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#### Interpretation – the aff may not defend that a just government ought to recognize the right to strike for a subset of workers

#### 1. Workers is a generic bare plural

Nebel 20 [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs. He writes a lot of this stuff lol – duh.] “Indefinite Singular Generics in Debate” Victory Briefs, 19 August 2020. no url AG

I agree that if “a democracy” in the resolution just meant “one or more democracy,” then a country-specific affirmative could be topical. But, as I will explain in this topic analysis, that isn’t what “a democracy” means in the resolution. To see why, we first need to back up a bit and review (or learn) the idea of generic generalizations.

The most common way of expressing a generic in English is through a *bare plural*. A bare plural is a plural noun phrase, like “dogs” and “cats,” that lacks an overt determiner. (A determiner is a word that tells us which or how many: determiners include quantifier words like “all,” “some,” and “most,” demonstratives like “this” and “those,” posses- sives like “mine” and “its,” and so on.) LD resolutions often contain bare plurals, and that is the most common clue to their genericity.

We have already seen some examples of generics that are not bare plurals: “A whale is a mammal,” “A beaver builds dams,” and “The woolly mammoth is extinct.” The first two examples use indefinite singulars—singular nouns preceded by the indefinite article “a”—and the third is a definite singular since it is preceded by the definite article “the.” Generics can also be expressed with bare singulars (“Syrup is viscous”) and even verbs (as we’ll see later on). The resolution’s “a democracy” is an indefinite singular, and so it very well might be—and, as we’ll soon see, is—generic.

But it is also important to keep in mind that, just as not all generics are bare plurals, not all bare plurals are generic. “Dogs are barking” is true as long as some dogs are barking. Bare plurals can be used in particular ways to express existential statements. The key question for any given debate resolution that contains a bare plural is whether that occurrence of the bare plural is generic or existential.

The same is true of indefinite singulars. As debaters will be quick to point out, some uses of the indefinite singular really do mean “some” or “one or more”: “A cat is on the mat” is clearly not a generic generalization about cats; it’s true as long as some cat is on the mat. The question is whether the indefinite singular “a democracy” is existential or generic in the resolution.

Now, my own view is that, if we understand the difference between existential and generic statements, and if we approach the question impartially, without any invest- ment in one side of the debate, we can almost always just tell which reading is correct just by thinking about it. It is clear that “In a democracy, voting ought to be compul- sory” doesn’t mean “There is one or more democracy in which voting ought to be com- pulsory.” I don’t think a fancy argument should be required to show this any more than a fancy argument should be required to show that “A duck doesn’t lay eggs” is a generic—a false one because ducks do lay eggs, even though some ducks (namely males) don’t. And if a debater contests this by insisting that “a democracy” is existen- tial, the judge should be willing to resolve competing claims by, well, judging—that is, by using her judgment. Contesting a claim by insisting on its negation or demanding justification doesn’t put any obligation on the judge to be neutral about it. (Otherwise the negative could make every debate irresolvable by just insisting on the negation of every statement in the affirmative speeches.) Even if the insistence is backed by some sort of argument, we can reasonably reject an argument if we know its conclusion to be false, even if we are not in a position to know exactly where the argument goes wrong. Particularly in matters of logic and language, speakers have more direct knowledge of particular cases (e.g., that some specific inference is invalid or some specific sentence is infelicitious) than of the underlying explanations.

But that is just my view, and not every judge agrees with me, so it will be helpful to consider some arguments for the conclusion that we already know to be true: that, even if the United States is a democracy and ought to have compulsory voting, that doesn’t suffice to show that, in a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory—in other words, that “a democracy” in the resolution is generic, not existential.

Second, existential uses of the indefinite, such as “A cat is on the mat,” are upward- entailing.3 This means that if you replace the noun with a more general one, such as “An animal is on the mat,” the sentence will still be true. So let’s do that with “a democracy.” Does the resolution entail “In a society, voting ought to be compulsory”? Intuitively not, because you could think that voting ought to be compulsory in democracies but not in other sorts of societies. This suggests that “a democracy” in the resolution is not existential.

#### It applies to this topic – a] workers is an existential bare plural bc it has no determiner b] The sentence “A just government ought to recognize the right of workers to strike” does not imply “a just government ought to recognize the right of people to strike”

#### Violation – they spec teachers

#### Standards

#### 1] Limits – they can spec infinite different workers like agricultural workers, nurses etc - that’s supercharged by the ability to spec combinations of types of strikes. This takes out functional limits – it’s impossible for me to research every possible combination of workers, strikes and governments

#### 2] TVA solves – just read your aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff – we don’t stop them from reading new FWs, mechanisms or advantages. PICs aren’t aff offense – a] it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse justifies the aff being non-T b] There’s only a small number of pics on this topic c] PICs incentivize them to write better affs that can generate solvency deficits to PICs
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#### A just government ought to formally declare that customary international law compels not enforcing restrictions and/or conditions on teachers’ strikes.

#### CP solves and avoids the net benefit. CIL is legally binding and enforceable.

**Brudney 21** (Professor James J. Brudney is the Joseph Crowley Chair in Labor and Employment Law at Fordham Law School. Professor Brudney served for six years as Chief Counsel and Staff Director of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Labor. He has been Adjunct Professor of Law at the Georgetown Law Center and Visiting Professor of Law at Harvard Law School. His scholarly writing is in the areas of workplace law and statutory interpretation. Professor Brudney is co-chair of the Public Review Board for the United Auto Workers International Union, and is a member of the Committee of Experts of the International Labor Organization “The Right to Strike as Customary International Law”. 2021.)

This Article pursues a different path. Using international labor and human rights doctrine, it analyzes **the right to strike** as an integral element of freedom of association among workers, and concludes that this right **has achieved the status of customary international law** (CIL). It then explores possible ways to incorporate such an international right in the U.S. context, recognizing certain very real jurisdictional and remedial challenges. Recourse to international law sources has garnered support from several current and recent justices, 10 but the tide may be ebbing. Given evidence of contemporary Supreme Court reluctance to accept developments in international human rights law asserted by foreign nationals as U.S. federal law,11 or to refer to foreign constitutions when interpreting federal constitutional rights,12 the arguments developed here may be discounted by some readers as more of an aspiration than a practical possibility. There are several reasons, however, to look past this position. For a start, **establishing the right to strike as CIL is an important development in itself,** beyond as well as within the U.S. judicial context. Because CIL has long been an incorporated source of English common law upon which courts may draw as required, 13 the international right to strike may be applicable in British and related common law settings. Moreover, **state courts have invoked CIL** **when relevant to resolving disputes under their own laws**, 14 **and** they **may choose to apply this** international **right to reconsider the restrictions imposed on strikes under state statutes**. Additionally, **worker movements in this country may make use of CIL as part of their vocabulary to defend the legality of strikes outside the courtroom**.15 Although the Supreme Court as currently constituted appears skeptical of CIL applications in a foreign affairs context, it has considered international human rights law relevant to domestic legal challenges in relatively recent times.16 In this regard, commentators and judges have long invoked CIL or its antecedent “law of nations” in aspirational as well as pragmatic terms. On diverse matters such as slave trading and slavery, reasonable and proportionate forms of criminal punishment, and the right to a healthy environment, international human rights doctrine has been deemed applicable even when U.S. laws and courts seemed inhospitable to recognizing relevant legal protections. 17 In what follows, the Article addresses four distinct questions. The first question involves the contents and contours of the right to strike as recognized under international instruments. The **international right is embedded within two widely endorsed U**nited **N**ations **human rights treaties,**18 **and was recently reaffirmed by the human rights committees responsible for monitoring implementation of those treaties**19 **It is set** forth **in** more **precise and detailed terms** pursuant to Convention 87 of the International Labor Organization (ILO) addressing freedom of association (FOA), and the interpretations given to that convention by ILO supervisory bodies. Notwithstanding recent objections from employers’ groups, the right is recognized by the overwhelming majority of governments that have ratified Convention 87 as being an integral part of the Convention. In this regard, there is an established ILO jurisprudence on the right to strike, developed by two of its key supervisory committees—the independent Committee of Experts (CEACR), and the tripartite Committee on Freedom of Association (CFA),20 and reinforced by observations from the two UN human rights committees. 21 The Article summarizes this jurisprudence and describes how protections for the international right exceed U.S. protections for the right to strike in two key areas. **The international law** **prohibit**ion on **private employers’ ability to permanently replace** lawfully **striking workers** conflicts with Supreme Court precedent construing the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). 22 And the international law protection for public employee strikes with only limited exceptions conflicts with the NLRA’s allowing states to prohibit all strikes by their employees. At the same time, the international right is hardly untethered: it includes a range of exceptions and limitations that constrain its scope in certain ways when compared with U.S. statutory law. The second question is whether this international right to strike qualifies as CIL. The Article contends that it does, based on the existence of widespread State practice in which ratification or conformity reflects opinio juris, a genuine sense of obligation under international law. In addition to Convention 87 having been ratified by more than 80 percent of ILO Member States, the right to strike as an integral part of FOA is an element in broader ILO documents that obligate all countries, including those like the U.S. that have not ratified the Convention.23 Relatedly, the right is recognized through the two previously mentioned U.N. Covenants whose language expressly incorporates the guarantees provided for in Convention 87. **The right is further established in prominent decisions from transnational courts, and in domestic legal frameworks around the world** (constitutions, statutes, and high court decisions), reinforcing the argument that widespread respect from governments is based on a sense of legal obligation. Further, the broad-based evidence from domestic legal frameworks indicates that ratification reflects not simply formal commitment but active compliance by governments. Application of the international right to strike recognizes variations in nationally-specific approaches. However, the two key areas in which U.S. law deviates from the international right—approving permanent replacements for lawful strikers and allowing the prohibition of all public employee strikes—are central elements of the right itself, rather than more marginal aspects subject to national circumstances. Finally, notwithstanding that U.S. statutory protections for strikes deviate from international standards in these two areas, respect for the international right is reflected in legislation enacted by Congress in recent decades, and by executive action indicating the express understanding of the Obama and Trump Administrations that the right to strike is an integral part of FOA.24

#### Spurs and advances workers movements globally.

**Brudney 21** (Professor James J. Brudney is the Joseph Crowley Chair in Labor and Employment Law at Fordham Law School. Professor Brudney served for six years as Chief Counsel and Staff Director of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Labor. He has been Adjunct Professor of Law at the Georgetown Law Center and Visiting Professor of Law at Harvard Law School. His scholarly writing is in the areas of workplace law and statutory interpretation. Professor Brudney is co-chair of the Public Review Board for the United Auto Workers International Union, and is a member of the Committee of Experts of the International Labor Organization “The Right to Strike as Customary International Law”. 2021.)

**Application of CIL on behalf of U.S. workers** in domestic courts faces distinct challenges. The Article has examined these challenges and proposed ways in which they may be countered if not overcome. In the short-term, the challenges may seem too large in light of jurisdictional and procedural hurdles, linked in many ways to the Supreme Court’s current reluctance to accept international human rights law in a federal court setting. Nonetheless, the exploration of this international right remains important for a number of reasons. A common law right to strike **may open doors to litigation for public employees** in states that are more hospitable to recognizing CIL than the current majority of justices. **The right also may have immediate utility for American workers seeking a persuasive language in which to justify their growing interest in strike activities**. Further, given that the Court in its relatively recent past has recognized the relevance of international human rights law, there is reason to believe that it may do so again—in which case this in-depth analysis of how one significant human right has been advanced and applied in other countries may well be of value. **Finally, arguments stemming from the right to strike under international law are sure to have ongoing resonance beyond U.S. borders, as the right continues to be developed and debated on the global stage.**

#### Bolstering CIL regime fills Outer Space Treaty gaps and solves international space conflict

**Koplow 09** (David Koplow is a professor and the co-director of the Center on National Security and the Law at the Law Center. He joined the Georgetown faculty in 1981. His government service has included stints as Special Counsel for Arms Control to the General Counsel of the Department of Defense (2009-2011); as Deputy General Counsel for International Affairs at the Department of Defense (1997-1999); and as Attorney-Advisor and Special Assistant to the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (1978-1981). He is a graduate of Harvard College and Yale Law School and a Rhodes Scholar. “ASAT-isfaction: Customary International Law and the Regulation of Anti-Satellite Weapons”. 2009.)

Remarkably, the **CIL** version of the law **of outer space** **would achieve even more comprehensive** geographic **coverage than the treaty** version. **Half of the** countries in the **world have not** yet **gotten** around **to ratify**ing **the OST**; even larger cohorts have not acted to affiliate themselves with the other important space-related instruments. **In contrast, all countries would be bound by the CIL of outer space**; it is hard to imagine any "persistent objectors" who have exempted themselves from any aspect of the now-entrenched custom, and any **new States** that emerge onto the world scene **would automatically be covered by the body of space-related CIL, even if they do not affirmatively join the treaties**. Third, outer space also illustrates the law-making role of the UNGA. When the legal regime for space was first emerging, many countries opted to employ the UNGA as the most apt mechanism for expressing themselves about the putative rules for exo-atmospheric interaction; their statements in this "global town meeting" carry weight in the evaluation of emerging CIL. Successive UNGA resolutions, especially the 1963 Outer Space Declaration' 153 (which initiated and expressed many of the principles that were later cast into treaty vocabulary in the OST) were prepared with a solemnity (and adopted via unanimous vote) suggesting a conscious legislative function. As the Restatement notes, [t]he Outer Space Declaration, for example, might have become law even if a formal treaty had not followed, since it was approved by all, including the principal "space powers." ... A spokesman for the United States stated that his Government considered that the Declaration "reflected international law as accepted by the members of the United Nations," and both the United States and the U.S.S.R. indicated that they intended to abide by the Declaration.154 Of course, not every enactment of the UNGA (still less, the actions of the CD) is automatically entitled to the status of CIL, but **the elusive mechanisms of customary law**-making sometimes **do repose special respect to the weightiest resolutions of those global instrumentalities.** 155

#### Space war goes nuclear.

Johnson-Freese 17 (Joan Johnson-Freese, Professor and chair of space science and technology @ Naval War College, *Space Warfare in the 21st Century*, Routledge, ISBN 978131552917, p 18-20. 2017.)

Space warfare runs two untenable risks: the creation of destructive debris and escalation to terrestrial, even nuclear, warfare. Kinetic warfare in space creates debris traveling at a speed of more than 17,000 miles per hour, which then in itself becomes a destructive weapon if it hits another object—even potentially triggering the so-called Kessler Syndrome,86 exaggerated for dramatic effect in the movie Gravity. Ironically, both China and the United States learned the negative lessons of debris creation the hard way. In 1985, the United States tested a miniature homing vehicle (MHV) ASAT launched from an F-15 aircraft. The MHV intercepted and destroyed a defunct US satellite at an altitude of approximately 250 miles. It took almost 17 years for the debris resulting from that test to be fully eliminated by conflagration re-entering the Earth’s atmosphere or being consumed by frictional forces, though no fragment had any adverse consequences to another satellite—in particular, no collisions. China irresponsibly tested a direct-ascent ASAT in 2007, destroying one if its defunct satellites. That test was at an altitude almost twice that of the 1985 US test. The debris created by the impact added 25 percent to the debris total in low Earth orbit87 and will dissipate through the low Earth orbit, heavily populated with satellites, for decades, perhaps centuries, to come. Perhaps most ironically, because of superior US debris-tracking capabilities, the United States—even though not required to do so—has on more than one occasion warned China that it needed to maneuver one of its satellites to avoid a collision with debris China itself had likely created.88 In 2013, a piece of Chinese space junk from the 2007 ASAT test collided with a Russian laser ranging nanosatellite called BLITS, creating still more debris.89 The broader point is that all nations have a compelling common interest in avoiding the massive increase in space debris that would be created by a substantial ASAT conflict. Gen. Hyten has said that not creating debris is “the one limiting factor” to space war. “Whatever you do,” he warns, “don’t create debris.”90 While that might appear an obvious “limiting factor,” preparing to fight its way through a debris cloud had been a Pentagon consideration in the past. Now, however, sustaining the space environment has been incorporated into Pentagon space goals. Beyond debris creation, MacDonald points out that as China becomes more militarily capable in space and there is more symmetry between the countries, other risks are created – specifically, escalation. That is, the United States could threaten to attack not just Chinese space assets, but also ground-based assets, including ASAT command-and-control centers and other military capabilities. But such actions, which would involve attacking Chinese soil and likely causing substantial direct casualties, would politically weigh much heavier than the U.S. loss of space hardware, and thus might climb the escalatory ladder to a more damaging war that both sides would probably want to avoid.91 MacDonald isn’t alone in concerns about escalation. Secure World Foundation analyst Victoria Samson has also voiced apprehension regarding US rhetoric that does not distinguish between actions against unclassified and classified US satellites, stating that “things can escalate pretty quickly should we come into a time of hostility.”92 Theresa Hitchens explained the most frightening, but not implausible, risk of space war escalation in a 2012 Time magazine interview. Say you have a crisis between two nuclear-armed, space-faring countries, Nation A and Nation B, which have a long-standing border dispute. Nation A, with its satellite capability, sees that Nation B is mobilizing troops and opening up military depots in a region where things are very tense already, on the tipping point. Nation A thinks: “That’s it, they’re going to attack.” So it might decide to pre-emptively strike the communications satellite used by Nation B to slow down its ability to move toward the border and give itself time to fortify. Say this happens and Nation B has no use of satellites for 12 hours, the time it takes it to get another satellite into position. What does Nation B do? It’s blind, it’s deaf, it’s thinking all this time that it’s about to be overwhelmed by an invasion or even nuked. This is possibly a real crisis escalation situation; something similar has been played out in U.S. Air Force war games, a scenario-planning exercise practiced by the U.S. military. The first game involving anti-satellite weapons stopped in five minutes because it went nuclear – bam. Nation B nuked Nation A. This is not a far-out, “The sky’s falling in!” concern, it is something that has been played out over and over again in the gaming of these things, and I have real fears about it.93 While escalation to a nuclear exchange may seem unthinkable, in war games conducted by the military, nuclear weapons are treated as just another warfighting weapon. Morgan also voiced concerns about escalation generally and nuclear escalation specifically in the 2010 RAND report, stating: The adversary would also likely be deterred from damaging U.S. satellite early-warning system (SEWS) assets to avoid risking inadvertent escalation to the nuclear threshold, but that firebreak would almost certainly collapse with the conclusion that such escalation is inevitable and that it is in the adversary’s interest to launch a preemptive nuclear strike.94
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#### The global economy is recovering and is set to accelerate this year, but any shocks can devastate growth

World Bank 21 - [The World Bank is an international financial institution that provides loans and grants to the governments of low- and middle-income countries for the purpose of pursuing capital projects.] "The Global Economy: on Track for Strong but Uneven Growth as COVID-19 Still Weighs" 06/08/2021 <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2021/06/08/the-global-economy-on-track-for-strong-but-uneven-growth-as-covid-19-still-weighs> VS

A year and a half since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the global economy is poised to stage its most robust post-recession recovery in 80 years in 2021. But the rebound is expected to be uneven across countries, as major economies look set to register strong growth even as many developing economies lag. Global growth is expected to accelerate to 5.6% this year, largely on the strength in major economies such as the United States and China. And while growth for almost every region of the world has been revised upward for 2021, many continue to grapple with COVID-19 and what is likely to be its long shadow. Despite this year’s pickup, the level of global GDP in 2021 is expected to be 3.2% below pre-pandemic projections, and per capita GDP among many emerging market and developing economies is anticipated to remain below pre-COVID-19 peaks for an extended period. As the pandemic continues to flare, it will shape the path of global economic activity. The United States and China are each expected to contribute about one quarter of global growth in 2021. The U.S. economy has been bolstered by massive fiscal support, vaccination is expected to become widespread by mid-2021, and growth is expected to reach 6.8% this year, the fastest pace since 1984. China’s economy – which did not contract last year – is expected to grow a solid 8.5% and moderate as the country’s focus shifts to reducing financial stability risks.

#### Strikes decrease productivity, create investment risk, weaken capital, and market volatility– causes econ collapse

Wisniewski et al 19 - Wisniewski, T. P., Lambe, B. J., & Dias, A. (2019). The Influence of General Strikes against Government on Stock Market Behavior. Scottish Journal of Political Economy. doi:10.1111/sjpe.12224 VS

The research that has been done to date focused primarily on the incidence of general strikes and the motivations that drive the unions to stage opposition to government plans and reforms (Vandaele, 2011; Gall, 2013; Hamann et al., 2013a). A number of papers considered the determinants of union success, which can be measured according to the concessions granted by the government (Johnson, 2000; Hamann et al., 2013b; Nowak and Gallas, 2014).Implications for policy-makers were further highlighted by Hamann et al. (2013c) who documented the vote share losses of incumbents in the presence of general strikes. This is unsurprising considering the substantial efforts exerted by the unions to engage voters, generate news stories, and expose the alleged incompetency of the government. To counter the resultant electoral losses, a country’s leadership that faces popular protests is more likely to align fiscal policy with the election cycle. More specifically, Klomp and de Haan (2013) showed that affected governments increase their spending and deficits in the pre-election year in order to temporarily stimulate the economy and, as a consequence, boost popular support. While some clarity may have emerged with respect to the outcomes encountered by workers and governments, the literature remains silent with regards to the ramifications faced by employers. It is this void in the body of knowledge that our paper intends to fill. Even if the general strikes are not strictly directed against companies, their value may be adversely affected for several reasons. First, the unproductive periods impose costs in terms of lower levels of output and profits. Although general strikes are typically short in duration, the large number of employees involved has a bearing on the total number of days not worked (Gall, 2013). Second, such manifestations of popular dissent signal to the market the workforce’s frustration with the government and its policies. In the case where policy-makers are responsive to the demands being made, a general strike may also signal the weakening position of capital providers and other sources of power within the productive process. Corporations may also be forced into a position of carrying the burden of government concessions and the costs of social pacts that are agreed in the aftermath of a general strike. Third, in instances where the future response of the government is not known with certainty, additional investment risk is created. Such risk will raise the time-varying discount rates leading to lower stock valuations and increased market volatility. Fourth, conceding to workers’ demands may lead to a deterioration in a government’s financial position, which will exert upward pressure on bond yields and discount rates. This, in turn, would further aggravate the falls in stock prices. Our findings in this study reflect the abovementioned considerations. Through investigating a large sample spanning an array of countries, we demonstrate a valuation impact that is both statistically and economically significant. Since the magnitude of the fall in stock prices coinciding with the occurrence of a general strike is substantial, investors should pay particular attention to this type of event. Furthermore, we record significant increases in stock index return volatility and Value-at-Risk1 in the year of the event, which could be indicative of the policy uncertainty that arises alongside mass strike action. Such findings should be brought into consideration by those on both sides of the divide who are engaged in the collective bargaining process. Market vulnerability around times of mass strike action could be particularly distressing to shareholders who are not internationally diversified. The problem is of concern not only to frontline investors but extends to a wider swathe of the population invested in the market through pension funds. It is neither in the interest of trade unions nor governments to adversely affect the value of retirement portfolios. For this reason, both parties should seek alternative resolutions that do not involve walkouts. This means that in order to avoid costly economic frictions, governments should be wary of situations which may inflame worker indignation. Similarly, trade unions should consider the full welfare implications for their members before staging a mass protest.

#### C-apply 1ac – liu – econ decline causes war

## OFF

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

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

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

#### The plan tanks youth education – that hurts their ability to get jobs and youth in general

Aldeman, 20, 8/12/20, 74 million, Chad Aldeman is policy director of the Edunomics Lab at Georgetown University. “Aldeman: What a Wave of Teacher Strikes in Argentina Can Teach Us About Learning Disruptions, Degree Attainment, Higher Unemployment & Lower Earnings”, URL: <https://www.the74million.org/article/aldeman-what-a-wave-of-teacher-strikes-in-argentina-can-teach-us-about-learning-disruptions-degree-attainment-higher-unemployment-lower-earnings/>, KR

Beginning in 1983, Argentina faced a wave of teacher strikes, some regional and others national. In a paper looking at the long-term effects, researchers David Jaume and Alexander Willén found that the strikes caused the average student to miss out on 88 days of instruction over the course of primary school, or about 7 percent of elementary school class time. Because the strikes varied by province in terms of frequency and length, Jaume and Willén were able to look at the educational and longer-term life outcomes of the affected students.

In the short run, students who lost educational time had lower high school and college completion rates and completed fewer years of schooling. These effects were concentrated among students in the bottom 75 percent of family income, with the poorest students suffering the largest declines. Students from the richest 25 percent of families suffered no adverse consequences at all.

The negative effects also lingered into adulthood. Adults who lost more educational time as children had higher unemployment rates and earned lower wages. For an average elementary school student who lost 88 days of instructional time, that amounted to a 3 percent loss in future earnings as an adult.

Both men and women suffered from the strikes, but the lost educational time affected them differently. As adults, boys who were affected by the strikes worked the same number of hours as their peers, but in lower-paying jobs and industries.

Women suffered in different ways. For one, they were more likely to shift out of the workforce entirely. The strikes also seemed to cause a downward effect in the marriage market. Girls who missed more school time due to the strikes tended to marry less-well-educated spouses who, in turn, earned less money. In summary, the authors conclude that “females exposed to teacher strikes during primary school have more children, less educated partners and lower per capita family income.”

To top it off, Jaume and Willén found that the negative effects of lost instructional time can be passed down to new generations. Once the strike-affected students grew up and had children of their own, the children of the strike-affected students were more likely than their peers to be held back in school.

So what lessons can we glean from the Argentina teacher strikes for our pandemic situation today?

The first is that the more days of instruction students lost, the larger the negative effects they suffered. For those of us living through the current pandemic, that means we should do everything we can to get kids learning as much as possible. That is, every additional hour of instructional time we can give kids today will pay dividends for them down the road.

Second, this study is yet another example of why our recovery efforts have to focus on the most disadvantaged students. According to data from Harvard University’s Opportunity Insights Economic Tracker, during the peak of last spring’s school closures, American students in high-income zip codes made more progress in online math courses than they had while they were in school. In contrast, students from low-income zip codes were making much less progress during the shutdowns. We have to acknowledge these disparities and target our resources accordingly.

Third, the Argentina study is helpful in that it shows both short- and long-term consequences of educational disruptions. Test score declines in the fall or spring may be an early indicator, but if we fail to act and choose to disregard any short-term results, we will be harming this generation of students for the rest of their lives.

Fourth, this study does offer one hopeful note, which is that there are large gains to be had by addressing any short-term gaps. With millions of Argentinean children affected, Jaume and Willén estimate that the strikes reduced the Argentinean economy by more than $700 million a year. But here in the U.S., we have about 15 times as many public school students and an economy more than 40 times as large. If American policymakers have a hard time focusing on children at the moment, this study helps make an economic case for why they are worthy of large investments.

#### And, CX plus this card confirm that teachers will use power to strike often which undercuts our youth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### A robust youth workforce is key to revitalizing the economy and the environment

O’Mara 20 [Collin O’ Mara is the president and C.E.O. of the National Wildlife Federation and a former participant in the AmeriCorps VISTA program.] “7.7 Million Young People Are Unemployed. We Need a New ‘Tree Army.’” The New York Times. May 18, 2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/18/opinion/coronavirus-unemployment-youth.html> BSPK

Nearly [7.7 million](https://int.nyt.com/data/documenthelper/6953-unemployment-under-30/8b646ef429cecb7d77a7/optimized/full.pdf#page=1) American workers younger than 30 are now unemployed and [three million](https://int.nyt.com/data/documenthelper/6954-3-million-left-workforce/8b646ef429cecb7d77a7/optimized/full.pdf#page=1) dropped out of the labor force in the past month. Combined that’s nearly one in three young workers, by far the[highest rate](https://int.nyt.com/data/documenthelper/6955-highestunemplyment/d1c48c3099970861ff19/optimized/full.pdf#page=1) since the country started tracking unemployment by age in 1948.

Nearly [40 percent](https://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.nr0.htm) worked in the devastated retail and food service sectors. And as the most recently hired, young workers are typically the first let go and often the last rehired, especially those of color.

As our country’s leaders consider a range of solutions to address this crisis, there’s one fix that will put millions of young Americans directly to work: a 21st-century version of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

In 1933, when President Franklin Roosevelt created the C.C.C., he was facing, as we are today, the possibility of a lost generation of young people. The conservation-minded president’s idea was to hire young unemployed men for projects in forestry, soil conservation and recreation. By 1942, the [3.4 million participants](http://archiveswest.orbiscascade.org/ark:/80444/xv31307) in “Roosevelt’s Tree Army” had planted more than three billion trees, built hundreds of parks and wildlife refuges and completed thousands of miles of trails and roads.

While the corps was not perfect — only men were hired, work camps were segregated, and some projects caused ecological damage — the C.C.C. was the most expansive and successful youth employment program in American history. It also played a crucial role in forging the Greatest Generation, which defeated fascism and built the strongest economy in the world. Today, there’s plenty to do for a revitalized conservation corps that would put young Americans back to work.

We’ve amassed a staggering backlog of restoration needs for our nation’s lands and waters, and face escalating vulnerabilities to fires, floods, hurricanes and droughts. Our national parks, wildlife refuges and other public lands have [$20 billion in deferred maintenance](https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R43997.pdf) — and states have tens of billions of dollars more. Eighty million acres of national forests need rehabilitation. [Half a million](https://www.abandonedmines.gov/extent_of_the_problem) abandoned coal and hard-rock mines and [thousands](http://iogcc.ok.gov/Websites/iogcc/images/Publications/2019%2012%2031%20Idle%20and%20Orphan%20oil%20and%20gas%20wells%20-%20state%20and%20provincial%20regulatory%20strategies%20(2019).pdf) of orphaned oil and gas wells need reclamation. More than [12,000 species](https://www.nwf.org/-/media/Documents/PDFs/NWF-Reports/2018/Reversing-Americas-Wildlife-Crisis_2018.ashx) of at-risk wildlife, fish and plants need conservation.

Smart investments in natural solutions could create millions of immediate jobs for the demographic groups and regions acutely affected by the downturn. One study found that restoration jobs support up to [33 jobs per $1 million of investment](https://curs.unc.edu/files/2014/01/RestorationEconomy.pdf), which can stimulate economic growth and employment in other industries. Those that would stand to benefit include outdoor recreation, agriculture, forestry and ranching, which have been hit hard by the pandemic.

These projects would expand recreational opportunities, increase our resilience to extreme weather and use nature by planting trees to sequester the carbon dioxide emissions that are warming the planet.

We already have federal, state, local and tribal plans and projects that have been vetted and are ready to go, and pending bipartisan legislation, like the [Great America Outdoors Act](https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/senate-bill/3422) and the [Recovering America’s Wildlife Act](https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/3742/), which would provide financing for some of this work. We also have the infrastructure of AmeriCorps’ [National Civilian Community Corps](https://www.nationalservice.gov/programs/americorps/americorps-programs/americorps-nccc) and other programs that are part of the Corporation for National and Community Service. They can be scaled up and modernized, as proposed by Senators Chris Coons of Delaware and Martin Heinrich of New Mexico, both Democrats, and others.

To maximize these benefits, three lessons from the C.C.C. should guide our recovery today.

First, all communities must benefit, including youth of color and Indigenous young people. Second, states, local governments and tribes must be full partners. Third, high-quality educational opportunities and apprenticeships must be included to ensure that the program’s participants are fully prepared for private-sector employment opportunities.

How much would all this cost? That depends on the scope of our ambitions. But clearly, there is plenty of work to be done and too many young people without jobs or prospects who are available to do it.

We can prevent a youth unemployment crisis from hobbling the next generation, strengthen local economies and bolster community resilience, but we must act now to put millions of young people to work restoring America’s natural treasures.

#### C-apply 1ac – liu – econ decline causes war

## CASE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Teacher strikes worsen students in the short term which triggers long term problems

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

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

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

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

How strikes harm student populations:

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

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

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

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

#### No link to econ decline – their ev is about education in areas – no reason it prevents econ decline

1AC WEF 15 (World Economic Forum, world-renowned economic/leadership organization, 5-19-2015, "Why education is the key to sustainable development," World Economic Forum, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/05/why-education-is-the-key-to-sustainable-development/>) AG

A strong education system broadens access to opportunities, improves health, and bolsters the resilience of communities – all while fueling economic growth in a way that can reinforce and accelerate these processes. Moreover, education provides the skills people need to thrive in the new sustainable economy, working in areas such as renewable energy, smart agriculture, forest rehabilitation, the design of resource-efficient cities, and sound management of healthy ecosystems

#### Innovation impact is contextual to changing educational practices that has no IL towards more teachers in the workforce

Peter 1AC **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).

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

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

**In recent years, consistent with this vision, there has been a shift in the kinds of strikes [are] workers and their organizations engage in—increasingly public-facing, engaged with the community, and capacious in their concerns**.178 They have transcended the ostensible apoliticism of their forebearers in two ways, less voluntaristic and less economistic. They are less voluntaristic in that they seek to engage and mobilize the broader community in support of labor’s goals, and those goals often include community, if not state, action. They are less economistic in that they draw through lines between workplace-based economic issues and other forms of exploitation and subjugation that have been constructed as “political.” **These strikes do not necessarily look like what strikes looked like fifty years ago, and they often skirt—or at times, flatly defy—legal rules. Yet, they have often been successful**. Since 2012**, tens of thousands of workers in the Fight for $15 movement have engaged in discourse-changing, public law-building strikes.** They do not shut down production, and their primary targets are not direct employers. **For these reasons, they push the boundaries of exiting labor law.179 Still, the risks appear to have been worth it. A 2018 report by the National Employment Law Center found that these strikes had helped twenty-two million low-wage workers win $68 billion in raises, a redistribution of wealth fourteen times greater than the value of the last federal minimum wage increase in 2007**.180 They have demonstrated the power of strikes to do more than challenge employer behavior. As Kate Andrias has argued: [T]he Fight for $15 . . . reject[s] the notion that unions’ primary role is to negotiate traditional private collective bargaining agreements, with the state playing a neutral mediating and enforcing role. Instead, the movements are seeking to bargain in the public arena: they are engaging in social bargaining with the state on behalf of all workers.”181 **In the so-called “red state” teacher strikes of 2018, more than a hundred thousand educators in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, and other states struck to challenge post-Great Recession austerity measures, which they argued hurt teachers and students, alike.182 These strikes were illegal; yet**, no penalties were imposed.183 **Rather, the strikes grew workers’ unions, won meaningful concessions from state governments, and built public support.** As noted above, public-sector work stoppages are easier to conceive of as political, even under existing jurisprudential categories.184 But these strikes were political in the broader sense as well. Educators worked with parents and students to cultivate support, and they explained how their struggles were connected to the needs of those communities.185 Their power was not only in depriving schools of their labor power, but in making normative claims about the value of that labor to the community. Most recently, **2020 saw a flurry of work stoppages in support of the Black Lives Matter movement**.186 These ranged from Minneapolis bus drivers’ refusal to transport protesters to jail, to Service Employees International Union’s Strike for Black Lives, to the NBA players’ wildcat strike.187 **Some of these protests violated legal restrictions. The NBA players’ strike for instance, was inconsistent with a “no-strike” clause in their collective-bargaining agreement with the NBA.**188 And it remains an open question in each case whether workers sought goals that were sufficiently job-related as to constitute protected activity.189 **Whatever the conclusion under current law, however, striking workers demonstrated in fact the relationship between their workplaces and broader political concerns.** The NBA players’ strike was resolved in part through an agreement that NBA arenas would be used as polling places and sites of civic engagement.190 Workers withheld their labor in order to insist that private capital be used for public, democratic purposes. And in refusing to transport arrested protestors to jail, Minneapolis bus drivers made claims about their vision for public transport. **Collectively, all of these strikes have prompted debates within the labor movement about what a strike is, and what its role should be.** These strikes are so outside the bounds of institutionalized categories that public data sources do not always reflect them.191 And there is, reportedly, a concern by some union leaders that these strikes do not look like the strikes of the mid-twentieth century. There has been a tendency to dismiss them.192 In response, Bill Fletcher Jr., the AFL-CIO’s first Black Education Director, has argued, “People, who wouldn’t call them strikes, aren’t looking at history.”193 Fletcher, Jr. analogizes these strikes to the tactics of the civil-rights movement. As Catherine Fisk and I recently argued, **law has played an undertheorized role in constructing the labor movement and civil-rights movement as separate and apart from each other**, by affording First Amendment protections to civil rights groups, who engage in “political” activity, that are denied to labor unions, engaging in “economic” activity.194 Labor unions who have strayed from the lawful parameters of protest have paid for it dearly.195 As such, it is no surprise that some unions are reluctant to embrace a broader vision of what the strike can be. Under current law, worker protest that defies acceptable legal parameters can destroy a union. **Recasting the strike—and the work of unions more broadly—as political is risky**. Samuel Gompers defended the AFL’s voluntarism and economism not as a matter of ideology but of pragmatism; he insisted that American workers were too divided to unite around any vision other than “more.”196 He did not want labor’s fortunes tied to the vicissitudes of party politics or to a state that he had experienced as protective of existing power structures. Now, perhaps more than ever, it is easy to understand the dangers of the “political” in a divided United States. Through seeking to be apolitical, labor took its work out of the realm of the debatable for decades; for this time, the idea that (some) workers should have (some form of) collective representation in the workplace verged on hegemonic. **And yet, labor’s reluctance to engage in the “contest of ideas” has inhibited more than its cultivation of broader allies; it has inhibited its own organizing.** If working people have no exposure to alternative visions of political economy or what workplace democracy entails, it is that much harder to convince them to join unions. **Similarly, labor’s desire to organize around a decontextualized “economics” has always diminished its power (and moral authority), given that the economy is structured by race, gender, and other status inequalities—and always has been.** During the Steel Strike of 1919, the steel companies relied on more than state repression to break the strike. They also exploited unions’ refusal to organize across the color line. Steel companies replaced striking white workers with Black workers.197 Black workers also sought “more.” But given their violent exclusion from many labor unions at the time, many believed they would not achieve it through white-led unions.198