

FOREWORD: A GATHERING WAVE

*Amy Sinden**

It was way back in the “before times”—November of 2019—that Nancy Fisher and Nikki Hatza, the *Temple Law Review* symposium editors for the 2019–2020 academic year, first contacted me to say that they wanted the next law review symposium to focus on the climate crisis.

Wow. What a difference a year makes! It, of course, never occurred to us that we would be holding the 2021 symposium—*A Gathering Wave: Emerging Legal and Policy Implications of Climate Migration*—over Zoom. Nor did we know we would holding this symposium against the backdrop of a brand-new Biden-Harris administration, which would not only allow federal employees to talk about climate change for the first time in four years but would also put climate and environmental justice front and center in virtually everything it is doing, across every agency and department of the executive branch.¹ This all-of-government approach to the climate crisis is extraordinary—a sea change that goes far beyond anything we have seen before, even from the Obama administration.²

So while some people view the topic of climate migration as a depressing one, I see this as a moment of exhilarating possibility. There is a gathering wave to be sure, but it is not just a wave of accelerating crisis, catastrophe, and human misery. There is also a gathering wave of optimism and hope, and it is gaining strength as a new set of leaders unleash the pent-up energies and creativity of people in every corner of society. Throughout the country and the world, at every level of government, and in both the private and public spheres, people who suddenly feel the weight of four years of denial and cynicism lifted from their shoulders are ready to roll up their sleeves and imagine new possibilities.

It is precisely that spirit of inspiration and hope and willingness to tackle society’s toughest problems that I saw reflected in the hard work that the 2020–2021 symposium editors—Sarah Hand and Kevin Kennedy—put in to gathering the extraordinary group of speakers and panelists that brought us an inspiring and thought-provoking day of dialogue and exploration on February 22, 2021. Nikki and Nancy passed the baton to Sarah and Kevin just days before the COVID-19 pandemic hit the United States in March 2020. Indeed, in the week that elapsed between my first email exchange with Sarah and

* Professor of Law, Temple University Beasley School of Law; member scholar and board member, Center for Progressive Reform.

1. Brook J. Detterman, Jessalee L. Landfried, Madeleine Boyer, Julius M. Redd, James M. Auslander & Allyn L. Stern, *Biden Administration Rapidly Advances Climate Change Agenda*, NAT’L L. REV. (Feb. 17, 2021), <http://www.natlawreview.com/article/biden-administration-rapidly-advances-climate-change-agenda> [https://perma.cc/4AKS-9VCX].

2. See, e.g., Zack Colman & Ben Lefebvre, *Biden Pitching a Much Vaster Climate Plan than Obama Ever Attempted*, POLITICO (Jan. 27, 2021, 3:03 PM), <http://www.politico.com/news/2021/01/27/biden-climate-orders-energy-463051> [https://perma.cc/K8YC-9GT8].

Kevin and our first meeting (which, in blissful ignorance, we initially scheduled as an ordinary in-person appointment), the world turned upside down. Instead of talking across the desk in my office on the seventh floor of Temple Law's Klein Hall, the three of us found ourselves adjusting to Zoom and planning for the first virtual symposium any of us had ever experienced or imagined.

Despite the considerable challenges and disappointments the pandemic presented, Sarah and Kevin grabbed that baton and launched into a sprint that day on Zoom. They did not stop running for the eleven months it took to bring this idea to fruition. It was their patient and relentless planning, discipline, thoughtfulness, and attention to detail that made the day the smashing success that it was. Despite the inevitable drawbacks of the virtual setting, the panels and speakers were so thoughtfully curated and the logistics and flow of the program so flawlessly executed, that you could almost palpably feel the buzz in the Zoom "room." Panelists engaged in genuine conversation with each other, building off each other's ideas; questions, comments, and compliments came pouring in from the audience; and colleagues of mine (including some not generally known for doling out indiscriminate praise) were direct chatting, emailing, and texting me with rave reviews:

- "I came expecting the usual boring CLE fare, but this was super interesting."
- "Learned a ton."
- "WOW! What a brilliant panel!"
- "This was a really incredible symposium . . . a real inspiration."

Part of that buzz came from the extraordinary diversity among the speakers—another testament to Sarah's and Kevin's hard work, thoughtfulness, and wise judgment about not just the gravity of the changes being precipitated by a global climate run amok but also their myriad points of intersection with the issues of social and economic justice that have rightfully taken center stage in our public policy discourse.³ The diversity along the lines of race, gender, ethnicity, LGBTQ+ status, and more was remarkable and refreshing, as was the diversity of disciplines and professions represented on the virtual stage. While there were certainly plenty of law professors, there were also sociologists, geographers, and urban and regional planners, as well as a handful of activists and community organizers who were there to keep the rest of us honest. These folks are on the front lines, dealing with the day-to-day, community-level fallout of the global forces we were discussing. All of these dimensions of diversity added spark and a sense of newness and possibility to the day's conversations.

Another one of the wonderful things about the symposium was that it brought together two of my most beloved institutions: Temple University Beasley School of Law and the Center for Progressive Reform (CPR). In the early stages of planning, it seemed to me that these are two institutions especially well-positioned to propel the dialogue around climate migration forward. The faculty at Temple Law has a particularly deep bench of thoughtful, engaged, and accomplished scholars working on issues of international law, migration, human rights, and immigrant and workers' rights. This was

3. See, e.g., *Social Dimensions of Climate Change*, WORLD BANK, <http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/social-dimensions-of-climate-change#:~:text=As%20the%20climate%20continues%20to,identity%2C%20and%20other%20related%20risks.&text=Climate%20change%20is%20deeply%20intertwined%20with%20global%20patterns%20of%20inequality> [https://perma.cc/Q4M8-ENAZ] (last visited June 1, 2021).

apparent from the valuable contributions to the day's discussions made by my colleagues Jaya Ramji-Nogales, Peter Spiro, and Jen Lee. At CPR, we have done important and pathbreaking work on the climate crisis and environmental justice for decades. But a number of years ago also we began to recognize the importance of the new set of issues developing around both international and domestic climate migration. Several of our member scholars represented on the day's agenda are leading lights in this emerging field: Keynote speaker Maxine Burkett⁴ and panelists Carmen Gonzales,⁵ Alice Kaswan,⁶ and CPR Board President Rob Verchick.⁷

The morning began with a panel on international climate migration: "Adapting to an Unprecedented Challenge—Global Climate Migration and International Law."⁸ Professor Ramji-Nogales' Essay, *Slow-Onset Climate Justice and Human Mobility*, provides a nice overview of many of the themes the first panel discussed, including the tensions and mismatches that mark international law's largely inadequate response to the issues cross-border climate migration raises, particularly in the context of slow-onset climate changes.⁹ Ramji-Nogales points to three characteristics of cross-border migration in response to slow-onset climate change that make its fit with international law particularly awkward: (1) its causes are "diffuse," (2) it is difficult to pigeon-hole into existing legal categories of voluntary versus forced, and (3) it occurs outside the context of the kinds of sudden disasters and imminent threats that traditionally garner the attention of international refugee and human rights law.¹⁰

She then works systematically through the three subfields of international law that we might expect to prove helpful and finds in each case a significant mismatch between

4. See, e.g., Maxine Burkett, *Behind the Veil: Climate Migration, Regime Shift, and a New Theory of Justice*, 53 HARV. C.R.-C.L. L. REV. 445 (2018); Maxine Burkett, *Climate Reparations*, 10 MELBOURNE J. INT'L L. 509 (2009) [hereinafter Burkett, *Climate Reparations*]; Maxine Burkett, *Climate Migration and the Deep Roots of Climate Justice*, 93 TEMP. L. REV. 653 (2021) [hereinafter Burkett, *Deep Roots*].

5. See, e.g., Carmen G. Gonzalez, *Climate Justice and Climate Displacement: Evaluating the Emerging Legal and Policy Responses*, 36 WIS. INT'L L.J. 366 (2019) [hereinafter Gonzalez, *Climate Justice*]; see also Carmen G. Gonzalez, *Migration as Reparation: Climate Change and the Disruption of Borders*, 66 LOY. L. REV. 401 (2020) [hereinafter Gonzalez, *Migration as Reparation*].

6. See, e.g., Alice Kaswan, *Climate Adaptation and Land Use Governance: The Vertical Axis*, 39 COLUM. J. ENVTL. L. 390 (2014); Alice Kaswan, *Creating Home: Governance Structures for Emerging Climate Migration*, 93 TEMP. L. REV. 735 (2021) [hereinafter Kaswan, *Creating Home*]; Alice Kaswan, *Domestic Climate Change Adaptation and Equity*, 42 ENVTL. L. REP. 11125 (2012).

7. Robert R.M. Verchick, *Disaster Justice: The Geography of Human Capability*, 23 DUKE ENVTL. L. & POL'Y F. 23 (2012); Robert R.M. Verchick, *The Long Goodbye: How To Build a Responsible Climate Migration Program*, 93 TEMP. L. REV. 713 (2021) [hereinafter Verchick, *The Long Goodbye*]; Robert R.M. Verchick & Lynsey R. Johnson, *When Retreat Is the Best Option: Flood Insurance After Biggert-Waters and Other Climate Change Puzzles*, 47 J. MARSHALL L. REV. 695 (2014).

8. TEMP. LAW REVIEW, A GATHERING WAVE: EMERGING LEGAL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF CLIMATE MIGRATION AGENDA 3 (2021). In addition to Jaya Ramji-Nogales and Ama Francis, whose essays appear in this Issue, this panel also included Nisha Agarwal, Deputy Executive Director of the International Refugee Project, Elizabeth Ferris, Research Professor at Georgetown University Institute for the Study of International Migration, and Carmen Gonzalez, Professor of Law at Loyola University, Chicago School of Law and CPR Member Scholar. *Id.* at 6–7.

9. See Jaya Ramji-Nogales, *Slow-Onset Climate Justice and Human Mobility*, 93 TEMP. L. REV. 671 *passim* (2021).

10. *Id.* at 674.

these characteristics and the structures and definitions that shape each legal field.¹¹ In international environmental law, several nascent initiatives over the past decade have tentatively aimed at climate migration, but their focus on disaster and forced versus voluntary movement make them ill-suited to slow-onset contexts.¹² International human rights law has made some moves toward bringing climate change harms within the rubric of a few long recognized human rights, such as the “right to life.”¹³ But while one 2019 decision of the UN Commission on Human Rights suggested that the “right to enjoy life with dignity” might extend to the particular context of climate migration, that tribunal went out of its way to restrict the right to migration brought on by rapid-onset events, explicitly declining to apply the right to a farmer’s claim rooted in migration that was induced by slow-onset climate changes.¹⁴

Finally, the framework of international refugee law is also very difficult to map onto cases of slow-onset climate migration due to narrow causation requirements and the need to establish imminent threats.¹⁵ Refugees must be able to show a causal link traced specifically to an individual perpetrator with intent to harm them on some protected ground (e.g., race, religion, or political opinion) and a “well-founded fear of future persecution.”¹⁶ That last element is interpreted to require a showing of imminent danger.¹⁷ None of this is feasible in the context of slow-onset climate migration.

Ramji-Nogales illustrates the problem with a case study of smallholder farmers in Guatemala.¹⁸ As the climate crisis brings increasing desertification, drought, and soil erosion to their land, these small rural farmers are uniquely vulnerable due to a variety of challenges that range from broadly systemic to local, particularized, and pragmatic.¹⁹ Likewise, their decisions to migrate are complex and multifaceted, involving all of the physical, social, and economic challenges of a changing climate, in combination with the particular resources and resilience of their individual households, the existence of family connections abroad, and the availability of government assistance.²⁰

Having laid out the problem with both clarity and nuance, Ramji-Nogales provides ideas on the path forward, calling on international law to “expand its gaze beyond a blinkered focus on the most imminent and dramatic harms to include slow-onset climate harms that will impact the most vulnerable populations.”²¹ Here, she draws in part on the work of co-panelist, Professor Carmen Gonzalez, calling for a climate justice approach

11. *Id.* at 677–80.

12. *Id.* at 677–78.

13. *See id.* at 679.

14. *Id.*; *see also* Teitiota v. New Zealand, U.N. Doc. CCPR/C/127/D/2728/2016, Views Adopted by the Committee Under Article 5(4) of the Optional Protocol, Concerning Communication No. 2728/2016 (U.N. Hum. Rts. Comm. Oct. 24, 2019).

15. Ramji-Nogales, *supra* note 9, at 679–80.

16. *Id.* at 680.

17. *Id.*

18. *See id.* at 680–83.

19. *See id.*

20. *Id.* at 683.

21. *Id.* at 686.

to climate migration,²² as well as on the work of keynote speaker Professor Maxine Burkett, arguing for climate reparations.²³ She argues that international law's new "expanded gaze" should also include a rethinking of existing categories, providing support for local adaptation and resilience initiatives that could enable those who prefer to stay in their homes to do so, encouraging regional free movement agreements,²⁴ and designing a process that is informed and guided by locally affected individuals and communities themselves.²⁵

Ama Ruth Francis's contribution to this Issue builds on the groundwork that Ramji-Nogales laid by identifying another aspect of current structures of thought in international law that inhibits progress on issues of climate migration.²⁶ As a starting point, Francis introduces a school of international law scholarship known as Third World Approaches to International Law (TWAIL).²⁷ TWAIL scholars focus on power relations on the international stage and critique the current norms and structures of international law for privileging the nation-states in the Global North over those in the Global South.²⁸ The climate crisis is, of course, a perfect example of this tendency. International law has largely allowed the nation-states of the Global North, which are to a large degree the perpetrators of this global catastrophe,²⁹ to continue emitting planet-warming gases at per capita rates many times higher than those of the Global South.³⁰ Yet it is the Global South that is bearing the brunt of the harms wrought by the warming climate.³¹

Francis argues that TWAIL scholarship is disserved by its unthinking adherence to Westphalian understandings of international law as concerned solely with relations between nation-states.³² This, they point out, overlooks the fact that "there are Global Souths in the geographic North and Global Norths in the geographic South."³³ Francis calls for a new approach that would "unmoor[] the Global South from geography."³⁴ Racial capitalism, they argue, renders certain spaces and communities—predominantly the places Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) call home—as "expendable," "sacrifice zones," and "externalities."³⁵ Further, Francis highlights that these sacrifice

22. See Gonzalez, *Climate Justice*, *supra* note 5, at 379–88; Gonzalez, *Migration as Reparation*, *supra* note 5, at 401.

23. See Burkett, *Climate Reparations*, *supra* note 4.

24. See, e.g., Ama Francis, *Migrants Can Make International Law*, 45 HARV. ENVTL. L. REV. 99 (2021).

25. Ramji-Nogales, *supra* note 9, at 686–87.

26. See Ama Ruth Francis, *Global Southerners in the North*, 93 TEMP. L. REV. 689 *passim* (2021) [hereinafter Francis, *Global Southerners*].

27. *Id.* at 690.

28. *Id.*

29. See Johannes Friedrich, Mengpin Ge & Andrew Pickens, *This Interactive Chart Shows Changes in the World's Top 10 Emitters*, WORLD RESOURCES INST. (Dec. 10, 2020), <http://www.wri.org/insights/interactive-chart-shows-changes-worlds-top-10-emitters> [https://perma.cc/D9EQ-FLBV].

30. See Hannah Ritchie & Max Roser, *CO₂ Emissions*, OUR WORLD IN DATA, <http://ourworldindata.org/co2-emissions> [https://perma.cc/GM3H-GWBX] (last visited June 1, 2021).

31. Francis, *Global Southerners*, *supra* note 26, at 690.

32. *Id.* at 692–91.

33. *Id.* at 689.

34. *Id.* at 697.

35. *Id.* at 698–99.

zones occur within the Global North as well as in the Global South.³⁶ Flint, Michigan, and the Indian Reservations and ghettos of the United States all serve as examples.³⁷

Francis shows how this new lens helps to clarify thinking about the problem of climate displacement. Just as low-lying atoll nation-states of the Global South are having to manage wholesale relocation of their communities as rising seas engulf their territory, several indigenous communities within the United States have begun the process of community relocation in response to rising seas.³⁸ Deterritorializing the Global South and recognizing the existence of Global Southerners in the geographic North “is useful because it highlights a site of political potential.”³⁹ Francis argues, “[t]he agency of Global Southerners in the geographic North in particular has the potential to overcome intransigent issues of the North-South divide by producing resistance from the inside out.”⁴⁰ Thus, the domestic political sphere within the nations of the Global North is an especially important leverage-point for producing change in international law’s treatment of climate displacement.⁴¹

Professor Maxine Burkett’s keynote address, *Climate Migration and the Deep Roots of Climate Justice*, transcribed and lightly edited for this Issue, builds on all of these themes.⁴² She begins with four over-arching “propositions”: (1) the consistent and long-standing linkages and synergies between racial hierarchy and environmental degradation, including the various ways in which these two forces of colonial and postcolonial political economy have frequently acted as “mutual accelerants;” (2) the complicity of law in this racialized degradation of the global environment and climate; (3) the extent to which law’s inadequacy in this regard is traceable to its tendency to compartmentalize and cordon off the environment from other aspects of social organization; and (4) the importance of looking to alternative ways of knowing as we chart a path forward on climate.⁴³

Burkett then brings readers along on a wide-ranging tour through some of the most important and interesting recent developments in the science, law, and political economy of the climate crisis and its implications for human mobility. She touches on the dramatic disparity between the Global North and Global South in their relative contributions to the planet warming gases currently accumulated in the atmosphere, the importance of systems thinking, the politics and media coverage surrounding migrant caravans in Central America, climate reparations, the George Floyd protests, the legacy of redlining, the historical antecedents of the Anthropocene, and the inadequacies of international refugee law.⁴⁴

After that sobering yet exhilarating ride, Burkett ends on an optimistic note, describing President Biden’s February 4, 2021, Executive Order directing his

36. *Id.* at 698.

37. *Id.*

38. See Verchick, *The Long Goodbye*, *supra* note 7, at 714–17.

39. Francis, *Global Southerners*, *supra* note 26, at 705.

40. *Id.* at 706.

41. *Id.*

42. See Burkett, *Deep Roots*, *supra* note 4.

43. *Id.* at 654.

44. *Id. passim.*

administration to begin developing plans for the protection and resettlement of climate refugees and to initiate collaboration with other countries, international organizations, and NGO's on climate migration issues more generally.⁴⁵ Burkett calls this a “seismic development,” a “game changer,” and another piece of evidence that “[t]he Biden administration has signaled a clear-eyed understanding of the urgency of the crisis.”⁴⁶ This is a hopeful note indeed, in a field in which hope was for many years in desperately short supply.

A number of panelists in the morning session noted that much of the climate migration in the coming decades is expected to occur within domestic borders. It was therefore apt that the second and third panels turned to the issues that domestic migration raises—the second panel focused on sending communities and the third panel focused on receiving communities.⁴⁷ On the second panel, “Responding to the Climate Crisis—Coastal Displacement in Sending Communities,” scholars from the fields of law, urban and regional planning, and geography tackled some of the challenging issues raised by community relocation, managed retreat, the adaptive capacities of municipal governments, and the complicated constellation of federal programs and policies bearing on these issues.⁴⁸ Professor Robert Verchick's piece, *The Long Goodbye: How To Build a Responsible Climate Migration Program*, touches on many of those themes.⁴⁹

Verchick begins with the stories of two tribal communities separated by four thousand miles but linked by their common struggle to relocate in the face of the imminent threat of rising seas—the Biloxi-Chitimacha-Choctaw Tribe on the Isle de Jean Charles in southern Louisiana and the Yup'ik village of Newtok, Alaska.⁵⁰ In both instances, the process of rebuilding the communities on higher ground has begun with the help of federal funds, but not without considerable conflict and controversy. Verchick explains that in both cases, community representatives have accused the state officials who manage the federal funds “of misrepresenting facts and impermissibly diverting funds.”⁵¹ This sets the stage for broader questions about how the federal response to domestic climate migration might be better designed to serve the millions of people who will move within U.S. borders over the coming decades to escape rising seas, flooding rivers, melting permafrost, raging wildfires, and other impacts of global climate disruption.

Verchick, after guiding readers systematically through the various limitations and inadequacies of the existing federal policy response to these challenges, identifies four

45. *Id.* at 668–69; *see also* Rebuilding and Enhancing Programs To Resettle Refugees and Planning for the Impact of Climate Change and Migration, Exec. Order No. 14,013, 86 Fed. Reg. 8839 (Feb. 4, 2021).

46. Burkett, *Deep Roots*, *supra* note 4, at 668.

47. *See* TEMP. LAW REVIEW, *supra* note 8, at 3.

48. *See id.* This panel included Robert R.M. Verchick, whose essay appears in this Issue, as well as Liz Koslov, Assistant Professor in the Department of Urban Planning and the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Linda Shi, Assistant Professor in the Department of City and Regional Planning at Cornell University, and A.R. Siders, Assistant Professor in the Biden School of Public Policy and Administration, Department of Geography and Spatial Sciences, Disaster Research Center at the University of Delaware. *Id.*

49. *See* Verchick, *The Long Goodbye*, *supra* note 7.

50. *Id.* at 714–17.

51. *Id.* at 715–16.

concrete steps the federal government could take to set it “on track for tackling the climate migration challenge.”⁵² These steps involve establishing a clear leadership structure, assessing the vulnerabilities of at-risk communities, identifying existing laws and policies that can be deployed to tackle these problems, and finally—and most ambitiously—enacting federal legislation to fill the gaps in existing law and policy and provide a reliable and durable source of funding.⁵³ Ultimately, Verchick’s assessment is clear-eyed and sober, but not devoid of optimism. “Hope is alive,” he says, “but time is running short. The water is lapping at our heels.”⁵⁴

The symposium’s final panel examined the other side of the coin of domestic migration—receiving communities. Entitled “Planning Ahead: Implications for Receiving Communities,” this panel comprised a law professor, a sociologist, a housing researcher, and a movement lawyer advocating for migrants’ and workers’ rights.⁵⁵ Panelist Professor Alice Kaswan contributed an essay to this Issue entitled, *Creating Home: Multilevel Governance Structures for Emerging Climate Migration*.⁵⁶ In this piece, Kaswan explores a key tension in this set of issues: How should authority and responsibility over research, planning, and implementation of strategies to address the challenges that receiving communities face be allocated among federal, state, and local governments?⁵⁷

Focusing on housing issues in particular, Kaswan proposes a multilevel governance approach to such challenges.⁵⁸ The first component of this approach would be a program of comprehensive research on where climate migrants will be driven from, where they are likely to go, and the demographic characteristics of these migrant populations. Kaswan persuasively argues that, while state and local governments will be necessary partners in this research, the federal government’s jurisdiction over both sending and receiving communities, combined with its superior resources and expertise, make it better suited to this task than state or local governments.

The second component would be a federal requirement on receiving communities to do proactive planning.⁵⁹ This planning requirement, enforced by the federal government but carried out by local governments, would include both a substantive requirement to plan for affordable housing as well as procedural “parameters to ensure meaningful community engagement.”⁶⁰ Additionally, in order to counteract widespread and deeply rooted disincentives that have traditionally prevented local governments from expanding affordable housing options, the third component of Kaswan’s proposed

52. *Id.* at 713.

53. *See id.* at 720–33.

54. *Id.* at 733.

55. TEMP. LAW REVIEW, *supra* note 8, at 3. This panel included Alice Kaswan, whose essay appears in this Issue, as well as Mathew Hauer, Assistant Professor of Sociology at Florida State University, Carlos Martín, Senior Fellow at Urban Institute, and Rachel Micah-Jones, Founder and Executive Director, at Centro de los Derechos del Migrante. *Id.*

56. Kaswan, *Creating Home*, *supra* note 6.

57. *See id. passim.*

58. *Id.* at 753.

59. *Id.* at 755.

60. *Id.* at 757.

approach would involve federal mandates requiring the reduction or elimination of local governments' low-density zoning provisions.⁶¹

Finally, in light of the very real budgetary constraints that many cities and municipalities face, Kaswan's approach also calls on the federal government to provide substantial financial support to local governments for the development of affordable housing.⁶² Anticipating pushback to her proposal on federalism grounds, Kaswan closes by laying out how her proposed approach, by allocating power and responsibility between federal and local actors, comports with and upholds the key federalism values of pragmatism, democratic legitimacy, and the prevention of tyranny.⁶³

What a day it was! The contributions to this Issue showcase the breadth, depth, and complexity of the issues this gathering wave of climate migration raises. Certain themes run throughout these Essays, as they did throughout the discussions that day: the need to be proactive rather than reactive; the inadequacy of existing legal structures; the need to nonetheless leverage existing structures while simultaneously pushing for systemic change—to, in Burkett's words, "build[] the solar plane as we fly it";⁶⁴ and the crucial importance of consistently and doggedly interrogating the myriad interactions, intersections, and synergies between a climate spinning out of control and the systemic and centuries-long disenfranchisement of and disinvestment in BIPOC communities and other marginalized groups.

Confronting the realities of the steadily accelerating climate crisis with a clear-eyed and unflinching gaze can be sobering to say the least. My hope is that this symposium serves as a clarion call. For better or worse, we are the generation on whose shoulders rests an awesome, intimidating, terrifying, but perhaps also exhilarating responsibility—to meet and live up to the biggest challenge ever to confront human civilization. With a new set of leaders in the White House jumpstarting ambition at every scale, from international to local, and in every sector, from public to private, the time is ripe to seize the day.

61. *Id.* at 758–59.

62. *Id.* at 759–60.

63. *See id.* at 760–63.

64. Burkett, *Deep Roots*, *supra* note 4, at 668.