## NC

#### I negate that A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### First, discourse is the foundation of ethics. Moral frameworks are only justified and tested for truth via the process of rational argumentation and justification. Even if a theory does derive truth without language, it still relies on human expression to be articulated which concedes its authority.

#### Second, discourse must be undeniable. Even if a framework is logically justified, we can always ask “why be moral” or “why care” which prevents it from having universal authority since it can be denied. The only solution to this is to find a framework that produces performative contradiction, where denying its ethical truth is contradictory to discourse itself.

#### Thus the standard is constituency with Libertarianism, or the idea that freedom is valuable and we ought to refrain from coercion. Any attempt to justify a violation of property rights commits performative contradiction.

Marian Eabrasu, Research fellow at the GRANEM (Angers University), A Reply to the Current Critiques Formulated Against Hoppe’s Argumentation Ethics, 03/13/2009, <https://mises.org/library/reply-current-critiques-formulated-against-hoppe%E2%80%99s-argumentation-ethics> ///AHS PB

Hoppe observes that “the right to self-ownership” is very similar with the statement “I am alive.” One has to be not only a living person but she has to be also a non-coerced self-owner in order to deny the right to self-ownership. Hence, Hoppe purports to show that denying the right to self-ownership is self-contradictory: Such property right in one’s own body must be said to be justified a priori. For anyone who would try to justify any norm whatsoever would already have to presuppose an exclusive right to control over his [their] body as a valid norm simply in order to say “I propose such and such.” And anyone disputing such right, then, would become caught up in a practical contradiction, since arguing so would already implicitly have to accept the very norm which he was [they where] disputing. [Hoppe 2006, 342] Were this argument valid, libertarianism would be the only theory of justice that can be justified. By libertarianism it is intended the normative set of propositions derived from the self-ownership axiom. “In effect, this argument supports the natural rights position of libertarianism as espoused by the other master thinker of the modern libertarian movement, Murray N. Rothbard—above all in his Ethics of Liberty” (Hoppe 2006, 340–41). Showing that only the self-ownership axiom can pass the test of performative contradiction, justifies the preference for it. Libertarianism should be preferred to any other theory of justice, because only libertarianism is non-contradictory. To be sure, this fact does not impede conflicts to arise or non-libertarian solutions to be provided. Hoppe’s argument shows only that it would be absurd (i.e., self-contradictory) to adopt a non-libertarian ethics: I demonstrate that only the libertarian private property ethic can be justified argumentatively, because it is the praxeological presupposition of argumentation as such; and that any deviating, non-libertarian ethical proposal can be shown to be in violation of this demonstrated preference. Such a proposal can be made, of course, but its propositional content would contradict the ethic for which one demonstrated a preference by virtue of one’s own act of proposition-making, i.e., by the act of engaging in argumentation as such. […] Likewise, non-libertarian ethical proposals are falsified by the reality of actually proposing them. [Hoppe 2006, 341] If libertarianism is the correct ethical theory, the foremost political implication which follows from this idea is anarchy. As simple as the solution to the problem of social order is and as much as people in their daily lives intuitively recognize and act according to the ethics of private property just explained, this simple and undemanding solution implies some surprisingly radical conclusions. Apart from ruling out as unjustified all activities such as murder, homicide, rape, trespass, robbery, burglary, theft, and fraud, the ethics of private property is also incompatible with the existence of a state defined as an agency that possesses a compulsory territorial monopoly of ultimate decision-making (jurisdiction) and/or the right to tax. [Hoppe 2006, 388]

#### Prefer the standard:

#### 1] It’s a contradiction for the state to violate freedom since the government only derives its authority from people agreeing to follow it, but if a citizen decides they no longer want to follow the government, the government no longer has authority to regulate them.

#### 2] Goodness is subjective so only procedural ethics matter.

**Pidgen[[1]](#footnote-1),** For any naturalistic or metaphysical ‘X’, **if ‘good’ meant ‘X’, then** (i) ‘**X things are good’ would be a** barren **tautology, equivalent to** (ii) ‘**X things are X’ or (iii) ‘Good things are good’.** (1.2) For any naturalistic or metaphysical ‘X’, if (i) ‘X things are good’ were **a** barren **tautology**, it **would not provide a reason** for action (i.e. a reason **to promote X-ness**). (1.3) So for any naturalistic or metaphysical ‘X’, **either** (i) ‘X **things are good’ does not provide a reason for action** (i.e. a reason to promote X-ness), **or ‘good’ does not mean ‘X’.**

#### 3] Only Libertarianism can answer why be moral.

Bruno Verbeek, University of Leiden, Summarizes Naveson, Published in Liberty, Games and Contracts: Jan Narveson and the Defence of Libertarianism, Malcolm Murray (ed.). Ashgate, 2007. Pp. 273., <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/16519/Verbeek_Murray-Corrections.pdf?sequence=4> ///AHS PB

Narveson’s position can summed up in three fundamental claims. First, the justification of a political philosophy or indeed any normative ethical theory, requires contractarian foundations. All contractarians consider morality as the outcome of an agreement among relevant parties. More precise, moral norms are those rules that are agreed upon by agents in a suitably characterized bargaining situation. Contractarians share this starting point with other social contract theorists. However, contractarians differ from other social contract theories, like that of John Rawls, in that the latter treat such an agreement among rational agents as a heuristic instrument for identifying the content of morality. That is, authors like Rawls claim that moral norms are binding for reasons other than that they are agreed upon by agents in the original position. Narveson, like other contractarians, believes that agreement of some sort is necessary and sufficient for the normativity of such norms. (“Of some sort” because closer reading reveals that this social contract is not an actual agreement. Rather, it is “an agreement in the sense of a co-ordinated set of conditional dispositions”, see Narveson 1994.) The type of contractarianism that Narveson endorses is Hobbesian. Hobbesian contractarians hold that rational agents are primarily motivated to maximize what they regard as valuable. This could include many things, but among these self-interest figures prominently. Hobbesian contractarians regard morality as an answer to a problem. The problem is posed by what would happen under conditions of moral anarchy to rational creatures who are disposed to maximize their self-interest. Under such conditions, rational agents, who aim to maximize what they value, will compete with all means at their disposal for the scarce resources needed to realize this aim. Other agents will appear as actual or potential competitors and it is best to eliminate such competition as efficiently and effectively as possible. The result is a situation best modeled as an n-person prisoner’s dilemma, where a non-optimal equilibrium is realized. In such a situation, rational agents will realize that they can benefit each other. As Jan Narveson puts it, “first because we are vulnerable to the depredations of others, and second because we can all benefit from cooperation with others” (1988, 148). This will motivate the agents to start bargaining with the aim of arriving at an agreement to constrain this maximizing behavior and coordinate actions so as to benefit each other. Morality, for the Hobbesian contractiarian, is a form of self-imposed constraint – a rational constraint – on the pursuit of the maximization of value. Unlike Hobbes, Hobbesian contractarians do not regard morality as something that is enforced by a authoritarian state. Instead, the restrictions that morality poses on the unfettered pursuit of what one values are restrictions that rational agents can agree to in a rational bargaining process that aims to bring about an optimal mutually cooperative outcome. Moral constraints are those constraints it is rational to adopt provided others do so as well. The second fundamental claim of Narveson’s philosophy is that such Hobbesian contractarian starting points inevitably lead to a restricted list of rights and corresponding obligations that emphasize individual freedom. The corresponding political conclusion is that a legitimate state necessarily is a libertarian state. Narveson is a so-called right-libertarian (as opposed to left libertarians). Such libertarians typically argue for a small, non-authoritarian state in which basic liberties are rigorously respected, but nothing beyond this. As a consequence, right libertarians do not believe that the state has any business requiring citizens to support others beyond respecting the negative claim rights of others. The third claim of Narveson is typical for all right-libertarian political philosophy. In order to guarantee individual freedom, a legitimate state respects strong property rights and corresponding institutions (especially the market). That is to say, Narveson believes that individual freedom necessitates a robust respect for private property and the market.

#### [4] Only evaluate the intent of actions: A) Consequentialist ethics are incompatible with libertarianism since it would justify the state violating rights to achieve a desired end B) Inductive logic is infinitely regressive, since every induction about the world is justified through a previous induction, which doesn’t prove what will happen in the future C) consequences always trigger more consequences, so determining the final consequence is impossible and D) Util can never call certain things always wrong, since the ends would decide in that particular instance.

### Offense

#### [1] Unions violate property rights

#### Peter Levine, “The Libertarian Critique of Labor Unions”, Fall 2001, [http://www.peterlevine.ws/Libertarian\_Critique.pdf] // swickle

Libertarians strongly defend freedom of choice and association. Thus, when workers choose to act collectively, negotiate together, or voluntarily walk off the job, libertarians have no reasonable complaint--even if other people are harmed--because they support the right to make and exit voluntary partnerships. But **unions gain strength by overriding private rights. They** routinely **block anyone from working under a non-union contract, and** they **prevent employers from making offers**--even advantageous ones--to individual workers unless the union is informed and consents. **Unions declare strikes** and establish picket lines **to prevent customers and workers from entering company property**; they may fine employees who cross these lines. They also extract fees from all workers who are covered by their contracts. Although covered workers may avoid paying for certain union functions (such as lobbying) that are not germane to contract issues, they must pay for strikes and other activities that some of them oppose.

**[2] The right to strike necessarily involves violating the right to property and contract – it’s coercive, Gourevitch 16,** Alex Gourevitch “Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike.” Perspectives on Politics 14 (2016): 307 - 323. [https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/S1537592716000049]//LHP AV Accessed 7/4/21 recut AHS//NPR

A second problem follows on the first. **If workers have rights to the jobs they are striking then they must have some powers to enforce those rights**. **Such powers might include** mass picketing, secondary boycotts, sympathy strikes, **coercion and intimidation of replacement workers, even destruction or immobilization of property** – **the familiar panoply of strike actions**. While workers have sometimes defended such actions without using the specifically juridical language of ‘rights,’ in many cases they have used that kind of appeal.3 Even when they have not employed rights-discourse, they have invoked some related notion of demanding fair terms to their job (Frow, Frow and Katanka 1971). **Each and any of the above listed activities of a strike – pickets, boycotts, sympathy actions – are part of the way workers not only press their demands but claim their right to** 3 See James Gray Pope’s (1997) remarkable reconstruction of the way, in the 1920s, rights-discourse helped organize and sustain a ‘constitutional strike’ against attempts to curtail and outlaw the strike. **the job**. Strikers regularly implore other workers not to cross picket lines and take struck jobs. **These are more than speech-acts. At the outer edges, they amount to intimidation and coercion**. Or at least, workers claim the right to intimidate and coerce if the state will not itself enforce this aspect of their right to strike. Liberal societies rarely permit a group of individuals powers that come close and even cross over into rights of private coercion. It is no surprise that regulation and repression of these strike-related activities have been the source of some of the most serious episodes of strike-related violence in US and European history (Brecher 2014; Lambert 2005; Forbath 1991; Adamic 1971; Taft and Ross 1969; Liebknecht 1917). So, alongside the unclear basis for the strikers’ rights to their jobs, the problem for a liberal society is that this right seems to include private rights of coercion or at least troubling forms of social pressure. Yet there is more. **The standard strike potentially threatens the fundamental freedoms of three specific groups**. • **Freedom of contract** **It conflicts with the freedom of contract of those replacement workers who would be willing to take the job** on terms that strikers will not. Note, this is not a possible conflict but a necessary one. **Strikers claim the job is theirs, which means replacements have no right** to it. But replacements claim everyone should have the equal freedom to contract with an employer for a job. • **Property rights A strike seriously interferes with the employer’s property rights**. **The point of a strike is to stop production**. **But the point of a property right is that, at least in the owner’s core area of activity, nobody else has the right to interfere with his use of that property**. **The** **strikers**, by claiming the employer has no right to hire replacements and thus no way of employing his property profitably, **effectively render the employer unfree to use his property as he sees fit**. To be clear, **strikers claim the right** not just to block replacement workers, but **to prevent the employer from putting his property to work without their permission**. For instance, New Deal ‘sit-down’ strikes made it impossible to operate factories, which was one reason why the courts claimed it violated employer property rights (Atleson 1983, 46-48). Similarly, during the Seattle general strike in 1919, the General Strike Committee forced owners to ask permission to engage in certain productive activities – permission it often denied (Brecher 2014, 106-111). • Freedom of association Though the conceptual issues here are complicated, a strike can seriously constrain a worker’s freedom of association. It does so most seriously when the strike is a group right, in which only authorized representatives of the union may call a strike. In this case, the right to strike is not the individual’s right in the same way that, say, the freedom to join a church or volunteer organization is. Moreover, the strike can be coercively imposed even on dissenting members, especially when the dissenters work in closed or union shops. That is because refusal to follow the strike leads to dismissal from the union, which would mean loss of the job in union or closed shops. The threat of losing a job is usually considered a coercive threat. So not only might workers be forced to join unions – depending on the law – but also they might be forced to go along with one of the union’s riskiest collective actions. **Note that each one of these concerns follows directly from the nature of the right to strike itself**. **Interference with freedom of contract, property rights**, and the freedom of association **are all part and parcel of defending the right** that striking workers claim to the ‘their’ jobs. These are difficult forms of coercive interference to justify on their own terms and **they appear to rest on a claim without foundation**. Just what right do workers have to jobs that they refuse to perform?

## DA

**Business confidence high now**

**Conference Board 5/19** Conference Board. “The Conference Board Measure of CEO Confidence™.” CEO Confidence Hit All-Time High in Q2 | The Conference Board, 19 May 2021, www.conference-board.org/research/CEO-Confidence/.

Another Quarter of Soaring Optimism Leaves **CEO Confidence at Highest Level** since Measure began in 1976 The Conference Board Measure of CEO Confidence™ in collaboration with **The Business Council improved further in the second quarter of 2021, following a sharp increase in Q1.** The measure now stands at 82, up from 73. This marks the highest level of CEO confidence recorded since the measure began in 1976. (A reading above 50 points reflects more positive than negative responses.) CEOs’ assessment of current economic conditions rose substantially, after slightly moderating last quarter. In Q2, **94 percent said conditions are better compared to six months ago,** up from 67 percent in Q1. CEOs also expressed greater optimism about conditions in their own industries, with 89 percent reporting better conditions compared to six months ago, up from 68 percent in Q1. Historically high expectations in Q1 climbed even further in Q2: **88 percent of CEOs expect economic conditions to improve over the next six months,** up from 82 percent. “This quarter’s survey marks **a remarkable turnaround from a year ago**—when CEO confidence reached a nadir of 34 at the height of COVID-19’s first wave,” said Dana Peterson, Chief Economist of The Conference Board. **“For CEOs, the challenge of navigating a once-in-a-century pandemic is receding, as the focus turns to hiring and investing to compete in an economy poised to see the fastest growth in decades over the months ahead.” In the job market, the pace of hiring is expected to accelerate over the next 12 months, with 54 percent of CEOs expecting to expand their workforce, up from 47 percent in Q1.** While the outlook for wages was virtually unchanged in Q2, more CEOs are reporting difficulty finding qualified workers—57 percent in Q2, up from 50 percent in Q1. “Optimism is surging in C-suites and boardrooms across industries,” said Roger W. Ferguson, Jr., Vice Chairman of The Business Council and Trustee of The Conference Board. “For CEOs, the challenge is no longer staying afloat, but keeping pace—in particular, with a likely resurgence of the labor shortages experienced before the pandemic.” Current Conditions CEOs’ assessment of general economic conditions rose sharply in Q2: 94% of CEOs reported economic conditions were better compared to six months ago, up from 67% in Q1. Only 2% said conditions were worse, down from 10%. CEOs were similarly optimistic about conditions in their own industries in Q2: 89% of CEOs reported that conditions in their industries were better compared to six months ago, up from 68%. Only 4% said conditions in their own industries were worse, down from 8%. Future Conditions Expectations about the short-term economic outlook improved further in Q2: 88% percent of CEOs said they expect economic conditions to improve over the next six months, up from 82% in Q1. Only 1% expect conditions to worsen, down from 7%. CEOs’ expectations regarding short-term prospects in their own industries also improved in Q2: 81% of CEOs expect conditions in their own industry to improve over the next six months, up from 78%. Only 4% expected conditions to worsen, down from 7%. Capital Spending, Employment, Recruiting, and Wages The survey also gauged CEOs’ expectations about four key actions their companies plan on taking over the next 12 months. Capital Spending: 47% of CEOs expect to increase their capital budgets in the year ahead, up from 45% in Q1. Employment: 54% of CEOs expect to expand their workforce, up from 47% in Q1. Hiring Qualified People: 57% of CEOs report some problems attracting qualified workers, up from 50% in Q1. Notably, 28% report difficulties that cut across the organization, rather than concentrated in a few key areas—up from 18% in Q1. Wages: **37% of CEOs expect to increase wages by 3% or more over the next year,** virtually unchanged from 36% in Q1.

**A shift toward pro-union policies cause fear in business**

John **DiNardo** University of Michigan, Ann Arbor and NBER David S. **Lee** UC Berkeley and NBER https://www.princeton.edu/~davidlee/wp/unionbf.pdf

It is widely understood that **unions raise the cost of labor by raising members’ wages above market rates**.1 Unions also **impose other costs on employers - limiting discretion in hiring and firing, for example, and altering the structure of pay differentials across skill groups**. A key question for understanding the social costs of unionization is whether the **wage premiums and other costs** of unionism **create large or small distortions in the allocation of labor**.2 These **distortions can take the form of reduced employment at unionized firms, or most dramatically, an accelerated pace of business failures**. The potentially **adverse effects of unions on firm survival are acknowledged by employers and employees alike**. During union organizing drives, **firms routinely threaten to close a plant if the union drive is successful** [Bronfenbrenner 2000]. Employees seem to take these threats seriously: the risk of plant closure is cited as the leading cause of union withdrawal from organizing attempts [Commission for Labor Cooperation 1997]. Such **risks are arguably higher now, in light of rapidly expanding trade with low-wage countries such as China and Mexico, and increasing international capital mobility**.

**Business confidence dictates growth**

**McQuarie 16** McQuarie, Economic risk consulting firm, 5 factors that impact business and consumer confidence, 25 May 2016 <https://www.macquarie.com/au/advisers/expertise/market-insights/business-consumer-confidence-australia> TR

In 1933, US President Franklin D. Roosevelt pointedly noted that "**confidence... thrives on** honesty, on honour, **on the sacredness of obligations**, on faithful protection and on unselfish performance. **Without them it cannot live**". And over 80 years later these words still resonate with political, policy and business leaders as they grapple with increasingly fickle cycles of consumer and business confidence. To be fair, global policymakers are currently confronting a perplexing set of factors in the aftermath of the financial crisis and major central banks' deployment of unconventional monetary policy via unprecedented asset purchase programs and negative interest rates. Arguably, the crisis of 2008-09 and its legacy continue to cast some doubt on the effectiveness and accountability of policymaking institutions in the major developed economies. Confidence levels in the major developed economies have also been influenced by concerns about the socioeconomic consequences of the unrelenting pressure for ‘structural change’ in an increasingly competitive global economic system. At the household/consumer level, a key concern has been persistently high levels of unemployment faced in some regions and subdued income growth in developed economies, while for businesses, sluggish demand and highly competitive operating conditions continue to influence perceptions of resilience and confidence. Consequently, as the global economy moves into the second half of 2016 it is important to understand the causes and consequences of shifts in consumer and business confidence and the possible implications for the business cycle and macroeconomic policy settings. Confidence may be a case of shifting sands With policymakers in the major economies working **hard to restore** and maintain **confidence** levels and shifts in sentiment indicators playing a **key role** in risk assessments of investors, it is worthwhile to consider the various influences on this qualitative economic measure. Our analysis of the various indicators of consumer and business confidence that are regularly published highlight several common factors that have the potential to cause **marked shifts** in sentiment; including: Changes in interest rates and/or exchange rates, particularly if they are **rapid**, large **and unexpected** Swings in the business cycle and associated movements in employment/unemployment levels and business investment intentions Shifts in the relative prices of nondiscretionary goods and services, notably petrol, healthcare, education and utilities prices Large external economic and/or financial shocks, such as the financial crisis of 2008/09 and the Eurozone sovereign debt crisis of 2010/11 **Announced policy shifts** in the stance of government fiscal policy, including large structural spending cuts or increases/decreases in taxation rates. Interestingly, it is widely accepted by economists that the financial economy operating via interest rates and exchange rates acts as a buffer for the real economy in terms of external shocks, but this effect can often be magnified due to the out-sized impact on consumer and business confidence. For example, Australia was not directly affected by either the financial crisis or the subsequent Eurozone debt crisis, but on both occasions a considerable upsurge in general anxiety and slumping confidence were recorded. Australian households and businesses reported concerns about the economy's vulnerability in the face of unprecedented upheaval in global financial markets. Not surprisingly, in some quarters concerns continue to be expressed that small open economies such as Australia and New Zealand often experience **disproportionate reactions** to economic and financial disturbances that **emanate from** much larger and more complex economies, including **the US**, the Eurozone, Japan, and China. To be sure, we are not suggesting that economic policymakers should maintain inappropriate macro policy settings in order to buoy consumer and business confidence. Rather, the **announcement and implementation of shifts in** key macro **policy** needs to be sensitive to the psychological impact on households and firms in the real economy. It is the need to manage psychology that has led the major central banks to bolster their policy 'forward guidance' activities, as they fine-tune strategies to eventually end a period of extraordinary monetary policy accommodation. It's not all in the mind as sentiment shapes activity Although it is often said that **'confidence can turn on a dime'**, this should not be taken as diminishing the role of sentiment in **shaping economic activity** and in turn the **path of business cycles**. The power of confidence was **patently demonstrated in** late **2008** with the collapse of Lehman Brothers and the subsequent slump in global consumer and business sentiment. This was accompanied by an **unprecedented collapse** in global trade volumes, industrial production, investment and importantly risk-taking. It is estimated that in the major developed economies, including Australia and New Zealand, consumer spending contributes up to two thirds of aggregate demand, based on income levels or changes, buying and spending trends, and underlying economic conditions. If we consider credit and liquidity to be the **life-blood of the economic system**, then it is reasonable to regard confidence as the **oxygen that sustains the system.** So heightened economic anxiety and languishing confidence will have manifest impacts on the health and wellbeing of the economy, often determining whether or not it can reach and sustain its long term potential rates of growth. Recent experience indicates that there are several important consequences of low and declining levels of confidence, including: unusually high household and business savings rates, including the hoarding of capital by financial and nonfinancial firms subdued nominal income growth and tepid private sector credit growth widespread household deleveraging declining business investment spending and weak employment growth dominance of short-term thinking and absence of longer-term strategic activity risk of a decline in the economy’s structural growth rate and associated deterioration in productivity growth. Therefore, economies facing 'crises of confidence' may find if this prevails it will undermine productive capacity and prove to be 'growth limiting'. In this event, it could lead to deterioration in living standards as the base of economic activity gradually contracts and the willingness and capacity to engage in risk-taking is curtailed.

**Nuclear War**

**Tønnesson 15** Stein Tønnesson, PhD from the University of Oslo, is research professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo(PRIO), adjunct professor at the Department of Peace and Conflict Research,Uppsala University where he leads a six-year research programme on the East AsianPeace, associate editor for Asia in the Journal of Peace Research, International Area Studies Review, 2015, Vol. 18(3), “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace”, 297–311

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

**Nuke war causes extinction**

**PND 16**. internally citing Zbigniew Brzezinski, Council of Foreign Relations and former national security adviser to President Carter, Toon and Robock’s 2012 study on nuclear winter in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Gareth Evans’ International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament Report, Congressional EMP studies, studies on nuclear winter by Seth Baum of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute and Martin Hellman of Stanford University, and U.S. and Russian former Defense Secretaries and former heads of nuclear missile forces, brief submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, Open-Ended Working Group on nuclear risks. A/AC.286/NGO/13. 05-03-2016. <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/OEWG/2016/Documents/NGO13.pdf> //Re-cut by Elmer

Consequences human survival 12. Even if the 'other' side does NOT launch in response the smoke from 'their' burning cities (incinerated by 'us') will still make 'our' country (and the rest of the world) **uninhabitable**, potentially inducing global famine lasting up to **decades**. **Toon and Robock** note in ‘Self Assured Destruction’, in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists 68/5, 2012, th1AR - AT: 13. “A nuclear war between Russia and the United States, even after the arsenal reductions planned under New START, could produce a nuclear winter. Hence, an attack by either side could be suicidal, resulting in **self assured destruction**. Even a 'small' nuclear war between India and Pakistan, with each country detonating 50 Hiroshima-size atom bombs--only about 0.03 percent of the global nuclear arsenal's explosive power--as air bursts in urban areas, could produce so much smoke that temperatures would fall below those of the Little Ice Age of the fourteenth to nineteenth centuries, shortening the growing season around the world and threatening the global food supply. Furthermore, there would be massive ozone depletion, allowing more **ultraviolet** radiation to reach Earth's surface. **Recent studies** predict that agricultural production in parts of the **U**nited **S**tates and **China** would decline by about **20 percent** for four years, and by 10 percent for a decade.” 14. A conflagration involving USA/NATO forces and those of Russian federation would most likely cause the deaths of most/nearly all/**all humans** (and severely impact/extinguish **other species**) as well as destroying the delicate interwoven techno-structure on which latter-day 'civilization' has come to depend. Temperatures would drop to below those of the last ice-age for up to 30 years as a result of the lofting of up to 180 million tonnes of very black soot into the stratosphere where it would remain for decades. 15. Though human ingenuity and resilience shouldn't be underestimated, human survival itself is arguably problematic, to put it mildly, under a 2000+ warhead USA/Russian federation scenario. 16. The Joint Statement on Catastrophic Humanitarian Consequences signed October 2013 by 146 governments mentioned 'Human Survival' no less than 5 times. The most recent (December 2014) one gives it a highly prominent place. **Gareth Evans**’ ICNND (International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament) Report made it clear that it saw the threat posed by nuclear weapons use as one that at least threatens what we now call 'civilization' and that potentially **threatens human survival with an immediacy that even climate change does not**, though we can see the results of climate change here and now and of course the immediate post-nuclear results for Hiroshima and Nagasaki as well.

## DA

**Global tech innovation high now.**

**Mercury News et al 6/4** [Mercury News and East Bay Times Editorial Boards, June 4, 2021, “Editorial: How America can Win the Global Tech War” <https://www.mercurynews.com/2021/06/04/editorial-why-silicon-valley-needs-endless-frontier-bill/> //gord0]

The nation that wins the global tech race will dominate the 21st century. This has been true since the 1800s. Given the rapid pace of innovation and tech’s impact on our economy and defense capabilities in the last decade, there is ample evidence to suggest that the need for investment in tech research and development has never been greater. China has been closing the tech gap in recent years by making bold investments in tech with the intent of overtaking the United States. This is a tech war we cannot afford to lose. It’s imperative that Congress pass the Endless Frontier Act and authorize the biggest R&D tech investment in the United States since the Apollo years. Rep. Ro Khanna, D-Santa Clara, made a massive increase in science and technology investment a major part of his platform while campaigning for a seat in Congress in 2016. Now the co-author of the 600-page legislation is on the cusp of pushing through a bipartisan effort that has been years in the making. Khanna and his co-authors, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., Sen. Todd Young, R-Ind., and Rep. Mike Gallagher, R-Wisc., are shepherding the bill through the Senate, which is expected to approve it sometime later this month. That would set up a reconciliation debate between the House and Senate that would determine the bill’s final language. The ultimate size of the investment is still very much up in the air. Khanna would like Congress to authorize $100 billion over a five-year period for critical advancements in artificial intelligence, biotechnology, cybersecurity, semiconductors and other cutting-edge technologies. The Senate is talking of knocking that number down to $50 billion or $75 billion. They should be reminded of China Premier Li Keqiang’s March announcement that China would increase its research and development spending by an additional 7% per year between 2021 and 2025. The United States still outspends China in R&D, spending $612 billion on research and development in 2019, compared to China’s $514 billion. But the gap is narrowing. At the turn of the century, China was only spending $33 billion a year on R&D, while the United States was spending nearly 10 times that amount. The bill would authorize 10 technology hubs throughout the nation designed to help build the infrastructure, manufacturing facilities and workforce needed to help meet the nation’s tech goals. Building tech centers throughout the United States should also create more support for the industry across the country. Tech’s image has taken a beating in recent years — the emergence of the term “Big Tech” is hardly a positive development — and the industry will need all the support it can muster in Congress. The United States continues to have a crucial tech edge over its competitors, most notably China. The only way we can hope to win the 21st century is to make significant investments in research and development that will spark the next wave of innovation.

**Violent strike efforts are increasing – they slow innovation, specifically in the tech sector.**

**Hanasoge 16** [Chaithra; Senior Research Analyst, Market Researcher, Consumer Insights, Strategy Consulting; “The Union Strikes: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly,” Supply Wisdom; April/June 2016 (Doesn’t specifically say but this is the most recent event is cites); https://www.supplywisdom.com/resources/the-union-strikes-the-good-the-bad-and-the-ugly/]//SJWen

The result: Verizon conceded to several of the workers’ demands including hiring union workers, protection against outsourcing of call-center jobs, and employee benefits such as salary hikes and higher pension contributions, among others and thus bringing an end to the strike in June.

The repercussion: The strike witnessed **several instances** of **social disorder**, **violence** and **clashes**, ultimately calling for third party intervention (Secretary of Labor – Thomas Perez) to initiate negotiations between the parties. Also, as a result of the strike, Verizon reported **lower** than **expected revenues** in the **second quarter of 2016**.

Trade unions/ labor unions aren’t just this millennia’s product and has been in vogue since times immemorial. **Unions**, to **ensure fairness** to the working class, have **gone on strike for better working conditions** and employee benefits since the **industrial revolution** and are as strong today as they were last century. With the **advent of technology and advancement in artificial intelligence**, machines are grabbing the jobs which were once the bastion of the humans. So, questions that arise here are, what relevance do unions have in today’s work scenario? And, are the strikes organized by them avoidable?

As long as the concept of labor exists and employees feel that they are not receiving their fair share of dues, unions will exist and thrive. Union protests in most cases cause work stoppages, and in certain cases, disruption of law and order. Like in March 2016, public servants at Federal Government **departments across Australia** went on a series of **strikes** over failed pay negotiations, **disrupting operations** of many **government departments** for a few days.  Besides such direct effects, there are many **indirect effects** as well such as **strained employee relations**, **slower work processes**, **lesser productivity** and **unnecessary legal hassles**.

Also, union strikes can **never be taken too lightly** as they have prompted major overturn of decisions, on a few occasions. Besides the **Verizon incident** that was a **crucial example** of this, nationwide strikes were witnessed in India in March and April this year when the national government introduced reforms related to the withdrawal regulations and interest rate of employee provident fund, terming it as ‘anti-working class’. This compelled the government to withhold the reform for further review. In France, strike against labor law reforms in May turned violent, resulting in riots and significant damage to property. The incident prompted the government to consider modifications to the proposed reforms.

However, aside from employee concerns, such incidents are also determined by a number of other factors such as the country’s political scenario, economy, size of the overall workforce and the unions, history of unionization, labor laws, and culture. For example, it is a popular saying that the French are always on strike as per tradition (although recent statistics indicate a decline in frequency). In a communist government like China, strikes have steadily risen in number. In 2015, China Labor Bulletin (CLB), a Hong Kong-based workers’ rights group recorded 2,700 incidents of strikes and protests, compared to 1,300 incidents in 2014. Most of them have stemmed out of failure by the government to respect the basic rights of employees and address labor concerns.

Interestingly, unions have **not been able to gain a strong foothold** in the **IT-BPO industry**. While many countries do have a separate union to represent workers from the sector, incidents of strikes like Verizon **have been relatively lo**w.  However, workplace regulations, in addition to other factors mentioned could be a trigger for such incidents, even if on a smaller scale. For example, a recent survey that **interviewed several BPO employees** in India revealed that while **forming a union** in the BPO sector was **difficult**, irksome workplace regulations such as constant surveillance, irregular timings and incentives have prompted employees to express their resentment in smaller ways such as corruption of internal servers and so on.  Such risks are further enhanced in a city like Kolkata, which carries a strong trade union culture.

**[did not finish da, just implicated under rawls]**

1. Pigden, Charles. “Russell’s Moral Philosophy.” SEP. 2007. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)