# 1AC – US

## FW

#### The standard is maximizing expected well being

#### 1] TJFS

#### Util is the best fw for debate - some fw are arbitrary and subjective and always only ever flow one way

#### A] util stops intervention bc its an objective impact that can be weighed whereas any other fw isn’t bc everything is just infinite

#### B] Reciprocity –any other fw only has offense as aff, util gives offense for both sides good for fairness bc it makes debate less skewed and gives them a chance to the ballot

#### And 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

#### 2] 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

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

#### 4] 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.

## 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 – Inequality

#### Unionization down now – strikes needed to confront the risking income inequality

**Bahn 19** (Kate Bahn, August 29,2019, "The once and future role of strikes in ensuring U.S. worker power," Equitable Growth, <https://equitablegrowth.org/the-once-and-future-role-of-strikes-in-ensuring-u-s-worker-power/> )

Unions in the United States are at their lowest level of density since they became legal around 80 years ago, with 6.4 percent of private-sector workers in unions today. Yet there is increasing energy for bringing back this crucial force to balance the power of capital and ensure the fruits of economic growth are more broadly shared among everyone who creates it. Strikes are a compelling tool for dealing with rising U.S. income and wealth inequality—just as they were in an earlier era of economic inequality, when unions first gained their legal stature in the U.S. labor market.

#### As labor strikes slow down – income inequality is exacerbated, labor law acts without stipulations like PRO are the only way to solve

**Shierholz 20** (Heidi Shierholz ,1-27-2020, "Weakened labor movement leads to rising economic inequality," Economic Policy Institute, <https://www.epi.org/blog/weakened-labor-movement-leads-to-rising-economic-inequality/> )

The basic facts about inequality in the United States—that for most of the last 40 years, pay has stagnated for all but the highest paid workers and inequality has risen dramatically—are widely understood. What is less well-known is the role the decline of unionization has played in those trends. The share of workers covered by a collective bargaining agreement dropped from 27 percent to 11.6 percent between 1979 and 2019, meaning the union coverage rate is now less than half where it was 40 years ago. Research shows that this de-unionization accounts for a sizable share of the growth in inequality over that period—around 13–20 percent for women and 33–37 percent for men. Applying these shares to annual earnings data reveals that working people are now losing on the order of $200 billion per year as a result of the erosion of union coverage over the last four decades—with that money being redistributed upward, to the rich. The good news is that restoring union coverage—and strengthening workers’ abilities to join together to improve their wages and working conditions in other ways—is therefore likely to put at least $200 billion per year into the pockets of working people. These changes could happen through organizing and policy reform. Policymakers have introduced legislation, the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act, that would significantly reform current labor law. Building on the reforms in the PRO Act, the Clean Slate for Worker Power Project proposes further transformation of labor law, with innovative ideas to create balance in our economy. How is it that de-unionization has played such a large role in wage stagnation for working people and the rise of inequality? When workers are able to join together, form a union and collectively bargain, their pay goes up. On average, a worker covered by a union contract earns 13.2 percent more than a peer with similar education, occupation and experience in a non-unionized workplace in the same sector. Furthermore, the benefits of collective bargaining extend well beyond union workers. Where unions are strong, they essentially set broader standards that non-union employers must match in order to attract and retain the workers they need and to avoid facing an organizing drive. The combination of the direct effect of unions on their members and this “spillover” effect to non-union workers means unions are crucial in fostering a vibrant middle class—and has also meant that as unionization has eroded, pay for working people has stagnated and inequality has skyrocketed. Unions also help shrink racial wage gaps. For example, black workers are more likely than white workers to be represented by a union, and black workers who are in unions get a larger boost to wages from being in a union than white workers do. This means that the decline of unionization has played a significant role in the expansion of the black–white wage gap. What has caused declining unionization? One key factor is fierce corporate opposition that has smothered workers’ freedom to form unions. Aggressive anti-union campaigns—once confined to the most anti-union employers—have become widespread. For example, it is now standard, when workers seek to organize, for their employers to hire union avoidance consultants to coordinate fierce anti-union campaigns. We estimate that employers spend nearly $340 million per year hiring union avoidance advisers to help them prevent employees from organizing. And though the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) makes it illegal for employers to intimidate, coerce or fire workers in retaliation for participating in union-organizing campaigns, the penalties are grossly insufficient to provide a meaningful disincentive for such behavior. This means employers often engage in illegal activities, such as threatening to close the worksite, cutting union activists’ hours or pay, or reporting workers to immigration enforcement authorities if employees unionize. In at least 1 in 5 union elections, employers are charged with illegally firing workers involved in organizing. In the face of these attacks on union organizing, policymakers have egregiously failed to update labor laws to balance the system. Fundamental reform is necessary to build worker power and guarantee all workers the right to come together and have a real voice in their workplace.

#### Strikes are an articulation of worker power over production – they halt the operation of capitalist society and refuse capitalist organization of labor

Tronti 1966 (Tronti, Mario. Mario Tronti was the principal theorist of the radical political movement of the 1960s known in Italy as *operaismo* and in the Anglophone world as Italian workerism, a current which went on to inform the development of autonomist Marxism. His “Copernican revolution”—the proposal that working class struggles against exploitation propel capitalist development, which can only be understood as a reaction that seeks to harness this antagonism—has inspired dissident leftists around the world. “Workers and Capital.” 1966. <https://libcom.org/book/export/html/42233>) // Park City NL

Adam Smith says - and Marx comments on the accuracy of his observation -that the effective development of the productive power of labour begins when labour is transformed into wage labour, that is, when the conditions of labour confront it in the form of capital. One could go further and say that the effective development of the political power of labour really begins from the moment that labourers are transformed into workers, that is, when the whole of the conditions of society confront them as capital. We can see, then, that the political power of workers is intimately connected to the productive power of wage labour. This is in contrast to the power of capital, which is primarily a social power. **The power of workers resides in their potential command over production**, that is, over a particular aspect of society. Capitalist power, on the other hand, rests on a real domination over society in general. But the nature of **capital** is such that it **requires a society based on production**. Consequently production, this particular respect of society, becomes the aim of society in general**. Whoever controls** and dominates **it controls** and dominates **everything**. Even if factory and society were to become perfectly integrated at the economic level, nevertheless, at a political level, they would forever continue to be in contradiction. One of the highest and most developed points of the class struggle will be precisely the frontal clash between the factory, as working class and society, as capital. **When** the development of **capital's interests in the factory** **is blocked, then the functioning of society seizes up: the way is** then **open for overthrowing** and destroying **the very basis of capital's power**. Those, however, who have the contrary perspective, of taking over the running of the "general interests of society", are committing the error of reducing the factory to capital by means of reducing the working class, that is, a part of society, to society as a whole. Now we know that the productive Dower of labour makes a leap forward when it is put to use by the individual capitalist. By the same token, it makes a political leap forward when it is organised by social capital. It is possible that this political leap forward does not express itself in terms of organisation, whereupon an outsider may conclude that it has not happened. Yet it still exists as a material reality, and the fact of its spontaneous existence is sufficient for the workers to refuse to fight for old ideals - though it may not yet be sufficient for them to take upon themselves the task of initiating a new plan of struggle, based on new objectives. So, can we say that we are still living through the long historical period in which Marx saw the workers as a "class against capital", but not yet as a "class for itself"? Or shouldn't we perhaps say the opposite, even if it means confounding a bit the terms of Hegel's dialectic? Namely, that the workers become, from the first, "a class for itself" - that is, - from the first moments of direct confrontation with the individual employer - and that they are recognised as such by the first capitalists. And only afterwards,after a long-terrible, historical travail which is, perhaps, not yet completed, do the workers arrive at the point of being actively, subjectively, "a class against capital". A prerequisite of this process of transition is political organisation, the party, with its demand for total power. In the intervening period there is the refusal - collective, mass, expressed in passive forms - of the workers to expose themselves as "a class against capital" without that organisation of their own, without that total demand for power. The working class does what it is. But it is, at one and the same time, the articulation of capital, and its dissolution. Capitalist power seeks to use the workers' antagonistic will-to-struggle as a motor of its own development. The workerist party must take this same real mediation by the workers of capital's interests and organise it in an antagonistic form, as the tactical terrain of struggle and as a strategic potential for destruction. Here there is only one reference point - only one orientation - for the opposed world views of the two classes - namely the class of workers. Whether one's aim is to stabilise the development of the system or to destroy it forever, it is the working class that is decisive. Thus the society of capital and the workers' party find themselves existing as two opposite forms with one and the same content. And in the struggle for that content, the one form excludes the 'other. They can only exist together for the brief period of the revolutionary crisis. The working class cannot constitute itself as aparty within capitalist society without preventing capitalist society from functioning. As long as capitalist does continue to function the working class party cannot be said to exist. Remember: "the existence of a class of capitalists is based on the productive power of labour". Productive labour, then, exists not only in relation to capital, but also in relation to the capitalists as a class. It is in this latter relationship that it exists as the working class. The transition is probably a historical one: it is productive labour which produces capital; it is the fact of industrial workers being organised into a class that provokes the capitalists in general to constitute themselves as a class. Thus we see that - at an average level of development - workers are already a social class of producers: industrial producers of capital. At this same level of development the capitalists, themselves, constitute a social class not of entrepreneurs so much as organisers: the organisers of workers through the medium of industry. A history of industry cannot be conceived as anything other than a history of the capitalist organisation of productive labour, hence as a working class history of capital. The "industrial revolution" necessarily I springs to mind: This must be the starting point of our research if we are to trace the development of The contemporary form of capital's domination over workers, as it increasingly comes to be exercised through the objective mechanisms of industry, and also the development of capital's capacity to prevent these mechanisms being used by workers. This would lead us to see that the development of the relationship between living labour and the constant part of capital is not a neutral process. Rather, it is determined, and often violently so, by the emerging class relationship between the collective worker and the whole of capital, qua social relations of production. We would then see that it is the specific moments of the class struggle which have determined every technological change in the mechanisms of industry. Thus we would achieve two things: one, we would break free of the apparent neutrality of the man-machine relationship; and two, we would locate this relationship in the interaction, through history, of working class struggles and capitalist initiative. It is wrong to define present day society as "industrial civilisation". The "industry" of that definition is, in fact, merely a means.' The truth of modern society is that it is the civilisation of labour. Furthermore, a capitalist society can never be anything but this. And, in the course of its historical development, it can even take on the form of "socialism". So.... not industrial society (that is, the society of capital) but the society of industrial labour, and thus the society of workers' labour. It is capitalist society seen from this point of view that we must find the courage to fight. **What are workers doing when they struggle against their employers?** Are they not they, above all else, **saying "No" to the transformation of labour power into labour**? Are they not, more than anything, **refusing to receive work from the capitalist**? Couldn't we say, in fact, that stopping work does not signify a refusal to give capital the use of one's labour power, since it has already been given to capital once the contract for this particular commodity has been signed. Nor is it a refusal to allow capital the product of labour, since this is legally already capital's property, and, in any case, the worker does not know what to do with it. Rather, stopping work - **the strike**, as the classic form of workers' struggle - **implies a refusal of the command of capital as the organiser of production**: it is a way of saying "No" at a particular point in the process and a refusal of the concrete labour which is being' offered; it is a momentary.' blockage of the work-process and it appears as a recurring threat which derives its content from the process of value creation. The anarcho-syndicalist "general strike", which was supposed to provoke the collapse of capitalist society, is a romantic naivete from the word go. It already contains within it a demand which it appears to oppose - that is, the Lassallian demand for a "fair share of the fruits of labour" - in other words, a fairer "participation" in the profit of capital. In fact, these two perspectives combine in that incorrect "correction" which was imposed on Marx, and which has subsequently enjoyed such success within the practice of the official working class movement - the idea that it is "working people" who are The true "givers of labour", and that it is the concern of workpeople to defend the dignity of this thing which they provide, against all those who would seek to debase it. Untrue...The truth of the matter is that the person who provides labour is the capitalist. The worker is the provider of capital. In reality, he is the possessor of that unique, particular commodity which is the condition of all the other conditions of production. Because, as we have seen, all These other conditions of production are, from the start, capital in themselves - a dead capital which, in order to come to life and into play in the social relations of production, needs to subsume under itself labour power, as the subject and activity of capital. But, as we have also seen, this transition into social relati9ns of production cannot occur unless the class relation is introduced into it as its content. And the class relationship is imposed from the very 'first moment and by the very fact that the proletariat is constituted as a class in the face of the capitalist.

#### And income equality spills over – extinction

CREAMER 9 — Robert Creamer, political organizer, strategist, and author, owner of Strategic Consulting Group—a political consulting firm that works on many of the country’s most significant issue campaigns, married to Congresswoman Jan Schakowsky of Illinois, 2009 (“Why Growing Income Inequality Is Bad for America,” The Huffington Post, October 27th, Available Online at <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-creamer/why-growing-income-inequa_b_335115.html>, Accessed 10-27-2009)

4). Finally, increased **income inequality is completely undemocratic. It is a betrayal of our most fundamental democratic values. And it is dangerous to our prospects for long-term survival.** The increasing inequality of income leads inexorably to increasing inequality in the distribution of wealth. Power in the society is more and more concentrated in the hands of a few. It becomes more and more likely that some of our most powerful citizens came to that station not because of their merit, but because they got it the "old fashion way" -- they inherited it. That is directly contrary to our shared belief in a more democratic society -- where power and opportunity are broadly shared -- where no one's power or station in life are determined by accident of birth. The earliest Americans came to this continent to escape tyranny, aristocracy and plutocracy. Progressives who stand up against the increasing concentration of economic power in the hands of a few are standing for one of the proudest traditions of our democracy. And our commitment to the democratic distribution of power is not simply an expression of utopian idealism. **In his** brilliant **study of why societies in the past have failed**, called Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed , Pulitzer Prize-winning physiologist and ethno-geographer Jared **Diamond concluded** that **one of the most common factors was "rational behavior" by actors -- and decision-making elites -- that benefited some individual or private self-interest but was harmful to the prospects of the entire society.** He found that this was often complicated because the benefits to a small group that profited from the action were great in the short run, and the resulting damage to everyone else was not very palpable or immediate, except over time. This problem became especially acute when elites thought **they could insulate themselves from the consequences of communal disaster**. Then, they were even less prone to make decisions in the public interest. The **increased inequality in the distribution of wealth and income makes this kind of decision-making more and more likely. We see when the interests of the wealthy stand in the way of solutions to the problems of climate change and environmental destruction** -- or when we fail to raise enough money for the public education that benefits all children because the few who can afford private schools refuse to pay "higher taxes." The **creation of a democratic society, built on egalitarian principles, is the only real systematic means of assuring that the interests of the entire society are not sacrificed to those of powerful** elites. Most stories of decisions leading to catastrophic collapse involve decision-making elites whose interests diverge from the society at large. Democracy is the only real antidote. The **undemocratic** **increase in the distribution of wealth and income is not only wrong. It is also dangerous to our future survival**.

#### The alternative to workers striking is quitting – squo proves

**Ewoc 21**(Ewoc, 10-18-2021, "Workers are angry and quitting their Jobs. Should they consider striking for Union Recognition?," EWOC, <https://workerorganizing.org/workers-are-angry-and-quitting-their-jobs-should-they-consider-striking-for-union-recognition-2857/> //aw)

With millions of workers quitting bad jobs, and bosses scrambling to find employees, it may be time for workers to organize and strike for union recognition. Folks are calling it #Striketober for a reason. A lot of union workers are on strike, with large walkouts at John Deere, Kellogg’s, Frontier Communications, and Catholic Health starting just this month, and 60,000 Hollywood workers and tens of thousands of Kaiser Permanente workers have threatened to walk out. Moreover, millions of workers are quitting their jobs. In August, 4.3 million workers quit, which was 2.9% of the workforce, a record number. This follows other record-setting months of mass quitting, as tracked by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The last five months have seen tens of millions of workers quitting, a clear sign that workers are angry and feel they deserve better. We haven’t seen this kind of turmoil in the workforce in a long time. Employers are scrambling to find employees and have had to raise wages. What should the working class do with the leverage they have? While it’s understandable for workers to quit bad jobs, they should consider organizing for improvements instead. And one tactic that should absolutely be on the table is the union recognition strike. A recognition strike happens when non-union workers refuse to work to force their employer to recognize their union and bargain a contract. This is legal and protected activity under the National Labor Relations Act. That generally means workers can’t legally be fired for doing this. It does officially come with some restrictions though, for example, picketing can usually occur for no more than 30 days. Recognition strikes used to be more common in the past and can be a powerful strategy, but the risks, as with other strikes, are that the employer may try to replace the workers with scabs. Labor law unfortunately allows for the permanent replacement of striking workers. However, if the workers are conducting an Unfair Labor Practice strike, for example, in response to illegal retaliation for organizing, then it’s unlawful for the employer to permanently replace them with scabs.

## Under view

#### 1] 1] Aff gets 1AR theory a] neg can be infinitely abusive and we can’t check back b] times skew – it’s a 4-7, 3-6 skew c] reciprocity – neg gets 1nc theory to check abuse and 1ar theory comes first – a] time skew the 1ar is already really hard u being abusive makes it harder

#### 2] reasonability on T w a brightline of being disclosed – a) this is a core aff on the topic and any generic still applies plus u get 30 min preround prep

#### 3] Aff gets rvi a) 4 min 1ar means its impossible to cover otherwise and we don’t have time to make offense elsewhere AND no neg RVI a) no time skew

## Disclosure theory

#### Interpretation: Teams must disclose past neg positions either in the cite box or open source on the 2021-2022 NDCA policy wiki 30 minutes pre-round.

#### Violation: They don’t – insert ss
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Description automatically generated

### Standards

#### 1] Strat Skew - I cant plan out a strategy ahead of time bc you don’t disclose and I have no way of knowing what you are going to read or what your past strategies are. And reciprocity bc I meet the interp u know my strat – skews strat even more and controls fairness bc I cant compensate for other forms of abuse wo a strategy

#### AND – contact info doesn’t solve a] no way to determine if you will actually reply and b] we’ve been prepping for this tournament all week – disclosing 30 min before on email doesn’t solve c] most email disclosure just leads to you sharing the plantext and not the actual cites which doesn’t help out strat at all

#### 2] Norms – Disclosure is a norm on the circuit and you don’t meet should be held to a higher standard to at least adhere to norms in debate otherwise bad for fairness bc I never know what you will and wont follow. Especially from big schools with multiple coaches

#### 3] Clash – Because I have less time to prep out the 1AC, There won’t be as much substantial clash on case. That directly controls the internal link to education because a] clash teaches us more about the aff b] clash teaches us more about debate.

#### Fairness matters

#### **1] it’s a constitutive part**

#### 2] its

and edu

1] its why schools fund debate

#### **2] it’s the only portable skill from debate**

### Competing interps

#### 1] Aff theory is comp. interps because a) time skew means we can reasonably win a model + interp in 4 min and b) theres no “reasonable” way to meet disclosure because it skews the round starting in the 1ac.

### Drop the Debater

#### 1] dropping the debater deters any future abuse bc when you lose the round you learn and stop doing it