

THE WEAR JUSTICE MOVEMENT:

An Autoethnographic Study

Elaine Giles

Point Loma Nazarene University

INTRODUCTION

If I close my eyes, I can transport right back into the drafty all-purpose room where I first heard the term “human trafficking”. I was sitting on a mundane, monochromatic folding chair that was likely manufactured before I was born. This space, Cubberley Community Center in Palo Alto, California, held so many memories for me. From Christmas productions where I switched from my sheep to angel costume frantically backstage, to the time my dad accidentally drove home without me because I was too distracted climbing trees in the back. But despite all of the accumulated memories I had in this space, this memory will always stand out to me as the most important. It was 2010 and I was twelve years old, which is a wonderfully awkward age where you still want to play mermaids in the community pool, but you also so badly want people to listen to your thoughts and opinions and take you seriously. In an effort towards the latter, my mom had invited me to a workshop after church about the growing problem of modern day slavery, a term with which neither of us were familiar. Human Trafficking is often defined in two major categories: sex and labor trafficking. The United States House of Representative Code 7102 defines both types of trafficking,

Sex trafficking is the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting of a person for the purposes of a commercial sex act, in which the commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such an act has not attained 18 years of age.

Labor trafficking is the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purposes of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery. (22 USC § 7102)

Human trafficking of all forms is a wide-reaching problem that stretches across all geographic borders, as well as socioeconomic and gender lines. Although anyone can be vulnerable to victimization through trafficking, women and children are disparagingly targeted, especially women and children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. 22 USC § 7102 stated “at least 700,000 persons annually, primarily women and children, are trafficked within or across

international borders. Approximately 50,000 women and children are trafficked into the United States each year.” It should be noted that human trafficking continues to be incredibly subversive and well-hidden. Although estimates of those being victimized are incredibly high, it is difficult to determine the true severity of human trafficking because so much of it goes undiscovered and unpunished.

That day in the community center, as we rotated through the various stations, some focused on prayer and card-writing, and others on education and awareness, I felt my life change. I began to learn that the beautiful Bay Area was plagued with the deep injustice of human trafficking. Even more shockingly, children my own age were disproportionately victims of this crime. I was blessed with a largely uneventful and privileged childhood, where sexual exploitation of minors was far from my radar before this point. My heart that longed for all people to experience love and safety broke that afternoon, and I am incredibly grateful for that.

The lessons I learned that day continued with me long after I left that drafty community center. I worked diligently on educating myself about human trafficking, and spreading awareness to my peers. In 2013, during my sophomore year of high school, my English teacher assigned a persuasive speech as our biggest project of the year. I pitched her my proposal to write about human trafficking, and she told me it was too vague. Discouraged and confused, I retreated to my room after school and went into a hole of research to find more specific niches in the broad problem of human trafficking. A month later, I delivered a speech on the intersection of foster care and sex trafficking. Because I had researched so intensely and written and rewritten the speech so many times, I did not look down at my speech once while speaking to the class. I delivered it completely from memory, and felt the passion I had for this topic fully take me over. Before this moment, I had seen myself as unintelligent, unmotivated and wildly insignificant, but

that speech changed everything. Not only did I have a voice, but that voice could be used to advocate for people, and people were moved by what I said. After leaving class that day, with a bold, red “A+” on my speech rubric, I was filled with motivation and a deep sense of vocation.

I continued to advocate against human trafficking throughout high school, and then chose a college that had strong ties to anti-trafficking work in San Diego County. Having never taken a sociology class, I somehow chose to major in sociology, and have never looked back. In 2016, in my introduction to sociology course, my professor, Dr. Valiente-Neighbours, taught a unit on consumerism and fast fashion. Prior to this unit, I thought of myself as fairly removed from the causation and demand of human trafficking. I was obviously not purchasing children for sex, and did not know anyone who would, so I was in the clear. When I learned about the fashion industry and the injustices taking place within it, I was shocked and convicted about the ways my consumer habits were facilitating the oppression of people. I left the classroom that day and vowed to cease purchasing new clothing, and educate myself further on the injustices of the fashion industry.

Unfortunately, I felt fairly alone in this goal and calling. Quickly, I was right back at the mall, purchasing shirts for \$5 and feeling horribly shameful about it. I felt so devastated by the difficulty I was having in maintaining an ethical closet that it seemed easier to give up than continue failing miserably. My mind was flooded with cognitive dissonance and shame, which was incredibly un motivating and kept me in a stagnant space of inaction. This response was unfortunately incredibly common: myriad psychological studies have explicated upon the common pattern of cognitive dissonance leading to inaction. Leon Festinger was the first psychologist to discuss and research the idea of dissonance. He replaced the word “inaction”

with “dissonance” and “consistency” with “consonance” (1). His initial study, conducted in 1957, found two major outcomes of dissonance:

1. The existence of dissonance, being psychologically uncomfortable, will motivate the person to try to reduce the dissonance and receive consonance.
2. When dissonance is present, in addition to trying to reduce it, the person will actively avoid situations and information which would likely increase the dissonance. (3)

This excerpt illustrates the human tendency to remove ourselves from situations in which we are forced to reconsider our actions or practices in new lights that might cause dissonance. I was definitely experiencing this phenomenon in the beginning of my awareness about the fashion industry, and often removed myself from thinking about it more. Thankfully, in 2017 I was hired by the Center for Justice & Reconciliation, a small nonprofit housed at the university. The Center for Justice & Reconciliation, or the CJR for short, was the nonprofit that made me choose to attend Point Loma. I was quickly welcomed into the small, closet-like office space by a team of passionate students and fiercely empathetic female employees. This began a journey for me of using my talents and voice to advocate for change to be made on campus. In a space of mourning my own failures at living ethically, and awareness of a lack of conversation around clothing justice, I pitched an idea to Kim Berry Jones, the marketing director of the CJR.

Kim took a chance on a 19 year old with a big idea, and in February 2018, I gathered my first committee and held the initial planning meeting of my fair trade clothing fair. After tossing around names such as “Loma Thrift Shop” and “Sustainable Clothing Fair” we landed on calling the event “Wear Justice.” In April of 2018, a little clothing fair idea became a week’s worth of events attended by a thousand students. Wear Justice has become a household name at PLNU, and will be in its third year in April 2020. The story of Wear Justice is about advocacy and fighting against oppression, but it is also my story of believing in the importance of my voice and working tirelessly to achieve my goals.

In 2019, I experienced many personal changes that influenced the Wear Justice campaign. Being in a small college community, I found that I had gained a reputation due to Wear Justice. I struggled in my own social groups because Wear Justice had been such a major public event, that everyone saw me as the “Wear Justice girl”, the girl who was solely focused on ethical clothing. I remember lying to a peer when they asked me where my pants were from, saying they were thrifted when I had really bought them at Target the week beforehand. I loved making a big statement, but it also emphasized to me the ways in which I was still struggling with the same issues I was preaching against. I began to have so much anxiety and shame around clothing that I didn’t even want to think about it or talk about it in my own life. Clothes have always been something I’ve loved, and I grappled with how I could still find joy in something that I now saw as being so problematic. Wear Justice 2018 marked a season of cognitive dissonance and personal struggle. I wanted to upkeep and maintain this thing I believed to be critically important, but I also struggled with living a lifestyle of Wear Justice. I felt an immense burden to be perfect in the fight against consumerism, and did not give myself very much grace when I made mistakes.

When I became increasingly cognizant of the personal toll that starting Wear Justice was taking on me, it caused me to reflect on what messages Wear Justice was spreading in the first place. If I left Wear Justice week 2018 feeling ashamed and disappointed in myself for my consumerist mentality, then I was sure other people must have as well. Feeling such a personal burden made me think a lot about the ways in which we address social change, and how Wear Justice can be improved upon and stray from the shaming rhetoric that far too often accompanies social movements. I began to observe the messages that were being spread about all social issues, particularly environmental issues, as they were being frequently discussed . This was

right in the thick of the reusable straw craze, which provided an unbelievably applicable lens through which to analyze social movement guilt. I saw social media influencers get bullied into taking down pictures where they were using plastic straws, friends flusteredly try and explain away the plastic straw their server involuntarily gave to them, and so much more. The entirety of the United States seemed to be placing the full burden of environmental degradation and climate change onto the plastic straw, but even moreso, the individuals using the plastic straws. Drinking out of a straw was now synonymous with dumping an Exxon-Valdez amount of oil directly into the Pacific Ocean. Drinking out of a straw put you amongst the ranks with war criminals and baby seal fur wearers.

This phenomenon was so interesting to me, and it shaped a huge portion of the changes I implemented in Wear Justice 2019. I realized that the Plastic Straw Panic mentality was what fueled so much of my own feelings of shame around clothing consumption. The burden is placed entirely on the individual, rather than giving weight to the role that culture, politics, and corporations have played in influencing individual actions. Once I realized this, I began to make one of the core principles of Wear Justice “de-emphasizing the individual.” In my own journey, I have felt so much more readily able and willing to make changes in my lifestyle when I have realized that social problems are culturally ingrained and have been taught to me. Shame is one of the least motivating feelings, but personal exploration is empowering.

De-emphasizing the individual is just one of the ways that I felt led to change aspects of the Wear Justice movement. As stated above, there were many changes that occurred between 2018 and 2019. The major changes can be summarized as a movement from individual approaches to community approaches, market driven to grassroots solutions, and increased campus collaboration.

| 2018 | 2019 |
|---|--|
| <p>Market-driven solutions.</p> <p>Five vendors.</p> <p>Focus on changing individual behavior.</p> <p>Minor involvement of ambassadors in planning.</p> | <p>Decreased emphasis on market-driven solutions, more focus on grassroots approaches.</p> <p>One vendor.</p> <p>De-emphasizing the individual & focusing on systemic methods of change.</p> <p>Ambassadors were leaders in the planning process.</p> <p>Student artists included.</p> |

There are three overarching theoretical components of the Wear Justice movement. These three pillars are the most integral, critical elements that I hope will be at the core foundation of any future Wear Justice campaigns. Although these elements did not exist at the beginning of the movement, they have formed out of my experience and the lessons that I have learned through developing and changing Wear Justice.

De-emphasizing the Individual. We are each deeply and radically influenced by those around us, and the fashion industry is not exempt from this. From the time of our birth, we have been indoctrinated into a culture of consumption and materialism. From the media we consume, to what we are taught in school, there is a current of consumerism underlying everything. Capitalist consumerism was human-created, and has been perpetuated by corporations and our political system. Consumption has become such an important tenet of our culture. Karl Marx and Max

Engels discussed this phenomenon in *The Communist Manifesto*, referring to the deep cultural importance of commodities at “commodity fetishism.” They wrote,

Fetishism in anthropology refers to the primitive belief that godly powers can inherit in inanimate things (e.g., in totems). Marx borrows this concept to make sense of what he terms “commodity fetishism.” As Marx explains, the commodity remains simple as long as it is tied to its use-value. When a piece of wood is turned into a table through human labor, its use-value is clear and, as a product, the table remains tied to its material use. However, as soon as the table “emerges as a commodity, it changes into a thing which transcends sensuousness” (163). The connection to the actual hands of the laborer is severed as soon as the table is connected to money as the universal equivalent for exchange. People in a capitalist society thus begin to treat commodities as if value was inherent in the objects themselves, rather than in the amount of real labor expended to produce the object. (Felluga, Marx)

In light of the deeply ingrained and culturally taught aspects of consumer capitalism, may we not only become increasingly aware of the ways in which we have been taught to consume, but also have grace with ourselves when we struggle to detach ourselves from these teachings. Rather than place the blame on any one individual, let us turn the attention towards larger structural influences at play.

Following the buy-erarchy of needs. There are so many materials already in existence in our world and communities that we do not need to purchase or make anything new. The United States Environmental Protection Agency reported that “landfills received 11.2 million tons of MSW textiles in 2017.” (EPA) “Fast fashion” has resulted in constant recycling of clothing trends to increase constant consumption. “Fast fashion” describes the retail strategy of adapting merchandise assortments to current and emerging trends as quickly and effectively as possible. Fast fashion retailers have replaced the traditional designer-push model – in which a designer dictates what is “in” – with an opportunity pull approach, in which retailers respond to shifts in the market within just a few weeks, versus an industry average of six months.” (Sull, Turconi)

Massive clothing companies such as Zara, H&M and Forever 21 rely on constantly changing consumer desires to keep their sales high. Fashion companies rotate trends and styles at an unbelievably rapid rate, so that clothes go in and out of popularity at alarming speeds.

In order to impact the amount of clothing being created and wasted, a new model of consumption must be emphasized. We should shift our focus to using what we already have first, and buying as a last resort. When we do buy, let it be ethically made and sustainably sourced, so garment manufacturers are treated fairly throughout. The original buy-erarchy of needs was created by Sarah Lazarovic, and provides a helpful and accessible visual toolkit for those looking to become more ethical.



Emphasizing the necessary connection between education and community-based solutions.

I strongly believe that education must go hand-in-hand with practical and radical solutions. It is critical that we become educated on the specific ways in which capitalist consumerism is harming people and the environment. The fact is, the current state of environmental degradation is devastating, but there is still a huge amount that we can do to keep it from worsening. In their

2019 Climate Change Report, the United Nations Secretary General wrote, “The “Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) on the Impacts of Global Warming of 1.50C above preIndustrial Levels,” (2018) demonstrates that we must limit global warming to 1.50C by the end of this century to avoid irreversible and catastrophic impacts. This means that carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions need to decline by about 45 percent by 2030 and reach net zero in 2050. While the IPCC says that this goal is within reach, to achieve it would require urgent and unprecedented social and economic transformation,” (3) illustrating the need for immediate, radical social action. While we educate ourselves on the dire state of the problems facing our societies and planet, let us never forget that there is hope, particularly when we all work together to reach solutions. Each element of Wear Justice will implement education along with specific community-based solutions that individuals can use within their own lives.

SOCIAL CONTEXT OF POINT LOMA NAZARENE UNIVERSITY

In order to understand the context of the Wear Justice movement, it is critical to look at the social location of the community in which the campaign began. Point Loma Nazarene University (PLNU) is an evangelical Christian, predominantly female, predominantly white, patriarchal institution. PLNU was founded in 1902 in Pasadena, California by a group of Christian women and Phineas Bresee. In 1973, it was moved to its current location on Sunset Cliffs in Point Loma, San Diego. PLNU is, first and foremost, a Christian higher education institution. The Nazarene denomination is fairly small, and few students and faculty still align themselves with the Nazarene belief system, but it is still an incredibly important foundation of the university. The Point Loma website defines the Nazarene tenants, writing that “the church is firmly Wesleyan in doctrine and evangelical in mission. Emphasis is given to the conversion of

sinner, the entire sanctification of believers, and the spreading of the gospel to every person” (pointloma.edu). The Nazarene Church is deeply evangelical in nature. The “Mission to the World” (Church of the Nazarene) and the expansion of their global church is one of the two core beliefs of the denomination, alongside “Unity in Holiness.” According to the Pew Research Center, 70.6% of Americans identify themselves as Christians, and 25.4% of Americans are proclaimed Protestant Evangelicals, making this religious group the largest in the country by 5% (Catholics are directly following, at 20% of the population). Evangelical Protestants are also 76% white (Pew Research Center).

The religious makeup of PLNU has influenced a huge amount of the Wear Justice movement. In *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Max Weber observed that protestant Christianity’s strong emphasis on vocation started consumer capitalism. He wrote,

To-day the spirit of religious asceticism—whether finally, who knows?—has escaped from the cage. But victorious capitalism, since it rests on mechanical foundations, needs its support no longer. The rosy blush of its laughing heir, the Enlightenment, seems also to be irretrievably fading, and the idea of duty in one’s calling prowls about in our lives like the ghost of dead religious beliefs. Where the fulfillment of the calling cannot directly be related to the highest spiritual and cultural values, or when, on the other hand, it need not be felt simply as economic compulsion, the individual generally abandons the attempt to justify it at all. In the field of its highest development, in the United States, the pursuit of wealth, stripped of its religious and ethical meaning, tends to become associated with purely mundane passions, which often actually give it the character of sport.

This excerpt illustrates Weber’s belief that the protestant (more specifically, Calvinist) reliance on working hard as one’s calling created the current form of consumer capitalist. In addition to emphasizing vocation and hard work, Evangelical protestantism is also excessively individualistic. In his book, *The Puritan Origins of the American Self*, Sacvan Bercovitch wrote on the development of Protestant individualistic thinking, writing, “...the individual affirming his identity by turning against his power of self-affirmation. But to affirm and to turn against are

both aspects of self-involvement. We can see in retrospect how the very intensity of that self-involvement—mobilizing as it did the resources of the ego in what amounted to an internal Armageddon—had to break loose into the world at large.” (Bercovitch 20) Individualism is particularly over-emphasized in neoliberal cultures. Neoliberalism is a critical concept to define and understand in the conversation surrounding modern American consumer capitalism. David Harvey defines the term, writing that “neoliberalism is a theory of political economic practices proposing that human well-being can best be advanced by the maximization of entrepreneurial freedoms within an institutional framework characterized by private property rights, individual liberty, unencumbered markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices.” (Harvey) The concept of neoliberalism is one that I will continue to critique throughout this paper.

PLNU has a student body of 3,232 students. Diversity of many types is a crucial factor in the context of beginning to understand the campus tone. The “Loma Ratio,” as it is often referred to, describes the major inequality between male and female students. The university is demographically dominated by female students. According to Point Loma’s website, PLNU’s student body consists of 65% female students and 35% male students. Although this is unequal, it is fairly typical of many higher education institutions, particularly Christian colleges and universities. In a 2017 article in *The Atlantic*, Alana Semuels wrote, “across socioeconomic classes, women are increasingly enrolling and completing postsecondary education, while, even as opportunities for people without a college education shrink, men’s rates of graduation remain relatively stagnant. In 2015, the most recent year for which data is available, 72.5 percent of females who had recently graduated high school were enrolled in a two-year or four-year college, compared to 65.8 percent of men.” (Semuels) At PLNU, the gender ratio is especially

perpetuated through the strong nursing, social work, and education programs, three areas of study which women have been restricted to throughout American history. Although the admissions department of PLNU has boasted a strong pride in the cultural and ethnic diversity of the campus, the university is still majority white Americans. 55.2% of the student body is white, while 73.5% of faculty and staff are white. Furthermore, the vast majority of the student body hails from California, many from neighboring counties in Southern California.

Although PLNU is known by the other Nazarene colleges as the “liberal one,” it is still a vastly politically conservative institution. As a current student at PLNU, I can comment on my own experiences of the ideologies of the average student. Coming from an intensely politically liberal area, I was surprised by the number of extremely right-leaning students and faculty on campus. I was a freshman in 2016, which was a politically tumultuous time in the United States (to make a dramatic understatement). I unfortunately heard a large amount of hate speech, specifically of a racial nature, from some students. In 2019, a chapel conversation about racial justice by Lisa Sharon Harper caused such outrage that a large group of conservative students signed a petition to “depoliticize” chapel. Unfortunately, there were also a number of students who planned to protest the racial underpinnings in chapel by walking out during the next chapel service. Although a majority of students and faculty were upset by this display, there was still a definite amount of support for the upset students. Overall, I would describe PLNU as a moderately right-leaning university.

PLNU can also be described as a patriarchal institution. Dr. Gerda Lerder wrote on the concept of patriarchy in 1986 in her book *The Creation of Patriarchy*. “Although historically, patriarchy was a form of social organization in which the father or eldest male headed a family or tribe, the word's meaning has been extended to mean governance or domination by men ...

‘Patriarchy has gone through many forms,’ she said, adding that as it exists now, patriarchy is ‘an institutionalized pattern of male dominance in society.’” (Collins, Lerder) There are most definitely institutionalized patterns of male dominance evident at PLNU. Although 64.6% of the student body is female, there is a disparity in female faculty, with women making up 56.2% of the overall faculty. Furthermore, I believe that it is critical to note the need for intersectional viewpoints in examining patriarchal systems. Intersectionality was first written about by Kimberlé Crenshaw in 1989. In a recent article with Columbia’s School of Law, she stated that “intersectionality is a lens through which you can see where power comes and collides, where it interlocks and intersects. It’s not simply that there’s a race problem here, a gender problem here, and a class or LGBTQ problem there. Many times that framework erases what happens to people who are subject to all of these things” (Crenshaw). Black feminist theorist Patricia Hill Collins wrote, “viewing relations of domination for Black women for any given sociohistorical context as being structured via a system of interlocking race, class, and gender oppression expands the focus of analysis from merely describing the similarities and differences distinguishing these systems of oppression and focuses greater attention on how they interconnect” (554). In this viewpoint, the disparities in inclusion at PLNU, especially amongst faculty, are even greater. Although women do make up the slight majority of faculty, the faculty on campus is majority white. This inequality further emphasizes the characteristically white patriarchal dominance characteristic of PLNU.

FAST FASHION & THE FASHION REVOLUTION

If it were not for the work of so many people and communities in the areas of Fashion Justice, the Wear Justice Campaign would have never come into existence. There have been

many groups that have worked tirelessly to advocate for changes in the fashion industry. The topic of fashion justice is fairly recent, as the fashion industry is changing and transforming rapidly. Fast Fashion has resulted in massive strains on the environment and garment workers because of the pressure for constant clothing production. The concept of fast fashion only dawned around the 1990s, and therefore is a relatively recent phenomenon.

Commodity Fetishism has allowed for the abuses of the fast fashion industry to flourish. The current systems in which our clothing is manufactured allow for deep commodity fetishism. We are exceptionally separated from the people who manufacture our clothes. In my own life, I have felt incredibly separated from the people who create my clothes, and even the materials from which they are created. The organization Fashion Revolution has done a huge amount of work to de-fetishize our clothing. Each year, Fashion Revolution facilitates a global “Fashion Revolution Week,” which aims to educate people on the abuses and negative impacts of the fashion industry. In 2018, they debuted a series of educational posters with the tagline “Who Made Your Clothes?” Each poster featured an image of a garment worker from a developing nation, attempting to de-fetishize clothing and inform people of the human thread that ties together everything we wear.

The tagline was simple, yet effective. Since our modern society is so deeply fetishized, sometimes simply considering the creators can be enough to stop us in our tracks. This was definitely the case in my own life, and I owe so much to organizations such as the Fashion Revolution for tirelessly working to advocate for human and environmental rights. They directly acknowledge the potential for cognitive dissonance in fashion reform, calling themselves “pro-fashion protestors,” who love fashion but call for practices of the fashion industry to be improved. Their website biography states, “We celebrate fashion as a positive influence while

also scrutinising industry practices and raising awareness of the fashion industry's most pressing issues. We aim to show that change is possible and encourage those who are on a journey to create a more ethical and sustainable future for fashion" (FashionRevolution.org). In a sociological analysis of the Fashion Revolution social movement, it is a Global movement as it started in Great Britain and has moved into other nations such as the United States. It is also a reform movement, despite being a self-titled "revolution." Revolutions desire a change to every aspect of society, while reform movements seek to change a specific aspect of society. The Fashion Revolution seeks to rethink the fashion industry, which is one part of society (although the entire society may change as a result). Lastly, Fashion Revolution is in an institutionalized stage, where they are beyond a grassroots movement and have more concrete staffing and goals. (Little and McGiven) Their model is one of individual encouragement of systemic change, while working to de-shame the love of fashion that can lead to dissonance. I look up to their movement, and believe that Wear Justice has been influenced and informed by it in many ways. Fashion Revolution has served as an incredible resource in previous years to educate our community at PLNU. As their "Who Made My Clothes" posters are free resources to all, we were able to put them up all around campus, which provided a great means of cross-collaboration. As the Wear Justice campaign continues to grow, I look forward to finding more opportunities to expand and borrow from other fashion justice movements.

RESOURCE MOBILIZATION OF STUDENT VOLUNTEER NETWORKS

In 2017, during my sophomore year, I was obsessed with philosophy. The obsession stemmed from having an incredible professor in my Introduction to Philosophy course. Heather (she wanted us to call her by her first name to eliminate power inequalities) had teal hair, a

southern drawl, and laced her Platonic dialogue with profanity. We started as most Western philosophy introduction courses start, with the big three: Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. Every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday at 8:30am I sat in a circle with my 15 other classmates, absolutely entranced with the ideas of these ancient thinkers. I recall the morning when Heather drew a crude sketch of Plato's *Allegory of the Cave* on the chalkboard. The Messenger, their eyes opened to the world outside the cave, wanted the prisoners still stuck in their false illusions of reality to get up, remove their shackles, and come see the truth. When they escaped the cave they had spent their entire lives in, they were blinded by the light of the sun. As soon as their eyes were able to open, they saw the earth in front of them: the true forms of the shadows that had been cast on the wall of their cave for years. Some wished they could return to what they once knew, and others embraced their new life and wanted to return to the cave only to bring more people to the truth. "It is the task of the enlightened not only to ascend to learning and to see the good but to be willing to descend again to those prisoners and to share their troubles and their honors, whether they are worth having or not. And this they must do, even with the prospect of death." (Plato) From this lecture onward, I talked about the *Allegory of the Cave* fairly constantly. I related so much to the story, especially in my own journey of learning about the inequalities and injustices of the world. I felt like I had been living in a false reality, until I was enlightened to the truth of human trafficking, climate change, consumerism. And now that I was out, I desperately desired to pull others along with me so they could see the Truth. I think I've always operated this way: I cannot simply learn about something and feel anything other than a compulsion to respond and advocate. A storm was brewing inside of me, one that had been forming for 19 years, and it was all going to culminate in Wear Justice. Karl Marx wrote on the idea of two different and distinct areas of life, which he referred to as "The Veil." He writes

about the separation of different areas of life in order to assist in the separation of social classes, saying “the historical process by which the commodification of laborers and the commodification of labor power came to be understood as two entirely separate and, indeed, opposite things-slavery and freedom, black and white, household and market, here and there-rather than as two concretely intertwined and ideologically symbiotic elements of a larger unified though internally diversified structure of exploitation.” (Johnson) As seen through this excerpt, the dichotomous mindset of “inside the cave” and “outside the cave” has aided in the neoliberal individualistic mindset that I am often critiquing in this paper. Just as there are many other contradictions and ironies that arise when trying to critique a culture that one has also grown up embedded within. The dichotomous, individualistic mindset that was ingrained within me as an American is the same mindset that led me to critique the systems that created it.

This mindset, my drag-everyone-out-of-the-cave mindset, is what drove the heart behind Wear Justice being as community-oriented as possible. I wanted everyone on my small college campus to have the same “aha” moment I had. But more than that, I wanted my peers to know how to move forward from that feeling, rather than just see the light and wish to crawl back into the comforts of their caves. I wanted to drag people from their caves responsibly, where they would not only see the harsh light of Truth, but also see the practical ways to move forward and live their lives differently. To think about what this should look like, I retrospectively thought back on myself a year ago, and what I would have benefited from throughout my own journey of becoming more ethical and sustainable in my clothing choices. Over and over again, I felt reminded that the best method of support is other people. “We humans are social beings; we share mirror neurons that allow us to match each other’s emotions unconsciously and immediately. We leak emotions to each other,” (Morgan) we innately desire connection with one

another. Therefore, I concluded that if I intended to shatter the worldviews of my peers on campus, I wanted to make sure that everyone felt supported and connected within the upheaval.

Because of this community-centered desire, all of the initial discussions of Wear Justice focused on developing a community-led campaign. As a student hoping to captivate other students, I believed it was crucial to organize a strong base of other student leaders to plan and execute the movement. To make this possible, I put my focus onto developing a program for recruiting and organizing student leaders. In my experience, I had seen previous attempts at mobilizing students fail because those involved were not given enough creativity and ownership, so they felt no stake in the projects. Therefore, my foremost goal in mobilizing student leaders was to ensure that they had true ownership over Wear Justice. The development of social movements is a major area of sociological study, particularly in the field of resource mobilization theory (RMT). RMT takes into account the many interlocking factors which either support or stifle the development of a movement. The basic tenets of RMT are “rational actions oriented towards clearly defined, fixed goals with centralized organizational control over resources and clearly demarcated outcomes that can be evaluated in terms of tangible gains” (Jenkins, 529) One of the major resources that we mobilized in the Wear Justice movement was student volunteers.

The development of our strong base of student leaders occurred from August to December of 2017 through intense community-building. I initiated an ambassador program with the Center for Justice & Reconciliation along with my fellow interns, Gabby and Lauren. We utilized social media marketing and physical posters throughout the campus to advertise a first ambassador meeting, where students could learn more about getting involved in leadership. From this initial marketing push, we had around 40 students in attendance. These students were already

interested in social justice topics, and desired to get more involved in creating change on campus. From that meeting, students signed up on a sign-in sheet if they were interested in becoming more involved. We then reached out to those students with an application process for them to express their specific desires for social justice movements on campus. By the end of this application process, there was a group of 17 dedicated students who were invested in seeing change occur on campus. These students made a year-long commitment to the CJR. From that point, the students were separated into three different sectors of justice work based on their specific interests: race relations, fair trade, or anti-trafficking. This allowed ambassadors to customize their experience with the CJR based on where their interests were stronger. The fair trade group, made up of 6 students, constituted the group of Wear Justice student leaders. This group assisted in planning fair trade events in the fall semester, received education on fair trade and ethical purchasing practices, and worked on Wear Justice during the spring semester.

One of the benefits of collaboration across various fashion justice movements occurred in our efforts towards mobilization of student volunteers. The organization Fair Trade Campaigns was started in order to unify fair trade movements across the United States and provide resources to those aiming to increase the scope of ethical and sustainable purchasing practices. Their website states that, “Fair Trade Campaigns recognizes towns, colleges, universities, schools and congregations in the US for embedding Fair Trade practices and principles into policy, as well as the social and intellectual foundations of their communities. We provide tools, resources and support events to launch and grow local Fair Trade Campaigns in your town, university, school or congregation” (FairTradeCampaigns.org). FTC has multiple levels of national and local assistance for campaigns. In the San Diego Area, there was a fair trade college fellow, whose role was to support our campaign and give us any resources we need to succeed. I relied upon

Chase Manar-Spears and her many layers of wisdom and expertise throughout the process of mobilizing student leaders. I continue to work with FTC and even became a fellow myself and was able to help other campaigns succeed. I am incredibly grateful for the resources they have provided and continue to provide.

The ambassador program that I began through the Center for Justice & Reconciliation on campus was effective at mobilizing, educating, and empowering student volunteers. Some of the reasons that the ambassador program was effective in these ways was through these three principles of the program:

- A. Ambassadors became more educated on social justice topics around San Diego and beyond. Ambassadors were encouraged in their groups to become educated on social justice issues, particularly the issue of their specific group. Education occurred in the form of journal article readings and discussions, documentary viewings, and guest speakers. This strong focus on education ensured that student leaders would also be learning more about their area of justice work while planning events. We had them watch the documentaries *The True Cost*, *13th*, and read articles on global fair trade issues, and more.

- B. Ambassadors developed a sense of community. They met bi-monthly in their small justice issue focused groups. They were able to get to know each other more closely, push each other in event planning and education, and provide new resources to one another. This was particularly important because the ambassadors were majority freshmen, and many did not already have group involvement on campus, so this was their main way of meeting new people and

making close friends with similar interests. Two years later, there are multiple people on campus who are still friends with one another because they met through the ambassador program.

- C. Ambassadors were able to take ownership over events and the mission of the CJR. Ambassadors played integral roles in developing and implementing Wear Justice week and the events that took place. Although not everyone took the opportunities, there were plenty of ways for ambassadors to get as involved as they wanted to in the inner workings of the CJR, and Wear Justice week in particular. As I mentioned previously, there were few on-campus opportunities that allowed student volunteers to help in the planning of major events, so this was significant about the CJR ambassador program.

The emphasis on education, sense of community, and sense of ownership contributed to making the ambassador program an effective method of developing a strong base of student volunteers, as well as providing a positive growth experience for those involved.

Personally, I learned a huge amount about developing leadership groups through this process. When we initially recruited the 17 students who had attended the meeting, submitted their application, and responded via email, I thought the work was over. This was far from the case. Building a reliable network of student volunteers was far more difficult than I expected. While some of those involved were highly dedicated and wanted a lot of responsibility, there were also a number of ambassadors who did not show up to meetings, take personal responsibility, or utilize the educational opportunities. Although this was likely because they had intense work and school schedules, I felt a huge amount of personal frustration. It became increasingly problematic during the process of planning Wear Justice. Many volunteers were

needed throughout the week and I was really worried that a lot of them would not show up when needed.

In this process, I felt that my biggest method of fighting against the lack of reliability was to develop passion amongst the group. I was so nervous that they wouldn't show up to pieces of Wear Justice because *I needed them to be there*. I couldn't do this without them. So, I told them that. At some moments I felt like I was pleading with this wide-eyed group of freshmen, pleading with them to care about the thing that I cared so much about. Pleading with them to understand that I can't do this alone, that I needed them by my side throughout this process. Although I felt ridiculously humbled through this process, I learned a huge amount about leadership and motivating people. I think we're often told a story about social justice movements that harms us. We're told the story about the one person who felt a call and took action. We're told about the Rosa Parks who refused to move to the back of the bus, but we're not told about the Rosa Parks who worked tirelessly to organize the Montgomery Bus Boycott, one of the most effective social movements in United States history. We're not told about the Rosa Parks who continued to fight for women of color, standing by black women who experienced sexual violence and were pressured into silence. We're given these "talking head" moments in history, driven by the idea of a single hero. Troy A Murphy commented further on the romanticized but short-scoped public heroism of Rosa Parks,

Like the increasingly common modern day enactments of heroism, Parks' story has historically been formulated and further idealized to fit the rhetorical form of an individual hero.

But the common mythology surrounding Parks does not reveal the history of activism and training that preceded her moment of defiance. She was one of the first women in Montgomery to join the NAACP, serving as the organization's secretary for many years and detailing for over a decade the egregious acts of racial injustice that were everyday occurrences in Montgomery (Murphy 202)

I believe the archetype of the soul hero/heroine harms us because social change seldom occurs in the heroic singular moments of unprecedented bravery. I believe that a much more beautiful story is the one that tells the truth about the countless hours worked by regular people, the glorious paperwork, the rejections and failures that came before the successes. I wanted the story of Wear Justice to be one of truth, even if the truth is not as well-packaged as the story of the brave singular hero. I knew I could not do this alone, even if I wanted to. I needed those with more experience than me, I needed the people who doubted me, and I especially needed the many volunteers who stood with me and did so much of the behind-the-scenes work.

Through this learning process and reflection on the viewpoint given to us about social movements, I became incredibly transparent with the ambassadors about the importance of their involvement in the process. I found that this was the most helpful approach, because everyone was much more likely to help when they saw the work behind the movement, and knew that their time and involvement was absolutely critical to its success. Of course, there were still a number of people who were fairly uninvolved, but every single ambassador came to the fair, and there were seven ambassadors who took leadership roles in some part of Wear Justice. Although there was a decent amount of struggle in encouraging the involvement, I deeply appreciate the lessons I learned and the self-reflection I was forced to do on how I wanted to talk about the group planning importance of Wear Justice.

In 2019, Wear Justice still relied upon a strong group of dedicated student volunteers. Given that I had a year of experience to go off of learning how to better recruit and utilize student volunteers, the implementation of students in the movement was increasingly effective.

I wanted to make Wear Justice increasingly intersectional, so attendees could learn about the many ways that clothing justice relates to other areas of justice. I strongly believe that the fair

trade movement needs to pay special attention to intersectionality, and I wanted Wear Justice to be increasingly intersectional wherever possible. I felt that using the ambassadors to achieve this goal would be a great use of their time and skills, as the ambassadors represented a diverse group of students with various interests and passions. When we got into January of 2019, I called all the ambassadors into a meeting about Wear Justice and asked them to consider ways in which we could increase our educational reach on campus. After providing them with resources on the global context of fair trade, they decided to add an event to Wear Justice Week called Drink Justice.

Drink Justice took place on the first morning of Wear Justice Week, and was meant to educate students on the importance of consuming fair trade coffee and tea. We invited a number of local, ethical coffee shops to come sample their drinks for students, who could then vote on their favorite. The event was a major success as it definitely attained the goal of teaching attendees about fair trade coffee, and showed them easy ways to implement fair trade products through local shops. A number of students told me that they had already been frequenting the coffee shops that attended the event, but the fair informed them about the ethical aspects of their favorite cafes.

SEXISM HINDERING WOMEN LEADING SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

It is important to note that there were tense structural complications occurring during the second year of Wear Justice. CJR is structured with a director, a group of post-graduate full-time staff members, two part-time student staff members, and 2-3 student interns. In 2017-2018, my first year with the CJR, I was in the internship role. In 2018-2019, I was promoted along with my fellow intern, Lauren, to student staff. Three new interns were hired, and therefore all of the

interpersonal dynamics shifted. I think this is a critical element to highlight because it is extremely common in campus organizing. Each school year, everything turns absolutely upside-down and has to be reconfigured. As soon as one student team gets into a groove, the school year is over and new obstacles and strengths come into play with the introduction of a new team. This was definitely the case in the 2018-2019 school year. While delegating ambassadors had been my role as an intern, I needed to take a step back in my staff role. I struggled with determining the balance between taking responsibility and trusting the new interns to handle the ambassadors. This stretched my leadership abilities greatly, as I had worked incredibly hard to develop Wear Justice and worried about giving up responsibility to someone new. Unfortunately, this already complex intrapersonal struggle was made communal when I received negative feedback that I was being “bossy” or “controlling” for wanting to maintain some personal control over Wear Justice. This criticism came from a leader of the CJR. In an effort to be collaborative with leadership, I would inform those above me about the changes I was making between 2018 and 2019. In one specific meeting, constant references were made to my need to control Wear Justice, and my inability to collaborate with others. I left the conversation feeling terribly guilty for my leadership shortcomings, and chose to apologize to my team members and ambassadors for this dynamic. To my surprise, this sentiment from the CJR leader was not shared by those who worked with me on Wear Justice. They respected me, my knowledge, my expertise, and saw me as collaborative.

Through conversations with other women in leadership positions whom I trusted, I began to piece together the fact that the critiques I had been receiving were largely fueled by sexism. My male counterparts were not being told that they were being “bossy” or “control freaks” when they self-started and worked to maintain integrity of their leadership positions. As a sophomore

in college, I was experiencing subversive sexism in my workplace that had the potential to have really harmed (or even caused the demise of) Wear Justice. I am exponentially grateful for the people in my life who affirmed me throughout this process and used it to develop me into a stronger leader and human being. That being said, I continued to struggle with these sexist stereotypes in the day-to-day of my job.

During 2019, I constantly walked a tightrope of trying to improve Wear Justice, while also trying not to step on any toes or come across as being overly controlling. I would ask the interns to motivate their student teams, and it wouldn't happen, so I would step in. Then I would wonder if I should have let them try to motivate them for longer, and if I was taking too much control too quickly. I am positive that this cycle is familiar to many women who have taken on leadership positions. An article on women in leadership stated,

Women often face different expectations than men in the workplace, as well as increased scrutiny for reasons other than ability (e.g., appearance), and are frequently evaluated more severely, particularly women in management and leadership roles. ... Johns and others noted that women tend to be "penalized for displaying either too little or too much assertiveness, competitiveness, and independence." ... Women thus face a double burden in their careers if they want to get ahead: not only doing their jobs well but also overcoming stereotypes that may hamper perceptions of their leadership potential. (313)

Thankfully, I learned a great deal through this process, but it also posed a burden to the planning of Wear Justice 2019.

PUBLICIZING APPROACHES

One of the biggest hurdles facing the creation of Wear Justice was making people aware of it and what it was about. How would people understand that it was a clothing movement? How would they learn about the various parts of the week? How would such an abstract and complex topic be simplified for people to understand? I grappled with these questions constantly.

As with many other aspects of Wear Justice, I benefited greatly from calling upon my own experience as a student on campus. Throughout my first year and a half at Point Loma, I had taken very specific interest in what marketing techniques worked and what did not. When a campus organization followed me on Instagram and I declined it, I thought about why I did and what would have made me follow. When I decided that I needed to go to an event on a weekday night, I wondered why I decided that compared to other options. In truth, seeing really ineffective marketing methods on campus taught me the most about what to do. I realized from my own experiences that understanding social media recruitment would be critical to the success of Wear Justice.

Social media platforms, particularly Instagram, are frequently used by students at Point Loma Nazarene University. Harnessing the power of social media recruitment allowed information to be spread about Wear Justice, and educate students on the importance of ethical and sustainable clothing. Although there are many popular social media applications on the market currently, Instagram is by far the most popular and frequently utilized amongst young adults. A study conducted by the University of Chicago found that “76% of teens ages 13-17 use Instagram,” and the trends definitely align with those findings at PLNU. I also utilized minimal YouTube, Twitter, and Facebook marketing, but Instagram was where I focused most of the marketing efforts as I saw that having the most potential to reach students.

We decided to incentivize our Instagram posts through material rewards. Fair Trade companies gifted us with their products, and we decided to use those to incentivize engagement with us on social media. During Wear Justice 2018, we held two different social media contests that allowed students to compete for prizes (such as Patagonia jackets) by posting photos with the Wear Justice stickers.

In 2019, social media marketing looked fairly similar. We conducted the sticker photo contest again, where one student won a Patagonia jacket for posting the best picture with their Wear Justice sticker. A new addition to our social media marketing strategy was a Disneyland ticket raffle. We received the ticket through a donation from the Disney corporation due to a high number of volunteer hours, which they rewarded. During the three days before the Wear Justice fair, students could repost a promotional Instagram story in order to enter into a Disneyland raffle. Hundreds of students posted the picture, which included a link to the Center for Justice & Reconciliation's Instagram page. Although it was difficult to measure the exact effect of participation in story posts and attendance at the fair, the marketing push definitely increased exposure to the Wear Justice campaign. Since people also needed to be following our Instagram page to enter, we gained a large number of followers who have continued to follow the page and engage with our content. In comparison between 2018 and 2019 social media engagement, Wear Justice posts in 2018 received an average of 35 likes, while posts in 2019 received an average of 50 likes, a notable increase.

When reflecting upon the marketing strategies, I felt some tension and irony with the use of market-driven methods in a campaign that I was attempting to de-focus from market-driven approaches. During Wear Justice Week 2019, there was a massive internal debate amongst the CJR staff about the ethics of using Disneyland tickets to publicize the event. Disney is arguably one of the most consumer capitalist corporations in the world, with billions of dollars in revenue. Were we really promoting an anti-consumerist lifestyle if we were also promoting Disney in the same breath? I held this tension throughout the week of Wear Justice, and ended up moving forward with publicizing using the tickets. This was mainly because we had received the tickets for free because of a previous volunteer event, so I felt better about having not spent any money

supporting the Disney corporation. I also decided that the ticket raffle would bring so many students to the event that it was worth the bit of mixed messaging. My hope was that students would come to Wear Justice having not thought much about consumerism, and leave with a desire to make changes in their own life. If free Disney tickets happened to be the way we got people to that point, so be it. In his book *Liquid Consumption: Anti Consumerism and the Fetishized De-Fetishization Commodities*, Sam Binkley points out some of the tensions that arise when attempting to combat consumer habits. He writes, “Anti-consumerist lifestyle discourse exalts the autonomy and criticality of the sovereign, individual consumer, critically aware of the dangerous obfuscations of the commodity form and free in her own choices, while relating that autonomy to a newly discovered social bond with distant but imagined others, thereby diffusing the anxiety and responsibility that accompanies such radically free choice” (602) The fact of the matter is that this tension is incredibly complex and difficult to fully consider from every perspective, particularly given that there have not been any studies conducted on this specific dissonance of pushing anti-consumerism through market-driven methods.

In 2019, we also increased in-person canvassing and community presence. It took a significant amount of volunteers, but we had a table every single day on the main lane of campus for the week before and week of Wear Justice. The table included free stickers, informational materials, thrifted shirts for \$3, fundraising items, and the posters that detailed the events. We intentionally planned to have the table out during the busiest times for student traffic, so there was a huge amount of engagement with the booth. Wear Justice is complex and because there were different events taking place during the week, having face-to-face interactions was a very necessary addition to our marketing strategy.

Lastly, academic incentivization was used throughout the week to further encourage attendance. We worked with professors in various departments to provide extra credit to students who attended the Wear Justice week events and further engaged in some ways. Extra Credit was particularly important for events like the fair trade film festival, which was mainly meant to be educational. Thankfully, professors were extremely excited to support the mission of Wear Justice and most were happy to provide extra credit in exchange for attendance. Collaboration with professors was a really important aspect of encouraging students to attend the events throughout the week.

EVENTS & VENDOR SELECTION

In both years of Wear Justice, the event followed a basic model, which included:

- A. Vendors
- B. Clothing Swap
- C. Repairs
- D. Interactive & Educational Elements

Although each year featured all of these things, the ways in which each category was implemented varied vastly. The main overall shift was due to my desire to make the entire event less market-driven. While Wear Justice 2018 emphasized more market-driven approaches to fast fashion, Wear Justice 2019 included an increased amount of grassroots, community-centered approaches. I will describe the details of that transition in the following section.

In 2018, there were 6 different vendors who came to the event, and made up a section of the fair. These vendors were each fair trade clothing companies, and had extremely high price points for the student body. These vendors did not sell well, and seemed to be more of a

distraction than anything else. I also wanted to make the fair less market-driven, so, in 2019, I cut the number of vendors from seven to two. The vendors that came were focused on repurposing thrifted clothes to avoid waste, and they had much lower price points. I feel that this change was far more reflective of the goals of the Wear Justice movement.

Patagonia also attended and repaired worn out clothing items both years through their “Worn Wear” initiative. They are an extremely ethical and sustainable organization, so I was happy that they could be there and support what we were doing at PLNU. In 2019, we also added a student clothing artist section of the event, which ended up being my favorite element of the entire fair. There were people who came and taught knitting and embroidery on the spot to those who wanted to learn. It was a perfect illustration of closed-loop consumerism, as attendees would swap their clothes for something new, and then take their new item to make it their own through these clothing customizations.

The clothing swap looked incredibly similar between both years, especially because I believed it to be a successful and very community-centered aspect of the event. Both years, students dropped off clothes at a promotional booth during the week, and received a punch card based on the number of clothing items they had brought. During the event, they could also drop off clothes and receive a punch card for the same number of items. Between both years, we had two consistent problems: leftover clothing waste and male participation. During the event, we quickly realized that people were dropping off far more clothes than they were taking with them. Because it was near the end of the semester, many students were thinking about clearing out their closets, and Wear Justice became a replacement for a thrift store. Students would bring garbage bags full of clothes, and then only take one or two items with them. In 2018, Goodwill came to the event, they took all of the leftover clothes that were not swapped. There were hundreds of

clothing items left over at the end. In 2019, I personally schlepped eleven bags of leftover clothing items to Salvation Army. We had decided not to invite Goodwill in 2018 because of their unethical business practices. Although the nonprofit publicly implies that their main focus is providing jobs for those with disabilities, the leaders of the organization take home huge salaries. In a specific case study of Goodwill in Omaha, Nebraska by the Nonprofit Quarterly found that

Of the \$4 million in profits made from the \$30 million operation, only \$566,000 was spent on job-related program costs. The rest of these costs were covered by grants. Even its signature program that employs disabled job trainees within its stores is primarily funded by school districts. Goodwill officials identified only \$557,000 in jobs program spending in 2015 that was funded by retail sales. Most store profits are being consumed by administrative overhead, which includes much of the pay to its top leaders (McCambridge)

Another previously unforeseen issue was that the swap was very disproportionately female. The ratio of female clothing items to male clothing items was likely 40:1. The problem became that male students who brought clothes were not able to find anything they wanted to swap them out with. The few men who participated walked away with nothing, because the men's swap section was almost entirely the clothing they donated. This was partially to be expected, given that Point Loma has a much larger population of female students than male students. But it also made me think a lot about how women are more heavily targeted by the fashion industry than men. Women are more consistently told that their presentation of gender relies heavily on being well-dressed and well-styled, in a way that men are not. On top of that, hegemonic masculinity encourages men to stray away from any characteristics that could be considered feminine, including empathy. Empathy is an incredibly important factor in becoming involved with social justice movements. Tracy L Davis and Rachel Wagner wrote on the lack of involvement of men in social movements, stating,

The invisible experience of privilege serves both to facilitate denial that oppression even exists and inhibit a more complex and empathic understanding of oppression for those who intellectually understand it. That is, those who have a purely or even predominantly intellectualized experience (as opposed to a firsthand personal experience) with oppression may not fully see oppression for what it is or have a more difficult time sustaining social justice attitudes and actions in the face of challenge.

This unawareness of privilege that stifles empathetic attitudes is particularly common amongst white, straight, upper class men. Given PLNU's gender and racial makeups, we can see that the population of men on campus will mainly fall into the categories of white, straight, and upper class. The fact is, men need to be a part of the conversation, because the abuses of the fashion industry affect everyone. As bell hooks so eloquently stated in 2004, "after hundreds of years of anti-racist struggle, more than ever before non-white people are currently calling attention to the primary role white people must play in anti-racist struggle. The same is true of the struggle to eradicate sexism—men have a primary role to play," (hooks) and the same must be true for the involvement of those with privilege in the fashion justice movement.

EDUCATION ON ETHICAL PURCHASING

As mentioned throughout, education and emphasis on community-based solutions is incredibly important to me and I have worked to implement it throughout Wear Justice. Due to the fact that I was inspired to make a personal change through watching *The True Cost* documentary, I wanted to make sure that it was shown as part of the week. In 2018, we showed the documentary to 300 students who came wanting to learn more about becoming involved in the fair trade conversation.

In 2019, I felt that I could do more to make sure that people were not only becoming educated, but also leaving with practical calls to action that would help them live more ethical and sustainable lives, rather than leave discouraged and overwhelmed by everything they had

just learned. Rather than just show *The True Cost* again, we decided to have a “Fair Trade Film Festival” where we showed short films on various fair trade topics. In between each film, a different student came up front and shared about the ways in which they implement ethical and sustainable practices into their own lives. We intentionally chose both men and women to speak, to highlight the role that men have in the fashion justice conversation as well. I believe this was much more fulfilling of the tenant of “education through community-based solutions.”

FUNDRAISING

Fundraising was a necessary element of Wear Justice. Because this event was never done before, all of the funds had to be raised in order to make it happen. During both 2018 and 2019, we collaborated with other campus organizations for funding assistance. These departments and organizations would provide the funding for specific aspects of Wear Justice week, and we would put them as a sponsor of the event. It was a largely symbiotic agreement because we advertised their organizations by putting them on all promotional materials, so they would also get student attention through being involved with the events.

During both years, we also fundraised through selling shirts with the Wear Justice logo. Although I was somewhat against the idea of selling clothes, we decided it was a great opportunity to de-fetishize commodities and emphasize that to the students. We partnered with an organization that worked with survivors of sexual exploitation in Cambodia, that provided job opportunities to them through clothing production. Each shirt was handmade by one of the women, and their name was on the tag of the shirt. This was a great way to start a conversation about commodity fetishism with students who attended Wear Justice events. Three years later, I still see at least one person in a Wear Justice shirt every single day. I like to believe that the

personal aspect of these shirts helped make students value their shirts more and therefore think of them as more important, which is how we should think about all of our clothing.

A large amount of money was also raised through selling and raffling off donated items. As I explained in the promotional section of this paper, I felt dissonance surrounding the irony of sponsoring an anti-consumerist event with consumerist methods. I have struggled with determining different, non-consumerist methods of fundraising, and it is extremely difficult to do. In future years, this is an area in which I hope Wear Justice can improve.

FUTURE TRAJECTORY

2020 brings a host of new dynamics and changes for Wear Justice. I decided to take a step back from the CJR, and am no longer an employee there. I decided to use my final year of college to work on developing a system for replicating Wear Justice, and ensuring that there is consistent theory behind the movement. The CJR has undergone a massive number of infrastructural changes, including a change of director, 90% new full-time staff, and an entirely new group of student staff members and interns. I have been incredibly lucky to have a huge amount of continued support from the CJR, including encouragement to bring this campaign into other spaces and spreading the message to larger audiences. I am also lucky that the four new students are also deeply committed to continuing Wear Justice on campus and ensuring that it maintains theoretical integrity. I have taken a consultation role in the movement this year, as I do not feel that it is fully ready to be without my direction entirely. It has been inspiring for me to see a new group of people take on the movement, and put their own flair and voices within it. It has also been an immense opportunity for growth, as I am still learning the art of delegating. I presume that I will be a perpetual student of delegation, and that is okay.

I am incredibly proud of this thing which I have created on my college campus, and I am optimistic about the potential it has for replication and growth. Although Wear Justice is a story about rethinking consumerism through community, it is just as much my own story of massive successes, massive failures, learning to stand up for myself, and learning not to apologize for being a driven and passionate female leader. Whatever becomes of Wear Justice, I have taken so much from this process that I am positive it will influence the remainder of my life and career. While planning the two years of this movement, I was constantly being informed by my studies and professors, which reminds me further of the beauty of being in community. If I were to list every person who helped create Wear Justice through encouraging me, pushing me, challenging me, and teaching me, I would add a minimum of 10 pages to this paper. I truly could not have even begun to imagine Wear Justice if it weren't for the incredible support systems in my life, which really is the entire meaning behind the movement. We are all deeply influenced and affected by one another, so let us use that for good, to better the world for all people.

REFERENCES

- Bauman, Zigmunt. *Liquid Modernity*. 35.
- Bercovitch, Sakvan. *The Puritan Origins of the American Self*. 20.
- Binkley, Sam. *Liquid Consumption: Anti consumerism and the fetishized de-fetishization commodities*. 602.
- Bruce, Margaret. Daly, Lucy. *Buyer Behavior for Fast Fashion*. 329.
- Church of the Nazarene. Core Values. 2010. ChurchoftheNazarene.org
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. "Kimberle Crenshaw on Intersectionality, more than Two Decades Later." *Columbia Law School*. 2017.
- Chisholm-Burns, Marie A. Spivey, Christina A. Hagemann, Tracy. Josephson, Michelle A. "Women in leadership and the bewildering glass ceiling." *Annual Journal of Health-Systems Pharmacy*. 74(5).

Davis, Tracy L. Wagner, Rachel. "Increasing men's development of social justice attitudes and actions." *Wiley Periodicals*. 2005.

Environmental Protection Agency. 2018. "Facts and Figures." *Facts and Figures about Materials, Waste and Recycling*. 1.

Fair Trade Campaigns. "What is fair trade?" *About*. fairtradecampaigns.org/about

Felluga, Dino. "Modules on Marx: On Fetishism." *Introductory Guide to Critical Theory*. 32.

Festinger, Leon. "An Introduction to the Theory of Dissonance." *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. 1.

Harvey, David. "Neoliberalism as creative destruction." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2007.

House of Representatives. "Report on Human Trafficking." *US Code Chapter 78*. (22 USC § 7102)

Hooks, bell. "Increasing men's development of social justice attitudes and actions." *Wiley Periodicals*. 2005.

Introduction to Sociology. "Chapter 21: social movements and social change." *First Canadian Edition*. OpenText. 2012.

Jenkins, Craig. "Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 1983. 9-527-53.

Johnson, Walter. "The pedestal and the veil: rethinking the capitalism/slavery question." *Journal of the Early Republic*. 306.

Marx, Karl. 1848. "The Communist Manifesto." *The Communist League*. 7(2)

McCambridge, Ruth. "Goodwill industries omaha: the ugly wage ratios that define this nonprofit business." *Nonprofit Quarterly*. 2016.

Morgan, Nick. "We Humans are Social Beings - And Why That Matters for Speakers and Leaders." *Forbes Magazine*. 2015.

Murphy, Troy. "Romantic democracy and the rhetoric of citizenship." *Communication Quarterly*, 51:2, 192-208.

Pew Research Center. "Religious Landscape Study." Religion in America. <https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/>.

Plato. *Allegory of the Cave*.

Sull, Donald. Turconi, Stefano. "Fast Fashion Lessons." *London Business School Review*.

United Nations. 2019. "The Secretary General's Call to Action." *Report of the Secretary-General on the 2019 Climate Action Summit - The Way Forward 2020*. 3(1)