **This cannot be true.** In fact, the easy thing to do here is to praise white-owned establishments for acknowledging that indeed Black lives matter and throwing chump change to Black organisations. **What they do is less about dismantling systemic racism and more of a ploy to appease a quick-to-forget public; it is performative.** If we are moving towards change, reform and justice, white-owned establishments need to be held to a higher standard than posting on Instagram. Substantive change begins where decisions are made, in boardrooms, where often the only thing of colour is a pen. **A global movement for social justice can only succeed if it goes beyond moments when white supremacy uncovers itself** in the form of state-sponsored brutality on Black bodies in the US, and gets transported to our computer screens through social media. We need to demand the same response from governments, corporations and international bodies when queer Black women are murdered in Brazil, like Marielle Franco, when sex workers die in police custody in South Africa, like Robyn Montsumi, and when Black trans people are killed in the US, like Kiki Fantroy. The only alternative to a lack of global substantive change, is the continuous treatment of systemic racism as isolated events that "sometimes" happen in the US. **If we do not truly coordinate, we will be back here again, with another global outcry and our protests of solidarity will be rendered meaningless over time.**

Death Penalty Link turn

Turn: Abolishing the death penalty is key to build movement momentum

Malkani 20 [Bharat, senior lecturer law and politics at Cardiff university, The Conversation, "Why the fight for racial justice in the US requires the abolition of the death penalty" June 23, <https://theconversation.com/why-the-fight-for-racial-justice-in-the-us-requires-the-abolition-of-the-death-penalty-140681>

Protests in response to the extrajudicial killings of Breonna Taylor, Rayshard Brooks, George Floyd, and so many other Black Americans have raised awareness of the perennial struggle for racial justice in the US. The Black Lives Matter movement has set out several demands to achieve this aim, such as defunding the police. As I set out in my book, the struggle for racial justice also requires abolition of the death penalty, because this practice is bound up with America's history of slavery, lynching and racial violence.

Facial Recognition Link turn

Stopping biometric surveillance to social movement strength

Hood 6/16 (Jacob Hood, New York University, sociology, graduate student, 6/16/20 “Making the Body Electric: The Politics of Body-Worn Cameras and Facial Recognition in the United States,” *Surveillance & Society* 18(2): 167, <https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/surveillance-and-society/article/view/13285>) |suf|

BWCs are now a routine tool in law enforcement, and future upgrades often seem more of a question of “when” than “if.” However, as actions by both Axon and San Francisco lawmakers demonstrate, the only inevitability in policing technology is pushback and change. As law enforcement agencies, policymakers, and activists consider the use of biometrics and other body technologies for ensuring public safety, they must also consider the political implications of these technologies. BWCs must be situated within the same critical framework as other, arguably more explicit, techniques of social control. At its core, police surveillance is a social justice issue. Indeed, on the Movement for Black Lives’s policy platform, an end to the use of body cameras is listed as one of the crucial points to “end the war on black people.” Body cameras are criticized along with other mass surveillance technologies utilized against black communities such as ISMI-catchers and predictive policing software (The Movement for Black Lives n.d.). Even as we look to address the immediate concerns presented by developing BWC technology, we must also consider the ethics of these devices in a shifting technological/surveillance culture. What making the body electric offers us, then, is a site for analyzing ongoing practices of integrating technology with the body as well as a space for imagining a resistance and social order outside of state control over physical bodies. Making the body electric uses as its grounding point the inherent political nature of the body and the political/economic usevalue of the body within reciprocal systems of white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, and racial capitalism. Physical bodies cannot be separated from politics: politics both form and are formed by understandings of the body. Bodies serve as our most intimate aspect, to be protected and sustained, and also our mode of moving through the social world. As Sara Ahmed (2006: 551) puts it in her examination of bodily orientations in space, “the skin connects as well as contains.” In that sense, and in the context of policing, the body is both personally sacred and frightfully public.

1ar

Non-Unique

The movement is only huge because of the pandemic – not durable

Covert, a contributor at The Nation and a contributing op-ed writer at The New York Times. Her writing has also appeared in The Washington Post, the New Republic, New York magazine, Slate, and others, and she won a 2016 Exceptional Merit in Media Award from the National Women’s Political Caucus, **2020**

(Bryce, 6/29/20, The Nation, “How to Make Defunding the Police a Reality,” <https://www.thenation.com/article/society/police-reform-defund-activism/>, accessed 7/13/20, tmur)

It’s no coincidence that these protests and the demands issuing from them are happening in the midst of a historic health crisis. “When you live in a pandemic for three months and lose jobs and lose family members and think about how society is organized, it becomes much easier to say, ‘Well, maybe we do need to get rid of the cops,’” Pierre said. “We got rid of going outside. So maybe we should get rid of the cops.”

Not to mention that black people have been disproportionately dying of Covid-19. Everyone has watched the federal government’s paralysis in the face of the crisis, and many feel that the \$1,200 stimulus checks and enhanced unemployment benefits don’t go far enough to cushion such an enormous blow. The protests are “happening in the context of the US government abandoning its people under the coronavirus,” Blackmon said. “It’s almost like a perfect storm that has now exploded and blossomed into a nationwide resistance movement.”

Movements Fail

Ideological issues undermine movement success

Dyke and Amos 17 [Nella and Bryan, both professors at University of California-Merced, Sociology Compass, "Social movements coalitions: Formation, longevity, and success" Vol 11(7) March]

Numerous studies demonstrate that ideological differences can inhibit coalition formation (Barkan, 1986; Diaz Veizades & Chang, 1996; Gerhards & Rucht, 1992). Obviously, we would not expect groups with diametrically opposed goals, such as pro- and anti-LGBT rights, to work together. However, even organizations within the same movement who share broadly similar goals may hold ideological positions inimical to coalition. Roth (2010) demonstrates that many women's organizations in the early 1970s failed to form coalitions across racial and ethnic lines because of a widely shared belief that activism is best pursued by those whose direct interests are at stake and that others should not take action on others' behalf. Lichterman (1995) describes an environmental group unwilling to join a coalition because of their construction of activism as an individualistic rather than community project—shared goals and multi-cultural values notwithstanding. Thus, while some elements of two groups' ideologies may overlap, they may hold other positions that prevent collaboration.

A broad ideology coupled with opportunities for interaction can help overcome status differences and enable alliances. Enriquez (2014: 155) shows how a broad social justice ideology encouraged interaction among undocumented and citizen college students, noting, "conflict among members can be best negotiated through the development of discursive and interactive spaces that allow individuals to engage across their different social locations." A lack of social ties and spaces for interaction can prevent groups from seeing their shared interests and thereby inhibit coalition formation. Ferree and Roth (1998), in their study of a strike of day care workers in Berlin, show how feminist organizations never joined a coalition with the day care workers because the feminists were focused on other issues, not viewing the plight of day care workers as an issue worthy of pursuit. The lack of social connections, or bridge builders,

between the two movements meant that there was no one within the feminist organizations to make the case for the striking day care workers. Staggenborg (1986: 384) observes, "a lack of overlap in membership among diverse groups exacerbates ideological differences, creating many disagreements and misunderstandings which might be avoided with better communication."

Social movements are not able to produce lasting change

Gaby and Caren 16 [Sarah, Doctor Candidate at University of North Carolina, Neal, professor of Sociology University of North Carolina, Mobilization: An International Quarterly, "The Rise of Inequality: How Social Movements Shape Discursive Fields" 21(4)]

The influence of social movements and organizations that employ radical ideologies and tactics remains contested in previous work. The influences of radical movement organizations are often minimized due to their insufficient resources and inability to integrate into existing

political systems (Fitzgerald and Rodgers 2000). Although fleeting radical movements may not become integrated into the formal political process, they can still influence public opinion and political actions through discursive agenda setting (Polletta 2012). In this article, we examine the impact of a radical social movement organization on shaping public discourse. We expect that these types of movements are likely to be able to raise the salience of particular issues, but have much more modest abilities to shape media frames and their own standings (Gitlin 1980).

Although the Occupy movement declined by the end of 2011 and has since lost cohesion, we find that the one major enduring outcome of the movement is increased and altered attention to income inequality. Further, we find that while the movement was able to increase attention to the issue, the radical, decentralized nature of the movement limited its ability to achieve lasting media standing (Gitlin 1980). OWS helped shape the discursive agenda, but other political actors, particularly think tanks, were better positioned to take advantage of the new opportunities. Radical social movements can achieve long-term influence, but by quickly fading they are unable to take advantage of the opportunities they create. We call this phenomenon discursive eruption, referring to the ability of radical movements to initially ignite media coverage (Seguin 2016), but not control the content once other actors, particularly those that can take advantage of journalistic norms enter the discourse (Gitlin 1980).