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#### Counterplan text: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right to strike if teachers agree to make up lost time. Teachers will agree to make up lost time.

#### Empirics prove that anything else justifies putting kids further behind – the net benefits are youth and the case page

Matthews 12 – Dylan Matthews is an American journalist. He is currently a correspondent for Vox, an online media venture. He studied at Harvard and won a ton of awards for journalism at the Washington Post; “How teacher strikes hurt student achievement”; September 10, 2012; pdf no link, dm me if you want it but this should be the whole article //advay

This card:

* answers standardized testing indicts,
* uses multiple different studies
* and completes a global and holistic analysis of the problem with striking

Talks between the Chicago Public Schools and the Chicago Teachers Union broke down yesterday, and now the city's teachers are on strike, just as class was about to start for the 2012-13 school year. Labor will insist that the strikes lead to contracts that attract good teachers who promote student learning in the long-run, while Emanuel notes that the teachers are striking over his proposed evaluation system, which he argues will help achievement going forward. Leaving that debate aside, what does the strike itself mean for students?

Nothing good, the best empirical evidence suggests. Two of the best recent studies on the effects of teacher work stoppages and strikes concern labor disputes in Ontario schools in the late '90s and early 2000s. One, by the University of Toronto's Michael Baker, compared how standardized test scores rose between grade 3 and grade 6 for students who lost instructional time because of the Ontario strikes, and for students who were unaffected.

Baker found that if the strike happened when a student was in grade 2 or 3, their scores rose by slightly less. But if the strike happened when the student was in grade 5 or 6, their scores rose by a whole lot less. Scores for strike-affected fifth-graders were a full 3.8 percent lower than those for fifth-graders in schools and grades not affected. If that doesn't seem like much, it's 29 percent of the standard deviation (or the typical amount by which students differ from their class average).

Wilfrid Laurer's David Johnson studied the same Ontario strikes and also found that they hurt student achievement. Like Baker, he found only small effects for students for whom the strike occurred in third grade, but large effects if the student was in sixth grade. In the latter case, the percentage of students getting a passing score on math standardized tests fell by 0.21 percentage points per day, and the percentage getting a non-failing score across all tests fell by 0.10 points per day. The effects were much more dramatic in poorer and more socially disadvantaged school districts, where overall passing scores went down by 0.35 points per day. Given that strikes typically last a week or more, these results can add up. A nine-day strike, for instance, reduces passing rates 3.15 percentage points.

And it's not just Ontario. Michèle Belot and Dinand Webbink, now of the Universities of Edinburgh and Rotterdam, respectively, found that work stoppages hurt student achievement, increased the number of students repeating grades and reduced higher education attainment in Belgium. What's more, studies dealing with teacher absences for reasons other than strikes bolster these findings.

A study (pdf) by Harvard's Raegen Miller, Richard Murnane and John Willett tracked the effects of teacher absences while controlling for teacher experience and skill level. They noted that teachers who are absent more regularly may be less motivated and skilled, and so they isolated absences due to poor weather, the idea being that even highly skilled teachers will be absent if the weather prevents them form getting to work.

The study found that absences lead to statistically significant drops in student math and reading scores. The drops are lower than those found in the Baker and Johnson studies, but then again, the students in the Harvard study received instruction from substitutes, whereas students in strikes get no instruction at all. Studies by Charles Clotfelder, Helen Ladd and Jacob Vigdor at Duke and by Mariesa Herrmann and Jonah Rockoff (pdf) at Columbia found significant drops in student achievement because of absences in North Carolina and New York schools, respectively, with the latter finding that a lengthy absence had the same effect as replacing an average teacher with one at the 30th percentile.

The only recent study (pdf) to find no significant results from teacher strikes was conducted by Harris Zwerling, a researcher at the Pennsylvania State Education Association, the state's largest teacher's union. That study compared Pennsylvania school districts that experienced strikes to those that didn't, and found no difference in outcomes once one controls for demographics and years of teacher service; this is much the same methodology as the Ontario studies. One could argue that because the study focused on U.S. schools rather than Canadian or Belgian ones, it is more directly relevant.

But then again, Pennsylvania requires schools to make up lost time due to teacher strikes at the end of the school year, which Canadian and Belgian schools don't. Illinois schools are required to teach 176 days a year, and the union insists that agreements to make up lost school days are traditional in bargaining agreements. But the 176-day requirement is frequently ignored, with 400,000 Chicago schoolchildren only attending school for 170 days. So there's a real possibility that the Chicago strike will end up like the Canadian and Belgian ones, with real lost instructional time and big effects on student learning as a result, rather than like the Pennsylvania one, with no lost time and no effect on learning.

One last thing — one could protest that all these results rely on standardized testing, which may or may not correlate to real learning. That's fair enough, but there's a bounty of evidence, from Harvard's Raj Chetty (pdf) and Stanford's Eric Hanushek, among others, suggesting that standardized test scores correlate with higher education achievement, lifetime earnings and more. So if the Chicago strike does end up hurting student scores it could affect their lives for lifetime earnings and more.

## 2

#### U.S. youth unemployment is skyrocketing—Covid-19 is devastating for young workers and current measures are comically inadequate.

[Genevieve Leigh (2020), National Secretary of the International Youth and Students for Social Equality (US) & writer for [WSWS](https://t.co/Rskv8OjyPr?amp=1), Unemployment skyrockets among youth, World Socialist Web Site, <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2020/05/27/yout-m27.html> (5-27-2020)]//CHS PK

More than 7.7 million workers younger than 30 are now unemployed in the US. Over 3 million dropped out of the labor force over the course of a single month, from mid-April to mid-May. The number of young people now unemployed amounts to nearly one in three young workers, the highest rate since the country started tracking unemployment by age in 1948. These figures are paralleled in countries hit by the coronavirus pandemic all around the world. In Australia, the youth unemployment rate has jumped to 13.8 percent. Youth unemployment rates in Australia were already more than double the overall unemployment rate of the country and were almost three times higher than for those 25 and older. A report from the Resolution Foundation think tank recently found that youth unemployment in the UK could rise by 640,000 this year, bringing the total above 1 million. In Spain, half of all those who have lost jobs since the start of the outbreak have been adults under the age of 35. In Canada, the youth unemployment rate jumped to 27.2 percent in April, from 16.8 percent in March. Student unemployment was even higher. Young workers are vastly over-represented in the sectors hardest hit by the lockdown and social distancing measures. These sectors include hospitality, food services, retail, arts and recreation. Nearly [40 percent](https://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.nr0.htm) of the young workers who are unemployed in the US worked in the devastated retail and food service sectors alone. The Millennial generation, those aged between 26 and 40, make up a majority of bartenders and half of restaurant workers. According to a new report by Data for Progress, over half of people under the age of 45 say that the $1,200 cash payment from the US federal government covered just a week or two of expenses, compared with a third of older adults. The US Labor Department continues to report that the majority of laid-off workers expect their joblessness to be temporary. However, there is growing concern among economists that many jobs will never come back. Nicholas Bloom, an economist at Stanford University, recently told the New York Times that the path to recovery “is going to take longer and look grimmer than we thought.” Bloom is the co-author of an analysis of the pandemic’s effects on the labor market titled “COVID-19 Is Also a Reallocation Shock.” In it, he and his co-thinkers estimate that 42 percent of recent layoffs will result in permanent job loss. A large body of research, along with the fresh experience of the 2008 recession, shows that young people, especially those without a college degree, are particularly vulnerable during economic downturns and recessions. An [analysis](https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/public-sector/our-insights/covid-19-and-jobs-monitoring-the-us-impact-on-people-and-places) by the McKinsey Global Institute estimates that up to 57 million US jobs are now vulnerable, including a growing number of white-collar positions. Furthermore, the report finds that 86 percent of jobs made vulnerable by the pandemic pay less than $40,000 a year. In other words, those workers who were already in precarious situations are not only getting hit the hardest, many will be forced out of their industry altogether. For those workers in the Millennial generation (now aged 26 to 40) and older, this is the second major economic catastrophe in barely a decade. The researchers note in their report that “the generation that first entered the job market in the aftermath of the Great Recession is now going through its second ‘once-in-a-lifetime’ downturn.” If the 2008 financial crash is any indication, we can expect that the current economic downturn will exact a devastating toll on all workers, the youth in particular. In the aftermath of the 2008 financial crash, youth unemployment soared to more than 60 percent in some European regions. In many countries, the youth unemployment rate never fully recovered to pre-recession levels. In the US, half of recent graduates were unable to find work during the recession years. Millennials’ official unemployment rate [ranged as](https://epionline.org/release/new-epi-analysis-shows-teen-unemployment-rate-averages-33-6-percent-in-arizona/) high as 20 or 30 percent. The recession was used as an opportunity to make more fundamental changes to the economy that would leave young workers hounded by high rates of underemployment, low wages and stagnant earnings trajectories for the following decade. Full-time salaried positions were slashed with the introduction of “gig” economy work. Nearly 95 percent of the jobs created during the Obama administration, from 2009 to 2017, were part-time, contract, on-call or temporary. This piecemeal work, cynically sold to the younger generation as “flexible” work, often excludes health care, retirement benefits, sick days and other benefits, and is highly unreliable. It has already become commonplace for workers to hold down two or three part-time jobs in order to make ends meet and provide for their families. To get a sense of the scale of the economic crisis pre-pandemic, one should consider that in 2019 some 61 percent of US workers were reporting that they did not have enough savings to cover a $1,000 emergency room visit or car repair. One in five Millennials reported not being able to afford routine health care expenses, and nearly half had nothing saved. This situation is being dramatically worsened by the impact of the pandemic. In 2018, taking note of the devastating toll the recession had taken on a whole generation of young workers, the Wall Street Journal noted that Millennials were at risk of becoming “America’s Lost Generation.” Similar warnings have already begun to circulate in regard to the emerging generation, known as Gen Z. However, as the Journal itself nervously pointed out at the time, the Millennial generation in the US was also the first generation to favor socialism over capitalism. The dire conditions facing young people, which are more and more understood to be the consequence of decaying social order, have created the objective basis for a vast radicalization of young people and workers across the globe. The two years prior to the onset of the pandemic were marked by the reemergence of the class struggle internationally, in which young workers played leading roles. Generation Z is now coming of age under conditions that far outstrip those which the Millennials confronted in the aftermath of 2008. The events of the day will not pass by this new generation, or the older generations, for that matter, without leaving a profound and revolutionary political impact. The younger generation is coming of age in a world of immense contradictions, with enormous developments in technology and science occurring simultaneously with the deaths of hundreds of thousands of workers internationally as a result of the criminal response of the ruling class to the pandemic. Trillions of dollars are being poured into the coffers of the global corporate elites while young people’s schools are defunded and their jobs destroyed. Instability and uncertainty are among the defining features of everyday life. Under such conditions, there is no doubt that the popularity of socialism among young people will continue to grow at a rapid pace. Far from becoming the “Lost Generation” as predicted by the Wall Street Journal, the emerging generation of young workers carries within it an enormous revolutionary force.

#### teachers will use power to strike often- conceded in CX- which undercuts our youth

Norton and Hernandez 18 – Hilary Norton is BizFed chair and executive director of FAST (Fixing Angelenos Stuck in Traffic); Tracy Hernandez is the founding CEO of the Los Angeles County Business Federation (BizFed) and president of IMPOWER Inc. BizFed is a grassroots alliance of more than 175 business organizations representing 395,000 businesses with nearly 4 million employees throughout Los Angeles County. BizFed advocates for policies and projects that strengthen the regional economy by exploring all sides of critical issues and takes action on policies to make a difference for business growth, job creation and economic vitality in Southern California; “Commentary: A teachers strike is bad for our students, families and economy”; “October 10, 2018”; <http://laschoolreport.com/commentary-a-teachers-strike-is-bad-for-our-students-families-and-economy/> advay

When schools are closed due to strikes, students miss learning opportunities, parents must take days off from work and our region is disrupted. Beyond hurting families, this strike will hurt our businesses and their ability to sustain and create new jobs.

This potential strike by LAUSD teachers will be the first in nearly three decades. The strike in 1989 lasted nine days; the most recent teachers strike in West Virginia lasted seven days. For a family living paycheck to paycheck, over a week of unpaid time off to watch their children should not be the deciding factor between paying the rent and putting food on the table; the entire family’s livelihood is threatened. Imagine a single mom who is a nurse and has no one to watch her children. She must choose between leaving her children at home or missing a shift. That money cannot be paid back.

Every day that a student is not in the classroom, they lose learning opportunities. Students fall behind the content standards set by the California State Board of Education, and teachers have to add those lost days into their curriculum. Students lose daily social interactions with their peers, which helps build character and good citizenship. Think of a student who has the dream of being a doctor. They miss school and now are discouraged and lose the aspiration of being a doctor.

At-risk youth are the most vulnerable when there are school closures. If parents don’t have the ability to skip work during a teacher strike, can’t afford childcare or don’t have family that can help out, that means students are left unsupervised. Anyone who has children knows that the course of their lives can change in an instant. We must avoid putting our children’s health and safety at risk.

 In LAUSD, over 84 percent of the students qualify for free or reduced-price meals; the district serves over 700,000 meals each day. For many of these students, this is their only chance to eat a healthy breakfast, lunch and supper after school. A child’s nutrition should not be compromised at the hands of this potential strike.

As business leaders, we value the importance of treating teachers fairly while maintaining fiscal solvency. We urge LAUSD and UTLA to find a resolution that accomplishes both. Employers care deeply for the strength and effectiveness of our K-12 educational systems. These students will also become the workforce that will grow our economy into the future.

We understand that LAUSD needs more resources and support from the state, but they do not need to exacerbate the problem by cutting off the current stream of per-pupil state funding each day the strike occurs.

The business community is ready to stand with its school district and teachers to support our public education system. We implore LAUSD and UTLA to avoid public fights, come to a resolution and work with the larger community to improve our city’s education system for all. Keep our future leaders learning!

#### High youth unemployment destroys the economy – lower spending, more job losses, and higher costs

Steinberg 13 [Sarah Ayres Steinberg is a Policy Analyst with the Economic Policy team at the Center for American Progress.] “The High Cost of Youth Unemployment.” Center for American Progress. April 5, 2013. <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/reports/2013/04/05/59428/the-high-cost-of-youth-unemployment/> BSPK

What is the true cost of youth unemployment?

Youth unemployment leads to depressed lifetime earnings

Not only is unemployment bad for young people now, but the negative effects of being unemployed have also been shown to follow a person throughout his or her career. A young person who has been unemployed for six months can expect to earn about $22,000 less over the next 10 years than they could have expected to earn had they not experienced a lengthy period of unemployment. In April 2010 the number of people ages 20–24 who were unemployed for more than six months had reached an all-time high of 967,000 people. We estimate that these young Americans will lose a total of $21.4 billion in earnings over the next 10 years.

This estimate is based on a study that found men who experienced a six-month period of unemployment at age 22 earned 8 percent less at age 23 than they would have otherwise. The wage gap narrows with age, but it still persists. By age 26, the men earned 6 percent less than they would have if they had never been unemployed. Even by age 31, their wages were 3 percent or 4 percent lower than they otherwise would have been. Long-term unemployment robs young people of the opportunity to gain the skills, experiences, and connections that translate into higher wages.

Related studies have found similar negative effects on future earnings. Researchers in the United Kingdom found that one year of youth unemployment at the age of 22 resulted in wages that were 13 percent to 21 percent less 20 years later. Another study that looked at American men who graduated from college during a recession estimated that an increase in the national unemployment rate of 1 percent translated into 6 percent to 7 percent lower wages initially and 2.5 percent lower wages 15 years down the road.

The impact of these lost earnings on young Americans is readily apparent. Young Americans today find themselves being increasingly squeezed by everything from rising tuition costs to health care expenses to energy bills, but income for the typical household hasn’t increased in 20 years. The repercussions of this financial squeeze are clear. Today Americans under the age of 40 have accumulated less wealth than their parents did at that age more than 25 years ago. More than 13 percent of borrowers—mainly young adults—have defaulted on their student loans, and another 26 percent are delinquent. Young adults are now more likely to live with their parents and less likely to own a home than they were before the recession. And more than half of Americans ages 25–34 have saved less than $10,000 for retirement, increasing the odds that they will lack sufficient savings to retire in their old age.

Yet another casualty of these lost wages is long-term U.S. economic growth. When workers earn less because they were once unemployed, they spend less money at supermarkets, bookstores, cafes, and other businesses. The effect of taking this spending out of the economy adds up, resulting in fewer jobs and slower economic growth. Allowing high levels of youth unemployment to persist will weaken America’s economic growth and prosperity for years to come.

Youth unemployment incurs fiscal costs

Moreover, youth unemployment creates an additional cost burden for taxpayers in the form of lost revenues, the need for government-provided health care, increased crime, and additional welfare payments. In a recent study commissioned by the White House Council on Community Solutions, researchers estimate that the fiscal cost of the 6.7 million Americans ages 16–24 who are neither working nor attending school is $1.6 trillion over their lifetimes. Failing to create jobs for unemployed young people today will leave taxpayers with a huge bill down the road.

Conclusion

Ignoring the dire employment situation for young Americans is simply not an option. The economic consequences of high youth unemployment are enduring, and failing to employ young people today will result in lost earnings, greater costs, and slower economic growth tomorrow. Unfortunately, Congress is moving in the wrong direction with sequestration and misguided policy decisions to end programs that are proven to put young people to work. While youth unemployment has risen, Congress has cut $1 billion from youth jobs programs over the past decade. Furthermore, sequestration, with its across the board automatic spending cuts, will result in the elimination of 4,200 AmeriCorps positions, cutting back on an important source of jobs that allow young people to gain valuable experience and develop marketable skills. In future briefs, CAP will propose a series of forward-thinking policies that will help lawmakers tackle the nation’s youth-unemployment crisis. But Congress can start to address the crisis now by putting a stop to these shortsighted funding cuts and beginning to take youth unemployment seriously.

#### Young americans are k2 the economy

Steinberg 13 Sarah Ayres Steinberg is the Vice President of Global Philanthropy at JPMorgan Chase & Co. Prior to joining JPMorgan Chase, Sarah was Senior Economic Policy Analyst at the Center for American Progress, where she led CAP’s research on workforce development and expanding apprenticeships. Her research has been cited by The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, and The Washington Post, among others., 4-5-2013, "The High Cost of Youth Unemployment," Center for American Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/reports/2013/04/05/59428/the-high-cost-of-youth-unemployment/>) //EG

Nearly everyone has struggled in the wake of the Great Recession, but young Americans have suffered the most. While others have slowly returned to work, the unemployment rate for Americans ages 16–24 stands at 16.2 percent, more than double the national rate of unemployment. And even when this group eventually starts earning a paycheck, the impact of their unemployment will follow them for years. According to a new analysis by the Center for American Progress, young Americans will lose a staggering $20 billion in earnings over the next decade.

Research shows that workers who are unemployed as young adults earn lower wages for many years following their period of unemployment due to forgone work experience and missed opportunities to develop skills. Building on this research, we estimate that the nearly 1 million young Americans who experienced long-term unemployment during the worst of the recession will lose more than $20 billion in earnings over the next 10 years. This equates to about $22,000 per person. The economic consequences of these lost wages to individuals and to the broader economy are serious. These young Americans—referred to as Millennials—will increasingly be forced to delay moving out of their parents’ homes, struggle to make payments on ballooning student-loan debt, and fail to save adequately for retirement. As a consequence of the prolonged unemployment of Millennials, the U.S. economy will feel the loss of aggregate demand in the form of slower growth and less job creation.

#### Econ collapse goes nuclear and causes extinction

Mann 14 (Eric Mann is a special agent with a United States federal agency, with significant domestic and international counterintelligence and counter-terrorism experience. Worked as a special assistant for a U.S. Senator and served as a presidential appointee for the U.S. Congress. He is currently responsible for an internal security and vulnerability assessment program. Bachelors @ University of South Carolina, Graduate degree in Homeland Security @ Georgetown. “AUSTERITY, ECONOMIC DECLINE, AND FINANCIAL WEAPONS OF WAR: A NEW PARADIGM FOR GLOBAL SECURITY,” May 2014, <https://jscholarship.library.jhu.edu/bitstream/handle/1774.2/37262/MANN-THESIS-2014.pdf>)

The conclusions reached in this thesis demonstrate how economic considerations within states can figure prominently into the calculus for future conflicts. The findings also suggest that security issues with economic or financial underpinnings will transcend classical determinants of war and conflict, and change the manner by which rival states engage in hostile acts toward one another. The research shows that security concerns emanating from economic uncertainty and the inherent vulnerabilities within global financial markets will present new challenges for national security, and provide developing states new asymmetric options for balancing against stronger states.¶ The security areas, identified in the proceeding chapters, are likely to mature into global security threats in the immediate future. As the case study on South Korea suggest, the overlapping security issues associated with economic decline and reduced military spending by the United States will affect allied confidence in America’s security guarantees. The study shows that this outcome could cause regional instability or realignments of strategic partnerships in the Asia-pacific region with ramifications for U.S. national security. Rival states and non-state groups may also become emboldened to challenge America’s status in the unipolar international system.¶ The potential risks associated with stolen or loose WMD, resulting from poor security, can also pose a threat to U.S. national security. The case study on Pakistan, Syria and North Korea show how financial constraints affect weapons security making weapons vulnerable to theft, and how financial factors can influence WMD proliferation by contributing to the motivating factors behind a trusted insider’s decision to sell weapons technology. The inherent vulnerabilities within the global financial markets will provide terrorists’ organizations and other non-state groups, who object to the current international system or distribution of power, with opportunities to disrupt global finance and perhaps weaken America’s status. A more ominous threat originates from states intent on increasing diversification of foreign currency holdings, establishing alternatives to the dollar for international trade, or engaging financial warfare against the United States.

## Case

### Top-level

#### Turn: Today’s strikes rely on public support—legal strikes always incite social tensions among groups of different statuses—only illegal strikes have the potential to be successful and change minds

Reddy 21-- Diana S. Reddy [Diana Reddy is a Doctoral Fellow at the Law, Economics, and Politics Center at UC Berkeley Law]; “There Is No Such Thing as an Illegal Strike”: Reconceptualizing the Strike in Law and Political Economy; Jan 6 2021; Yale Law Journal; <https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy>. (AG DebateDrills)

In recent years, consistent with this vision, there has been a shift in the kinds of strikes [are] workers and their organizations engage in—increasingly public-facing, engaged with the community, and capacious in their concerns.178 They have transcended the ostensible apoliticism of their forebearers in two ways, less voluntaristic and less economistic. They are less voluntaristic in that they seek to engage and mobilize the broader community in support of labor’s goals, and those goals often include community, if not state, action. They are less economistic in that they draw through lines between workplace-based economic issues and other forms of exploitation and subjugation that have been constructed as “political.” These strikes do not necessarily look like what strikes looked like fifty years ago, and they often skirt—or at times, flatly defy—legal rules. Yet, they have often been successful. Since 2012, tens of thousands of workers in the Fight for $15 movement have engaged in discourse-changing, public law-building strikes. They do not shut down production, and their primary targets are not direct employers. For these reasons, they push the boundaries of exiting labor law.179 Still, the risks appear to have been worth it. A 2018 report by the National Employment Law Center found that these strikes had helped twenty-two million low-wage workers win $68 billion in raises, a redistribution of wealth fourteen times greater than the value of the last federal minimum wage increase in 2007.180 They have demonstrated the power of strikes to do more than challenge employer behavior. As Kate Andrias has argued: [T]he Fight for $15 . . . reject[s] the notion that unions’ primary role is to negotiate traditional private collective bargaining agreements, with the state playing a neutral mediating and enforcing role. Instead, the movements are seeking to bargain in the public arena: they are engaging in social bargaining with the state on behalf of all workers.”181 In the so-called “red state” teacher strikes of 2018, more than a hundred thousand educators in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, and other states struck to challenge post-Great Recession austerity measures, which they argued hurt teachers and students, alike.182 These strikes were illegal; yet, no penalties were imposed.183 Rather, the strikes grew workers’ unions, won meaningful concessions from state governments, and built public support. As noted above, public-sector work stoppages are easier to conceive of as political, even under existing jurisprudential categories.184 But these strikes were political in the broader sense as well. Educators worked with parents and students to cultivate support, and they explained how their struggles were connected to the needs of those communities.185 Their power was not only in depriving schools of their labor power, but in making normative claims about the value of that labor to the community. Most recently, 2020 saw a flurry of work stoppages in support of the Black Lives Matter movement.186 These ranged from Minneapolis bus drivers’ refusal to transport protesters to jail, to Service Employees International Union’s Strike for Black Lives, to the NBA players’ wildcat strike.187 Some of these protests violated legal restrictions. The NBA players’ strike for instance, was inconsistent with a “no-strike” clause in their collective-bargaining agreement with the NBA.188 And it remains an open question in each case whether workers sought goals that were sufficiently job-related as to constitute protected activity.189 Whatever the conclusion under current law, however, striking workers demonstrated in fact the relationship between their workplaces and broader political concerns. The NBA players’ strike was resolved in part through an agreement that NBA arenas would be used as polling places and sites of civic engagement.190 Workers withheld their labor in order to insist that private capital be used for public, democratic purposes. And in refusing to transport arrested protestors to jail, Minneapolis bus drivers made claims about their vision for public transport. Collectively, all of these strikes have prompted debates within the labor movement about what a strike is, and what its role should be. These strikes are so outside the bounds of institutionalized categories that public data sources do not always reflect them.191 And there is, reportedly, a concern by some union leaders that these strikes do not look like the strikes of the mid-twentieth century. There has been a tendency to dismiss them.192 In response, Bill Fletcher Jr., the AFL-CIO’s first Black Education Director, has argued, “People, who wouldn’t call them strikes, aren’t looking at history.”193 Fletcher, Jr. analogizes these strikes to the tactics of the civil-rights movement. As Catherine Fisk and I recently argued, law has played an undertheorized role in constructing the labor movement and civil-rights movement as separate and apart from each other, by affording First Amendment protections to civil rights groups, who engage in “political” activity, that are denied to labor unions, engaging in “economic” activity.194 Labor unions who have strayed from the lawful parameters of protest have paid for it dearly.195 As such, it is no surprise that some unions are reluctant to embrace a broader vision of what the strike can be. Under current law, worker protest that defies acceptable legal parameters can destroy a union. Recasting the strike—and the work of unions more broadly—as political is risky. Samuel Gompers defended the AFL’s voluntarism and economism not as a matter of ideology but of pragmatism; he insisted that American workers were too divided to unite around any vision other than “more.”196 He did not want labor’s fortunes tied to the vicissitudes of party politics or to a state that he had experienced as protective of existing power structures. Now, perhaps more than ever, it is easy to understand the dangers of the “political” in a divided United States. Through seeking to be apolitical, labor took its work out of the realm of the debatable for decades; for this time, the idea that (some) workers should have (some form of) collective representation in the workplace verged on hegemonic. And yet, labor’s reluctance to engage in the “contest of ideas” has inhibited more than its cultivation of broader allies; it has inhibited its own organizing. If working people have no exposure to alternative visions of political economy or what workplace democracy entails, it is that much harder to convince them to join unions. Similarly, labor’s desire to organize around a decontextualized “economics” has always diminished its power (and moral authority), given that the economy is structured by race, gender, and other status inequalities—and always has been. During the Steel Strike of 1919, the steel companies relied on more than state repression to break the strike. They also exploited unions’ refusal to organize across the color line. Steel companies replaced striking white workers with Black workers.197 Black workers also sought “more.” But given their violent exclusion from many labor unions at the time, many believed they would not achieve it through white-led unions.198

### Turns

#### Turn: Teachers unions are corrupt and self-serving – bolstering them doesn’t solve the aff and spurs corruption

Talgo 20 – Chris Talgo is an opinion contributer for the Hill; “Teacher unions are holding America's students hostage”; 09/13/20; <https://thehill.com/opinion/education/516028-teacher-unions-are-holding-americas-students-hostage> //advay

This begs a simple question: Why are the overwhelming majority of schools in the United States closed if students are practically invulnerable to COVID-19?

Well, here is one educated guess: Because teacher unions (and their political allies) are holding America’s students hostage in a devil’s bargain for more money and power.

On July 24, American Federation of Teachers (AFT) President Randi Weingarten said, “Let’s stop the debate about whether safety matters and start rolling up our sleeves so we get the resources to meet the needs of students, whether we are teaching remotely or in person.”

When referring to “resources,” Weingarten seems to mean more money and political favors, of course.

Unlike Weingarten’s statement, which requires some reading between the lines, many teacher unions are much more explicit with their outrageous demands, which have nothing to do with protecting teachers or students.

For example, the Los Angeles Teachers Union (LATU) list of demands includes “implementing a moratorium on private schools, defunding the police, increasing taxes on the wealthy, implementing Medicare for all, and passing the HEROES Act, which allocated an additional $116 billion in federal education funding to the states.”

Give the LATU some brownie points for honesty, at least.

Like it or not, America’s teachers are essential workers. Grocery store clerks, gas station attendants and a whole host of other “essential workers” have braved the pandemic. Why shouldn’t teachers do the same?

It is downright pitiful that America’s teachers are flat-out refusing to do their jobs unless they are showered with more “resources,” as Weingarten put it.

Yet, it is doubtful that the teacher unions’ dereliction of duty would work if it were not for their cozy relationships with politicians on the left side of the political aisle, who constantly fulfill their demands.

For decades, the Democratic Party and teacher unions have engaged in a corrupt relationship in which teacher unions flood the party with so-called “resources” in return for salary increases, spectacular health care benefits and remarkable retirement packages.

Yet, it seems as if the teacher unions might have jumped the shark this time. As Americans look to get back to some semblance of normalcy after the spring and summer shutdown, the last thing they need is teachers refusing to return to the classroom.

On the other hand, the refusal of teacher unions to allow their members to perform their jobs might also be the very best thing to happen to the American education system in quite a long time.

It would be ironic if teacher unions’ outrageous demands during the pandemic actually led to their downfall by making American parents aware of the fact that teacher unions are not concerned with the best interests of their students.

Could the greed of teacher unions at this precarious point in time be the kryptonite that causes their downfall and opens the door to unfettered school choice in America? If so, that would be a silver lining of the coronavirus pandemic.

#### Turn inequality – teacher strikes worsen students in the short term which triggers long term problems

IP 19 – The Illinois Policy Institute is a nonpartisan 501(c)(3) research organization. Our partner organization, Illinois Policy, is an independent, nonpartisan 501(c)(4) advocacy organization; “TEACHER STRIKES HURT STUDENT OUTCOMES AND MAY WORSEN INCOME INEQUALITY”; October 2, 2019; <https://www.illinoispolicy.org/press-releases/teacher-strikes-hurt-student-outcomes-and-may-worsen-income-inequality/> advay

CHICAGO (Oct. 2, 2019) – As the Chicago Teachers Union plans to announce this afternoon whether it will walk out on more than 360,000 students, [studies show](https://illinoispolicy.us1.list-manage.com/track/click?u=7fe208d3c85ffa1d03aeaade4&id=5ecc6a508a&e=0b391c8e91) strikes negatively affect student academic outcomes.

Research published in the National Bureau of Economic Research indicates strikes can temper growth in elementary student test scores by 2.2%. Given 90% of Chicago Public School students in 2018 were minority and 83% were classified as low-income, this means a strike will disproportionately harm those most in need and leave them to endure the long term negative consequences.

*Experts from the nonpartisan Illinois Policy Institute are available to comment on how a strike would hurt minority and low-income students, potentially worsening income inequality.*

How strikes harm student populations:

* Test score decline: Expert consensus finds strikes have long-term negative effects on students. One study published by the NBER discovered that long strikes of 10 or more days have a significant negative effect on math test scores. Another published by Columbia University economists found extended disruptions, such as a strike, have negative effects on math and English achievement.
* Less instruction: Unless the educational time lost during a strike is made up – such as by extending the school year – students lose the corresponding time in the classroom. In addition, students may require extensive review of material to get back up to speed.
* Underperforming state averages: CPS already underperforms state academic achievement benchmarks. Its average SAT scores are 56 points lower than the state average, its four-year graduation rates are 11 percentage points lower and the percentage of CPS teachers rated proficient or excellent is 11 percentage points lower. A strike could exacerbate this.

Quote from Orphe Divounguy, chief economist for the nonpartisan Illinois Policy Institute:

“In the case of a teachers’ strike in Chicago, it is students who will ultimately be left behind. Lost classroom time worsens academic achievement and harms poor and disadvantaged students the most.

“With growing concerns about income inequality, the best way to ensure low-income students succeed is for CTU to accept Mayor Lightfoot’s generous offer and keep students in the classroom.”

#### Link turn: Teachers unions and entrenched in leftist politics – any support for them emboldens the right

McDonald 20 – Kerry McDonald is a Senior Education Fellow at FEE and author of Unschooled: Raising Curious, Well-Educated Children Outside the Conventional Classroom (Chicago Review Press, 2019). She is also an adjunct scholar at The Cato Institute and a regular Forbes contributor. Kerry has a B.A. in economics from Bowdoin College and an M.Ed. in education policy from Harvard University; “Teachers Unions Are More Powerful Than You Realize—But That May Be Changing”; August 31, 2020; <https://fee.org/articles/teacher-unions-are-more-powerful-than-you-realize-but-that-may-be-changing/> advay

Teachers unions throughout the US claim to be looking out for the best interests of teachers and students, but they are deeply political organizations with significant influence over what, how, where, and with whom most children learn.

While the nation’s largest teachers unions have long been deeply connected to the Democratic Party and left-wing ideology, this political affiliation has become increasingly apparent in recent months. From hinging their support for reopening schools on outrageous policy demands to launching court battles, threatening strikes, and openly supporting disturbing actions during recent protests, today’s teachers unions are more powerful and dangerous than many parents may realize.

Public sector unions by their nature are problematic because they are funded by taxpayers under a threat of force and often have monopoly power. Unlike private sector unions where consumers have more choice, no taxpayer can opt out of paying their portion of public sector union dues (which come from government employee salaries), including what those dues fund.

In July, the Los Angeles teachers union released a report detailing the conditions they identified for a safe reopening of schools. This document went far beyond requesting social distancing plans and personal protective equipment to an agenda that eclipsed both COVID-19 and educational matters. Specifically, it laid out policy requirements for school reopening, including passing Medicare for All at the federal level, raising state taxes, defunding the police, and imposing a moratorium on charter schools.

In Florida, the teachers union waged a court battle against the state’s school reopening plans this fall. In New York City, the teachers union is threatening to strike this week over in-person school reopening plans. And in Massachusetts, teachers unions recently succeeded in delaying the school start date to later in September, ensuring no funding cuts, and pushing for remote-only learning in many districts.

As Corey DeAngelis of the Reason Foundation observed, school reopenings are closely linked to the power and influence of teachers unions in a given location—not to virus-related safety concerns. Citing mounting data on school reopening plans across the country, DeAngelis reports that the “relationship between unionization and reopening decisions remains substantively and statistically significant even after controlling for school district size and coronavirus deaths and cases per capita in the county during the month of July.”

Beyond COVID-19, teachers unions are also weighing in on the social unrest impacting major US cities. Particularly disturbing was a tweet issued last week by the Chicago Teachers Union supporting protesters who erected a guillotine outside of Amazon founder and CEO, Jeff Bezos’s, house:

We are completely frightened by, completely impressed by and completely in support of wherever this is headed. #Solidarity https://t.co/IfsQgJaD1z

— ChicagoTeachersUnion (@CTULocal1) August 27, 2020

Contentious back-to-school plans, a heated presidential election cycle, and mounting civil strife are shining an illuminating spotlight on teachers unions and their established political affiliations. While we may think of public schools across the country as reflecting the political and ideological diversity of their local communities, the reality is that the teachers unions and their members swing hard left.

According to EducationNext, the nation’s two top teachers unions have been among the leading financial contributors to national elections since 1990: “They have forged an alliance with the Democratic Party, which receives the vast majority of their hard-money campaign contributions as well as in-kind contributions for get-out-the-vote operations.” Teachers union members comprise 10 percent of the delegates at the Democratic National Convention, where they represent “the single largest organizational bloc of Democratic Party activists.”

Fortunately, the 2018 US Supreme Court’s Janus decision freed non-members of public sector unions from being forced to contribute union dues, allowing government employees to avoid supporting political organizations and platforms with which they may disagree. Despite this win, the influence of teachers unions on progressive policy across the country continues unabated. In fact, the National Education Association, the nation’s largest public sector union and the largest teachers union, reported that both dues and membership increased a year after the Janus decision.

At their July convention, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the nation’s second-largest teachers union, voted almost unanimously to endorse Joe Biden’s presidential bid. In her convention speech, AFT president Randi Weingarten made no secret of the far-left policies and politics her union and its members endorse. She said:

Imagine a world with: universal pre-K; debt forgiveness for educators; triple Title I funding; expanded community schools; supports for kids with special needs; high-stakes testing thrown out the window; charter school accountability; public colleges and universities tuition-free for families who earn less than $125,000.

That’s not from an AFT resolution. That’s straight from the Democratic Party platform, born out of the Biden-Sanders Unity Task Force recommendations we helped draft.

Additionally, the AFT endorsed other progressive policies at their convention that are unrelated to education, such as the Green New Deal, affordable housing, and universal healthcare. For many of the parents of the nearly 50 million K-12 public school students in the US, these policies likely go against their personal and political beliefs and they should be concerned that this leftist ideology is creeping into their child’s classroom.

This seems to already be occurring in California. State lawmakers have paved the way for the country’s first mandatory ethnic studies graduation requirement, a move that is actively embraced by the California Teachers Union. The Wall Street Journal editorial board wrote Sunday about California’s planned curriculum mandate: “This is ugly stuff, a force-feeding to teenagers of the anti-liberal theories that have been percolating in campus critical studies departments for decades. Enforced identity politics and ‘intersectionality’ are on their way to replacing civic nationalism as America’s creed.”