## 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative debater must specify the type of strike in a delineated text in the 1AC.

#### Violation:

#### Standards –

#### 1] Topic lit – strikes are the core question of the topic and there’s no consensus on normal means so you must spec.

Law Library

[“Strike”, N.D., <https://law.jrank.org/pages/10554/Strike-Status.html>, Law Library, This law and legal reference library provides free access to thousands of legal articles, covering important court cases, historical legal documents, state laws & statutes, and general legal information. Popular articles include Landlord and Tenant Relationship, Health Insurance Law and Employment Law. The legal reference database also covers historically important court cases such as the Ulysses obscenity trial, Plessy vs. Ferguson, Roe vs. Wade and many others. All of the legal information on this website was professionally written and researched, and each law article has been carefully selected -- all to create the most comprehensive legal information site on the web. Read more: Law Library - American Law and Legal Information - JRank Articles <https://law.jrank.org/#ixzz6yOIvCHj7>] [SS]

**Strikes can be divided into** two basic types: **economic and unfair labor practice**. An economic strike seeks to obtain some type of economic benefit for the workers, such as improved wages and hours, or to force recognition of their union. An unfair labor practice strike is called to protest some act of the employer that the employees regard as unfair. A Lexicon of Labor Strikes Over the years different types of labor strikes have acquired distinctive labels. **The following are the** most common **types of strikes, some of which are illegal**: **Wildcat strike** A strike that is not authorized by the union that represents the employees. Although not illegal under law, wildcat strikes ordinarily constitute a violation of an existing collective bargaining agreement. **Walkout** An unannounced refusal to perform work. A walkout may be spontaneous or planned in advance and kept secret. If the employees' conduct is an irresponsible or indefensible method of accomplishing their goals, a walkout is illegal. In other situations courts may rule that the employees have a good reason to strike. **Slowdown** An intermittent work stoppage by employees who remain on the job. Slowdowns are illegal because they give the employees an unfair bargaining advantage by making it impossible for the employer to plan for production by the workforce. An employer may discharge an employee for a work slowdown. **Sitdown strike** A strike in which employees stop working and refuse to leave the employer's premises. Sitdown strikes helped unions organize workers in the automobile industry in the 1930s but are now rare. They are illegal under most circumstances. **Whipsaw strike** A work stoppage against a single member of a bargaining unit composed of several employers. Whipsaw strikes are legal and are used by unions to bring added pressure against the employer who experiences not only the strike but also competition from the employers who have not been struck. Employers may respond by locking out employees of all facilities that belong to members of the bargaining unit. Whipsaw strikes have commonly been used in the automobile industry. **Sympathy strike** A work stoppage designed to provide AID AND COMFORT to a related union engaged in an employment dispute. Although sympathy strikes are not illegal, unions can relinquish the right to use this tactic in a COLLECTIVE BARGAINING agreement. **Jurisdictional strike** A strike that arises from a dispute over which LABOR UNION is entitled to represent the employees. Jurisdictional strikes are unlawful under federal LABOR LAWS because the argument is between unions and not between a union and the employer.

#### **This acts as a resolvability standard. Debate has to make sense and be comparable for the judge to make a decision which means it’s an independent voter and outweighs.**

#### Implications:

#### [1] Stable advocacy – 1AR clarification delinks neg positions that prove why enforcement in a certain instance is bad by saying it isn’t their method of enforcement – wrecks neg ballot access and kills in depth clash – CX doesn’t check since it kills 1NC construction pre-round

#### [2] Prep skew – I don’t know what they will be willing to clarify until CX which means I could go 6 minutes planning to read a disad and then get screwed over in CX when they spec a different funding. This means that CX can’t check because the time in between is when I should be formulating my strat and waiting until then is the abuse. Key fairness because I won’t be able to use the strat I formulated if you skewed my prep and will have a time disadvantage

#### D. Voter

**Fairness is a voter—debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation. Education is a voter – it is the terminal impact of debate. Drop the debater—the abuse has already occurred and my time allocation has shifted—also the shell indicts your whole aff—justifies severance which skews my strat. Use competing interps—leads to a race to the top since we figure out the best possible norm and avoids judge intervention since there’s a clear briteline. No RVIs—**

**a. Baiting—they’ll just bait theory and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse and results in a chilling effect**

**b. its not logical—you don’t reward them for meeting the burden of being fair, especially on T debate where definitions are objective while your interp is subjective. Logic is a meta constraint on all args because it definitionally determines whether an argument is valid.**

## 2

#### Presumption and permissibility negates – a) more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways b) real world policies require positive justification before being adopted c) the aff has to prove an obligation which means lack of that obligation negates d) resolved in the resolution indicates they proactively did something, to negate that means that they aren’t resolved e) winning the nc proves since otherwise we’d be blindly deceived when skeptical f) to negate[[1]](#footnote-1) means to deny the truth of which means if the aff is false you vote neg g) permissibility can’t affirm since then anything would be ok which would justify racism – we should be safe and do nothing.

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 7 minutes of the 1NC and exacerbates the affirmative infinite prep time skew since I should be able to compensate by choosing – it’s the most logical since you don’t say vote for the player who shoots the most 3 points, the better player wins since debate is a game with rules given by how there’s a winner and loser. No arguments in the 1ar and 2ar so we can end debate quicker and go on with our personal live which o/w on probability b/c everyone does things outside debate. Answers collapse to truth testing since they require truth value i.e. truth testing is false requires proving that it is true that truth testing is false which means we’re also a prerequisite to your framing.

#### X Changing the structure of the activity can’t occur within the round i.e. in the middle of a chess match, it’s nonsensical to bring up new rules unless discussed outside of the act of playing the game – out of round rule-setting solves 100% of your offense.

#### Nothing leaves this round other than the result on the ballot which means even if there is a higher purpose, it doesn’t change anything, and you should just write whatever is important on the ballot and vote for me. Evaluate the debate after the 1nc because we each have 1 speech. Answering this triggers constitutivism since the win is necessary for your scholarship which means rules inside of the game matter otherwise negate on presumption.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical. 1ar theory isn’t reciprocal, you have 1 more speech.

#### [1] Workers are defined as “any of the sexually underdeveloped and usually sterile members of a colony of social ants, bees, wasps, or termites that perform most of the labor and protective duties of the colony” (https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/worker) but bees can’t strike so the resolution is incoherent

#### [2] To means “indicate movement” (Merriam Webster), but that means the resolution is incoherent because the word ought cannot move to the word provide. Means you negate on face because you can’t even know what the resolution looks like and an incoherent claim can’t have truth.

#### [3] Topicality-Inherency Double bind – either the aff defends a just government in which case it would already recognize the aff to strike so the aff has no inherency so you vote neg because there's no reason to do the aff or the aff doesn’t defend a just government in which case they’re not defending the resolution so you vote neg because they don't affirm – if the aff said nothing in the 1ac I couldn’t make arguments but you’d still vote neg because they didn’t affirm

## 3

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing

#### Prefer:

#### 1 – The argument from supervenience is true and coherently explains the grounding for morality. Thus, moral naturalism is true.

**Lutz and Lenman 18.** Lutz, Matthew and Lenman, James, "Moral Naturalism", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/naturalism-moral/>. //Massa

The first argument against normative non-naturalism concerns normative supervenience. **The normative supervenes on the natural; in all** metaphysically **possible worlds in which the natural facts are the same as** they are in **the actual world, the moral facts are the same** as well. **This** claim **has been called the “least controversial thesis in metaethics”** (Rosen forthcoming); **it is very widely accepted.** But it is also a striking fact that stands in need of some explanation. **For naturalists**, such an explanation is easy to provide: **the moral facts just are natural facts, so when we consider worlds that are naturally the same** as the actual world, **we will ipso facto be considering worlds that are morally the same** as the actual world. But for the non-naturalist, no such explanation seems available. In fact, **it seems** to be in principle **impossible for a non-naturalist to explain how the moral supervenes on the natural.** And if the non-naturalist can offer no explanation of this phenomenon that demands explanation, this is a heavy mark against non-naturalism (McPherson 2012).

#### Pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable.

Moen 16 [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI, brackets in original

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

#### [2] Actor specificity: util is the best for governments, which is the actor in the rez – multiple warrants:

#### [a] Governments must aggregate since every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### [b] States lack wills or intentions since policies are collective actions.

#### [c] No act-omission distinction—governments are responsible for everything in the public sphere so inaction is implicit authorization of action: they have to yes/no bills, which means everything collapse to aggregation.

#### [d] No intent-foresight distinction – the actions we take are inevitably informed by predictions from certain mental states, meaning consequences are a collective part of the will.

#### [e] Actor-specificity comes first since different agents have different ethical standings. Takes out util calc indicts since they’re empirically denied and link turns them because the alt would be no action.

#### [3] Extinction outweighs

Pummer 15 [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

#### [4] Ethical frameworks must be theoretically legitimate. Any standard is an interpretation of the words of the resolution-thus framework is functionally a topicality argument about how to define the terms of the resolution. My framework interprets ought as maximizing happiness. Prefer this definition:

#### [A] Ground: Both debaters are guaranteed access to ground to engage under util – ie Aff gets plans and advantages, while Neg gets disads and counterplans. Additionally, anything can function as a util impact as long as an external benefit is articulated, so all your offense applies. Other frameworks deny 1 side the ability to engage the other on both the impact and link level.

#### [B] Weighing ground: consequences lets us weigh the probability a scenario, its risk, scope, severity, etc. and we can even weigh between these standards. We can still run side constraints but they are compared to other impacts while other frameworks prevent weighing by making them absolute. Ow on resolvability because if there is framing mechanism that we don’t know what offense matters. That’s an independent voter: because the judge literally cannot make a decision

## 4

#### CP Text: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of all workers except for teachers to strike.

#### Biden made education a core priority in his post covid recovery plan and is investing billions of dollars-education is on the rise

USDE 4-29 Pandemic,, 4-29-2021, "100 Days of the Biden Administration: How the Department of Education Has Helped More Schools Safely Reopen and Meet Students Needs," No Publication, https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/100-days-biden-administration-how-department-education-has-helped-more-schools-safely-reopen-and-meet-students-needs//SJJK

During the first 100 days of the Biden Administration, the Department of Education's (ED) top priority has been to ensure students can return to schools safely, and has taken significant actions to help schools safely reopen for in-person instruction, address inequities exacerbated by the pandemic, and support the needs of all students, teachers, and staff. In less than three months, the Biden Administration has provided unprecedented resources to states and districts to achieve President Biden's goal of safely reopening the majority of K-8 schools for in-person learning and support students, families, teachers, and staff, and institutions of higher education during this challenging time. The Biden Administration has also proposed historic investments to education through the American Jobs Plan, the discretionary budget, and the American Families Plan, all to lead the country not just through recovery, but to transform our education system so students of all ages and backgrounds can access opportunities to receive a high-quality education and achieve their highest potential. The Biden Administration remains committed to accelerating this critical progress in the nation's reopening efforts.

#### Teacher strikes can be disastrous and hurt student growth.

**Norton and Hernandez 18** [Hilary and Tracy. *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*](http://www.bizfedlacounty.org/)*) and president of IMPOWER Inc.*. “Commentary: A teachers strike is bad for our students, families and economy ”. 10-10-2018. No Publication. http://laschoolreport.com/commentary-a-teachers-strike-is-bad-for-our-students-families-and-economy/.] SJ//VM

While a strike looms within our nation’s second-largest school district, the business community of Los Angeles urges the Los Angeles Unified School District and United Teachers Los Angeles to resolve their differences in a way that doesn’t put students at risk. As the organized, grassroots voice of the business community in Greater Los Angeles, BizFed works to support the public institutions that serve our community and the families that work to build our region’s economy. BizFed represents 390,000 businesses that employ nearly 4 million people throughout Los Angeles County. The majority of these employees are working to support their families, many of which include LAUSD students. It is important that the needs of students are placed first in the negotiations. Last week, BizFed wrote a letter to the LAUSD board and the UTLA executive officers urging them to do everything possible to avoid a strike. We received appreciative and positive feedback from LAUSD Board President Mónica García and Superintendent Austin Beutner as well as UTLA President Alex Caputo-Pearl. 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!

#### Education is needed to solve extinction.

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

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

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)