## Contention 1- Harms

#### [Lee 21] Transphobic legislation is targeting trans youth

**Lee 21** (Emma Lee, November 20, 2021, Education Workers Must Stand in Solidarity with Trans Rights, Left Voice, <https://www.leftvoice.org/education-workers-must-stand-in-solidarity-with-trans-rights/> ) SJ

The year 2021 has been tragically record-breaking for transphobic acts of violence. Just this year, we have already seen at least 47 transgender or gender non-conforming people [fatally shot or killed by other violent means](https://www.hrc.org/resources/fatal-violence-against-the-transgender-and-gender-non-conforming-community-in-2021). This statistic is already higher than it was in 2020, making it the worst year on record for transphobic violence. Tragically, several of these transphobic murders in 2021 targeted trans kids. In Pennsylvania, siblings Jeffrey “JJ” Bright, a 16-year-old trans boy, and Jasmine Cannady, a 22-year-old non-binary person were killed on February 22. Jeffrey was a student at Ambridge High School and Jasmine was a FedEx worker. In Oregon, Oliver “Ollie” Taylor, a 17-year-old white trans boy and student at Gervais High School, died on May 19 after being kidnapped and shot on May 12. On top of the physical violence, 2021 has been [the most active year for anti-trans legislative attacks](https://www.cnn.com/2021/04/15/politics/anti-transgender-legislation-2021/index.html) to date. Several Republican states have enacted legislation restricting trans students’ participation in sports, and state athletic associations have issued guidance restricting access to team sports. Other lawmakers have targeted bathroom and locker room access and proposed restrictions on transgender medical care. [The vast majority of states](https://www.glsen.org/policy-maps) have no laws prohibiting discrimination based on gender identity or sexual orientation, nor do they have statewide policies on the treatment of trans, nonbinary, or gender nonconforming students. In Texas alone, legislators have called four special sessions to introduce 47 bills that aim to restrict transgender kids’ access to sports and gender-affirming care, plus three bills that would block birth certificate updates for minors. Trans students and their parents are exhausted by the fight, which has forced students as young as eight, to testify in front of the Texas legislature. The Trevor Project, a suicide prevention and crisis intervention organization for young LGBTQ people, reported that crisis contacts from LGBTQ Texans seeking support has [increased more than 150 percent](https://www.thetrevorproject.org/blog/new-data-illuminates-mental-health-concerns-among-texas-transgender-youth-amid-record-number-of-anti-trans-bills/) compared to last year. These bills not only target students, but also teachers. Transphobic bills have been proposed in [Ohio](https://www.cnn.com/2018/06/29/health/ohio-transgender-students-bill-trnd/index.html) (in 2018) and [Alabama](https://www.them.us/story/alabama-anti-trans-student-legislation) (in 2021) that would legally require teachers to out trans students to their families — a violation of the trust that is built between ourselves and our students. This comes in the midst of a wave of right-wing attacks against “critical race theory” in schools, which strips teachers of their ability to teach accurate history in the classroom. Collectively, these legislative attacks constitute an assault on the rights of trans kids through a growing right-wing “culture wars” strategy to gain electoral momentum. Of the countless bills introduced across the country, none contained the word “transgender” — effectively erasing the targeted human beings in a populist attempt to reinforce gender conformity, appealing to the “moral” right-wing voters. These omissions are a symbol of the material effects of these attacks on trans people — one of the most vulnerable groups under the capitalist system. Though spearheaded by Republicans, the culture wars provide cover for a multitude of policies — put forward by both parties — that significantly worsen the material conditions of the working class. While most Democrats may not use transphobic rhetoric, they continue to perpetuate the structural oppression of trans people by protecting privatized health care, allowing cuts to social services, and continuing to fund the police. And other than writing a few tweets, they have done nothing to protect trans youth.

#### [Lee 21] Teachers are key to fighting against transphobic legislature

**Lee 21** (Emma Lee, November 20, 2021, Education Workers Must Stand in Solidarity with Trans Rights, Left Voice, <https://www.leftvoice.org/education-workers-must-stand-in-solidarity-with-trans-rights/> ) SJ

As teachers, we are caught in the crossfire, but we are powerful in our numbers and position within capitalism. As the debates about schools reopening have shown, education workers comprise a crucial sector of the working class because of our ability to keep the wheels of capitalism turning. The capitalist state needs childcare so that other workers can keep churning out profits for their bosses. We have to organize within our unions to demand that our teachers’ unions connect with the LGBTQ+ community and coordinate mobilizations around the country. We have to organize to oppose these laws, protect trans students, and safeguard the academic freedom to teach accurate information about gender and race. When we are organized, we can refuse to work each time a transphobic bill is introduced. By mobilizing our ranks, we can strike every time a trans person is attacked. Together we can build a mass movement for trans rights. Let’s start by talking to our co-workers and organizing in our workplaces and unions.

#### [Will 20] Teacher strikes are difficult and mostly illegal

**Will 20** (Madeline Will, July 20, 2020, Teachers Are Scared to Go Back to School. Will They Strike?, Education Week, Madeline Will is a reporter for Education Week who covers the teaching profession and graduated from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 2014, <https://www.edweek.org/leadership/teachers-are-scared-to-go-back-to-school-will-they-strike/2020/07> ) SJ

Over the past couple years, teachers have organized strikes and walkouts in more than a half-dozen states and at least five big cities to fight for higher wages and more school funding. Even so, any labor action on a national scale would be “wholly unprecedented,” said Jon Shelton, an associate professor in the department of democracy and justice studies at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, who studies teacher strikes. In most of the country, teacher strikes are illegal. And even in the 15 states where strikes are legal or not covered by statute or case law, teachers still have to follow a process before they go to the picket lines. Strikes are typically the last resort in a contract negotiation process between the local teachers’ union and the district, after negotiations and mediation fail. “There’s virtually no state where there’s just an unqualified right to strike,” Shelton said.

## Contention 2- Solvency

#### [Janse 21] Organized strikes give workers more leverage – now is the best time to strike

**Janse et al 2021** (Alejandra Marquez Janse, Ailsa Chang, Courtey Dorning, and Matt Ozug, November 2, 2021, “3 reasons labor strikes are surging right now — and why they could continue to grow,” National Public Radio, <https://www.npr.org/2021/11/02/1051112806/strikes-labor-great-resignation-covid>) //neth

Thousands of workers across the U.S. are on strike, demanding better wages, better working conditions and more benefits. In what some have called "Striketober," workers in factories as well as the health care and food industries have either started or authorized strikes in the past month. It comes after more than a year of working during the pandemic and as millions of workers are quitting in what has been named the "Great Resignation." Joseph McCartin is a professor of history and the director of the Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor at Georgetown University. He spoke with NPR's All Things Considered about why so many American workers seem to be either striking or threatening to strike. Ailsa Chang: Why exactly are we seeing so many strikes right now in particular? McCartin: One [reason] is that workers have just come through the pandemic and the economy is just beginning to improve. And usually, after a big crisis and when things begin to improve, workers can become more militant. I think the fact that this has coincided with the "Great Resignation" is also crucial because we've seen a tremendous upsurge in workers quitting jobs in the private sector. And that's unusual. In August, we set a record for such quits, and what I think that shows is there's a broad dissatisfaction that workers feel and that's giving workers who are organized more leverage. The third thing is that people see now that they have an administration in power that's really openly siding with workers and even taking positions in support of strikes. It's very unusual for Cabinet members to visit strike picket lines. Could that mean that we will be seeing even more strikes soon? Strikes tend to breed strikes. If workers see that strikes are being effective, they're more likely to use the strike weapon. What makes this current wave of strikes significant or unique? I think one of the things that makes it unique is the post-pandemic context. The pandemic disrupted a lot of the status quo and labor management relations in a way that only happened, I think, three times in the 20th century — after both of the world wars and during the Great Depression. It was in each of those cases, by the way, that we saw a big upsurge in worker militancy. When the status quo gets upended, it changes workers' expectations. Coming out of World War II, workers had made sacrifices and they wanted rewards after the war. I think a similar feeling pervades the American workforce today. A lot of people sacrificed a lot in the past year — the essential workers, for example — and yet they're looking at a labor market that they feel still doesn't reward them as they feel they ought to be rewarded. Do you think workers actually do have more leverage at this moment? They actually do have more leverage right now, and part of that has to do with the "Great Resignation," which is showing discontent that is tightening the labor market. What's unique about this moment is there is a labor shortage that many employers are complaining about, but it's a labor shortage that is largely worker driven. Workers have been withdrawing from the labor market in dissatisfaction with the jobs they currently have. We still haven't returned to the job levels we had before the recession; we're about 80% of what we had before COVID struck. Could this "Striketober" stretch into a months-long wave and have maybe even long-term impacts? It could. It could last for quite a while. The militancy that came up after World War II went on for more than a year, and it did have long-term consequences. The same thing after World War I. And what happened in those cases, especially after World War I — employers started to realize from the postwar strike militancy that workers weren't as happy as they thought that they were, and that the jobs needed to be improved and employers needed to get on that program and make some improvements. So, we could possibly see that.

#### [Will 19] Strikes in West Virginia prove teachers striking for political causes impact legislature

**Will 19** (Madeleine Will, February 20, 2019, Teachers Are Still Striking, But Their Demands Have Changed. Here’s How, Education Week, <https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/teachers-are-still-striking-but-their-demands-have-changed-heres-how/2019/02> ) SJ

But the flavor of the teacher strikes has changed. Unlike last year, when teachers across the country shared a similar narrative of crumbling classrooms and stagnant paychecks, the strike demands now are far-reaching. Now, teachers are pushing back against education-reform policies, like charter schools and performance-based pay. They’re also fighting for social-justice initiatives, like sanctuary protections for undocumented students. “This isn’t a fight just for a pay raise,” said Oakland Education Association President Keith Brown of the districtwide strike there. “Yes, it is a fight to retain teachers, to keep teachers, to provide teachers with a living wage, but it’s also a fight to give more resources to our students. It’s a fight to save public education.” There’s no clearer evidence of the shift in teacher activism than in West Virginia. Last year, teachers went on strike because they were frustrated with stagnant wages and rising health-insurance costs—and ultimately went back to their classrooms with a 5 percent pay raise. But this year, teachers went on strike again over an education bill that already included a second 5 percent pay raise. Instead, they were fighting against the provisions in the bill that would have established charter schools in the state and created up to 1,000 education savings accounts, which would allow parents of students with special needs or students who have been bullied to use public money to pay for private schools. Just hours after the strike began, lawmakers tabled the bill, showing the power that protesting teachers still have. But teachers remained on strike for a second day in order to make sure the bill was truly dead—a sign of both the lack of trust between teachers and lawmakers, and the increasingly militant direction unions are taking. Teachers will return to school on Thursday, but have given union leader the power to call for further action if legislators pursue those measures in future bills.

## Contention 3- Framing

#### Thus we affirm that just governments ought to provide an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### [Farrell and Gupta 04] Heteronormativity actively constrains education and expression in debate - challenging it is key to accessing education.

**Farrell and Gupta 2004** (Farrell, Kathleen, Honors B.A. in sociology from Trinity College; M.A. and Ph.D. in sociology from Syracuse University. Professor Farrell's primary research and teaching interests include gender and sexualities, with an emphasis on inequality studies. In her courses, Professor Farrell focuses on the interdisciplinary and practical implications of sociology and Nisha Gupta, Assistant Proffessor of Psychology at University of West Georgia, "Interrupting heteronormativity: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender pedagogy and responsible teaching at Syracuse University." (2004)) SJ

Should discussions of sexuality be included in the classroom?1 The easy answer might be no: it is not ‘relevant’ to the subject matter of most courses except perhaps to those that explicitly engage with human sexuality, such as Child and Family Studies, Sociology, or Women’s Studies. Moreover, this reasoning might go, given estimates that within the general population less than ten percent identify as non-heterosexual, there’s a good chance that in a class of sixty students everyone is straight. It is this kind of perspective, however, that not only contributes to the invisibility of LGBT students, but it also constructs and reinforces heteronormativity in our classrooms and across campus.2 LGBT students (and teachers) ARE present in our classrooms—whether we choose to see them or not—and it is their very invisible presence that demonstrates the power of heteronormativity to mask that which does not conform, and to naturalize that which does. This is a problem for both LGBT and heterosexual students and teachers alike. Heteronormative assumptions and practices regulate the beliefs, behaviors, and desires of ALL of us, restricting the range of possibilities of identification and expression for ALL of us, to such an extent that even momentary and joyful expressions (e.g. the heterosexual man singing “I feel like a woman” in the Chevy commercial discussed by Susan Adams) become sources of discomfort and fear. Practices of regulation and restriction are integral to creating and maintaining hierarchies of power, which in turn limit the kinds of learning and teaching that can happen in our classrooms. As responsible teachers, we know that our pedagogical theories and practices need to expand the kinds of learning opportunities we provide students, not restrict them. In fact, the administration of this university recognizes the importance of this by emphasizing the link between a rich intellectual climate and a diversity of perspectives and people: “[. . .] diversity in our student body, faculty, and staff has far-ranging and significant educational benefits for all nonminorities and minorities alike” (Syracuse University Academic Plan, 2001). Particular strategies to create more inclusive curricula have been developed and implemented in programs and departments university-wide because “[s]tudents in diverse learning environments learn more, and have higher levels of satisfaction and greater degrees of civic engagements. They are better able to appreciate the ideas of others and they are better prepared to enter the world they will lead” (SU Academic Plan, 2001). This diversity of students, faculty, and ideas includes: “race, ethnicity, gender, age, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, and physical and mental ability” (Syracuse University Human Resources, emphasis added). In principle, then, SU values diversity. Taking a closer look at what diversity means and how it is “practiced,” however, exposes some gaps between these principles and actual, everyday classroom procedures, particularly when that “diversity” topic is sexual orientation. It’s important to note that sexual orientation is a term that does not reference a particular set of people; it’s not only about LGBT people, but also non-LGBT, or heterosexual, people. Why is this broader definition of sexual orientation important? Because the sexual orientation of heterosexuality is simultaneously institutionalized and naturalized to the extent that it becomes the invisible norm against which all other sexual orientations, identifications, or expressions are named “abnormal.” The issue of “invisibility,” then, isn’t just about LGBT students and teachers; it’s about the ways in which our assumptions about (hetero)sexuality are invisible to us. And we carry these assumptions into our classrooms. As a result, heteronormativity is reproduced, most often unconsciously, through our own everyday classroom practices. Rather than expanding the kinds of learning opportunities we create space for, we inadvertently reinforce a regulated and restrictive framework for understanding the complexity of human sexuality.

#### [Damante 16] The role of the judge is to promote queer inclusion in educational spaces

**Damante 2016** (Rebecca Damante, June 16, 2016, “Can Education Reduce Prejudice against LGBT People?”, The Century Foundation, graduated from Smith College with a B.A. in the Study of Women and Gender. She worked as an LGBTQ Opposition Researcher at Media Matters for America in Washington D.C.., <https://tcf.org/content/commentary/can-education-reduce-prejudice-lgbt-people/?agreed=1>) SJ

Incorporating LGBT people, history, and issues in schools’ curricula could combat the widespread homophobia prevalent throughout the United States. In an ideal world, laws like those in [North Carolina](https://www.cnn.com/2016/03/29/health/north-carolina-bathroom-law-cards/) and [Tennessee](http://www.advocate.com/health/2016/4/27/tenn-gov-signs-bill-allowing-psychologists-turn-away-lgbt-patients) would be deemed unconstitutional, and people would not violently target those in the LGBT community. However, even the strictest gun control policies and largest campaigns to ban these laws doesn’t erase the problem at hand: intense homophobia exists in our country. Ensuring that information on the LGBT community is provided to the public during the developing years of their lives can begin to address this issue.There are many notable LGBT people that can be included in school curricula across a variety of fields such as Harvey Milk, Sylvia Rivera, Michel Foucault, Audre Lord, and Bayard Rustin; as well as notable media and sports icons like Anderson Cooper, Ellen DeGeneres, Jason Collins, Lady GaGa, and Laverne Cox. Talking about these individuals’ contributions to society, as well as the battles faced by the LGBT community as a whole, could open people’s minds to LGBT issues. While including LGBT content in schools is beneficial for students, the way in which this content is presented is just as important, if not more. Going forward, teachers can adopt an [anti-bias lens](http://www.tolerance.org/sites/default/files/general/PDA%20Critical%20Practices_0.pdf), a form of social-emotional learning that respects diversity and challenges sexism, racism, ableism, classism, and other societal prejudices. This means educating students about the history of heterosexism, and encouraging these students to speak out in support of the LGBT community.Some states have already begun to include LGBT history in their curricula. In 2011, for example, California passed the [Fair Education Act](http://www.faireducationact.com/about-fair/), which requires schools to teach some aspect of LGBT history, and [the results were astounding](http://www.casafeschools.org/FactSheet-curriculum.pdf). Both LGBT and non-LGBT students reported feeling safer in their classrooms when LGBT issues were included in the curriculum.

#### [Damante 16] Therefore discussing queer issues in the debate space is important for spillover into material change and makes the debate space more inclusive. The role of the ballot is to endorse the debater who performatively creates the best impacts for queer people.

**Damante 2016** (Rebecca Damante, June 16, 2016, “Can Education Reduce Prejudice against LGBT People?”, The Century Foundation, graduated from Smith College with a B.A. in the Study of Women and Gender. She worked as an LGBTQ Opposition Researcher at Media Matters for America in Washington D.C.., <https://tcf.org/content/commentary/can-education-reduce-prejudice-lgbt-people/?agreed=1>) SJ

Ensuring that these instances of anti-LGBT violence and discrimination do not continue to repeat themselves may require society to turn to one of its oldest tools: education. [Reports from GLAAD have found](https://www.glaad.org/blog/new-glaad-report-maps-long-road-full-lgbt-acceptance-despite-historic-legal-advances) that increased knowledge about LGBT people leads to lower levels of discomfort toward this community, and thus can reduce anti-LGBT discrimination. Yet, there is a lack of education across the nation on this sector of the population, with [only one state](http://www.faireducationact.com/about-fair/)—California—mandating the implementation of LGBT figures and history into school curricula. Taking that into consideration, one can’t help but wonder: what would have happened if state lawmakers or the Orlando shooter had received more education about LGBT people? As the American public learns more about the LGBT community, [this can foster LGBT acceptance.](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/02/14/glaad-accelerating-acceptance-report-_n_6681620.html) LGBT education can be fulfilled in a variety of ways, including getting to know a family member who is gay or a friend that is transgender; it can also include consuming media that features LGBT people or characters. Seeing Caitlyn Jenner on TV, for example, can help make the change from misunderstanding to acceptance, which is extremely important given that only [16 percent of people know someone who is transgender.](https://www.glaad.org/releases/number-americans-who-report-knowing-transgender-person-doubles-seven-years-according-new) With that in mind, teaching students about LGBT issues and individuals within the classroom could help them better understand LGBT people. Similar to the benefits of racial and socioeconomic integration explored in The Century Foundation’s report [How Racially Diverse Schools and Classrooms Can Benefit All Students](https://tcf.org/content/report/how-racially-diverse-schools-and-classrooms-can-benefit-all-students/), the inclusion of LGBT issues in a school’s curriculum could reduce stereotypes and biases against the LGBT population. Interacting with people from different backgrounds and varying preferences is an [integral skill](https://tcf.org/content/report/promoting-inclusion-identity-safety-support-college-success/), as [employers today](https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/2013_EmployerSurvey.pdf) are seeking professionals who can collaborate with our world’s [increasingly diverse population.](https://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/02-241.ZO.html) Furthermore, as the TCF contributors Amy Stuart Wells, Lauren Fox, and Diana Cordora-Cobo explain, learning in diverse environments has been shown to improve one’s educational experience, as it “promote[s] creativity, motivation, deeper learning, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills.”Including LGBT content in curricula could also offer LGBT students—who disproportionately feel the effects of bullying in schools—a safer, improved educational experience. More than [one-third of gay youth](http://www.mentalhealthamerica.net/bullying-and-gay-youth) have missed a day of school because they felt unsafe, and [nine out of ten of LGBT teens](http://www.bullyingstatistics.org/content/gay-bullying-statistics.html) have been bullied in school, which [can cause students to suffer academically.](http://newsroom.ucla.edu/releases/victims-of-bullying-suffer-academically-168220) Educating students about LGBT issues could foster an environment where LGBT students [feel safer in the classroom](https://www.glsen.org/download/file/MzIzMw==), improving their overall educational experience for years to come.

#### [Fahs 13] Academic spaces are used to communicate values systems and are important for promoting critical thinking and enacting social change.

**Fahs and Bertagni 13**(Breanne Fahs, Department of Women and Gender Studies, Arizona State University, Jennifer Bertagni, Arizona State University, “Up from SCUM: Radical Feminist Pedagogies and Consciousness-Raising in the Classroom”, Radical Pedagogy, 2013, <http://www.breannefahs.com/uploads/1/0/6/7/10679051/2013_radical_pedagogy_fahs_bertagni.pdf> ) SJ

Many scholars that utilize critical and feminist pedagogies have critiqued the traditional model of education as one that creates a learning environment centered on a grading system, memorization, and an authoritarian teacher and submissive student relationship. Embedded within this model, power imbalances are perpetrated without much consideration for how such imbalanced power dynamics affect student learning. Critics of traditional pedagogy argue that it overrelies upon what Paolo Freire describes as “banking,” where students become passive receptacles that teachers supposedly “fill” with information (Beckman, 1990; Freire, 1970; hooks, 1994; Larson, 2006). Both critical and feminist theorists argue that knowledge is socially constructed and that schools perpetuate certain value systems via beliefs, attitudes, and priorities set forth in the classroom. Pedagogical practices are therefore not “neutral,” but rather, modes of communicating dominance, social norms, and ideologies about social identities like race, class, and gender (Leistyna, Woodrum, & Sherblom, 1999; McLaren, 1998). Though feminist pedagogy and critical theory share similar criteria and goals for educating students, feminist pedagogy focuses specifically on women’s lives and experiences as a starting point for creating and learning about epistemology in the women’s studies classroom (Beckman, 1990; Larson, 2006). Feminist pedagogies insist upon a continual examination of the way gender affects lived experience, policy, and cultural norms, particularly by exploring and unpacking the unexamined dynamics of gender and power (Crabtree & Sapp, 2003; Stake, 2006). Crabtree and Sapp (2003) describe feminist pedagogy as “a set of classroom practices, teaching strategies, approaches to content, and relationships grounded in critical pedagogical and feminist theory” (p. 131). Feminist pedagogy challenges the teacher-student relationship and the student’s relationship to knowledge (Stake, 2001). Jayne Stake and Francis Hoffman (2000; 2006) qualitatively measured women’s studies professors’ pedagogical practices and found the following four categories most commonly used: 1)participatory learning: student participation by expressing their personal experiences in the classroom; 2)development of critical thinking/ open-mindedness: strengthening of critical thinking skills, where students engaged in critical thinking about the topics in lecture, rather than accepting information or “debanking”; 3)validation of personal experience/ development of confidence: encouraging students to see the connection between assigned readings and their own life experiences and 4) development of political/social understanding: helping students to conceptualize connections between readings, their societal context, and their role in engaging actively in social change. Therefore, feminist pedagogy enables students to critically examine the microcosmic implications of macrocosmic and hegemonic cultural policies and to decipher how those belief systems affect them on the personal level (Stake, 2006). In addition to the aforementioned tenets of feminist pedagogy, women’s studies professors often strive to practice egalitarian power dynamics in the classroom, as well as to encourage egalitarian attitudes in general (Crabtree & Sapp, 2003; hooks, 1994; Stake, 2006). This creates a supportive atmosphere where students respect everyone’s right to comment and critically evaluate their world. Opinions inconsistent with feminism expressed in the classroom can serve as platform for critical analysis and debate, with students deconstructing comments construed as sexist, racist, heterosexist, etc. while maintaining the democratic structure of the classroom (Kimmel & Worrell, 1997). Women’s studies classes have demonstrated the capacity to heighten students’ awareness of gender inequality; increase confidence and sense of empowerment; develop less conventional beliefs about gender and create greater practices of egalitarianism. Enhanced confidence, empowerment, and critical thinking skills students developed in women’s studies classes predicted feminist and political activism later on (Stake & Hoffman, 2001; 2007). No current studies have interrogated the intersections between radical politics and feminist pedagogy.

*The LA teacher strikes prove teacher strikes result in legislative change*

**Blume & Kohli 20** (Howard Blume, Sonali Kohli, January 21, 2020, The teachers’ strike gripped LA for 6 days. A year later, what are the results?, Los Angeles Times, Blume won the top investigative reporting prize from the L.A. Press Club and print Journalist of the Year from the L.A. Society of Professional Journalists chapter, <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-01-21/legacy-of-los-angeles-teachers-strike>) SJ

Leaders of United Teachers Los Angeles and their allies say their [hard-fought gains](https://www.latimes.com/local/education/la-me-edu-lausd-strike-deal-details-20190122-story.html) already are game-changers — within schools and in the political realm that shapes public education policy. They said the strike created an essential beginning toward achieving smaller classes and schools fully staffed with nurses, librarians and counselors. They count some of their biggest gains in non-traditional areas. For example, the agreement called for the district to commit to expanding social services at more schools and to begin dismantling the practice of randomly searching students for contraband. The union also lays claim to helping pass [new state laws](https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2019-09-02/california-charter-schools-compromise-education-wars) that restrict charter schools, which are privately operated and, for the most part, non-union.

#### [Reddy 21] Strikes are a method to engage in political discussions, and the influence they have on those discussions matters as much as the outcomes within the workplaces they take place in.

**Reddy, ‘21** (Diana S. Reddy is a Doctoral Fellow at the Law, Economics, and Politics Center at UC Berkeley Law, Published: 1/6/21, “’There is no such thing as an illegal strike’: Reconceptualizing the strike in law and political economy”, The Yale Law Journal Forum, <https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy>) SJ

For those who believe that a stronger labor movement is needed to counterbalance the concentrations of economic and political power in this new Gilded Age, the question is not just whether the law is bad (it is), but whether strikes can be effective nonetheless. If labor activists are correct that there is “no such thing” as an illegal strike, just an unsuccessful strike, the question follows: what makes a strike successful enough, under current conditions, to transcend legal constraints?[154](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref154) To some extent this is an empirical question, and one on which there are many opportunities for generative research. Beginning with the theoretical, however, I suggest that the success of strikes must be measured in more than economic wins in the private sphere. Like their Progressive Era progenitors, their success must be in raising political consciousness in the public sphere—in making the stakes of the twenty-first century labor question apparent.[155](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref155) As noted above, under current labor law, strikes are conceptualized as “economic weapons,” as hard bargaining.[156](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref156) And while legal terminology is distinct from on-the-ground understandings, unions have often emphasized the economic nature of the strike as well. Strikes are “[t]he power to stop production, distribution and exchange, whether of goods or services.”[157](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref157) A strike works because “we withhold something that the employer needs.”[158](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref158) At the same time, there has been a corresponding tendency to dismiss the more symbolic aspects of the strike. To quote White again, “while publicity and morale are not irrelevant, in the end, they are not effective weapons in their own right.”[159](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref159) These arguments are important. A strike is not simply protest; it is direct action, material pressure. But with union density lower than ever, ongoing automation of work tasks that renders employees increasingly replaceable, and decades of neoliberal cultural tropes celebrating capital as the driver of all economic growth and innovation, it is a mistake to think of publicity and morale as nice-to-haves, rather than necessities. Instead, striking must be part of building what sociologists have described as the “moral economy,” cultural beliefs about fair distribution untethered to technocratic arguments about what is most efficient.[160](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref160) And in that way, striking is and must be understood as political. The term political, of course, has many meanings—engendered by law, culture, and the relationship between the two. Building on the work of other scholars, I have argued that neo-Lochnerian readings of the First Amendment which have categorized labor protest as solely economic, and therefore apolitical, are one mechanism by which unions have lost legitimacy (and legal protection) as a social movement.[161](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref161) Under current law, what precisely constitutes the political is less than clear, though. In distinguishing “political” speech from other kinds of speech for the purpose of First Amendment analysis, the Supreme Court has at times equated the political with: electioneering;[162](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref162) speech directed to or about the government;[163](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref163) or most broadly, “speech and debate on public policy issues.”[164](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref164) Within labor parlance, by contrast, the term “political strike” is specifically used to refer to strikes that are “designed to win a specific political outcome, such as the passage of legislation or a change in regulation.”[165](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref165) Consistent with the NLRA’s construction of unions as economic entities, strikes which are solely “political” and without sufficient nexus to the employment relationship, are deemed unlawful secondary boycotts.[166](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref166) But my argument here for reconceptualizing the strike as political is not about more “political strikes,” or about electoral politics, or even necessarily about state action. Based on a vision of the “political” as normative engagement directed towards collective decision-making—it is about destabilizing jurisprudential line drawing between the economic and the political in the first place.[167](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref167) It is recognizing that all strikes are political or have the potential to be—in that all strikes are protest meant to transform collective conditions, not merely bargaining towards immediate, transactional ends. To use political science terminology, strikes are contentious politics: “[E]pisodic, public, collective interaction among makers of claims and their objects.”[168](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref168) They are a way through which workers engage in claims-making when business and politics as usual have proven nonresponsive.[169](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref169) They do not only address the employer; they engage the polity. The need to reconceptualize the strike as outward-facing towards the public, not just inward-facing towards the employer, is partly a function of material changes, both in economic production and union density. As labor scholar Jane McAlevey points out, “Today’s service worker has a radically different relationship to the consuming public than last century’s manufacturing worker had . . . In large swaths of the service economy, the point of production is the community.”[170](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref170) For this reason, she argues that effective strikes today must engage the public to be successful.[171](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref171) Union density is also many times higher now in the public sector than in the private one, an upending of the realities of unionization mid-century.[172](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref172) As illustrated by the Supreme Court’s decision in Janus v. AFSCME, it is easier to see the economic work of unions as political (qua affecting government policy, spending, and debt) in the public sector.[173](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref173) Yet, the shift is also about recognizing that it was a legal and an ideological accommodation that made the work of unions in their representative capacity appear as “economic,” and thus outside politics. The work of unions has been artificially “bifurcated” vis-à-vis the political realm.[174](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref174) For years, as Reuel Schiller has argued, unions have engaged in “two sets of activities that appear barely related to one another”: private, transaction bargaining in the workplace; combined with broad, public mobilization around electoral politics. But there were always alternate visions of the relationship between the economic and the political within union advocacy and workplace governance.[175](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref175) If “establishing terms and conditions of employment [is] a political act involving not just a worker and an employer, but also a union, an industry as a whole, and the state,” then union advocacy is a political act too.[176](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref176) Strikes are part of the “contest of ideas.” Reconstructing a purposefully political philosophy, jurisprudence, and tactical repertoire of collective-labor advocacy is a project that is new again; and it will inevitably require deliberation, debate, and compromise.[177](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref177) For the time being, though, one thing seems apparent. Strikes must be a part of engaging a broad swath of the public in reconceptualizing political economy.

#### The aff deploys the state to learn scenario planning – even if politics is bad, scenario analysis of politics is pedagogically valuable – it enhances creativity, deconstructs biases and teaches advocacy skills.
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What Are Scenarios and Why Use Them in Political Science? **Scenario analysis is** perceived most commonly as **a technique for examining the robustness of strategy**. It can immerse decision makers in future states that go beyond conventional extrapolations of current trends, preparing them to take advantage of unexpected opportunities and to protect themselves from adverse exogenous shocks. The global petroleum company Shell, a pioneer of the technique, characterizes scenario analysis as **the art of considering “what if”** questions about possible future worlds. Scenario analysis is thus typically seen as serving the purposes of corporate planning or as **a policy tool to be used in combination with simulations of decision making**. Yet scenario analysis is not inherently limited to these uses. This section provides a brief overview of the practice of scenario analysis and the motivations underpinning its uses. It then makes a case for the utility of the technique for political science scholarship and describes how the scenarios deployed at NEFPC were created. The Art of Scenario Analysis We characterize scenario analysis as the art of **juxtaposing current trends** in unexpected combinations **in order to articulate** surprising and yet **plausible futures**, often referred to as “alternative worlds.” Scenarios **are** thus explicitly **not forecasts** or projections based on linear extrapolations of contemporary patterns, and they are not hypothesis-based expert predictions. **Nor should they be equated with simulation**s, which are best characterized as functional representations of real institutions or decision-making processes (Asal 2005). Instead, **they are depictions of possible future states of the world**, offered together with a narrative of the driving causal forces and potential exogenous shocks that could lead to those futures. Good scenarios thus rely on explicit causal propositions that, independent of one another, are plausible—yet, when combined, suggest surprising and sometimes controversial future worlds. For example, few predicted the dramatic fall in oil prices toward the end of 2014. Yet independent driving forces, such as the shale gas revolution in the United States, China’s slowing economic growth, and declining conflict in major Middle Eastern oil producers such as Libya, were all recognized secular trends that—combined with OPEC’s decision not to take concerted action as prices began to decline—came together in an unexpected way. While scenario analysis played a role in war gaming and strategic planning during the Cold War, the real antecedents of the contemporary practice are found in corporate futures studies of the late 1960s and early 1970s (Raskin et al. 2005). Scenario analysis was essentially initiated at Royal Dutch Shell in 1965, with the realization that the usual forecasting techniques and models were not capturing the rapidly changing environment in which the company operated (Wack 1985; Schwartz 1991). In particular, it had become evident that straight-line extrapolations of past global trends were inadequate for anticipating the evolving business environment. Shell-style scenario planning “helped break the habit, ingrained in most corporate planning, of assuming that the future will look much like the present” (Wilkinson and Kupers 2013, 4). Using scenario thinking, Shell anticipated the possibility of two Arab-induced oil shocks in the 1970s and hence was able to position itself for major disruptions in the global petroleum sector. Building on its corporate roots, scenario analysis has become a standard policymaking tool. For example, the Project on Forward Engagement advocates linking systematic foresight, which it defines as the disciplined analysis of alternative futures, to planning and feedback loops to better equip the United States to meet contemporary governance challenges (Fuerth 2011). Another prominent application of scenario thinking is found in the National Intelligence Council’s series of Global Trends reports, issued every four years to aid policymakers in anticipating and planning for future challenges. These reports present a handful of “alternative worlds” approximately twenty years into the future, carefully constructed on the basis of emerging global trends, risks, and opportunities, and intended to stimulate thinking about geopolitical change and its effects.4 As with corporate scenario analysis, the technique can be used in foreign policymaking for long-range general planning purposes as well as for anticipating and coping with more narrow and immediate challenges. An example of the latter is the German Marshall Fund’s EuroFutures project, which uses four scenarios to map the potential consequences of the Euro-area financial crisis (German Marshall Fund 2013). Several features make scenario analysis particularly useful for policymaking.5 Long-term global trends across a number of different realms—social, technological, environmental, economic, and political—combine in often-unexpected ways to produce unforeseen challenges. Yet the ability of decision makers to imagine, let alone prepare for, discontinuities in the policy realm is constrained by their existing mental models and maps. This limitation is exacerbated by well-known cognitive bias tendencies such as groupthink and confirmation bias (Jervis 1976; Janis 1982; Tetlock 2005). The power of scenarios lies in their ability to help individuals break out of conventional modes of thinking and analysis by introducing unusual combinations of trends and deliberate discontinuities in narratives about the future. Imagining alternative future worlds through a structured analytical process enables policymakers to envision and thereby adapt to something altogether different from the known present. Designing Scenarios for Political Science Inquiry The characteristics of scenario analysis that commend its use to policymakers also make it well suited to helping political scientists generate and develop policy-relevant research programs. Scenarios are essentially textured, plausible, and relevant stories that help us imagine how the future political-economic world could be different from the past in a manner that highlights policy challenges and opportunities. For example, terrorist organizations are a known threat that have captured the attention of the policy community, yet our responses to them tend to be linear and reactive. **Scenarios that explore how seemingly unrelated vectors of change**—the rise of a new peer competitor in the East that diverts strategic attention, volatile commodity prices that empower and disempower various state and nonstate actors in surprising ways, and the destabilizing effects of climate change or infectious disease pandemics—**can be useful for illuminating the nature and limits of** the terrorist **threat in ways that may be missed by a narrower focus** on recognized states and groups. By illuminating the potential strategic significance of specific and yet poorly understood opportunities and threats, scenario analysis helps to identify crucial gaps in our collective understanding of global politicaleconomic trends and dynamics. The notion of “exogeneity”—so prevalent in social science scholarship—applies to models of reality, not to reality itself. Very simply, **scenario analysis can throw into sharp relief often-overlooked yet pressing questions** in international affairs **that demand focused investigation.** Scenarios thus offer, in principle, **an innovative tool for developing a political** science research **agenda**. In practice, achieving this objective requires careful tailoring of the approach. The specific scenario analysis technique we outline below was designed and refined to provide a structured experiential process for generating problem-based research questions with contemporary international policy relevance. The first step in the process of creating the scenario set described here was to **identify important causal forces** in contemporary global affairs. Consensus was not the goal; on the contrary, some of these causal statements represented competing theories about global change (e.g., a resurgence of the nation-state vs. border-evading globalizing forces). A major principle underpinning the transformation of these causal drivers into possible future worlds was to “simplify, then exaggerate” them, before fleshing out the emerging story with more details. Thus, the contours of the future world were drawn first in the scenario, with details about the possible pathways to that point filled in second. It is entirely possible, indeed probable, that some of the causal claims that turned into parts of scenarios were exaggerated so much as to be implausible, and that an unavoidable degree of bias or our own form of groupthink went into construction of the scenarios. One of the great strengths of scenario analysis, however, is that the scenario discussions themselves, as described below, lay bare these especially implausible claims and systematic biases. An explicit methodological approach underlies the written scenarios themselves as well as the analytical process around them—that of case-centered, structured, focused comparison, intended especially to shed light on new causal mechanisms (George and Bennett 2005). The use of scenarios is similar to counterfactual analysis in that it modifies certain variables in a given situation in order to analyze the resulting effects (Fearon 1991). Whereas counterfactuals are traditionally retrospective in nature and explore events that did not actually occur in the context of known history, our scenarios are deliberately forward-looking and are designed to explore potential futures that could unfold. As such, counterfactual analysis is especially well suited to identifying how individual events might expand or shift the “funnel of choices” available to political actors and thus lead to different historical outcomes (Nye 2005, 68–69), while forward-looking **scenario analysis can better illuminate surprising intersections and sociopolitical dynamics without the perceptual constraints imposed by fine-grained historical knowledge**. We see scenarios as a complementary resource for exploring these dynamics in international affairs, rather than as a replacement for counterfactual analysis, historical case studies, or other methodological tools. In the scenario process developed for NEFPC, three distinct scenarios are employed, acting as cases for analytical comparison. Each scenario, as detailed below, includes a set of explicit “driving forces” which represent hypotheses about causal mechanisms worth investigating in evolving international affairs. The scenario analysis process itself employs templates (discussed further below) to serve as a graphical representation of a structured, focused investigation and thereby as the research tool for conducting case-centered comparative analysis (George and Bennett 2005). In essence, these templates articulate key observable implications within the alternative worlds of the scenarios and serve as a framework for capturing the data that emerge (King, Keohane, and Verba 1994). Finally, this structured, focused comparison serves as the basis for the cross-case session emerging from the scenario analysis that leads directly to the articulation of new research agendas. The scenario process described here has thus been carefully designed to offer some guidance to policy-oriented graduate students who are otherwise left to the relatively unstructured norms by which political science dissertation ideas are typically developed. The initial articulation of a dissertation project is generally an idiosyncratic and personal undertaking (Useem 1997; Rothman 2008), whereby students might choose topics based on their coursework, their own previous policy exposure, or the topics studied by their advisors. Research agendas are thus typically developed by looking for “puzzles” in existing research programs (Kuhn 1996). Doctoral students also, understandably, often choose topics that are particularly amenable to garnering research funding. Conventional grant programs typically base their funding priorities on extrapolations from what has been important in the recent past—leading to, for example, the prevalence of Japan and Soviet studies in the mid-1980s or terrorism studies in the 2000s—in the absence of any alternative method for identifying questions of likely future significance. The scenario approach to generating research ideas is grounded in the belief that these traditional approaches can be complemented by identifying questions likely to be of great empirical importance in the real world, even if these do not appear as puzzles in existing research programs or as clear extrapolations from past events. The scenarios analyzed at NEFPC envision alternative worlds that could develop in the medium (five to seven year) term and are designed to tease out issues scholars and policymakers may encounter in the relatively near future so that they can begin thinking critically about them now. This timeframe offers a period distant enough from the present as to avoid falling into current events analysis, but not so far into the future as to seem like science fiction. In imagining the worlds in which these scenarios might come to pass, **participants learn strategies for avoiding failures of creativity and for overturning the assumptions that prevent scholars and analysts from anticipating** and understanding the pivotal junctures that arise in international affairs.