This project has illuminated an important aspect of advocacy: even though minorities often advocate for changes to environments or systems to better suit them, the smaller the minority the less of an impact they can make. The topic of advocacy for SRS acces for trans inmates in prison is a good illustration of this. Although there have been major cases, some going all the way to the supreme court, information on current advocacy efforts is hard to come by. Nevertheless, litigation for the right to SRS, informational handouts, and litigation to update and streamline the process

are all essential elements to this advocacy effort. ~~Instead of~~ These advocacy efforts all address different parts of the ~~legal~~ process though, and both compliment and necessitate the others.

AP: 2

Information on advocacy efforts around SRS is hard to come by because of the specificity of the topic. While most trans people experience dysphoria, which the APA defines as "a marked incongruence between one's experienced/expressed gender and assigned gender" [26], it is not always required for effective treatment. As the WPATH says in version 7 of its Standards of care, "many individuals need both hormone therapy & surgery to alleviate their gender dysphoria, others need only need one of these treatment options, and some need neither" [32]. From this, its clear that only a subset of trans people require SRS for effective treatment.

Past advocacy and analysis has largely focused on both the implementation by states of the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA), and on the provision of healthcare, as seen in [3], [24], ~~and [26].~~ Because of this SRs is not only a subtopic of healthcare, but a subtopic of a subtopic in the larger paper.

AP: 3

Litigation allowing prisoners to have SRS is the first step in the process of ensuring the provision of this surgery to transgender inmates. Cases usually claim that the correctional department was deliberately indifferent to a prisoner's serious medical need under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.[26] This is ultimately based on the 8th ammendment's prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment[26]. These cases ~~either~~ seek a settlement where the correctional department is legally responsible for providing the inmate with SRS, but can also include requests for larger changes or for inmates to be able to posess items

that allign with their gender, such as underware and cosmetics[26]. Litigation has been somewhat effective in securing inmate's right to SRS. Edmo v. corizon inc. in the 9th circuit court of appeals forced the Idaho department of corrections to provide SRS to Andre Edmo. The case of Quine v. Beard a few years before a was even more successful, not only winning SRS for shiloh Quine, but also demanding "structural changes [to] CDCR's treatment of transgender individuals" [26]. This resulted in California being the first state in the ~~country~~ US to allow prisoners access to SRS. However, litigation

~~also faces obsticles.~~ is far from 100% effective. ~~in acki granting~~ The case Gibson v. Collier, ~~despite breaking~~ broke juripresidence in its interpretation of the 8th ammendment, and resulted in a blanket ban on SRS within the 5th circuit. ~~court of appeals.~~ In the cases of De'lonta v. Johnson and Norsworthy v. Beard, litigation proceded but was cut short because the correctional department paroled the inmate. These cases reveal the biggest obsticles to advocacy through litigation: conservative judges. (especially those at the circuit court level), and correctional departments paroling inmates to avoid

being forced to provide SRS. Quine v. Beard was able to dodge both of these potentially fatal blows by being argued in California, and Quine not being elligible for parole because of her murder conviction.

Instead of addressing the problem of SRS access at its source like litigation, think tank reports complement litigation by making information more broadly accessable. While sources like the national transgender law center have resources like [44], a spreadsheet filled with links would be intimidating to someone casually browsing the internet. A report like the Prison Policy Initiative's the dismal state of transgender incarceration policies ~~with~~ has an easy to read ~~font~~ layout and expandable tables to summarize the policies it discusses. This clear format complements litigation by raising public awareness. If ~~justice~~

correctional departments know that the public is paying attention to a case, they may be less likely to parole the inmate to avoid providing care, as doing so would undermine the public's perception of their credibility. Public attention also makes news outlets more likely to report on the case. If people hear the inmates story, they might become sympathetic to their cause. This could put pressure on judges to rule in favor of inmates to appeal to voters, or avoid recall attempts. ← a

The drawback to think tank reports lies in the information they are able to present. For example the

a { Therefore, by presenting information accessably, think tank reports complement litigation by shifting public attention. }

2017 PPI report only discusses the policies of 21 states, while the NTLC document covers all 50. This is because the 21 states described had their policies freely available w/o freadom of info act requests. This shows that think tanks may be more limited in the information they present because of the scope of their projects, when compared to ~~law firms, or~~ other advocacy organizations. Presenting nuanced or complex information is also something that think tank

reports can struggle with. To illustrate this, a timeline is presented in figure 1. Despite changes already being underway in the CDCR, this information is completely absent from the 2017 PPI report. Perhaps this was left out because of an abundance of caution, but not even including a footnote demonstrates that information from think tank reports may also not be as timely as information from other sources.

while generating awareness in the general public of trans prisoner's struggle to get SRS ~~in the general public~~ is important, it is also important to do so inside the prisons themselves. Pamphleteering does this in a way that complements both think tank reports, and littigation. Pamphlets paralell think tank reports by providing key information about SRS. Instead of ~~fac~~ describing problems more generally, they provide prisoners with direct ~~resources~~ routes for self advocacy. These include form numbers, timelines, and rules the correctional department needs to follow throughout the process[45]. This information could

give prisoners confidence to pursue SRS if they were previously only considering it. Pamphleteering and litigation form a symbiotic structure. Changes to department systems brought on by litigation are not helpful to prisoners if the prisoners are not made aware of them. However, pamphleteering requires litigation in order to allow for the changes it discusses. The main obstacle that pamphleteering faces is distribution. Both the 2016 and 2021 versions of the PLO pamphlet start with a disclaimer saying in part that "the laws change frequently and are subject to differing interpretations... we do not always have the resources to make changes to this handout

too vague?

every time the law changes" [45].
In fact, the laws surrounding SRS have changed significantly, as seen in figure 2. The fact that the PLO needs to include this disclaimer because of the rapid rate of legal change indicates that distributing correct information to prisoners using pamphlets poses a significant challenge.

One possible cause of this legal change is litigation to streamline and update correctional department policies. This seeks to address issues that fell through the cracks in the initial settlement. For example, after Quine won her case against California, she received SRS and was transferred to a women's prison[35]. However, after her transfer, she was treated like a new inmate, and underwent an initial screening during which she was denied a razor, and grew a beard [35]. Because Quine had been serving a life sentence since 1981, it would be assumed that she would be transferred without undergoing this screening. However, ~~litigation~~

~~to~~ ensuring the smooth transfer of trans people after SRS, or at least the provi~~sion~~ding those who need it with a razor could require litigation. One obsticle that this particular case faced could have been its transience. Quine was only heald for 45 days before being released in to the general population and being allowed a razor. Law firms might choose to focus their attention on getting more people the right to SRS as opposed to improving an existing process. Improving policies in this way also faces obsticles of litigation for prisoners in general. The obstacle here is the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PRLA) which requires prisoners to exhaust

every level of complaint system within the prison before filing a lawsuit.[9] ~~If prisoners not only ha~~ Having to go through this process once to receive SRS along with the years-long legal battle required to win it through litigation, and then being sent back to the beginning when trying to address a different issue would be very disheartening. Therefore, both this case specifically, and the approach in general face obstacles in their advocacy approach.