# T – “A”

### A. Interpretation

#### [CCC] Affirmatives may not specify a just government that ought to make voting compulsory. “A” is an indefinite article that modifies “just govenrment” in the resolution which means that you have to prove the resolution true in a VACCUM, not in a particular instance.

**CCC:** Capital Community College [The Guide to Grammar and Writing is sponsored by the [Capital Community College Foundation](http://www.ccc.commnet.edu/giving/), a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation. I If you feel we have provided something of value and wish to show your appreciation, you can assist the College and its students with a tax-deductible contribution.] “Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers” 1994 AA

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin withan h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an historical moment, but we would say a History book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class.

### B. Violation

#### [Violation] They defend the unconditional right to strike in - The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

### C. Net Benefits

#### 1. First, LIMITS: there are 145 democracies that don’t currently have uncondo right to strikeeach with a dozen ways it could be enforced. This means LITERALLY THOUSANDS of affirmatives are topical under any other interpretation, and there is no way they can cope without relying on generics. Key to fairness since if they can defend anything they get an easier way to win.

#### 2. Second, GROUND: allowing the aff to spec one democracy gives debaters the ability to cherry-pick a democracy where there is no literature opposing uncodno right to strik. Ground is key to fairness – they spike out neg offense that is predicated off the aff defending democracies generally, rather that isolating one.

#### TVA Solves: read [democracy they spec] as an advantage to a whole-res aff. They’ll say we only allow for one aff, but that’s wrong since there are an infinite number of frameworks and advantages you could read while still providing a stable stasis point.

### D. Voter

#### [Voter] The voter is fairness, meaning our ability to engage within the debate without arbitrary interferences – comes first because without it the judge can’t vote for the better debater just the one with the unfair advantage.

#### [Implication] DROP THE DEBATER: dropping the argument justifies all debaters committing this abuse. Even if no one changes as a result of the judge’s decision in THIS round, dropping them still sends the message that breaking theory rules requires punishment.

#### [No RVIs] NO RVIs:

**1.** RVIs create a chilling effect that encourages debaters to read non-T affs and win on an RVI. The point of T is to check abuse, so RVIs destroy that.

**2.** RVIs make no sense on T debate. It's expected that you're topical, and just as you wouldn't win for reading a 6-minute aff, you shouldn't win for being T.

#### [Competing Interps] USE COMPETING INTERPS: Reasonability makes no sense on T. You can't be "reasonably" T; you either are or you aren't. Using competing interps forces them to defend why they are, and if they can't, they should lose.

### T

#### Interpretation: the affirmative must defend that only just governments ought to recognize the right to strike

#### Just governments respect liberties

Dorn 12 James A. Dorn, Cato Journal, "The Scope of Government in a Free Society", Fall 2012, https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2012/12/v32n3-10.pdf

If laws are just, liberty and property are secure. The most certain test of justice is negative—that is, justice occurs when injustice (the violation of natural rights to life, liberty, and property) is prevented. The emphasis here is on what Hayek (1967) called “just rules of conduct,” not on the fairness of outcomes. No one has stated the negative concept of justice better than the 19th century French classical liberal Frederic Bastiat ([1850] 1964: 65): When law and force confine a man within the bounds of justice, they do not impose anything on him but a mere negation. They impose on him only the obligation to refrain from injuring others. They do not infringe on his personality, or his liberty or his property. They merely safeguard the personality, the liberty, and the property of others. They stand on the defensive; they defend the equal rights of all. They fulfill a mission whose harmlessness is evident, whose utility is palpable, and whose legitimacy is uncontested. In short, the purpose of a just government is not to do good with other people’s money, but to prevent injustice by protecting property and securing liberty.

#### **[Nyabola] UK policies don’t secure liberties**

**Nyabola**: Nyabola 21: Nyabola, Nanjala. [Writer, researcher and political analyst based in Nairobi, Kenya] “Opinion: The U.K. just showed the world how not to craft covid-19 travel policies” Washington Post, 2021. JP

This week, the British government enacted and then rapidly changed its official covid-19 vaccination and travel policy for England, a confusing one that promised to create more problems than it solved. At first, visitors holding vaccination certificates from certain countries, primarily in Europe and North America, were exempt from mandatory 10-day quarantine on arrival. But the initial policy did not recognize certificates from many countries, including all African countries, much of Latin America and large Asian countries such as China and India. It also only recognizes four vaccines — by Pfizer, Moderna, AstraZeneca and Johnson & Johnson — not the full list of vaccines approved for emergency use by the World Health Organization. In countries where individuals are encouraged to mix vaccines, only doses from the above list will be recognized. Opinions to start the day, in your inbox. Sign up. The policy, which went into effect Monday, was changed on Thursday to recognize vaccination certificates from more countries, following public outcry about its inherent injustice. But it is still worth analyzing because several other countries are on the cusp of making vaccination rather than testing the cornerstone of their covid-19 travel policies — an approach that could easily exacerbate global inequalities, especially if implemented like in England. ADVERTISING Let’s start with the policy for England, which was full of contradictions. Britain has pledged to donate at least 80 million vaccine doses to other countries, and by August, around 1 million of these doses had been received by the African countries Kenya, Uganda, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Senegal and Egypt. Yet visitors from these countries would not have been exempt from the mandatory quarantine in the initial policy. Meanwhile, some of the countries whose certificates were recognized from the start have been using vaccines that are not on the approved vaccine list. The rationale for this initial policy was unclear. One argument could be that excluded systems have a higher risk of fraud. But the most systematic efforts at producing fraudulent vaccine records appear to be in Western countries. Earlier this year Israel-based researchers found that at least 1,200 vendors were selling fraudulent Britain and U.S. vaccine certificates on the dark web. Much of this is fueled by anti-vaccination sentiments, which are in turn fueled by specific political contexts in which systemic misinformation is driven by well-resourced, wealthy institutions. In contrast, there have been no major anti-vaccination protests in Africa because there are no widespread domestic vaccine mandates, nor enough vaccines to justify them. Western countries have hoarded global vaccine supplies, and only 4.4 percent of eligible Africans have been vaccinated. This generally means that anyone who has received a vaccine in a country initially excluded from the list has done so by choice. Given that those looking to and can afford to travel internationally are a small minority of these people, there is little incentive for the kind of systemic fraud that could justify this two-tier system. In fact, such a policy would counterproductively make the inequalities in vaccine distribution more dire. There are at least 12 billion doses of vaccine available by the end of the year, but most of these doses are being hoarded by wealthy countries like Britain, which has ordered 467 million doses of vaccine, with 210 million surplus doses to be delivered by the end of 2021, for a population of just over 67 million. People traveling to Britain from these countries are being pushed into taking extra doses of the vaccine to meet eligibility criteria. This is an unnecessary waste, particularly when countries like Britain are sustaining an artificial shortage of vaccines by stalling intellectual property waivers at the World Trade Organization that experts argue would be the quickest way to increase global production. Approaches like this do not occur in a historical vacuum. They reflect the preoccupations of those who were shaping migration policy before the pandemic, and will compound and consolidate pre-existing injustices. In the past 30 years, the space for legal migration has contracted significantly. The absence of legal routes to migration has left hundreds of thousands vulnerable to smugglers and clandestine routes, and to cruel and arbitrary punishment by their various destination countries. The indefinite detention in inhospitable conditions on the U.S.-Mexico border, characterized by growing cruelty like that recently witnessed against Haitian refugees; Australia’s extra-territorial processing centers in the South Pacific; and the increasingly ignored anonymous deaths on the Mediterranean Sea are united by an unspoken but evident global injustice — racism. This is why it is crucial to pay close attention to how immigration policy around the pandemic is taking shape: to ensure that we don’t normalize racist double standards that reflect unfounded paranoia rather than facts. The past three decades show that a momentum to criminalize and effectively stop mobility based on race. A policy premised on arbitrary exclusion is dangerously unnecessary when there is a simpler, more inclusive solution to anxieties about vaccination fraud — make vaccines so widely available and used around the world that it extinguishes interest in such fraud.

#### [Democratic Audit 18] Individual rights and human rights are at stake in Britain.

**Democratic Audit 18**: Democratic Audit “How well does the UK’s democracy protect human rights and civil liberties?” *Democratic Audit,* 2018. JP

**Despite these various layers of legal protection, human rights nevertheless remain a contested concept in the British political tradition. They are capable of being interpreted and understood in different ways.** Deep disagreement often exists as to what exactly constitutes a breach of a fundamental right. **Furthermore, different views exist as to when and how the courts should intervene to protect individual rights**. Politicians regularly subject the HRA to criticism, and bemoan the influence exerted by the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) over UK law. In 2010 and again in 2015 the Conservative election manifesto proposed replacing the HRA with a ‘British Bill of Rights’, although in practice Tory governments since 2015 have not been able to implement this idea. **Successive UK governments have also introduced legislation that has diluted protections for civil liberties and fundamental rights in the spheres of national security/counter-terrorism, immigration and socio-economic entitlements: it is likely that this pattern will continue**. Brexit is posing further challenges, by in particular removing the safety blanket for certain non-discrimination, migrant and labour rights formerly provided by EU law. **The place of both the HRA and European Convention of Human Rights within the UK’s legal system thus remains open to debate, as does the status of human rights values more generally: no consensus yet exists as to how human rights should best be protected within the framework of the British constitution**. And while the scope of legal rights protection in the UK is relatively strong, it is limited. **Socio-economic rights are particularly poorly covered, and international human rights law has very limited impact on UK law or policy.**

#### 1. Precision and semantics outweigh – the counter-interp justifies them arbitrarily doing away with random words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution. Independent voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### 2. Limits – There are millions of affs because they can consider anything as a “just government” including groups outside countries. There’s no universal DA since each has different functions and geopolitical implications – explodes limits since there are tons of independent affs plus functionally infinite combinations, all with different advantages in different political situations.

## 3

## Framework

#### [ROJ] I reject the illusions of false hope, so I negate. The Role of the Judge is to Promote Critical Education, which means they must enhance our potential to uncover biases and oppression in dominant thinking.

#### [Giroux] As educators, judges can uniquely make debate a space for challenging oppressive norms.

Giroux: Giroux, Henry. [Waterbury Chair Professor, Pennsylvania State University] “Critical Pedagogy and the Postmodern/Modern Divide: Towards a Pedagogy of Democratization.” *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Winter 2004. CH

The search for a new politics and a new critical language that crosses the critical theory/postmodern divide must reinvigorate the relationship between democracy, ethics, and political agency by expanding both the meaning of the pedagogical as a political practice while at the same time making the political more pedagogical. In the first instance, it is crucial to recognize that Pedagogy has less to do with the language of technique and methodology than it does with issues of politics and power. Pedagogy is amoral and political practice that is always implicated in power relations and must be understood as a cultural politics that offers both a particular version and vision of civic life, the future, and how we might construct representations of ourselves, others, and our physical and social environment. As Roger Simon (1987) observes: As an introduction to, preparation for, and legitimation of particular forms of social life, education always presupposes a vision of the future. In this respect a curriculum and its supporting pedagogy are a version of our own dreams for ourselves, our children, and out communities. But such dreams are never neutral; they are always someone’s dreams and to the degree that they are implicated in organizing the future for others they always have a moral and political dimension. It is in this respect that Any discussion of pedagogy must begin with a discussion of educational practice as a form of cultural politics, as a particular way in which a sense of identity, place, worth, and above all value is informed by practices which organize knowledge and meaning. (

#### [ROB & Giroux 2] The Role of the Ballot is to Endorse the Position that Fosters Solutions to Social Oppression. Fostering solutions to social oppression means identifying and trying to redress inequality, rather than theorizing without realizing.

Giroux 2: Giroux, Henry. [Waterbury Chair Professor, Pennsylvania State University] “Critical Pedagogy and the Postmodern/Modern Divide: Towards a Pedagogy of Democratization.” *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Winter 2004. CH

Critical pedagogy locates discursive practices in a broader set of interrelations, but it also analyzes and gives meaning to such relations by defining them within particular contexts constructed through the operations of power as articulated through the interaction among texts, teachers, and students. Questions of articulation and context need to be fore grounded as both a matter of ethics and politics. Ethically, critical pedagogy requires an ongoing indictment “of those forms of truth-seeking which imagined themselves to be eternally and placelessly valid” (Gilroy, 2000, p.69). Simply put, Educators need to must cast a critical eye on those forms of knowledge and social relations that define themselves through a conceptual purity and political innocence that cloud not only how they come into being but also ignore that their alleged neutrality on which they stand is already grounded in ethico-political choices. Thomas Keenan (1997) rightly argues that Ethics on the pedagogical front demands an openness to the other, a willingness to engage a ‘politics of possibility’ through a continual critical engagement. with texts, images, events, and other registers of meaning as they are transformed into public pedagogies (p. 2). One consequence of linking pedagogy to the specificity of place is that it foregrounds the need for educators to rethink the cultural and political baggage they bring to each educational encounter; it also highlights the necessity of making educators ethically and politically accountable for the stories they produce, the claims they make upon public memory, and the images of the future they deem legitimate. Pedagogy is never innocent and if it is to be understood and problematized as a form of academic labor, mold it.

**Running a standard like “util” or “maximizing expected well-being” links them *directly into the K.*** Assuming that people have identical interests, or that there’s some value-neutral “well-being” we all share, is exactly the problem.

## A. Links

#### 1. The aff upholds the idea of an abstract “just government” – the resolution’s wording appeals to this notion explicitly.

#### 2. They affirm an “ought” statement – i.e., “A just government *ought* to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike” – that’s a form of hyper-idealization.

## B. Impacts

#### [Curry 1] First, the very notion of “just governments” appeals to a White-centered ethic that itself oppresses black people.

Curry 1: Curry, Dr. Tommy J. [Ph.D., Associate Professor of Philosophy, Texas A & M University] “In the Fiat of Dreams: The Delusional Allure of Hope, the Reality of Anti-Black Violence and the Demands of the Anti-Ethical.” Academia.Edu [Working Draft, Cited with Permission from the Author], 2014. CH

Traditionally we have taken ethics to be, as Henry Sidgwick’s claims, "any rational procedure by which we determine what individual human beings 'ought'—or what is right for them—or to seek to realize by voluntary action.”vii This rational procedure is however at odds with the empirical reality the ethical deliberation must concern itself with. To argue, as is often done, that the government, its citizens, or white people should act justly, assumes that the possibility of how they could act defines their moral disposition. If a white person could possibly not be racist, it does not mean that the possibility of not being racist, can be taken to mean that they are not racist. In ethical deliberations dealing with the problem of racism, it is common practice to attribute to historically racist institutions, and individuals universal moral qualities that have yet to be demonstrated. This abstraction from reality is what frames our ethical norms and allows us to maintain, despite history or evidence, that racist entities will act justly given the choice. Under such complexities, The only ethical deliberation concerning racism must be anti-ethical, or a judgment refusing to write morality onto immoral entities. In the post-structuralist era, post-colonial thinking about racism specifically, and difference/otherness generally, has given a peculiar ameliorative function to discourse and the performance of “other-ed” identities. In this era, the dominant illusion is that discourse itself, an act that requires as its basis the recognition of the “other” as “similar,” is socially transformative—not only with regard to how the white subject assimilates the similitude of the “other-ed,” but as an actual activity gauged by the recognition by one white person or by a group of white people in any given scenario, is uncritically accepted and encouraged as anti-racist politics.. In actuality such Discourse appeals, which necessitate—become dependent on—(white) recognition, function very much like the racial stereotype, in that the concept of the Black body being the expression and source of experience and phenomena (existential-phenomenological-theorization) is incarcerated by the conceptualization created the discursive catalyst yearning to be perceived by the white thing seeing the Black. Such appeals lend potentiality-hope-faith to the already present/demonstrated ignorance-racism-interest of the white individual., who in large part expresses the historical tone/epistemology of their racial group’s interest. When morality is defined, not by the empirical acts that demonstrate immorality, but the racial character of those in question, our ethics become nothing more than the apologetics of our tyrannical epoch.

Thus, they ***can’t*** redefine the notion of “just governments” even if they try to reconceptualize the living wage: Black people must still appeal to white people for such claims to be recognized.

#### [Curry 2] Second, affirming an “ought” statement with respect to Blackness naïvely places faith in a future that will never come, entrenching oppression.

Curry 2: Curry, Dr. Tommy J. [Ph.D., Associate Professor of Philosophy, Texas A & M University] “In the Fiat of Dreams: The Delusional Allure of Hope, the Reality of Anti-Black Violence and the Demands of the Anti-Ethical.” Academia.Edu [Working Draft, Cited with Permission from the Author], 2014. CH

Ought implies a projected (futural) act. The word commands a deliberate action to reasonably expect the world to be able to sustain or support. For the Black thinker, the Black citizen-subject-slave-(in)human, ought is not rational but repressive,. For the oppressed racialized thinker, the ethical provocation is an immediate confrontation with the impossibility of actually acting towards values like freedom, liberty, humanity, and life, since none of these values can be achieved concretely for the Black in a world controlled by and framed by the white. The options for ethical actions are not ethical in and of themselves, but merely the options the immorality of the racist world will allow, thus the oppressed is forced to idealize their ethical positions, eliminating the truth of their reality, and the peeling away the tyranny of white bodies, so that as the oppressed, they can ideally imagine an ‘if condition,’ whereby they are allowed to ethical engage racism from the perspective of: ‘if whites were moral and respected the humanity of Blacks, then we can ethically engage in these behaviors.’ Unfortunately, this ought constraint only forces Blacks to consciously recognize the futility of ethical engagement, since it is in this ought deliberation that they recognize that their cognition of all values are dependent not on their moral aspirations for the world, but the determined by the will of white supremacy to maintain virtue throughout all ethical calculations. In short, Black ethical deliberation is censored so that it can only engage moral questions by asserting that whites are virtuous and4 hence capable of being ethically persuaded towards right action., hence all ethical question about racism, white supremacy and anti-Blackness is not about how Blacks think about the world, but what possibility the world allows Blacks to contemplate under the idea of ethics.

# Case

### UV

1ar theory skewed towards the aff

#### 1. No 1AR Theory –

**a.** Time skew – 1AR theory gets 7 minutes to justify it while I only get 6 to defend my interp—this outweighs the abuse they claim in the shell because indites their ability to read 1AR theory.

**b.** Strat skew – the aff gets 2 speeches to justify their interps—I only get one chance to respond—they have a huge advantage both because of the timing and because they get the only chance to frontline their arguments.

**c.** Reading 1AC theory solves – you can preempt which practices you think are abusive in the aff, so we can just have a substantive debate.

### FW

Extinction framing bad

#### 2. Just because extinction is important doesn’t mean it is the only thing we focus on; for example, oxygen is necessary to debate, but the standard isn’t maximizing oxygen.

#### bostrom

#### 1. This presupposes we can do anything to learn moral truths– that’s obviously false though. We wouldn’t sacrifice babies to find moral truths – likewise, my framework condemns actions independent of extinction

#### 2. Bostrom presumes that the good is aggregative and agent neutral – this assumes we care about the good for future people, but he never justifies these assumptions.

#### 3. Everything technically could cause extinction – spraying hairspray could put a hole in the ozone layer - it’s infinitely regressive

#### 4. No moral uncertainty if I win my framework – we should confidently accept it as true

#### 5. No warrant for why being alive longer somehow means that we would become less uncertain – more time means more theories, and more uncertainty

#### 1. Use epistemic confidence—modesty invites arbitrary judge intervention because there’s no way to determine the magnitude of an impact back to a framework and even if you use it our offense outweighs because any contradiction is infinite.

#### 2. Phil Education o/w’s since it is highly underrepresented in the debate space currently, and gives us the most portable skills because we can use it in our daily lives.

#### 3. T/ allowing a really dense phil debate is good because we can see the relation between the contention level offense and our framework. This is lacking in LD debate because no one links back to frameworks nowadays.

### Solvency

American enformcement impossble

Doesn’t defend uncondo

### Method

Reps first

Not about disibilti racial cape xplained

### Adv

#### [Garneau 1] Strikes are ineffective.

**Garneau 1:** Garneau, Marianne. [Writer at Organizing Work] “WHY DON’T STRIKES ACHIEVE MORE?” *Organizing Work,* 2019. JP

**There are a number of factors that contain how effective strikes can be, and impel unions to settle them. For one thing, they are expensive**. If a union is providing even minimal strike pay, it needs a war chest of millions of dollars to be able to support even a few hundred workers**. Strikes drain union coffers, and they take a financial, physical, and emotional toll on workers as well, who aren’t usually earning as much in strike pay as they would on the job, while getting yelled at or hit by cars or freezing on the picket line. Quite often, strikes don’t succeed in completely shutting down a business, not least because employers can legally hire scabs**. The product may suffer, and employers may take a hit, but they can hobble along (while draining the union’s bank account). (A note on the alleged $100 million loss suffered by Stop & Shop during the recent strike, which leftists also celebrated: that figure was put out by the employer, and is more than double an estimate put forward by an industry analyst. We should always remain skeptical about boss communications. In this case, they may be crying poverty to get workers to sign the proposed collective agreement.) Sometimes strikes end because of government intervention, as when workers are legislated back to work, or fired en masse. Less dramatically, the government can intervene to bring about some kind of settlement in the form of binding arbitration. Sometimes employers even goad unions into striking, knowing what a heavy toll strikes take. **If an employer knows they can weather a strike much better than the union, they are perfectly incentivized to provoke one and starve the union out. The bottom line is that strikes, under the current labor relations system, are not the slam-dunk tactic the left takes them to be. Strikes can only take place when the contract has expired, and once the membership has been balloted.** **This means that the employer has years to prepare, knowing when the contract is set to expire**. They probably even know roughly how long the strike can last. They’ve also seen strikes before, and aren’t bowled over by them. There is no element of surprise. They know the union won’t do anything too drastic like occupy the workplace or chain the doors shut. They hire scabs, they manage public relations (often by crying poverty or publicly claiming the union won’t come to the table), and they wait it out.

#### [Bennett et al] Teachers strikes anger the public – they disrupt social order.

**Bennett et al**: Bennett, William J. [Writer at Education Week] Nussle, Karen. [Writer at Education Week] “No, Teacher Strikes Do Not Help Students” *EducationWeek,* 2018. JP

There is a fundamental problem in education that has been on vivid display recently: confusion about whom our schools exist to serve. Our public school system exists to give our children a foundation in literacy and numeracy and to help them become informed citizens. **It is not the purpose of the public schools to use children as leverage for the gains of others. Only that base misconception could drive mass school closures and disruptions right in the midst of a critical time in the school year. Only that misconception could lead adults to go on strike, thrusting chaos and untenable choices on the most vulnerable families least able to cope with abrupt changes in the routines of their children.** When coal miners strike they lay down their equipment. When teachers strike, they lay down their students’ minds." We strongly believe in the importance and honor of great teaching and teachers. We believe policymakers should set budgets so that the best teachers are attracted and retained. Those decisions must be made at each state and district level. **We strongly disagree that adults in our public schools should use systematic disruption of students and families—that is, strikes or walkouts—as a tactic to secure financial outcomes**.