# 1AC R6 NSD

## FW

#### The standard is maximizing well being

#### 1] Epistemic Modesty

#### We should evaluate framework comparatively using how much you think the fw is true x how bad your fw is under your impact – extinction first because it causes the net worst pain

#### And evaluate epistemic modesty – 2 warrants -

#### 1] philosophically true, cant hone in one principle – we need to be pluralistic and weigh the impacts of different frameworks

#### 2] clash – EM assures clash between all levels of debate, it gives you a way to compare impacts from different fw’s

#### 2] TJFS

#### Util is the best fw for debate

#### A] util stops intervention bc its an objective impact that can be weighed whereas most phil ncs arent - judge intervention is bad bc it takes the debate out of the debaters which is bad for fairness bc it loses equal access to the ballot

#### B] Reciprocity – phil normally only has offense for one side, util gives offense for both sides good for fairness bc it makes debate less skewed and gives them a chance to the ballot

#### 3] AFC A] strat skew you can invalidate the entire aff by only contesting the fw B] best for topic edu C] no neg abuse, read fw u want when you affirm, if my fw is unfair you can just read theory on my fw – contesting it is dta

#### 4] No act omission distinction – not acting is an action – you should be held accountable for what you don’t do. You have to prevent bad consequences because otherwise you are responsible for them

#### 5] lexical pre requisite – you can’t evaluate philosophy if your dead, util is the only philosophy that tells us what to do in a crisis and prevents extinction

#### 6] Actor spec – governments have to use util, because every policy helps some people and hurts other people.

#### 7] No intent foresight distinction – The consequences that you think are going to happen are part of your intention

#### 8] Phenomenological introspection – everything can be reduced to pleasure and pain, and we intuitively know pleasure is good and pain is bad

**Moen 15** (Moen 15 Ole Martin Moen: Post-Doctoral Fellow in Philosophy at Centre for the Study of Mind in Nature, University of Oslo. “An Argument for Hedonism” [[http://www.olemartinmoen.com/wp-content/uploads/AnArgumentForHedonism.pdf](https://slack-redir.net/link?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.olemartinmoen.com%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2FAnArgumentForHedonism.pdf)] )  
Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have**.**‘‘Pleasure’’ and ‘‘pain’’ are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: ‘‘What for?’’ This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: **‘‘**To buy soda.’’ This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: ‘‘What is buying the soda good for?**’’** This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: **‘‘**Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.’’ If I then proceed by asking ‘‘But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?’’ the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.3 As Aristotle observes: **‘‘**We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself**.**’’4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says ‘‘This is painful!’’ we never respond by asking: ‘‘And why is that a problem?’’ We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.He continues

**Moen 15** ( Moen 15 Ole Martin Moen: Post-Doctoral Fellow in Philosophy at Centre for the Study of Mind in Nature, University of Oslo. “An Argument for Hedonism” [[http://www.olemartinmoen.com/wp-content/uploads/AnArgumentForHedonism.pdf](https://slack-redir.net/link?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.olemartinmoen.com%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2FAnArgumentForHedonism.pdf)] )

Many philosophers would accept the conclusion from the previous section, that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. Most of them would add, however, that this is probably not the complete story of what is intrinsically valuable and disvaluable. They would suggest that there are intrinsic values besides pleasure and intrinsic disvalues besides pain, and thus endorse some form of pluralism rather than hedonism. Pluralism has many defenders. W. D. Ross, for example, suggests that pleasure is indeed intrinsically valuable, but adds that so are knowledge and artistic activity.19 Noah Lemos adds consciousness, morally good actions, beauty, and flourishing to the list of intrinsic values.20 Martha Nussbaum suggests life, health, bodily integrity, emotional attachment, practical reason, affiliation, play, and more.21 William Frankena has provided what is arguably the most extensive list of intrinsic values: life, consciousness, and activity; health and strength; pleasures and satisfactions of all or certain kinds; happiness, beatitude, contentment, etc.; truth; knowledge and true opinions of various kinds, understanding, wisdom; beauty, harmony, proportion in objects contemplated; aesthetic experience; morally good dispositions or virtues; mutual affection, love, friendship, cooperation; just distribution of goods and evils; harmony and proportion in one’s own life; power and experiences of achievement; self-expression; freedom; peace, security; adventure and novelty; and good reputation, honor, esteem.22 Prima facie, these all seem to be reasonable suggestions for things worth having, not just for the sake of other things, but for their own sake. So is it clear, as G. E. Moore asks, that a hedonist can show **‘‘**that all other things but pleasure, whether conduct or virtue of knowledge, whether life or nature or beauty, are only good as a means to pleasure or for the sake of pleasure, never for their own sakes or as ends in themselves’’?23 I think several things should be said in response to Moore’s challenge to hedonists. First, **I** do not think the burden of proof lies on hedonists to explain why the additional values are not intrinsic values. If someone claims that X is intrinsically valuable, this is a substantive, positive claim, and it lies on him or her to explain why we should believe that X is in fact intrinsically valuable**.**Possibly, this could be done through thought experiments analogous to those employed in the previous section. Second, there is something peculiar about the list of additional intrinsic values that counts in hedonism’s favor: the listed values have a strong tendency to be well explained as things that help promote pleasure and avert pain**.** To go through Frankena’s list, life and consciousness are necessary presuppositions for pleasure; activity, health, and strength bring about pleasure; and happiness, beatitude, and contentment are regarded by Frankena himself as ‘‘pleasures and satisfactions.’’ The same is arguably true of beauty, harmony, and ‘‘proportion in objects contemplated,’’ and also of affection, friendship, harmony, and proportion in life, experiences of achievement, adventure and novelty, self-expression, good reputation, honor and esteem. Other things on Frankena’s list, such as understanding, wisdom, freedom, peace, and security, although they are perhaps not themselves pleasurable, are important means to achieve a happy life, and as such, they are things that hedonists would value highly**.** Morally good dispositions and virtues, cooperation, and just distribution of goods and evils, moreover, are things that, on a collective level, contribute a happy society, and thus the traits that would be promoted and cultivated if this were something sought after. To a very large extent, the intrinsic values suggested by pluralists tend to be hedonic instrumental values.Indeed, pluralists’ suggested intrinsic values all point toward pleasure, for while the other values are reasonably explainable as a means toward pleasure, pleasure itself is not reasonably explainable as a means toward the other values. Some have noticed this. Moore himself, for example, writes that though his pluralistic theory of intrinsic value is opposed to hedonism, its application would, in practice, look very much like hedonism’s: ‘‘Hedonists,’’ he writes ‘‘do, in general, recommend a course of conduct which is very similar to that which I should recommend.’’24 Ross writes that ‘‘[i]t is quite certain that by promoting virtue and knowledge we shall inevitably produce much more pleasant consciousness. These are, by general agreement, among the surest sources of happiness for their possessors.’’25 Roger Crisp observes that ‘‘those goods cited by non-hedonists are goods we often, indeed usually, enjoy.’’26 What Moore and Ross do not seem to notice is that their observations give rise to two reasons to reject pluralism and endorse hedonism. The first reason is that if the suggested non-hedonicintrinsic values are potentially explainable by appealtojust pleasure and pain (which, following my argument in the previous chapter, we should accept as intrinsically valuable and disvaluable), then—by appeal to Occam’s razor—we have at least a pro tanto reason to resist the introduction of any further intrinsic values and disvalues. It is ontologically more costly to posit a plurality of intrinsic values and disvalues, so in case all values admit of explanation by reference to a single intrinsic value and a single intrinsic disvalue, we have reason to reject more complicated accounts. The fact that suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values tend to be hedonistic instrumental values does not, however, count in favor of hedonism solely in virtue of being most elegantly explained by hedonism; it also does so in virtue of creating an explanatory challenge for pluralists. The challenge can be phrased as the following question: If the non-hedonic values suggested by pluralists are truly intrinsic values in their own right, then why do they tend to point toward pleasure and away from pain?

#### 9] Substitutability—only consequentialism explains necessary enablers.

Sinnott-Armstrong 92 [Walter, professor of practical ethics. “An Argument for Consequentialism” Dartmouth College Philosophical Perspectives. 1992.]

A moral reason to do an act is consequential if and only if the reason depends only on the consequences of either doing the act or not doing the act. For example, a moral reason not to hit someone is that this will hurt her or him. A moral reason to turn your car to the left might be that, if you do not do so, you will run over and kill someone. A moral reason to feed a starving child is that the child will lose important mental or physical abilities if you do not feed it. All such reasons are consequential reasons. All other moral reasons are non-consequential. Thus, a moral reason to do an act is non-consequential if and only if the reason depends even partly on some property that the act has independently of its consequences. For example, an act can be a lie regardless of what happens as a result of the lie (since some lies are not believed), and some moral theories claim that that property of being a lie provides amoral reason not to tell a lie regardless of the consequences of this lie. Similarly, the fact that an act fulfills a promise is often seen as a moral reason to do the act, even though the act has that property of fulfilling a promise independently ofits consequences. All such moral reasons are non-consequential. In order to avoid so many negations, I will also call them 'deontological'. This distinction would not make sense if we did not restrict the notion of consequences. If I promise to mow the lawn, then one consequence of my mowing might seem to be that my promise is fulfilled. One way to avoid this problem is to specify that the consequences of an act must be distinct from the act itself. My act of fulfilling my promise and my act of mowing are not distinct, because they are done by the same bodily movements.10 Thus, my fulfilling my promise is not a consequence of my mowing. A consequence of an act need not be later in time than the act, since causation can be simultaneous, but the consequence must at least be different from the act. Even with this clarification, it is still hard to classify some moral reasons as consequential or deontological,11 but I will stick to examples that are clear. In accordance with this distinction between kinds of moral reasons, I can now distinguish different kinds of moral theories. I will say that a moral theory is consequentialist if and only if it implies that all basic moral reasons are consequential. A moral theory is then non-consequentialist or deontological if it includes any basic moral reasons which are not consequential. 5. Against Deontology So defined, the class of deontological moral theories is very large and diverse. This makes it hard to say anything in general about it. Nonetheless, I will argue that no deontological moral theory can explain why moral substitutability holds. My argument applies to all deontological theories because it depends only on what is common to them all, namely, the claim that some basic moral reasons are not consequential. Some deontological theories allow very many weighty moral reasons that are consequential, and these theories might be able to explain why moral substitutability holds for some of their moral reasons: the consequential ones. But even these theories cannot explain why moral substitutability holds for all moral reasons, including the non-consequential reasons that make the theory deontological. The failure of deontological moral theories to explain moral substitutability in the very cases that make them deontological is a reason to reject all deontological moral theories. I cannot discuss every deontological moral theory, so I will discuss only a few paradigm examples and show why they cannot explain moral substitutability. After this, I will argue that similar problems are bound to arise for all other deontological theories by their very nature. The simplest deontological theory is the pluralistic intuitionism of Prichard and Ross. Ross writes that, when someone promises to do something, 'This we consider obligatory in its own nature, just because it is a fulfillment of a promise, and not because of its consequences.'12 Such deontologists claim in effect that, if I promise to mow the grass, there is a moral reason for me to mow the grass, and this moral reason is constituted by the fact that mowing the grass fulfills my promise. This reason exists regardless of the consequences of mowing the grass, even though it might be overridden by certain bad consequences. However, if this is why I have a moral reason to mow the grass, then, even if I cannot mow the grass without starting my mower, and starting the mower would enable me to mow the grass, it still would not follow that I have any moral reason to start my mower, since I did not promise to start my mower, and starting my mower does not fulfill my promise. Thus, a moral theory cannot explain moral substitutability if it claims that properties like this provide moral reasons.

## Case

## Ptxt

#### The United States ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

## Adv 1 – Teachers

### Scenario 1: Education

#### Teacher strikes illegal in 35 states

**Rutgers 20** (Rutgers School, 21-Aug-2020, "35 Illegal Teacher Strikes Since 2018. Are More Coming This Month?," No Publication, <https://www.newswise.com/coronavirus/35-illegal-teacher-strikes-since-2018-are-more-coming-this-month>)

Teacher strikes are legal in 13 states: Alaska, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Minnesota, Montana, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, and Vermont. Their legality is contested in two states, South Carolina and Wyoming. Teacher strikes are illegal in the remaining 35 states and Washington D.C. Givan’s analysis found: There have been 92 strikes in 21 states since January 1, 2012. More than 672,000 teachers walked out, affecting 6.7 million students. Close to half of the strikes, 42, were illegal in the state where they took place. More than 80 percent of the illegal strikes (35 of 42) occurred in 2018 and 2019, beginning with West Virginia. About 412,000 teachers participated in illegal strikes in 2018 and 2019, compared to fewer than 14,000 for the previous six years combined.

#### Teacher strikes are fighting to innovate the school systems

**Will 20** (Will, Madeline. “The New Flavor of Teacher Strike: More Than Just Pay Raises.” Education Week, Education Week, 8 Dec. 2020, www.edweek.org/leadership/the-new-flavor-of-teacher-strike-more-than-just-pay-raises/2019/01. )

Bargaining for the Common Good Teachers’ unions organizing for their students and the broader community, rather than just their own members’ working conditions, is called bargaining for the common good, or social unionism. The Los Angeles teacher strike isn’t the first occurrence—experts point to the 2012 Chicago teacher strike as the seminal event—but it’s one of the biggest. United Teachers Los Angeles had planned for a potential strike for a couple of years, working closely with the community in order to generate a groundswell of support, McCartin said. “As one union has watched another, they’ve learned ways to bring the community in,” he said. “With L.A., this is a full-blown methodology now. I think you’ll start to see other teachers’ unions picking up on it.” Even so, Randi Weingarten, the president of the American Federation of Teachers, said bargaining for broader social issues has been happening in pockets for years. Notably, teachers in St. Paul, Minn., have pushed for a reduction in standardized testing, smaller class sizes, and less severe disciplinary measures for students in their contract negotiations. “This notion of bargaining for the common good is something AFT locals have been involved in for a long time, but because of the [Los Angeles] strike, it gets the attention it deserves,” Weingarten said. “Teachers want what children need.” Just last month, Chicago charter school teachers went on strike for smaller class sizes and pay raises—but also for the 15-campus Acero charter network to provide sanctuary for undocumented students. And of course, teachers in a half-dozen states walked out of their classrooms last year. A push for higher pay was a driving force behind many of those widescale protests, but teachers also framed their walkouts as a fight for their students. Teachers across the state of Virginia will rally at the state Capitol on Jan. 28 for more school funding. Organizer Sarah Pedersen said in an email she expects between 2,000-3,000 teachers, at least. Denver teachers are also planning a potential walkout, though with salaries at the forefront. Becoming More Political Jon Shelton, an associate professor of democracy and justice studies at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay who writes about the history of teacher strikes, said many big-city teachers’ unions have inner caucuses that are progressive and take stances on racial and social justice. In places like Los Angeles and Chicago, those progressive members are in leadership positions, he said. “I think for unions who have these caucuses and teachers who are becoming more politically conscious, this is becoming a more effective model of organizing,” Shelton said. “It’s proven to really galvanize a discussion about the present and the future of public education.” There’s another factor that could influence the spread of social unionism: Last year, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that public-sector unions could not collect “agency” or “fair-share” fees from workers who declined to become members but were still represented in collective bargaining. The unions had argued that the fees only cover collective bargaining, and not political activities, but the justices ruled 5-4 that the arrangement still violated the free speech rights of nonmembers. “Once the court took that position, then the natural response of unions is, ‘OK, if everything we do is political, we’ll get political,’” said McCartin, pointing to UTLA’s demand for an immigration defense lawyer, among other things. “We can now take off the straitjacket that we used to live under, where we could only ask for our wages, and we’re going to use the bargaining process to ask for much more.” This tactic could also be another way to retain and recruit members, McCartin said. Because teachers can now stop paying dues to the union and still be represented in collective bargaining, observers expect teachers’ unions to lose members. The National Education Association has projected about a 10 percent membership decline over two years. But people like being part of an organization that fights not only for them, but for their community, McCartin said. In Los Angeles, he said, teachers can now say the union “doesn’t just fight for me, it makes L.A. better.”

#### Educational innovation k2 prevent extinction.

Peter **Serdyukov 17**. National University, La Jolla, California. 03/27/2017. “Innovation in Education: What Works, What Doesn’t, and What to Do about It?” Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 4–33.

Introduction Education, being a social institution serving the needs of society, is indispensable for society to survive and thrive. It should be not only comprehensive, sustainable, and superb, but must continuously evolve to meet the challenges of the fast-changing and unpredictable globalized world. This evolution must be systemic, consistent, and scalable; therefore, school teachers, college professors, administrators, researchers, and policy makers are expected to innovate the theory and practice of teaching and learning, as well as all other aspects of this complex organization to ensure quality preparation of all students to life and work. Here we present a systemic discussion of educational innovations, identify the barriers to innovation, and outline potential directions for effective innovations. We discuss the current status of innovations in US education, what educational innovation is, how innovations are being integrated in schools and colleges, why innovations do not always produce the desired effect, and what should be done to increase the scale and rate of innovation-based transformations in our education system. We then offer recommendations for the growth of educational innovations. As examples of innovations in education, we will highlight online learning and time efficiency of learning using accelerated and intensive approaches. Innovations in US education For an individual, a nation, and humankind to survive and progress, innovation and evolution are essential. Innovations in education are of particular importance because education plays a crucial role in creating a sustainable future. “Innovation resembles mutation, the biological process that keeps species evolving so they can better compete for survival” (Hoffman and Holzhuter, 2012, p. 3). Innovation, therefore, is to be regarded as an instrument of necessary and positive change. Any human activity (e.g. industrial, business, or educational) needs constant innovation to remain sustainable. The need for educational innovations has become acute. “It is widely believed that countries’ social and economic well-being will depend to an ever greater extent on the quality of their citizens’ education: the emergence of the so-called ‘knowledge society’, the transformation of information and the media, and increasing specialization on the part of organizations all call for high skill profiles and levels of knowledge. Today’s education systems are required to be both effective and efficient, or in other words, to reach the goals set for them while making the best use of available resources” (Cornali, 2012, p. 255). According to an Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) report, “the pressure to increase equity and improve educational outcomes for students is growing around the world” (Vieluf et al., 2012, p. 3). In the USA, underlying pressure to innovate comes from political, economic, demographic, and technological forces from both inside and outside the nation. Many in the USA seem to recognize that education at all levels critically needs renewal: “Higher education has to change. It needs more innovation” (Wildavsky et al., 2012, p. 1). This message, however, is not new – in the foreword to the 1964 book entitled Innovation in Education, Arthur Foshay, Executive Officer of The Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation, wrote, “It has become platitudinous to speak of the winds of change in education, to remind those interested in the educational enterprise that a revolution is in progress. Trite or not, however, it is true to say that changes appear wherever one turns in education” (Matthew, 1964, p. v).

### Scenario 2: Democracy

#### 1] Teachers are fighting against charter schools – they threaten democracy

**Mohler 19** (JEREMY MOHLER , 3-13-2019, "Privatization Is Fundamentally An Attack on Democracy. The Teachers Strikes Show Why.," In These Times, https://inthesetimes.com/article/privatization-democracy-teachers-strikes-charter-schools

One key feature of the Trump era is a renewed public focus on the issue of democracy. Last year’s congressional elections had the highest midterm voter turnout since 1966. Americans across the country have poured into the streets and packed the halls of Congress to protest President Trump’s power grabs. Over one million people convicted of felonies have regained the right to vote in Florida, thanks to a successful statewide ballot measure. New York City residents pushed their elected officials to all but force the world’s richest person, Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos, to walk away from $3 billion in tax breaks. But leave it to public school teachers to educate us about a direct attack on democracy that’s been hiding right under our noses since long before the Trump presidency: Privatization. A wave of teacher strikes is highlighting the country’s deepening education funding crisis while also raising concerns over the expansion of charter schools. Last month, West Virginia teachers walked off the job to protest legislation that would have opened up the state to charter schools and private school vouchers. Also in February, teachers in Oakland walked off on strike in the midst of their district’s funding crisis, which is being fueled by out-of-date state laws that allow a virtually unlimited number of charter schools to open. And in January, Los Angeles teachers walked out, forcing their district to demand that state legislators reevaluate California’s charter school laws, which they’ve agreed to do in the coming months. West Virginia teacher Katie Endicott from Mingo County — which Trump won in 2016 with more than three-quarters of the vote — didn’t pull any punches. ​“It’s infuriating that people would try to profit off us: Privatization would give millions of dollars to elites and it would create even more haves and have not,” she told Eric Blanc for Jacobin. There should be no doubt that charter schools are a form of privatization. Despite being funded with public dollars, they’re often less transparent about how they spend money than traditional, neighborhood schools. They also often rent buildings that weren’t designed as schools and they pay teachers, who are less likely to be unionized, much less. Most significantly, they’re of managed by private boards unelected members who get to decide how to spend public money with little to no accountability to parents, teachers and voters. Charter schools are, in a word, undemocratic. Debates about privatization often shy away from questions of democracy and focus on costs — will outsourcing a public good, say, bussing, save the government money? Or on efficiency — if a charter school produces high test scores, who cares how it does so? Evidence that privatization saves money is mixed at best, and charter schools generally perform about the same as neighborhood schools on standardized testing, but that’s beside the point. The more important question is: Will outsourcing take decision making power away from the public? Charter schools certainly do. For example, Cesar Chavez Public Charter Schools for Public Policy, a prominent Washington, D.C., charter school chain, recently announced that it was closing one of its campuses with no warning. Teachers found out in the middle of the school day when a journalist reached out for comment. Some parents learned from seeing the closure reported on the news. Because Chavez’s board meetings are closed to the public, and even to employees, no one knew the chain had been in financial trouble. No one could weigh in on the decision outside of the board, which includes a private equity investor and a retired ExxonMobil executive, among other corporate leaders. The board eventually explained that they decided to close the school to lease out its building, or, as they put it, ​“monetize the asset.” There are certainly great charter schools, just like there are great neighborhood schools. And it’s understandable that some parents want to send their kid to a different school, particularly in poor and working-class communities where neighborhood schools are frequently starved of funding. But when charter schools are allowed to replace neighborhood schools, they threaten the democracy that makes public education truly public. In that way, charter schools are one tactic in a decades-long push by corporate-backed politicians, wealthy funders and conservative think tanks to privatize public goods and services. They fit right in with other forms of privatization, like private prisons, which turn our already out-of-control and inhumane criminal justice system into a gold rush for a handful of corporate executives and Wall Street banks, and ​“public-private partnerships,” which shield decisions about infrastructure spending from public view in complicated private financing contracts. The through line is an attack on democracy. Yes, privatization is a corporate cash grab as well as a convenient way for politicians to dodge accountability and distract us from demanding higher taxes on corporations and the wealthy. But most of all, it takes decision-making power from the public and puts it into the hands of corporations.

#### 2] Teacher strikes encourage democracy – outside of students

**Fernandez 19** (Alexander Hertel-Fernandez, 11-12-2019, "Why the teacher strikes live on in Chicago, Kentucky – and beyond," https://www.theguardian.com/global/commentisfree/2019/nov/12/teacher-strikes-chicago-kentucky-political-impacts)

With a team of researchers from Columbia University, I have been studying the six original “Red4Ed” states with teacher walkouts or strikes: Arizona, Colorado, Kentucky, North Carolina, Oklahoma and West Virginia. I collected state and local newspaper coverage of teachers in those states from 2017 to present day, comparing differences in how teachers were described before and after the strikes. I also looked at newspapers in similar states where teachers did not go on strike. I found a regular pattern: teachers in striking states were moving from the streets to the ballot box, focusing on races at all levels of government, from state legislatures to Congress. And this wave of teacher strikes is not just inspiring more political action. It is also energizing further labor interest and action outside of schools. In a new study, my co-authors and I surveyed a representative sample of parents in early 2019 across the six teacher walkout states. We were interested in knowing whether parents who were the most exposed to the strikes, protests and walkouts changed how they thought about teachers and the labor movement. You might think that facing massive disruption to their children’s education, parents would turn against the teachers. But we found precisely the opposite. Comparing parents whose children’s ages placed them just in or out of school – and so were either exposed or not to the walkouts – we found that parents with greater firsthand experience with the protests were much more supportive of the teachers and their demands than were parents not exposed to the strikes. Even more surprising: parents who came into contact with walkouts and strikes were more interested in taking labor action, like strikes, at their own jobs. Seeing strikes and walkouts by their children’s teachers inspired these parents. Another piece of evidence: Google searches for “how to join a union” surged during the Red4Ed strikes in 2018. Digging deeper, we found that the strikes were the most motivating for parents who previously had little positive experience with the labor movement: conservatives, Republicans and individuals without friends or family in unions. In an era when only one out of 10 workers belongs to a union, it is easy to rely on stereotypes about the labor movement from the media or politicians. But when workers, even conservative workers, see what successful labor action can do, the prospects of labor organizing seem much more appealing. My research suggests that unions should not shy away from opportunities to educate the public on what the labor movement can offer through collective action. It also means that granting workers full strike rights ought to be an essential part of any effort to reform state and federal labor law. Without those legal rights workers lack the ability to fully exercise their labor – and political – voice. More immediately, however, the spread of teacher strikes across the country gives us every reason to think that these protests will continue to reverberate in the weeks and months to come. Unions have long been described as “schools of democracy”, endowing their members with skills they can bring into politics. Teachers have begun to put what they learned in their schools to work in elections. If they keep it up, imagine what teachers will do in November 2020 and beyond.

#### A strong democracy k2 preventing extinction and maintaining stability.

Kroenig 18 Matthew Kroenig 18. Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service at Georgetown University and a Senior Fellow in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security at the Atlantic Council. The Democratic Advantage: America’s Edge over Russia and China. Princeton University Press. 9/24/2018. https://www.princeton.edu/politics/graduate/departmental-colloquia/international-relations/The-Democratic-Advantage-Americas-Edge-over-Russia-and-China.pdf

To answer these questions, we lack a crystal ball, but theory and history can serve as a guide they suggest a clear answer: democracies enjoy a built-in advantage in long-run geopolitical competitions. The idea that democracies are better able to accumulate and maintain power in the international system has a distinguished pedigree. Polybius, Machiavelli, and Montesquieu are among the classical political theorists who argued that republican forms of government are best able to harness available domestic resources toward national greatness. And recent social science research concurs. For the past two decades, cutting-edge research in economics and political science has been obsessed with the issue of whether democracies are different and the consistent finding is that they perform a number of key functions better than their autocratic counterparts. They have higher long-run rates of economic growth.13 They are better able to raise debt in international capital markets and become international financial centers.14 They build stronger and more reliable alliances.15 They are more effective in international coercive diplomacy.16 They are less likely to fight wars (at least against other democracies).17 And they are more likely to win the wars that they fight.18 This book takes this line of argument a step further by aggregating these narrower findings into a broader theory about the relative fitness of democracy and autocracy in great power political competitions. The central argument of this book is that democracies do better in major power rivalries. After all, it is not much of a logical leap to assume that states that systematically perform better on these important economic, diplomatic, and military tasks will do better in long-run geopolitical competitions than those that do not This hunch is supported by the empirical record. As this book will show, autocrats often put up a good fight, but they fail to ultimately seize lasting global leadership. Napoleon, Hitler, and the Soviet Union are among the examples of authoritarian nations that launched campaigns for world domination, but came up short. On the other hand, states with relatively more open forms of government have often been able to establish themselves as the international system’s leading state, from Athens and the Roman Republic in the Ancient world to British Empire and the United States in more recent times. According to some scholars, the world’s leading state since the 1600s has also been among its most democratic. 19 It is hard to argue with an undefeated record of four centuries and counting. America’s greatest strength in its coming competition with Russia and China, therefore, is not its military might or economic strength, but its institutions. For all of its faults, America’s fundamentals are still better than Russia’s and China’s. There is good reason to believe, therefore, that the American era will endure and the autocratic challenges posed by China and Russia will run out of steam. The idea that democracies dominate may seem counterintuitive. After all, throughout history many have argued that dictators have a foreign policy advantage. 20 Autocrats can be ruthless when necessary, but democracies are constrained by public opinion and ethical and legal concerns. Autocrats take decisive action, but democracies dither in endless debate. Autocrats strategically plan for the long-term while democracies cannot see beyond a two or four-year election cycle. Many today laud Russia and China’s autocratic systems for precisely these reasons. Russians play chess and Chinese play go, but Americans play checkers, as the aphorism has it. It is true that autocracies are better at taking swift and bold action, but impulsive decisions uninformed by vigorous public debate often result in spectacular failure. Hitler, for example, was able to harness new technology to create Blitzkrieg warfare and conquer much of Europe, but he also invaded Russia in winter and needlessly declared war on the United States. Unfortunately, for autocracies, this story is all too common. As Machiavelli wrote in his Discourses on Livy in the 16th century: “Fewer errors will be seen in the people than in the prince—and those lesser and having greater remedies.”21 “Hence it arises that a republic has greater life and has good fortune longer than a principality.”22 There is good reason to hope that this argument is true because continued American leadership would be beneficial to the United States and the rest of the free world. The decline of American power would certainly be unwelcome for the United States. Americans have certainly grown accustomed to the benefits that accrue to the world’s leading power. But billions of others also have a stake in America’s success. For all of its faults, the United States has been a fairly benevolent hegemon. While far from perfect, it has gone to extraordinary lengths to provide security, promote economic development, and nurture democracy and human rights. The world is certainly safer, richer, and more free today than it was before the dawn of the American era. There is little reason to believe that Russia and China will be as kind. These autocratic powers long to establish spheres of influence in their near abroad and they have shown little concern for the sovereignty or personal freedoms of their own citizens or subjected populations. If readers doubt these claims, they can simply ask citizens of American allies in Eastern Europe or East Asia whether they desire continued American leadership, or whether they would prefer to live under the thumb of Moscow and Beijing, respectively. Even more consequentially for the globe, however, the decline of the United States could very well result in a major war. As noted above, international relations theory maintains that the decline of one dominant power and the rise of another often results in great power war.23 According to this telling, World War I and World War II were primarily the result of the decline of the British empire and the rise of Imperial and then Nazi Germany as a major competitor on the European continent. Falling powers fight preventive wars in a bid to remain on top and rising powers launch conflicts to dislodge the reigning power and claim their “place in the sun.”24Many fear that a power transition between Beijing and Washington would produce a similar catastrophic result. 25 Continued American leadership, therefore, could forestall this transition and may be a necessary condition for continued world peace and stability among the great powers.

#### And solvency – teacher strikes are key two improving education and keeping democracy stable

**Sean 13** (Sean H, 11-3-13, "Why Teacher Strikes Are Good for Students," Ideas Out There, https://seanhamptoncole.wordpress.com/2013/11/03/why-teacher-strikes-are-good-for-students/)

In any democratic country, the rights of workers to engage in industrial action to ensure a fair wage and decent working conditions are protected by law. Whether it is ‘work to rule’ or outright strike action, many of the world’s most successful nations have a long history of industrial action, and most still experience frequent worker strikes. In a healthy democratic society, when union-employer negotiations fail, workers have the right to ‘down tools’ to petition their employers for better wages, better working conditions, and better treatment. There is a strong argument that many of the world’s strongest economies are strong because of the continuing effects of industrial action. If employers are forced to pay a fair wage, living standards inevitably rise. But if these employers are not challenged in this way, and if they can get away with minimizing ‘staffing costs’, they will. It is no different in the realm of education. A quick Google search reveals that just in the last few years, Denmark, Ghana, the UK, the USA, Kenya, Australia, South Africa, Nigeria, and many others have had, or are considering strike action. Yet whenever we do have teachers going on strike, the objections (usually from parents, headmasters and the education authorities) goes something like this… Why do teachers strike, don’t they care about their students? It is such a simple and seemingly strong argument that it actually prevents many teachers from joining strikes. But it is quite clearly fallacious, and quite simply wrong. Teachers should go on strike exactly because they do care about their students. How on earth can this be true? The answer is quite simple: Teachers should go on strike to model the behaviours they want to instil in their students: standing up against injustice, making difficult decisions, and insisting on being treated with dignity and respect – despite such actions being very difficult and unpopular. Those who are generally against striking teachers are government departments, school heads and parents, simply because it makes their lives difficult. Parents want their children in school, and principals want to minimize disruptions and the authorities want to keep wage costs down. The majority of teachers will submit to the rhetoric and bullying to stay in the classroom, rather than to stand up for what’s right. But if we transferred this lesson to our students, we would take education backward by at least 30 years. Do parents really want this? Do principals? Does civil society? But there’s more to it. The only way to make a decent wage in teaching is to get promoted, but as you get promoted, you step further and further away from teaching. So to make a decent living in teaching, you need to be promoted out of the classroom. How does that make even a little bit of sense? If the best teachers were paid better, they would stay in the classroom. How can that be bad for education? Better salaries will also attract better teachers to the profession, and motivate those who are already there, hence, long-term, education benefits, even though there may be problems in the short-term. In essence, teacher strikes are a crucial part of a wider revolution in education. If all teachers can see the value of understanding the deeper issues, of taking relevant action and overcoming seemingly insurmountable challenges, then they can transfer this mindset to the classroom, and challenge students to do the same thing. Granted, education is an essential service, but this cannot be used as an argument against collective industrial action. It is exactly because it is such an essential service that we must fight to make it even better.

## Adv 2 – CC

#### Climate strike participants get arrested now.

**Scanlan 19** [Quinn. Quinn Scanlan. Voting, campaigns & elections for [@ABC](https://twitter.com/ABC). “Jane Fonda arrested in climate change strike outside Capitol”. 10-11-2019. ABC News. https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/jane-fonda-arrested-climate-change-strike-capitol/story?id=66209415.]

Academy Award winning actress Jane Fonda, 81, was arrested by police with a group of about a dozen protesters Friday after being warned repeatedly to leave the steps of the U.S. Capitol. Inspired by youth climate activists like Sweden's Greta Thunberg, 16, who herself recently came to Washington to [testify in front of Congress](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/greta-thunberg-teen-climate-activist-tells-us-lawmakers/story?id=65692288), Fonda, who, throughout her long career, has engaged in activism, dating as far back as the Vietnam War, recently told ABC News that while she's in the nation's capital, every Friday, she'll attend "Fire Drill Friday," a weekly event featuring scientists, celebrities and activists addressing the various facets and impacts of climate change. The event title is a play on Thunberg saying during a speech at the World Economic Forum's annual meeting in Davos, Switzerland in January, "I want you to act as if our house is on fire. Because it is." "11 o'clock every Friday morning come get arrested with me or choose not to it doesn't matter," told ABC News in an earlier interview about her planned effort. Fonda said she decided to leave her home, and comfort zone, through the holidays, and move to Washington for four months, because she wanted to "make a commitment to" the issue of climate change. In an interview with ABC News Deputy Political director MaryAlice Parks for an episode of of ABC News Live's "The Briefing Room," Fonda said that while they bear no blame for causing it, the [kids are leading the charge](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/teenage-climate-change-activist-greta-thunbeerg-takes-global/story?id=65601228) on fighting climate change. "They're saying, 'Come on, you know, you're taking our future away from us. We need -- we need you to support us.' And so grandmas unite," she said. "I want to stand with them and raise up... their message. This is -- this is serious... This is a crisis unlike anything that has ever faced humankind." Stressing she was not being hyperbolic, Fonda said this is the "one issue" that matters because it "will [determine the survival of our species](https://abcnews.go.com/International/united-nations-report-details-looming-climate-crisis/story?id=58354235)," and said that's why she'll be attending Fire Drill Fridays weekly. David Swanson/AP, FILE *Actress and activist Jane Fonda talks to a crowd of protestors during a global climate rall...Read More* "I think every single human being has to say, 'What can I do to put this at the forefront?'" she said. "(With) everything that's going on in the news, well, we have to fight our way through that and find ways to get climate change in people's minds." The esteemed actress pushed back against criticism that Hollywood's presence could make climate change a more polarizing issue. "What we're facing is so important and so urgent, it doesn't matter. Those -- those things don't even matter," she told Parks. "This is the future. This is whether we're going to survive." Fonda also said that the United States needs "to lead the way" on this issue, so that other countries who contribute heavily to greenhouse gas emissions, like China and India, "follow suit." While she's been passionate about this issue for "decades," she credits her current endeavors on [Thunberg's recurring protest](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/teenage-climate-change-activist-greta-thunbeerg-takes-global/story?id=65601228) outside Swedish parliament, and other student climate strikers around the world for taking on this issue so passionately.

#### Strikes incentivize companies to take climate action seriously.

**Ivanova 19** [Irin. Work, tech, climate and data for [@CBSNews](https://twitter.com/CBSNews). Priors: [@HuffPost](https://twitter.com/HuffPost), [@CrainsNewYork](https://twitter.com/CrainsNewYork), [@newmarkjschool](https://twitter.com/newmarkjschool). “These businesses are closing for Friday's climate strike”. 9-20-2019. No Publication. https://www.cbsnews.com/news/global-climate-strike-businesses-close-their-doors-in-time-for-climate-strike-2019/.]

Thousands of people are planning to walk out of work or school on Friday to press global leaders for solutions to rapidly escalating climate change. And while it was students who started the movement, more and more workers—and even companies—are joining them in support. Some businesses are letting workers take the day off to protest, while others plan to close their doors outright. They tend to be small or mid-sized businesses — most of the country's largest corporations have yet to weigh in on the strike, although plenty of people who work at them might yet participate when walkouts are set to start Friday afternoon. Here are the ways workers and companies are supporting the strike. **Walkouts** Amazon is expected to see more than 1,500 employees walk out, with the largest contingent exiting its Seattle headquarters, as they push the company to cut ties with fossil-fuel companies and stop funding groups that deny climate science. The company on Thursday announced it would make its operations carbon-neutral by 2040 and run entirely on renewable energy within a decade. More than 900 **Google** workers and unknown numbers of workers from **Facebook, Atlassian, Cobot, Ecosia, Microsoft** and **Twitter** are vowing walkouts. The strikers have details at [Tech Workers Coalition.](https://techworkerscoalition.org/climate-strike/) Some smaller companies are giving workers paid time off to participate in the walkouts. These include **Atlassian, Sustain Natural, Grove Collaborative** and others. **Closures** Ben & Jerry's corporate offices in South Burlington, Vermont, will be closed during the strike on Friday, while shops worldwide will either be closed or open later than usual. The company is also stopping production at its manufacturing plants in Vermont and the Netherlands, according to [Adweek](https://www.adweek.com/brand-marketing/brands-are-closing-their-doors-in-support-of-the-global-climate-strike/). "We recognize that climate change is an existential threat to our planet and all its inhabitants, and therefore we are proud standing with the youth-led movement demanding bold action in response to the climate emergency," a spokesperson said. **Patagonia** is closing its retail stores for 24 hours on Friday. "For decades, many corporations have single-mindedly pursued profits at the expense of everything else — employees, communities and the air, land and water we all share," CEO Rose Marcario wrote on [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/enough-join-climate-strikes-demand-action-rose-marcario/?sf219300827=1). "[C]apitalism needs to evolve if humanity is going to survive." Lush Cosmetics will close its manufacturing facilities and retail outlets on September 20 in the U.S. and on September 27 in Canada. It's also halting online sales on Friday. **Badger Balm** is closing for the day and giving workers paid time off to demonstrate or volunteer. The company is also donating 5% of online sales from September 16 to 27 to AmazonWatch.org to aid in preserving the shrinking Amazon's ecological systems, it said. **Burton**, the outdoor retailer, is closing its offices and owned retail stores on September 20th or 27th (depending on their country of location). It also won't make any online sales for 24 hours on Friday. **SodaStream**, the seltzer maker owned by PepsiCo, is shuttering its headquarters and closing e-commerce on Friday. **Digital doings and more** The heart of the strike will be in the streets, but that doesn't mean the action stops there. More than 7,000 [companies](https://digital.globalclimatestrike.net/) have pledged to draw attention to the protest by either donating ad space or putting banners on their sites. Participants include **Tumblr, WordPress, Imgur, Kickstarter, BitTorrent,** **Tor, BoingBoing**, **Greenpeace, Change.org**, among many others.

#### Extinction

Specktor 19 [Brandon writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years] 6-4-2019, "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html> Justin

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the **sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes**; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and **55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of** [**lethal heat conditions**](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly **one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert**. Entire **ecosystems collapse**, beginning with the **planet's coral reefs**, the **rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets.** The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to **stress the fabric of the world's largest nations**, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in **nuclear war, are likely**. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

## Under view

#### 1] Aff gets 1AR theory – otherwise the neg can be infinitely abusive and there’s no way to check back. 1AR theory is drop the debater, competing interps, and the highest layer of the round – the 1ARs too short to be able to rectify abuse and adequately cover substance. No RVI because you have 6 minutes to go for them whereas I only have a 3-minute 2AR to respond so I get crushed on time skew.

#### 2] Reasonability on aff T interps- substance crowd out caused by bidirectional shells on must spec country and must not spec create at least 2 minutes of substance crowd out in the 1NC and 1AR, if not the entire debate—this outweighs a) prescripted debates make judge decisions already arbitrary, b) bidirectional shells means there is no norming power since it is always strategic to find a way to split the 1AR

**3] Being able to strike gives workers more power of their freedom and forces companies to respect their dignity.**

**Gourevitch, 16** (Alex Gourevitch, Norman E. Bowie is professor emeritus at the University of Minnesota. Until his retirement in 2009 he was Elmer L Andersen Chair of Corporate Responsibility and served in the departments of strategic management and of philosophy., June 2016, accessed on 6-24-2021, American Political Science Association, "Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike", doi:10.1017/S1537592716000049)//st

On top of which, as Smith noted, “masters are always and every where in a sort of tacit, but constant anduniform combination.” In a world in which economic necessity couples with employer collusion, workers have little choice: “Such combinations [by employers], however, are frequently resisted by a contrary defensive combination of the workmen; who sometimes too, without any provocation of this kind, combine of their own accord to raise the price of their labour.” 51 For this reason Smith thought it was wrong to treat trade unions as criminal conspiracies.52 The view of unions and strikes as defensive, aimed at lessening employers’ ability to take advantage of workers’ need, persisted throughout the industrial age. By the time L.T. Hobhouse wrote Liberalism, it was possible for a liberal to argue that **strikes might even be connected to human freedom:** The emancipation of **trade unions,** however, extending over the period from 1824 to 1906, and perhaps not yet complete, **was in the main a liberating movement, because combination was [are] necessary to place the workman on something approaching terms of equality with the employer, and because tacit combinations of employers could never, in fact, be prevented by law.**53 We must note, however, that nearly all of these arguments remain within a form of social theory that attempts to make capitalist practice more like its theoretical self-image. These thinkers tended to defend unions and their right to strike as a way of achieving “real freedom of contract” in the face of economic necessity. Hobhouse was updating Smith and Mill when arguing that “in **the matter of contract true freedom postulates substantial equality between the parties. In proportion as one party is in a position of vantage, he is able to dictate his terms. In proportion as the other party is in a weak position, he [and] must accept unfavourable terms.”** 54 On this account, the right to strike is defensible only insofar as it helps maintain a position of relative equality among independent bargaining parties. It thereby secures contracts that are not just voluntary but truly free—Mill’s “necessary instrumentality of that free market.” This basic idea reappears in any number of twentieth-century acts of labor legislation and jurisprudence, perhaps most notably in the 1935 law granting American workers the right to strike.55