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#### Interpretation: workers is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend that a just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of a specific type of workers to strike.

Nebel 19 Jake Nebel [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs.] , 8-12-2019, "Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution," Briefly, https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/ SM

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions. Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window. So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why. 1.1 “Colleges and Universities” “Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons. First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural. Second, “colleges and universities” fails the upward-entailment test for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals. Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universities generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution. Fourth, it is extremely unlikely that the topic committee would have written the resolution with the existential interpretation of “colleges and universities” in mind. If they intended the existential interpretation, they would have added explicit existential quantifiers like “some.” No such addition would be necessary or expected for the generic interpretation since generics lack explicit quantifiers by default. The topic committee’s likely intentions are not decisive, but they strongly suggest that the generic interpretation is correct, since it’s prima facie unlikely that a committee charged with writing a sentence to be debated would be so badly mistaken about what their sentence means (which they would be if they intended the existential interpretation). The committee, moreover, does not write resolutions for the 0.1 percent of debaters who debate on the national circuit; they write resolutions, at least in large part, to be debated by the vast majority of students on the vast majority of circuits, who would take the resolution to be (pretty obviously, I’d imagine) generic with respect to “colleges and universities,” given its face-value meaning and standard expectations about what LD resolutions tend to mean.

#### Rules readings are always generalized – specific instances are not consistent.

Cohen 01 (Ariel Cohen (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev), “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars,” Journal of Semantics 18:3, 2001 https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/188590876.pdf)

In general, as, again, already noted by Aristotle, rules and definitions are not relativized to particular individuals; it is rarely the case that a specific individual¶ forms part of the description of a general rule.¶ Even DPs of the form a certain X or a particular X, which usually receive¶ a wide scope interpretation, cannot, in general, receive such an interpretation in the context of a rule or a definition. This holds of definitions in general, not¶ only of definitions with an IS subject. The following examples from the Cobuild¶ dictionary illustrate this point:¶ (74) a. A fanatic is a person who is very enthusiastic about a particular¶ activity, sport, or way of life.¶ b. Something that is record-breaking is better than the previous¶ record for a particular performance or achievement.¶ c. When a computer outputs something it sorts and produces information as the result of a particular program or operation.¶ d. If something sheers in a particular direction, it suddenly changes¶ direction, for example to avoid hitting something.

#### That outweighs—only our evidence speaks to how indefinite singulars are interpreted in the context of normative statements like the resolution. This means throw out aff counter-interpretations that are purely descriptive

#### Violation—they specified teachers

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Precision –any deviation justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Limits—specifying a just government offers huge explosion in the topic since they get permutations of hundreds of types of workers in the world depending on their definition of “workers”.

#### Paradigm Issues –

#### 1. Fairness first – debate is a game, and it’s the only way to determine the better debater

#### 2. Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for clash, best way to set norms

#### 3. Use Competing Interps –

#### Race to the top

#### Reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention

#### 4. No RVI’s –

#### Chilling effect on T and theory

#### Encourages baiting

#### Illogical – you don’t win for being fair

#### 5. T before theory – less time to set norms, 1NC abuse was necessary to check 1AC abuse
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#### The plan increases union membership by removing obstacles to organizing

Alexia Fernández Campbell, Politics & Policy Reporter at Vox, May, 2019 – [“Democrats have an ambitious plan to save American labor unions”, https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2019/5/14/18536789/right-to-work-unions-protecting-the-right-to-organize-act-bill]//bread

House Democrats have a plan to make unions great again. They’re trying to get support for a sweeping labor reform bill that would reverse decades of Republican-backed policies meant to crush labor unions. The [Protecting the Right to Organize Act (PRO Act)](https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/2474/cosponsors?s=1&r=185&overview=closed), introduced earlier this month by Rep. Bobby Scott (D-VA), would push back on a series of Republican-backed laws that have cropped up in more than two dozen states in the past decade. These so-called right-to-work laws let unionized workers skip out on paying union dues if they don’t want to. Normally, every worker chips in for the cost of negotiating a labor contract, because everyone in the bargaining unit benefits from it. Giving workers the option not to pay means many won’t, which then lowers a union’s membership and political influence. Unions have lost millions of dollars in states that have passed these laws. The Democrats’ new bill would also allow workers to sue employers who illegally interfere with unionizing efforts, instead of forcing them to take all their complaints to the National Labor Relations Board, an independent federal agency that enforces collective bargaining laws. The new bill would also let the board **hit employers with fines if they break the law**. Right now there’s currently no financial penalty for employers who illegally fire workers who are trying to unionize, for example. These are just two key provisions in the bill, but they’re enough to shift significant power from businesses to employees. If passed, it would mark the biggest change to US labor laws since Congress gave American workers the right to unionize back in 1935. Unions are also pushing hard for these reforms, which they hope will reverse a sharp decline in union membership in the US. Back in the 1950s, about one in three workers belonged to a labor union. Now it’s one in ten. And that decline is partly responsible for growing income inequality and stagnant wage growth in the US, [research shows](https://www.vox.com/2018/6/14/17437832/janus-afscme-supreme-court-union-teacher-police-public-sector). Still, it’s highly unlikely that any Republicans in the GOP-controlled Senate would ever touch the new labor reform bill. In fact, they’re moving in the other direction, trying to expand a bill in the Senate that implements right-to-work laws in every state. And anti-union groups have already started bashing the Democrats’ labor reform bill, calling it “anti-worker” and “anti-freedom.” Even with such slim prospects, House Democrats are introducing the bill at a crucial moment in the US labor movement. Despite declining union membership, more and more Americans support the idea of unionizing these days. In fact, there’s been a sharp [increase in public support for labor unions](https://news.gallup.com/poll/12751/labor-unions.aspx) in recent years, according to Gallup. On top of that, a record number of workers across the country have been going on strike in the past year, demanding higher wages and better benefits as the economy expands. Democrats have sensed this shift in favor of unions, and their new bill would give workers even more momentum. It would also end one of the GOP’s worst policy ideas. Right-to-work laws are great for businesses, not workers When Republicans took over a historic number of state legislatures in the 2010 midterms, they focused on two things: cutting taxes and weakening labor unions. With support from pro-business groups, lawmakers began [to expand right-to-work laws](https://www.vox.com/2018/8/7/17655690/missouri-election-proposition-a-right-to-work) from the South to Midwestern states with a strong union presence. Before the expansion, employees at unionized workplaces in those states didn’t have to pay dues if they didn’t want to join the union, but they did have to pay agency fees. These fees are lower than the dues members pay, but they cover the union’s cost of negotiating employment contracts that benefit all workers in the unit. In 2012, that began to change in the Midwest. Republican lawmakers passed right-to-work laws in Indiana and Michigan, two states with a large union presence. At the time, the country was in the midst of the Great Recession, and politicians promised that relaxing labor laws would attract businesses to the state and turn around the economy. Since then, Wisconsin, Kentucky, and West Virginia passed right-to-work laws too. Economists have been closely studying the economic impact of these types of laws, and none has found any evidence to back up the claim that they’ve significantly boosted the local economy. At best, the laws appear to slightly increase the number of businesses in the state, but they don’t really benefit workers. At worst, these laws lower average wages for all workers after they are passed. The latter is the most likely outcome, based on the research. One study [conducted](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1027987) by economist Lonnie Stevans at Hofstra University in 2007 found that right-to-work laws did lead to an increase in the number of businesses, but those economic gains mostly went to business owners. Meanwhile, average wages for workers went down. Another study, in 2015, showed that Oklahoma’s right-to-work law [didn’t lead to more jobs](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/pam.21861), but it also didn’t seem to affect wages. The Economic Policy Institute, a left-leaning think tank, attributes right-to-work laws to a [3.1 percent decline in wages for union and nonunion workers](https://www.epi.org/publication/right-to-work-states-have-lower-wages/) after accounting for differences in cost of living, demographics, and labor market characteristics. In truth, it shouldn’t be a surprise that anti-union laws would hurt middle-class families. [According to economists](https://books.google.com/books?id=qJzQAgAAQBAJ&pg=PA47&lpg=PA47&dq=strong+unions+have+helped+reduce+inequality,+whereas+weaker+unions+have+made+it+easier+for+CEOS,+sometimes+working+with+market+forces+that+they+have+helped+shape,+to+increase+it&source=bl&ots=Z5DdS-Ydcg&sig=tkoRjPEy8K0rrubo5ntVqWmMbMs&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjesLaXlNzcAhWQq1kKHVtXABEQ6AEwA3oECAgQAQ#v=onepage&q=strong%20unions%20have%20helped%20reduce%20inequality%2C%20whereas%20weaker%20unions%20have%20made%20it%20easier%20for%20CEOS%2C%20sometimes%20working%20with%20market%20forces%20that%20they%20have%20helped%20shape%2C%20to%20increase%20it&f=false), the decline of labor unions is largely responsible for the growing income inequality in the United States. Missouri could reverse the decline Back in the 1950s, about one-third of American workers belonged to labor unions. Today, only 10 percent do. Vox’s Dylan Matthew explains [why this happened](https://www.vox.com/2018/6/14/17437832/janus-afscme-supreme-court-union-teacher-police-public-sector): Labor unions were largely credited with helping maintain stable middle-class factory jobs in Rust Belt states like Missouri in the ’50s and ’60s. But the disappearance of manufacturing jobs, plus the aggressive corporate lobbying to weaken labor unions, has been a driving force behind the massive income gap in the United States. In 1965, CEOs earned an average salary that was [20 times higher](https://www.epi.org/files/pdf/130354.pdf) than the average worker’s; by 2016, their salaries were 271 times higher. Nobel Prize-winning economist Joseph Stiglitz [described the dynamic](https://books.google.com/books?id=qJzQAgAAQBAJ&pg=PA47&lpg=PA47&dq=strong+unions+have+helped+reduce+inequality,+whereas+weaker+unions+have+made+it+easier+for+CEOS,+sometimes+working+with+market+forces+that+they+have+helped+shape,+to+increase+it&source=bl&ots=Z5DdS-Ydcg&sig=tkoRjPEy8K0rrubo5ntVqWmMbMs&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjesLaXlNzcAhWQq1kKHVtXABEQ6AEwA3oECAgQAQ#v=onepage&q=strong%20unions%20have%20helped%20reduce%20inequality%2C%20whereas%20weaker%20unions%20have%20made%20it%20easier%20for%20CEOS%2C%20sometimes%20working%20with%20market%20forces%20that%20they%20have%20helped%20shape%2C%20to%20increase%20it&f=false) this way: Strong unions have helped reduce inequality, whereas weaker unions have made it easier for CEOs, sometimes working with market forces that they have helped shape, to increase it. The decline in unionization since World War II in the United States has been associated with a pronounced rise in income and wealth inequality. During the Great Recession, American workers were more focused on keeping their jobs than demanding higher wages. But now, with the economy growing fast and wages barely rising, American workers are starting to push back. In 2018, voters blocked Republican lawmakers from making Missouri the 28th right-to-work state — a sign that the expansion had come to an end. The Missouri vote was a turning point Missouri voters [made history in August](https://www.vox.com/2018/8/7/17655690/missouri-election-proposition-a-right-to-work) when primary voters rejected Proposition A, blocking Republicans from enacting a right-to-work law in the state. The vote wasn’t even close: Voters rejected the ballot measure by a two-to-one margin. Missouri was on track to become the 28th right-to-work state. In 2017, the state’s then-governor, Republican Eric Greitens, [signed the right-to-work bill](https://www.stltoday.com/news/local/govt-and-politics/missouri-gov-eric-greitens-signs-right-to-work-into-law/article_67c68456-c5a7-573f-a9fb-87bad29dbd1a.html), saying it would encourage businesses to move to the state. Missouri would have followed Michigan, Wisconsin, and other Rust Belt states that have passed similar anti-union measures in recent years under pressure from business groups. But workers and union leaders in Missouri put up a fight. They gathered about 300,000 signatures — more than double the number needed — to freeze the law, and put it on the ballot for voters to decide. Voters defeated the law. In fact, it was the first time voters have overturned a right-to-work law through a ballot referendum since Ohio did something similar in 2011. No other state has even tried to in recent years. That vote was a crucial victory for the US labor movement at a time when Republican leaders, big businesses, and the courts have doubled down on their attempts to weaken the influence of labor unions and the workers they represent. And after the US Supreme Court’s June ruling in [Janus v. AFSCME](https://www.vox.com/2018/6/27/17509460/supreme-court-janus-afscme-public-sector-union-alito-kagan-dissent), which mandated right-to-work rules for all government unions, Missouri’s vote was the first sign that unions are far from dead. The PRO Act would make it easier for workers to join unions The Democrats’ new labor reform bill does several things, but the goal is to cut down on the bureaucracy that’s involved when workers try to form labor unions, and to penalize companies that try to stop them. For example, it would bar businesses from making employees attend meetings to discourage them from joining a union, and would require both sides to quickly mediate disputes that often stall unionizing and contract negotiations (the current fight between Volkswagen and its [factory workers in Tennessee](https://www.reuters.com/article/labor-volkswagen-idUSL2N22I1I1) is a good example). The bill would also let the National Labor Relations Board hit companies with monetary penalties each time they fire someone for lawfully unionizing. Right now, companies just have to pay back wages to the employee and give them back their job if the board finds them at fault. Without penalties, companies have few incentives to follow the law. And instead of leaving fired workers unemployed as they wait for their case to be heard, the bill would require businesses to immediately reinstate these employees while their case is pending. And they would no longer be able to fire employees who go on strike, which is currently legal in some cases. Most importantly, though, the bill would allow workers to sue their bosses for violating their right to organize under the National Labor Relations Act. There are few things businesses hate more than the idea of a jury awarding millions of dollars to an aggrieved employee. That threat gives employers a strong incentive to follow the law. Of course, it’s unsurprising that business groups hate the bill, or that they’ve already started lobbying against it. “It remains to be seen if there are enough votes for this bill in the House, but anyone who wants the economy to continue its upward trajectory should just say no,” [wrote](https://www.uschamber.com/article/pro-act-introduced-house) Sean Redmond, director of labor policy for the US Chamber of Commerce in an op-ed. This means that House Democrats have a lot of work to do. They still need more than 120 of their members to join in support the bill, assuming that no Republicans will. Even if they get the votes, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell will likely let the bill wither. But the bill’s obstacles are unlikely to dampen the momentum of the labor movement. Richard Trumka, head of the AFL-CIO, the nation’s largest federation of labor unions, told members of Congress earlier this month that the shift is real. “Something is happening in America. Workers are embracing collective action with a fervor I haven’t seen in a generation,” he said [in his testimony](https://aflcio.org/speeches/trumka-calls-passage-pro-act), making his case for the PRO Act. “It is time for our laws to catch up.”

#### Unions have a negative impact on capital investment

Doucouliagos et al., 2017 – [Hristos Doucouliagos, Alfred Deakin Professor and Chair in Economics; Richard B. Freeman and Patrice Laroche, “The Economics of Trade Unions”, p. 108]//bread

Summary Our meta-regression analysis points to a modest negative association between unions on physical capital formation when data is aggregated beyond the firm level, and a larger negative association of unionism with investments in intangible capital, consistent with the tax on capital and union rent-sharing predictions. The meta-regressions showed heterogeneity in reported estimates and identified several factors that can explain heterogeneity. Some of these factors relate to specification of the econometric models and others relate to genuine economic effects. While we found no evidence of selection bias in estimates of the association of unionism and physical capital investment, we found some modest selection bias in estimates of the impact of unions on investments in intangible capital investment. We also uncovered a pattern in which the negative union effect on intangible capital investment is greater in **less regulated labor markets**. Perhaps the most important finding that deserves further analysis is the weakened negative association between unionism and investment over time: Does it reflect differential success of unions more favorable to investment? Changes in union attitudes over time? Or increased ability of firms to protect the rents from investments for the firm? Given that policy is forward-looking, it is important to pin down the trend and determine if it is likely to eliminate the negative association, and if so, why. The association of unionism with less investment in physical capital and intangible capital suggests that unions have an adverse association with productivity and productivity growth through the channel of investment behavior of firms. To what extent, if at all, does the effect of unions on the behavior of workers counteract this impact to produce the negligible net effects on productivity and productivity growth discussed in Chapters 3 and 4? We address this question in Chapter 6

#### That collapses the stock market

Miao et al. 12 (Jianjun Miao† , Pengfei Wang‡ , and Lifang Xu§. †Department of Economics, Boston University ‡Department of Economics, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, §Department of Economics, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, “Stock Market Bubbles and Unemployment”, https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/51ee/14529d89b630638b0ca428e929f56d7f3b48.pdf)

This paper provides a theoretical study that links unemployment to the stock market bubbles and crashes. Our theory is based on three observations from the U.S. labor, credit, and stock markets. First, the U.S. stock market has experienced booms and busts and these large swings may not be explained entirely by fundamentals. Shiller (2005) documents extensive evidence on the U.S. stock market behavior and argues that many episodes of stock market booms are attributed to speculative bubbles. Second, the stock market booms and busts are often accompanied by the credit market booms and busts. A boom is often driven by a rapid expansion of credit to the private sector accompanied by rising asset prices. Following the boom phase, asset prices collapse and a credit crunch arises. This leads to a large fall in investment and consumption and an economic recession may follow.1 Third, the stock market and unemployment are highly correlated.2 Figure 1. plots the post-war U.S. monthly data of the price-earnings ratio (the real Standard and Poor’s Composite Stock Price Index divided by the ten-year moving average real earnings on the index) constructed by Robert Shiller and the unemployment rate downloaded from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).3 This figure shows that, during recessions, the stock price fell and the unemployment rate rose. In particular, during the recent Great Recession, the unemployment rate rose from 5.0 percent at the onset of the recession to a peak of 10.1 percent in October 2009, while the stock market fell by more than 50 percent from October 2007 to March 2009. [Insert Figure 1 Here.] Motivated by the preceding observations, we build a search model with credit constraints, based on Blanchard and Gali (2010). The Blanchard and Gali model is isomorphic to the Diamond-Mortensen-Pissarides (DMP) search and matching model of unemployment (Diamond (1982), Mortensen (1982), and Pissarides (1985)). Our key contribution is to introduce credit constraints in a way similar to Miao and Wang (2011a,b,c, 2012a,b).4 The presence of this type of credit constraints can generate a stock market bubble through a positive feedback loop mechanism. The intuition is the following: When investors have optimistic beliefs about the stock market value of a firm’s assets, the firm wants to borrow more using its assets as collateral. Lenders are willing to lend more in the hope that they can recover more if the firm defaults. Then the firm can finance more investment and hiring spending. This generates higher firm value and justifies investors’ initial optimistic beliefs. Thus, a high stock market value of the firm can be sustained in equilibrium. There is another equilibrium in which no one believes that firm assets have a high value. In this case, the firm cannot borrow more to finance investment and hiring spending. This makes firm value indeed low, justifying initial pessimistic beliefs. We refer to the first type of equilibrium as the bubbly equilibrium and to the second type as the bubbleless equilibrium. Both types can coexist due to self-fulfilling beliefs. In the bubbly equilibrium, firms can hire more workers and hence the market tightness is higher, compared to the bubbleless equilibrium. In addition, in the bubbly equilibrium, an unemployed worker can find a job more easily (i.e., the job-finding rate is higher) and hence the unemployment rate is lower. [Insert Figure 2 Here.] After analyzing these two types of equilibria, we follow Weil (1987), Kocherlakota (2009) and Miao and Wang (2011a,b,c, 2012a,b) and introduce a third type of equilibrium with stochastic bubbles. Agents believe that there is a small probability that the stock market bubble may burst. After the burst of the bubble, it cannot re-emerge by rational expectations. We show that this shift of beliefs can also be self-fulfilling. After the burst of the bubble, the economy enters a recession with a persistent high unemployment rate. The intuition is the following. After the burst of the bubble, the credit constraints tighten, causing firms to reduce investment and hiring. An unemployed worker is then harder to find a job, generating high unemployment. Our model can help explain the high unemployment during the Great Recession. Figures 2 and 3 plot the hires rate and the job-finding rate from the first month of 2001 to the last month of 2011 using the Job Openings and Labor Turnover Survey (JOLTS) data set.5 These figures reveal that both the job-finding rate and the hires rate fell sharply following the stock market crash during the Great Recession. In particular, the hires rate and the job-finding rate fell from 4.4 percent and 0.7, respectively, at the onset of the recession to about 3.1 percent and 0.25, respectively, in the end of the recession.

#### Nuclear war.

Stein Tønnesson 15, Research Professor, Peace Research Institute Oslo; Leader of East Asia Peace program, Uppsala University, 2015, “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace,” International Area Studies Review, Vol. 18, No. 3, p. 297-311.

Several recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are right. Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and unreliably so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene.

### 1NC

#### As outlined by Darling-Hammond et al., a just government should improve

#### salaries and other compensation for teachers,

#### teacher preparation

#### hiring and personnel management,

#### induction and support for new teachers,

#### and working conditions, including school leadership, professional collaboration and shared decision making, accountability systems, and resources for teaching and learning.

#### and lower teacher’s costs to entry.

#### That solves teacher retention

Darling-Hammond et al. 16 [Linda Darling-Hammond is the Charles E. Ducommun Professor of Education Emeritus at Stanford University where she founded the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education and served as the faculty sponsor of the Stanford Teacher Education Program, which she helped to redesign. Joseph Bishop served as a Senior Policy Advisor for the Learning Policy Institute. Tara Kini serves as the Chief of Staff and Director of State Policy for the Learning Policy Institute, where she works nationally to bring high-quality research to policymakers and other stakeholders to advance evidence-based policies that support empowering and equitable learning for each and every child. She has co-authored several LPI research reports, including serving as lead author of a comprehensive analysis of the impact of experience on teacher effectiveness, Does Teaching Experience Increase Teacher Effectiveness? A Review of the Research. Anne Podolsky is a member of LPI’s Educator Quality Team. Her work includes having served as the co-author of the report, Does Teaching Experience Increase Teacher Effectiveness? A Review of the Research? and lead author on LPI’s report, Solving the Teacher Shortage: How to Attract and Retain Excellent Educators. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/solving-teacher-shortage]

How many teacher vacancies and uncertified teachers are in your state?

This report reviews an extensive body of research on teacher recruitment and retention, and identifies five major factors that influence a teacher’s decision to enter, remain in, or leave the teaching profession, generally, and high-need schools, specifically. Those factors are: salaries and other compensation; preparation and costs to entry; hiring and personnel management; induction and support for new teachers; and working conditions, including school leadership, professional collaboration and shared decision making, accountability systems, and resources for teaching and learning.

Salaries and Other Compensation

Teachers’ salaries affect the supply of teachers, including the distribution of teachers across districts, and the quality and quantity of individuals preparing to be teachers. Salaries also appear to influence teacher attrition—teachers are more likely to quit when they work in districts with lower wages. Better pay is also what would bring them back to the classroom. Of public school teachers who left the profession in 2012 and said they would consider returning, 67% rated an increase in salary as extremely or very important to their decision to return.

Despite the evidence that salaries influence teacher recruitment and retention, a teacher’s salary in much of the United States is too low to support a middle-class existence. A recent study from the Center for American Progress, for example, found that, in 30 states, mid-career teachers who head families of four or more are eligible for government subsidies, such as subsidized children’s health insurance or free or reduced-price school meals.

Preparation and Costs to Entry

Strong preparation increases teachers’ efficacy and makes it more likely they will remain in the profession. Depending on the study, attrition rates are found to be two to three times higher for teachers who enter the profession without full preparation, than for teachers who are comprehensively prepared.

But the rising costs of higher education—and concern about student loan debt—has contributed to many prospective teachers choosing alternative pathways that allow them to begin teaching and earning a salary, while they are studying to be a teacher. Debt loads can be offset with forgivable loans and scholarships that can boost recruitment and retention. In addition, pathway programs that provide financial aid and support to prospective teachers who already work in schools, often as teachers’ aides or paraprofessionals in hard-to-staff schools, help to recruit teachers who are knowledgeable about the communities in which they will teach.

Hiring and Personnel Management

Research suggests that district and school practices related to hiring and supporting teachers influence teachers’ decisions to enter, remain in, or leave the profession. Based on their review of the research, authors identify the following practices as contributing to the quality of teachers hired, teacher retention rates, and student achievement:

Timing of hiring: The late hiring of teachers negatively affects teacher recruitment, retention, and student achievement.

Information in the hiring process: Schools and districts sometimes engage in weak hiring processes because they have outdated technology, poor capacity to transmit information, and limited time for candidate demonstration lessons.

School and district support for mobile teachers: Of public school teachers who left and said they would consider returning to teaching, more than 40% cited state certification reciprocity as an important factor, and nearly 70% cited the ability to keep retirement benefits. Also cited is the loss of seniority when teachers move to another state or district.

Working Conditions

Teaching conditions—which also define learning conditions for students—are a strong predictor of teachers’ decisions about where to teach and whether to stay. Four factors are consistently cited:

School leadership and administrative support: Administrative support is often the top reason teachers identify for leaving or staying in the profession, or in a given school, outweighing even salary considerations for some teachers.

Opportunities for professional collaboration and shared decision-making: Teachers’ career decisions are shaped by their connectedness to a team working with a shared purpose. Opportunities for teacher collaboration and input are key factors.

Accountability systems: Approximately 25% of public school teachers who left the profession in 2012 reported that dissatisfaction with the influence of school assessment and accountability measures on their teaching or curriculum was extremely or very important in their decision to leave.

Resources for teaching and learning: Schools with sufficient instructional materials and supplies, safe and clean facilities, reasonable student-to-teacher ratios, and adequate support personnel can positively affect teacher retention rates, and influence the kind of teaching and learning that can occur.

### 1NC

#### Debt ceiling passes now and solves collapse, but floor time is limited and avoiding new fights is key

Zhou 10/7 [Li, politics and policy reporter for Vox, “The debt ceiling fight is far from over” https://www.vox.com/22711441/debt-ceiling-congress-december]

Lawmakers have ended another standoff over the debt ceiling — at least temporarily.

On Thursday, the Senate voted 50-48 to increase the debt ceiling (a legal cap to how much the US can borrow) by $480 billion, an action the House is expected to take too. That money will enable the US government to cover its loan obligations until early December, when Congress will once again have to either pass a longer-term increase or another stopgap suspension. The current agreement is the product of a weekslong stalemate on the issue that saw Democrats trying to pressure the GOP into giving up their roadblock of an increase or suspension of the debt ceiling, and Republicans repeatedly refusing to do so. The impasse had high stakes, as the US faced a rapidly approaching default deadline. According to Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen, the US could run out of money as early as October 18. Passing that deadline without an increase or suspension would have likely triggered a massive domestic and international economic collapse. Ultimately, Republican senators decided to cooperate with Democrats, for now. However, in approving this short-term fix, lawmakers have failed to address the issues that brought them to a stalemate in the first place. They’ve now set themselves up for another dangerous impasse when this bill expires after December 3. The standoff, briefly explained Republicans have been intent on using the debt ceiling to make Democrats look bad. Prior to their offer to back an increase this week, Republicans had not only said that they wouldn’t vote for a suspension but also that they would be blocking Democrats’ attempts to approve one using regular legislative order. If Republicans didn’t previously block the vote, Democrats would have been able to pass it with 51 votes — but because they did, the measure required 60 to advance. Instead, Republicans pushed Democrats to use budget reconciliation — another process that would enable them to raise the debt limit with just 51 votes — to increase the cap on their own. Democrats were reluctant to use budget reconciliation both because it can be a lengthy and convoluted process and because it would have required them to specify how much they are raising the debt limit (something they ended up having to do anyway for the December increase). Effectively, Republicans wanted Democrats on the record as having increased the debt limit by trillions of dollars in order to portray them during the midterms as big spenders. Additionally, Republicans argued that because Democrats are working on a partisan basis to pass an expansive social spending bill, they should take care of any debt ceiling increases on a partisan basis, too. “Republicans’ position is simple,” Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell wrote to President Joe Biden on Monday. “We have no list of demands. For two and a half months, we have simply warned that since your party wishes to govern alone, it must handle the debt limit alone as well.” Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-NY) talks with reporters on October 7. The Senate voted to increase the debt ceiling, enabling the US government to cover its loan obligations until early December. Win McNamee/Getty Images Democrats, on the other hand, have argued that Republicans ought to work with them to pass a suspension or increase, or simply get out of the way. One, because avoiding a gigantic economic collapse is in everyone’s interest, and the minority party hasn’t typically blocked action to this degree in the past. And two, because both Democrats and Republicans are responsible for the actual debt that this legislation would address. Both points are true: The debt grew nearly $8 trillion during the Trump administration as a result of massive tax cuts and pandemic relief. In that time frame, Republicans and Democrats both voted to suspend the debt limit three times. But that didn’t sway Republican lawmakers. Because Republicans had refused to give up their opposition and Democrats were intent on keeping the pressure on the GOP, the two sides were at an impasse until this week. How the debt deal came together On Wednesday, McConnell reversed his position and told Democrats that Republicans would not block a short-term increase to the debt limit into December. Adamant that they would not pursue reconciliation to raise the ceiling (and, given the deadline, likely out of time to try doing so) Democrats raised the possibility of creating a carve-out in the filibuster rules that would also allow them to pass debt ceiling measures with the 51 Democratic votes they have, rather than the 60 votes filibuster rules require. That latter option appeared to be gaining momentum this week, although key moderates like Sen. Joe Manchin (D-WV) were still wary of it. As a sign of its traction, however, Biden — who has traditionally been cautious of altering filibuster rules — called carving out a special debt-ceiling-related exemption to the filibuster a “real possibility.” That possibility may have spurred McConnell’s decision to cave for the time being. According to CNN’s Manu Raju, McConnell was worried about potential threats to the filibuster when he offered Democrats a deal to increase the debt ceiling for now. The filibuster has allowed McConnell to block a range of Democratic priorities — from police to voting reforms — despite his party being in the minority. The assumption is that exempting the debt ceiling from the filibuster would increase pressure on Democrats to do so for other issues Republicans oppose, like expanding protections for voting rights. For now, the filibuster stands. And the GOP’s move helps prevent the US from going into default in the near term. It does little to resolve the central conflict at hand, however. Republicans are still insisting, after all, that Democrats use budget reconciliation to approve a longer-term debt ceiling increase on a partisan basis. Democrats, meanwhile, are refusing to do so and may consider a filibuster carve-out again in December. “We’re not doing it on reconciliation,” Sen. Tim Kaine (D-VA) emphasized earlier this week. There will be more debt drama in December The use of the debt limit as political leverage is nothing new. As Republicans have been fond of pointing out, Biden was among the Democratic senators who voted against raising it in 2006 in order to send a message about his disagreement with Republican policies. In that scenario, though, Democrats did not filibuster the legislation or prevent Republicans from approving it with a simple majority. Additionally, Republicans have previously withheld votes for debt ceiling increases in exchange for policy concessions, something that’s not the case this time around. This year, as Republicans emphasized, they took issue with the debt limit in order to simply make a point, a tough position to negotiate with. Senator Elizabeth Warren (D-MA) speaks to reporters as the Senate was nearing a deal on a short-term increase to the debt ceiling. Bloomberg via Getty Images This short-term fix does help Democrats in that it allows them to focus their time and energies instead on a larger social spending bill they’ve struggled to complete. “McConnell caved,” Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-MA) told reporters. “And now we’re going to spend our time doing child care, health care, and fighting climate change.” But the larger disagreements between Republicans and Democrats regarding how to move forward remain. And by procrastinating on solving them, lawmakers have set themselves up for a difficult December. The new deadline to address the debt ceiling also coincides with another deadline to pass more government appropriations — that is, the money needed to keep the government functioning. That means Congress will find itself in a tough spot yet again in just a few months. Not only will lawmakers have to solve their debt ceiling disagreements and stave off economic disaster, but they’ll have to do so while fighting over how to avoid a government shutdown.

#### Manchin’s broadly opposed to strike activity – plan causes a fight

Furman & Winant 10/17/21 [Jonah Furman is a labor movement organizer and writer for Labor Notes based in Maryland. Gabriel Winant is an assistant professor of history at the University of Chicago. He is the author of “The Next Shift: The Fall of Industry and the Rise of Health Care in Rust Belt America.” "The John Deere Strike Shows the Tight Labor Market Is Ready to Pop." https://theintercept.com/2021/10/17/john-deere-strike-labor-market/]

In terms of strike activity, the current private sector wave picks up where the teachers left off, after an interlude of relative inaction during the height of the pandemic. In 2020, moreover, teachers formed the first major group of workers to refuse to accept whatever terms the employer dictated for reopening the workplace. It is difficult to imagine teachers speaking out against returning to work in unsafe conditions as much as they did without the national wave of militant teachers’ strikes in the two preceding years. This resistance has now spread across the economy, in both organized and individual forms.

TODAY, WORKERS’ ECONOMIC resistance — whether through organized strikes or in the refusal of dangerous, underpaid, and unappealing jobs — is shaping the political agenda. Many of the policies in the Democrats’ $3.5 trillion budget proposal would pursue the same ends as workers’ actions but in the realm of social policy. Proposed subsidies for home health care and child care, the child tax credit, Medicaid expansion, and investments in housing and green energy would all indirectly support workers’ power. Either by increasing demand for labor further or by alleviating some of the grotesque social pressures that have forced employees to accept whatever terms employers offered them, the federal government would strengthen workers’ bargaining position. When Sen. Joe Manchin, D-W.Va., warns against becoming an “entitlement society,” what he is opposing is the shift in labor market power that such policy measures help secure.

#### Debt default is the easiest way to wreck the US economy—ruins the US dollar and financial reputation

Egan 9/8 [Matt Egan is an award-winning reporter at CNN, covering business, the economy and financial markets across CNN's television and digital platforms, "'Financial Armageddon.' What's at stake if the debt limit isn't raised", 9/8/21, <https://www.cnn.com/2021/09/08/business/debt-ceiling-default-explained/index.html>]

The easiest way to spark a financial crisis and wreck the US economy would be to allow the federal government to default on its debt. It would be an epic, unforced error — and millions of Americans would pay the price. And yet that unlikely situation is once again being contemplated. If Congress doesn't raise the limit on federal borrowing the federal government will most likely run out of cash and extraordinary measures next month, Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen warned lawmakers on Wednesday. In short, a default would be an economic cataclysm. Interest rates would spike, the stock market would crater, retirement accounts would take a beating, the value of the US dollar would erode and the financial reputation of the world's only superpower would be tarnished. "It would be financial Armageddon," Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics, told CNN. "It's complete craziness to even contemplate the idea of not paying our debt on time." But it's a crazy world. Lawmakers in Washington are again playing chicken with America's creditworthiness. And the path to raising the debt ceiling is not clear. Even though Congress has in the past raised the debt ceiling with a bipartisan vote, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell vowed in July that Republicans will not vote to raise the debt ceiling. JPMorgan Chase (JPM) CEO Jamie Dimon urged lawmakers not to even think about going down this path again. During a hearing in May, Dimon said an actual default "could cause an immediate, literally cascading catastrophe of unbelievable proportions and damage America for 100 years." 'Irreparable damage' In her letter to Congress, Yellen said history shows that waiting "until the last minute" to suspend or increase the debt limit "can cause serious harm" to business and consumer confidence, raise borrowing costs for taxpayers and hurt America's credit rating. "A delay that calls into question the federal government's ability to meet all its obligations would likely cause irreparable damage to the U.S. economy and global financial markets," Yellen wrote. A US default would undermine the bedrock of the modern global financial system. "We pay our debt. That's what distinguishes the United States from almost every other country on the planet," Zandi of Moody's said. Because of America's long track record of paying its debt, it's very cheap for Washington to borrow. But a default would force ratings companies to downgrade US debt and shatter that borrowing advantage. Markets plunged in 2011 when that debt ceiling standoff caused Standard & Poor's to downgrade America's credit rating. Higher borrowing costs would make it much harder for Washington to borrow to pay for infrastructure, the climate crisis or to fight future recessions. And refinancing America's nearly $29 trillion mountain of existing debt would become that much more expensive. Interest expenses, which totaled $345 billion in fiscal 2020, would quickly rival what Washington spends on defense.

#### Extinction

Joshua Zoffer 20, Investor at Cove Hill Partners, Fellow at New America, JD Candidate at Yale University Law School, AB from Harvard University, “To End Forever War, Keep the Dollar Globally Dominant”, The New Republic, 2/3/2020, https://newrepublic.com/article/156417/end-forever-war-keep-dollar-globally-dominant

In early 2016, Obama Treasury Secretary Jack Lew cautioned that the dollar’s dominance as a global currency rested, in part, on the U.S. government’s reluctance to fully weaponize it. If foreign markets and governments “feel that we will deploy sanctions without sufficient justification or for inappropriate reasons,” he warned, “we should not be surprised if they look for ways to avoid doing business in the United States or in U.S. dollars.” Lew’s case stemmed from the more fundamental view that the dollar’s international role is “a source of tremendous strength for our economy, a benefit for U.S. companies and a driver of U.S. global leadership”—in other words, a role worth keeping. This view is emblematic of American financial governance since the Second World War. U.S. economic analysts, especially at the Treasury, have jealously guarded the dollar’s role and the many benefits it offers: the ability to run large deficits at low cost and disproportionate influence over the structure of the global economy, among others. Yet in their recent article in The New Republic, David Adler and Daniel Bessner argue the U.S. should abandon these advantages. In their view, the dollar’s role has encouraged American militarism and should be relinquished to curb such behavior. Dollar hegemony is not without cost, but to renounce it would be a profound mistake. Adler and Bessner’s view neglects the sizable economic benefits the dollar’s role confers on the U.S., as well as its possible use as an antidote to military adventurism. It ignores the enormous good that can be done with deficit spending, much of which has gone to the American military but could instead fund progressive programs. And it elides the inability of the U.S. and its global trading partners to shift away from dollar dominance without creating worldwide financial distress. Adler and Bessner are right that the U.S. has misused its privilege, but Washington should not abandon it; rather, American leaders should seek to transform it. Generations of American policymakers have been right to protect the dollar’s key currency role for economic reasons. Most notably, dollar hegemony affords the U.S. the ability to run large and prolonged budget and balance-of-payments deficits. The dollar represents 62 percent of allocated foreign exchange reserves, is used to invoice and settle roughly half of world trade, and accounts for 42 percent of global payments. Because governments, banks, and businesses worldwide need lots of dollars, the world market always stands ready to absorb new U.S.-dollar-denominated debt without charging higher interest rates. Adler and Bessner correctly point out that the rest of the world considers the dollar’s role as the world’s reserve currency to be an “exorbitant privilege,” a term coined in the 1960s by then French Finance Minister Valéry Giscard D’Estaing. The ability to spend beyond its means has enabled the U.S. to fund its impressive military might, whether one views that power as the fountainhead of Pax Americana or the source of illegitimate military adventurism. But these economic benefits go beyond just deficits. The demand for dollars also pushes up the dollar’s value against other currencies, enhancing American purchasing power and offering consumers access to imports on the cheap. The dollar’s role also means American firms rarely need to do business in foreign currencies, reducing transaction costs and exchange-rate risks. More broadly, America’s central economic role gives it outsize influence at crucial moments. At the height of the financial crisis that began in 2008, the Federal Reserve was able to inject vital liquidity into the global financial system by selectively offering dollar swap lines to trusted foreign central banks. Dollar hegemony enabled the U.S. to act swiftly, effectively, and on its own terms. In addition, the dollar’s role offers a potent alternative to kinetic military action as a means of pursuing foreign policy objectives. The dollar’s broad use means access to dollar liquidity—which in turn requires access to the U.S. financial system—is essential for foreign governments and businesses. For foreign banks, especially, being cut off from dollar access is essentially a death sentence. That makes sanctions that do so a powerful tool in the international arena. In 2005, for example, the U.S. used the dollar to strike a devastating blow against North Korea without firing a single shot or even formally enacting sanctions. Using authority provided by Section 311 of the Patriot Act, the Department of the Treasury crippled Banco Delta Asia, a bank accused of facilitating illegal activity by the North Korean government, by merely threatening to cut off its access to the American financial system. Deposit outflows began within days; within weeks the bank was placed under government administration to avoid a full collapse. Pyongyang was hit hard, as other banks ceased their business with it to avoid meeting the same fate. Similarly, though the Trump administration has worked hard to undo it, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran to limit the development of nuclear weapons was made possible, in part, by painful dollar sanctions that brought Iran to the table. Far from being a proximate cause of military conflict, the dollar’s central global role has often been used to contain adversaries without military intervention. Still, skeptics are right to point out that the dollar’s role has indirectly funded American interventionism and that dollar sanctions have been overused, provoking the ire of American allies. But these facts suggest we should use our dollar power to forge a more progressive U.S. order, not abandon the advantage altogether. America’s exorbitant privilege need not fund warships and missiles: The same low-interest borrowing could be used to fund a new universal health care system, expand access to higher education, or pursue any number of large-scale social policy objectives, including financing global public goods that no other country or consortium of countries is prepared to fund, such as climate change mitigation.

## Case

#### Boyce – we’ll turn this – if teacher shortages lead to increased pay, that decreases the budget of school districts which means they can support less teachers which increases class sizes – that’s the only internal link to increased education which the aff makes worse.

#### Carpenter – the carpenter evidence is just an opinion piece written by a Vermont parent about a proposal in Vermont legislature – its not a warranted piece of evidence from an expert but we’ll read statistical analysis from professionals that warrants why teacher strikes are bad for education – treat this as an analytic because Jennifer Carpenter has no more credentials than you or I.

#### Their internal link to econ is nonexistent – the WEF barely has any warrants that education leads to any actual significant effect on the economy – tons of alt causes to econ – we wouldn’t be able to see possible effects from the aff for decades because it’s kids in public schools – the actual education that matters would happen in colleges

#### Teacher strikes lead to decreases in income, employment rates, and years of schooling among students – these effects are intergenerational and more pronounced among low-income households

Jaume and Willén 18 (David Jaume is Deputy Manager at the Bank of Mexico and research affiliate at the Center for Distributive, Labor, and Social Studies (CEDLAS), has a Ph.D. in Economics from Cornell University, Master in Economics from Universidad Nacional de La Plata (Argentina), BA in Economics from Universidad Nacional de Cuyo; Alexander Willén is Professor of Economics at the Norwegian School of Economics, has PhD in Policy Analysis from Cornell University, MPP in Public Policy from Georgetown University, BA from Durham University; “The Long-run Effects of Teacher Strikes: Evidence from Argentina,” Journal of Labor Economics, Volume 37, Number 4, p. 3, June 2018, <http://barrett.dyson.cornell.edu/NEUDC/paper_179.pdf>)//daceto

We find robust evidence in support of adverse labor market effects when the students are between 30 and 40 years old: being exposed to the average incidence of teacher strikes during primary school reduces wages for males and females by 3.2 and 1.9 percent, respectively. We find some suggestive evidence that exposure to strikes in early grades have larger effects than exposure in later grades, though these differences are often not statistically significantly different from zero. The prevalence of teacher strikes in Argentina means that the effect on the economy as a whole is substantial: A back-of-the-envelope calculation suggests an aggregate annual earnings loss of $2.34 billion. This is equivalent to the cost of raising the average employment income of all primary school teachers in Argentina by 62.4%. In addition to adverse wage and earnings effects, our results reveal negative effects on several other labor market outcomes. With respect to males, we find evidence of both an increase in the likelihood of being unemployed and of occupational downgrading. The effects are very similar for females. However, rather than an occupational downgrading effect, we find an increase in home production (neither working nor studying). Our analysis suggests that these adverse labor market effects are driven, at least in part, by declines in educational attainment: being exposed to the average incidence of strikes leads to a reduction in years of schooling by 2.02 and 1.58 percent for males and females, respectively. By looking at 12-17 year olds, we show that negative education effects are visible immediately after children have finished primary school, and that they are larger among children from more vulnerable households. Our analysis reveals that strikes affect individuals on other sociodemographic dimensions as well. Specifically, individuals exposed to teacher strikes have less educated partners and lower per capita family income. Finally, we find significant intergenerational effects: children of individuals exposed to strikes during primary school suffer negative education effects as well.

#### Teacher strikes lead to worsened education outcomes and segregation especially if they are unsuccessful

Jaume and Willén 18 (David Jaume is Deputy Manager at the Bank of Mexico and research affiliate at the Center for Distributive, Labor, and Social Studies (CEDLAS), has a Ph.D. in Economics from Cornell University, Master in Economics from Universidad Nacional de La Plata (Argentina), BA in Economics from Universidad Nacional de Cuyo; Alexander Willén is Professor of Economics at the Norwegian School of Economics, has PhD in Policy Analysis from Cornell University, MPP in Public Policy from Georgetown University, BA from Durham University; “The Long-run Effects of Teacher Strikes: Evidence from Argentina,” Journal of Labor Economics, Volume 37, Number 4, p. 6-8, June 2018, <http://barrett.dyson.cornell.edu/NEUDC/paper_179.pdf>)//daceto

This paper exploits variation in teacher strikes within and across provinces over time to identify the reduced form effect of teacher strikes on student outcomes. As such, this is not a full analysis of the benefits and costs associated with teacher strikes, but rather a partial equilibrium analysis that uses strikes to measure the effect of school disruptions on students’ outcomes. Specifically, we are not measuring the benefits or costs in a general equilibrium / dynamic sense. For example, the ability of teachers to strike may give them leverage in negotiations, leading to changes in working conditions that attract a different quality of teachers or affect investments in schooling, and this may impact future student cohorts.8 In this section, we provide a discussion on a large subset of the potential implications of teacher strikes. This should not be viewed as an exhaustive list, but rather as an overview of some of the more common ways in which teacher industrial action can impact students. In addition to serving as an overview of what teacher strikes may do, this section is imperative for understanding which subset of these factors our empirical strategy is able to pick up. The main way in which strikes can affect student outcomes is by reducing the time students spend in school. Theoretical as well as empirical research provide clear predictions that reduced instructional time lowers academic achievement (Cahan and Cohen 1989; Neal and Johnson 1996; Lee and Barro 2001; Gormley and Gayer 2005; Cascio and Lewis 2006; Luyten 2006; Pischke 2007; Marcotte 2007; Sims 2008; Marcotte and Helmet 2008; Hansen 2008; Leuven et al. 2010; Fitzpatrick et al. 2011; Rivkin and Schiman 2013; Goodman 2014). However, these papers only examine the short-run educational effects of school disruptions. In addition to reducing effective instructional time, teacher strikes may, among other things, affect teacher effort, alter resource levels and allocation, affect academic expectations and graduation requirements, alter the value of a diploma, change the value differential between a public and a private degree, and change the composition of teachers. The direction and magnitude of the effects flowing through these channels will depend on the nature and 8 However, in Section 6.3 we provide suggestive evidence that this type of general equilibrium effect does not take place. 7 outcome of the strike. For example, if the unions go on strike to bargain for higher wages and are successful, the strike may improve teacher effort and productivity. However, if the teachers are unsuccessful, and the strike is in effect for several months, academic expectations and graduation requirements may be adjusted downwards with the potential implications of a reduction in the value of a diploma. Further, even if the teachers are successful, an increase in teacher pay may be financed through a reallocation of resources from other inputs that enter the education production function, and this can lead to a reduction in education quality. The above discussion makes clear that the effect of teacher strikes on education production can be both positive and negative, and the resulting predictions of the effects of teacher strikes on student outcomes are therefore ambiguous. With respect to the current study, it is important to note that we use teacher strikes to measure the effect of school disruptions on student long-term outcomes through a partial equilibrium analysis. To the extent that the above factors impact current students, they will contribute to the effects that we estimate. However, some of the factors discussed above may only impact future student cohorts, and our estimation strategy does not permit us to fully identify those effects.9, 10 In addition to having direct effects on student education outcomes, teacher strikes may impact several non-educational outcomes as well. For example, unless parents can make alternative child care arrangements (which will depend on whether it was an expected or unexpected strike, and on the resources that the parents possess), strikes will increase leisure time and the risk that students engage in bad behavior and criminal activity (e.g. Anderson 2014; Henry et al. 1999). This can directly impact the future education and labor market outcomes of children. Though we cannot look directly at the relationship between strikes and engagement in criminal activity, to the extent that this occurs and affects the long-run outcomes of students, it will be a part of the effects captured by our point estimates. A final factor that makes it difficult to anticipate the likely effects of strikes on student outcomes concerns treatment heterogeneity. The most likely source of heterogeneity relates to 9 To obtain suggestive evidence on the effect of strikes on future student outcomes, we have reestimated our baseline equation using exposure to strikes prior to school start as our treatment variable. If teacher strikes affect future student outcomes we would expect this analysis to return significant results. The results from this exercise are shown in Column H of Table 7. All point estimates are small and not statistically significant, suggesting that our data is inconsistent with this idea. 10 Given the large number of students affected by teacher strikes in Argentina, there could also be general equilibrium effects at the labor market level (for a discussion on how large educational shocks may generate GE effects on the labor market, see Moretti (2004) and Jaume (2017)). For example, old cohorts might benefit from younger cohorts being exposed to strikes since that lowers the competition that they face on the labor market. However, we provide suggestive evidence that these GE effects are not driving our results through a detailed placebo test. Specifically, we reassign the treatment variable for birth cohort c to birth cohort c-7, such that the measure of exposure to teacher strikes is the number of days (in tens of days) of primary school strikes that took place while the individuals were 13 – 19 years old (Panel E of Table 7). If teacher strikes affect past student cohorts (through, for example, reductions in labor market competition), we would expect this analysis to return significant and positive results. This exercise returns small and not statistically significant results, suggesting that this type of GE effect is not driving our results. 8 the socioeconomic characteristics of the students’ families: wealthy parents will be able to move their children to private school if they believe strikes to hurt their children. Depending on the prevalence of this behavior, it may lead to a segregated school system with additional adverse effects on the students left behind. Another source of heterogeneity relates to when during primary school children are exposed to strikes. Research suggests that young children are more susceptible to policy interventions in general, and children who lose instructional time in first grade may suffer more than children who lose instructional time in the final grade of primary school (Shonkoff and Meisels 2000; Cunha and Heckman 2007; Doyle et al. 2009; Chetty et al. 2015). Finally, the effect of several short disruptions may be very different from the effect of one long disruption. We explore all these types of heterogeneity in Section 6.3.

#### Illegal strikes solve better and aff strikes become water downed and negotiated out by the state- TURNS CASE – this is their author

Reddy 21 Reddy, Diana (Doctoral Researcher in the Jurisprudence and Social Policy Program at UC Berkeley) “" There Is No Such Thing as an Illegal Strike": Reconceptualizing the Strike in Law and Political Economy." Yale LJF 130 (2021): 421. <https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy>

In recent years, consistent with this vision, there has been a shift in the kinds of strikes workers and their organizations engage in—increasingly public-facing, engaged with the community, and capacious in their concerns.[178](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref178) They have transcended the ostensible apoliticism of their forebearers in two ways, less voluntaristic and less economistic. They are less voluntaristic in that they seek to engage and mobilize the broader community in support of labor’s goals, and those goals often include community, if not state, action. They are less economistic in that they draw through lines between workplace-based economic issues and other forms of exploitation and subjugation that have been constructed as “political.” These strikes do not necessarily look like what strikes looked like fifty years ago, and they often skirt—or at times, flatly defy—legal rules. Yet, they have often been successful. Since 2012, tens of thousands of workers in the Fight for $15 movement have engaged in discourse-changing, public law-building strikes. They do not shut down production, and their primary targets are not direct employers. For these reasons, they push the boundaries of exiting labor law.[179](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref179) Still, the risks appear to have been worth it. A 2018 report by the National Employment Law Center found that these strikes had helped twenty-two million low-wage workers win $68 billion in raises, a redistribution of wealth fourteen times greater than the value of the last federal minimum wage increase in 2007.[180](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref180) They have demonstrated the power of strikes to do more than challenge employer behavior. As Kate Andrias has argued: [T]he Fight for $15 . . . reject[s] the notion that unions’ primary role is to negotiate traditional private collective bargaining agreements, with the state playing a neutral mediating and enforcing role. Instead, the movements are seeking to bargain in the public arena: they are engaging in social bargaining with the state on behalf of all workers.”[181](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref181) In the so-called “red state” teacher strikes of 2018, more than a hundred thousand educators in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, and other states struck to challenge post-Great Recession austerity measures, which they argued hurt teachers and students, alike.[182](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref182) These strikes were illegal; yet, no penalties were imposed.[183](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref183) Rather, the strikes grew workers’ unions, won meaningful concessions from state governments, and built public support. As noted above, public-sector work stoppages are easier to conceive of as political, even under existing jurisprudential categories.[184](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref184) But these strikes were political in the broader sense as well. Educators worked with parents and students to cultivate support, and they explained how their struggles were connected to the needs of those communities.[185](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref185) Their power was not only in depriving schools of their labor power, but in making normative claims about the value of that labor to the community. Most recently, 2020 saw a flurry of work stoppages in support of the Black Lives Matter movement.[186](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref186) These ranged from Minneapolis bus drivers’ refusal to transport protesters to jail, to Service Employees International Union’s Strike for Black Lives, to the NBA players’ wildcat strike.[187](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref187) Some of these protests violated legal restrictions. The NBA players’ strike for instance, was inconsistent with a “no-strike” clause in their collective-bargaining agreement with the NBA.[188](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref188) And it remains an open question in each case whether workers sought goals that were sufficiently job-related as to constitute protected activity.[189](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref189) Whatever the conclusion under current law, however, striking workers demonstrated in fact the relationship between their workplaces and broader political concerns. The NBA players’ strike was resolved in part through an agreement that NBA arenas would be used as polling places and sites of civic engagement.[190](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref190) Workers withheld their labor in order to insist that private capital be used for public, democratic purposes. And in refusing to transport arrested protestors to jail, Minneapolis bus drivers made claims about their vision for public transport. Collectively, all of these strikes have prompted debates within the labor movement about what a strike is, and what its role should be. These strikes are so outside the bounds of institutionalized categories that public data sources do not always reflect them.[191](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref191) And there is, reportedly, a concern by some union leaders that these strikes do not look like the strikes of the mid-twentieth century. There has been a tendency to dismiss them.[192](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref192) In response, Bill Fletcher Jr., the AFL-CIO’s first Black Education Director, has argued, “People, who wouldn’t call them strikes, aren’t looking at history.”[193](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref193) Fletcher, Jr. analogizes these strikes to the tactics of the civil-rights movement.

#### Teacher salaries and per-student expenditures are on the rise, and the number of teachers isn’t declining

NEA 4-23 (National Education Association, “Teacher Pay and Student Spending: How Does Your State Rank?” 4-23-2021, <https://www.nea.org/resource-library/teacher-pay-and-student-spending-how-does-your-state-rank)//daceto>

NEA’s annual reports, which comb through data covering everything from the average teacher salary to state spending on students, show that the country was finally headed toward increased support for students when the COVID-19 pandemic struck. Now, much of the recovery from the Great Recession could reverse course, while recent progress around chronic funding gaps and the educator pay penalty could be lost. National Averages NEA’s Rankings and Estimates report, which provides thousands of education statistics and has been produced by the National Education Association for more than 70 years, estimates the national classroom teacher salary was $65,090 for the 2020-21 school year. This national average salary only slightly increased by 0.9 percent over the past decade, when adjusted for inflation. NEA also collects data on teacher starting salaries and released those findings alongside its Rankings and Estimates report. The average starting teacher salary for 2019-2020, across nearly 12,000 public school districts, was $41,163, an increase of 2.5 percent over 2018-2019. When adjusted for inflation, this marks the largest annual increase in starting pay since before the Great Recession. Key Findings Highlights from this year’s report, which include national and state-by-state averages, include: Enrollment and Attendance In fall 2019, U.S. public schools enrolled 50,189,401 students, a decrease of 0.1 percent from fall 2018. During the same period, the number of students in average daily attendance (ADA) decreased by 0.5 percent nationwide. Public school enrollment is expected to decrease by an estimated 2.4 percent from 2019-20 (50,189,401) to 2020-21 (48,985,186) and the number of students in average daily attendance is projected to decline by 2.0 percent. Classroom Teachers U.S. public schools employed 3,214,673 teachers in 2019-20. The number of classroom teachers is not expected to change significantly from 2019-20 to 2020-21. Teacher Salary The national average public school teacher salary for 2019-20 was $64,133. State average teacher salaries ranged from those in New York ($87,069), California ($84,531), and Massachusetts ($84,290) at the high end to Mississippi ($46,843), South Dakota ($48, 984) and Florida ($49,102) at the low end. The national average one-year change in public school teacher salaries from 2018-19 to 2019-20 was 2.9 percent. The average classroom teacher salary for 2020-21 is projected to increase by 1.5 percent over 2019-20, from $64,133 to $65,090. Expenditures Per Student The national average per-student expenditure in 2019-20 based on fall enrollment was $13,597, a gain of 4.0 percent from $13,078 in 2018-19. The following states had the highest per-student expenditures: New York ($25, 907), the District of Columbia ($23,231), and New Jersey ($22,097). Idaho ($7,705), Utah ($8,306), and Mississippi ($9,181) had the lowest per-student expenditures. Expenditures per student in fall enrollment are projected to increase by 4.8 percent to $14,243 in 2020-21, up from $13,597 in 2019-20.