### 1NC – Framework

#### I negate the resolution, Resolved: A just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### I value morality, defined as “the principles concerning the distinction between right and wrong or good and bad behavior.”[[1]](#footnote-1)

#### The value criterion is maximizing expected well-being. There are three reasons to prefer this standard –

#### 1] Onlypleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable. People consistently regard pleasure and pain as good reasons for action, all other values can be explained in relation.

**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

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] Governmental Necessity – governments have to aggregate since policymakers only know averages and aggregates. It’s impossible to satisfy all individuals in a society since there are so many, so we should try to maximize happiness instead of trying to please every individual person.

#### 3] Respect for humans as ends justifies utilitarianism.

**Cummiskey 90** (Cummiskey, David. Associate professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago. “Kantian Consequentiaism.” Ethics 100 (April 1990), University of Chicago. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2381810>)

We must not obscure the issue by characterizing this type of case as the sacrifice of individuals for some abstract “social entity.” It is not a question of some persons having to bear the cost for some elusive “overall social good.” Instead, the question is whether some persons must bear the inescapable cost for the sake of other persons. Robert Nozick, for example, argues that “to use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has.” But why is this not equally true of all those whom we do not save through our failure to act? By emphasizing solely the one who must bear the cost if we act, we fail to sufficiently respect and take account of the many other separate persons, each with only one life, who will bear the cost of our inaction. In such a situation, what would a conscientious Kantian agent, an agent motivated by the unconditional value of rational beings, choose? A morally good agent recognizes that the basis of all particular duties is the principle that “rational nature exists as an end in itself”. Rational nature as such is the supreme objective end of all conduct. If one truly believes that all rational beings have an equal value, then the rational solution to such a dilemma involves maximally promoting the lives and liberties of as many rational beings as possible. In order to avoid this conclusion, the non-consequentialist Kantian needs to justify agent-centered constraints. As we saw in chapter 1, however, even most Kantian deontologists recognize that agent-centered constraints require a non- value-based rationale. But we have seen that Kant’s normative theory is based on an unconditionally valuable end. How can a concern for the value of rational beings lead to a refusal to sacrifice rational beings even when this would prevent other more extensive losses of rational beings? If the moral law is based on the value of rational beings and their ends, then what is the rationale for prohibiting a moral agent from maximally promoting these two tiers of value? If I sacrifice some for the sake of others, I do not use them arbitrarily, and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings. Persons may have “dignity, that is, an unconditional and incomparable worth” that transcends any market value, but persons also have a fundamental equality that dictates that some must sometimes give way for the sake of others. The concept of the end-in-itself does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others.

### 1NC – DA

#### Contention 1 is the economy.

#### Economy recovery and business confidence are high now.

Michael Halloran writes on 9/14 [Michael; 2021; M.B.A. from Carnegie Mellon University, former aerospace research engineer, Equity Strategist; Janney, “Despite Potential Headwinds, Key Labor Market Indicators Bode Well for the Economy,” https://www.janney.com/latest-articles-commentary/all-insights/insights/2021/09/14/despite-potential-headwinds-key-labor-market-indicators-bode-well-for-the-economy]

However, we remain encouraged by the recovery that has been unfolding since the economy began reopening. We continue to see improvement in important cyclical sectors of the economy while consumers are historically healthy and still have pent-up demand. Business confidence has rebounded with strong corporate profits that should support further capital spending and hiring (there are now more job openings than there are unemployed people by a record amount). We expect to see further improvement in the international backdrop, supported by unprecedented fiscal and monetary stimulus and accelerating rates of vaccination. Although the impact of the Delta wave is still being felt, recent evidence confirms the effectiveness of vaccines in limiting deaths and hospitalizations. With the pace of vaccination now picking up in the areas most impacted by this wave—Asia and Australia—the case for fading headwinds leading to improving economic growth later this year remains positive. The signals from financial markets themselves remain positive. Despite consolidating last week, stocks remain near record highs while the 10-year Treasury remains well above the lows of earlier this summer when concerns about Delta first emerged. These factors support our view of a durable economic recovery from the pandemic that should continue supporting stock prices. A healthy labor market is a critical element for a sustainable recovery that supports profit growth and last week’s news from the labor market remains encouraging.

#### They hurt critical core industries that is necessary for economic growth

McElroy 19 John McElroy 10-25-2019 "Strikes Hurt Everybody" <https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody> (MPA at McCombs school of Business)

This creates a **poisonous relationship** between the company and its workforce. Many GM hourly workers don’t identify as GM employees. They identify as UAW members. And they see the union as the source of their jobs, not the company. It’s an unhealthy dynamic that puts GM at a disadvantage to non-union automakers in the U.S. like Honda and Toyota, where workers take pride in the company they work for and the products they make. Attacking the company in the media also **drives away customers**. Who wants to buy a shiny new car from a company that’s accused of underpaying its workers and treating them unfairly? Data from the Center for Automotive Research (CAR) in Ann Arbor, MI, show that **GM loses market share during strikes and never gets it back**. GM lost two percentage points during the 1998 strike, which in today’s market would represent **a loss of 340,000 sales**. Because GM reports sales on a quarterly basis we’ll only find out at the end of December if it lost market share from this strike. UAW members say one of their greatest concerns is job security. But causing a company to lose market share is a sure-fire path to **more plant closings and layoffs**. Even so, unions are incredibly important for boosting wages and benefits for working-class people. GM’s UAW-represented workers earn considerably more than their non-union counterparts, about $26,000 more per worker, per year, in total compensation. Without a union they never would have achieved that. Strikes are a powerful weapon for unions. They usually are the only way they can get management to accede to their demands. If not for the power of collective bargaining and the threat of a strike, management would largely ignore union demands. If you took away that threat, management would pay its workers peanuts. Just ask the Mexican line workers who are paid $1.50 an hour to make $50,000 BMWs. But strikes don’t just hurt the people walking the picket lines or the company they’re striking against. They hurt **suppliers, car dealers and the communities located near the plants.** The Anderson Economic Group estimates that 75,000 workers at supplier companies were temporarily laid off because of the GM strike. Unlike UAW picketers, those supplier workers won’t get any strike pay or an $11,000 contract signing bonus. No, most of them lost close to a month’s worth of wages, which must be financially devastating for them. GM’s suppliers also lost a lot of money. So now they’re cutting budgets and delaying capital investments to make up for the lost revenue, which is a further drag on the economy. According to CAR, the communities and states where GM’s plants are located collectively lost a couple of hundred million dollars in payroll and tax revenue. Some economists warn that if the strike were prolonged it could knock the state of Michigan – home to GM and the UAW – **into a recession.** That prompted the governor of Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer, to call GM CEO Mary Barra and UAW leaders and urge them to settle as fast as possible. So, while the UAW managed to get a nice raise for its members, the strike left a path of destruction in its wake. That’s not fair to the innocent bystanders who will never regain what they lost. John McElroyI’m not sure how this will ever be resolved. I understand the need for collective bargaining and the threat of a strike. But there’s got to be a better way to get workers a raise without torching the countryside.

#### And as Tenza notes in their 2020 case study on South Africa that strikes are harmful to the economy.

**Tenza writes:** [Mlungisi Tenza (Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal). “The effects of violent strikes on the economy of a developing country: a case of South Africa.” Obiter vol.41 n.3 Port Elizabeth 2020. JDN. http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci\_arttext&pid=S1682-58532020000300004]

When South Africa obtained democracy in 1994, there was a dream of a better country with a new vision for industrial relations.5 However, the number of violent strikes that have bedevilled this country in recent years seems to have shattered-down the aspirations of a better South Africa. South Africa recorded 114 strikes in 2013 and 88 strikes in 2014, which cost the country about R6.1 billion according to the Department of Labour.6 The impact of these strikes has been hugely felt by the mining sector, particularly the platinum industry. The biggest strike took place in the platinum sector where about 70 000 mineworkers' downed tools for better wages. Three major platinum producers (Impala, Anglo American and Lonmin Platinum Mines) were affected. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 25 June 2014. Business Day reported that "the five-month-long strike in the platinum sector pushed the economy to the brink of recession".7 This strike was closely followed by a four-week strike in the metal and engineering sector. All these strikes (and those not mentioned here) were characterised with violence accompanied by damage to property, intimidation, assault and sometimes the killing of people. Statistics from the metal and engineering sector showed that about 246 cases of intimidation were reported, 50 violent incidents occurred, and 85 cases of vandalism were recorded.8 Large-scale unemployment, soaring poverty levels and the dramatic income inequality that characterise the South African labour market provide a broad explanation for strike violence.9 While participating in a strike, workers' stress levels leave them feeling frustrated at their seeming powerlessness, which in turn provokes further violent behaviour.10 These strikes are not only violent but take long to resolve. Generally, a lengthy strike has a negative effect on employment, reduces business confidence and increases the risk of economic stagflation. In addition, such strikes have a major setback on the growth of the economy and investment opportunities. It is common knowledge that consumer spending is directly linked to economic growth. At the same time, if the economy is not showing signs of growth, employment opportunities are shed, and poverty becomes the end result. The economy of South Africa is in need of rapid growth to enable it to deal with the high levels of unemployment and resultant poverty. One of the measures that may boost the country's economic growth is by attracting potential investors to invest in the country. However, this might be difficult as investors would want to invest in a country where there is a likelihood of getting returns for their investments. The wish of getting returns for investment may not materialise if the labour environment is not fertile for such investments as a result of, for example, unstable labour relations. Therefore, investors may be reluctant to invest where there is an unstable or fragile labour relations environment.

#### Reduced economic growth negatively harms the quality of life for all involved long term, particularly workers and the bottom line. The Economic Policy Institute writes in 2009:

**EPI 09** [Economic Policy Institute, 9-30-2009, "Economic scarring: The long-term impacts of the recession," https://www.epi.org/publication/bp243/]

Economic recessions are often portrayed as short-term events. However, as a substantial body of economic literature shows, the consequences of high unemployment, falling incomes, and reduced economic activity can have lasting consequences. For example, job loss and falling incomes can force families to delay or forgo a college education for their children. Frozen credit markets and depressed consumer spending can stop the creation of otherwise vibrant small businesses. Larger companies may delay or reduce spending on R&D. In each of these cases, an economic recession can lead to “scarring”—that is, long-lasting damage to individuals’ economic situations and the economy more broadly. This report examines some of the evidence demonstrating the long-run consequences of recessions. Findings include: Educational achievement: Unemployment and income losses can reduce educational achievement by threatening early childhood nutrition; reducing families’ abilities to provide a supportive learning environment (including adequate health care, summer activities, and stable housing); and by forcing a delay or abandonment of college plans. Opportunity: Recession-induced job and income losses can have lasting consequences on individuals and families. The increase in poverty that will occur as a result of the recession, for example, will have lasting consequences for kids, and will impose long-lasting costs on the economy. Private investment: Total non-residential investment is down by 20% from peak levels through the second quarter of 2009. The reduction in investment will lead to reduced production capacity for years to come. Furthermore, since technology is often embedded in new capital equipment, the investment slowdown can also be expected to reduce the adoption of new innovations. Entrepreneurial activity and business formation: New and small businesses are often at the forefront of technological advancement. With the credit crunch and the reduction in consumer demand, small businesses are seeing a double squeeze. For example, in 2008, 43,500 businesses filed for bankruptcy, up from 28,300 businesses in 2007 and more than double the 19,700 filings in 2006. Only 21 active firms had an initial public offering in 2008, down from an average of 163 in the four years prior. There is also substantial evidence that economic outcomes are passed across generations. As such, economic hardships for parents will mean more economic hurdles for their children. While it is often said that deficits can cause transfers of wealth from future generations of taxpayers to the present, this cost must also be compared with the economic consequences of recessions that are also passed to future generations. This analysis also suggests that efforts to stimulate the economy can be very effective over both the short- and long-run. Using a simple illustrative accounting framework, it is shown that an economic stimulus can lead to a short-run boost in output that outweighs the additional interest costs of the associated debt increase. This is especially true over a short horizon. A recession, therefore, should not be thought of as a one-time event that stresses individuals and families for a couple of years. Rather, economic downturns will impact the future prospects of all family members, including children, and will have consequences for years to come.

### 1NC – CP

#### Contention 2 is the counter-advocacy – A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to participate in final offer arbitration.

#### Final offer arbitration incentivizes reasonableness amongst parties and minimizes time and money wasted – solves the aff but does it better.

**Max Bazerman and Daniel Kahneman write in 2016** [Max H. Bazerman and Daniel Kahneman, Harvard Business Review, September 2016, "What Negotiators Can Learn from Baseball Salary Arbitrations," <https://hbr.org/2016/09/how-to-make-the-other-side-play-fair>] //DD PT

It would be to everyone’s advantage if parties routinely came to a negotiation with a reasonable offer in hand: If starting positions are realistic, the offers will be more or less aligned, and any negotiation that follows should be relatively civil, speedy, and fair. But how can a negotiator who wants to be fair from the start ensure that his or her counterpart will be reasonable as well? This question inspired us to propose the final-offer arbitration challenge, a new negotiation strategy for reaching fair agreements efficiently, even when dealing with seemingly unreasonable opponents. Leveraging an approach first applied in labor negotiations in the 1960s, the strategy allows one side to encourage reasonableness on the part of the other by making a demonstrably fair offer at the outset and then, if the other side is unreasonable, challenging it to take the competing offers to an arbitrator who must choose one or the other rather than a compromise between them. We conceived the final-offer arbitration challenge in the course of our work with the global insurance company AIG. As we’ll describe, the strategy could be used in negotiations well beyond insurance. The Challenge in Action Insurance companies pay billions of dollars every year to settle claims, employing hundreds of people to evaluate and negotiate tens of thousands of cases. There is good reason to believe that their employees’ decisions are not always optimal, resulting in overpayment on some claims and needlessly costly negotiation over others. AIG’s CEO, Peter Hancock, who was familiar with Daniel Kahneman’s Thinking, Fast and Slow, invited TGG, the consulting firm with which Kahneman is affiliated, to explore solutions. Kahneman recruited Max Bazerman to examine the company’s approach to negotiation. What began as a brief engagement became a large-scale, long-term project to sharpen AIG’s ability to efficiently resolve claims and reach reasonable settlements, reduce costs, and improve its reputation for fairness. Success with this intervention, Hancock reasoned, could ultimately confer competitive advantage. AIG used the final-offer arbitration challenge in a difficult negotiation with a man who had been injured while working in a factory it insured. The company didn’t want to overpay on the claim, but it also didn’t want to appear unfair in the eyes of its customer, the factory owner. Drawing on the assessments of several outside experts, AIG estimated the claim’s fair value at $1 million to $1.1 million and made an offer of $850,000. The claimant’s attorney countered with $2.6 million—an amount he vehemently insisted was fair. AIG, confident that its position was reasonable (and that the claimant’s wasn’t), responded with a final-offer arbitration challenge: Present the two offers to a professional arbitrator, who would make a legally binding decision about which was more reasonable. By forbidding an arbitrator to split the difference between two offers, this procedure neutralizes any incentive to be unreasonable, because the arbitrator is unlikely to choose the less reasonable offer. In a conventional arbitration or a typical judicial process, the arbitrator is allowed to choose a value between the two figures. Although conventional arbitration may be efficient in comparison with a lengthy court process, it tends to reward unreasonableness, because the parties believe that the arbitrator will land somewhere between their offers. The more unreasonable your offer is, therefore, the better you are likely to fare. A Primer on Final-Offer Arbitration Final-offer arbitration—also known as “baseball arbitration” because of its use in Major League Baseball salary disputes—was first suggested in the 1960s by the labor relations scholar Carl Stevens as a strategy for driving parties to agreement. Conventional arbitration was already in frequent use as an alternative to strikes for resolving disagreements between management and labor. In conventional arbitration the two parties make their cases to a neutral third party whose ruling on the issue at stake is binding. Essentially, conventional arbitration serves as an efficient judicial process. But research showed that parties were remaining far apart in the expectation that the arbitrator would simply split the difference between them. In that case, the more unreasonable your offer, the better you fared. Thus many people questioned the wisdom of arbitration. Stevens created final-offer arbitration to address the problem and to encourage negotiators to solve disputes on their own. Under final-offer arbitration, reasonableness is rewarded rather than punished. The two parties submit their final offers, and the arbitrator must select one or the other. Although this may prevent the arbitrator from choosing a number he or she believes is truly fair, the riskiness of the process drives the parties toward agreement, dramatically raising settlement rates. In the rare case when arbitration is actually invoked, each party competes to be more reasonable than the other. “The suggestion was not received with overwhelming enthusiasm by the labor-relations community,” Stevens recounted in 1976. “Indeed, there was a tendency to write it off as an unworkable ‘gimmick.’” Many people criticized the requirement that the arbitrator choose the lesser of two evils rather than what was actually fair. Nevertheless, final-offer arbitration has proved to be a strong alternative to courts and strikes.

### 1NC – AT: Unions

#### Unions don’t solve inequality – they’re too weak and there are tons of alt causes

Epstein 20 [Richard A. Epstein Peter and Kirsten Bedford Senior Fellow @ the Hoover Institution. "The Decline Of Unions Is Good News." https://www.hoover.org/research/decline-unions-good-news]

So what then could justify this inefficient provision? One common argument is that unions help reduce the level of income inequality by offering union members a high living wage, as seen in the golden age of the 1950s. But that argument misfires on several fronts. Those high union wages could not survive in the face of foreign competition or new nonunionized firms. The only way a union can provide gains for its members is to extract some fraction of the profits that firms enjoy when they hold monopoly positions. When tariff barriers are lowered and domestic markets are deregulated, as with the airlines and telecommunications industries, the size of union gains go down. Thus the sharp decline in union membership from 35 percent in both 1945 and 1954 to about 15 percent in 1985 led to no substantial increase in the fraction of wealth earned by the top 10 percent of the economy during that period. However, the income share of the top ten percent rose to about 40 percent over the next 15 years as union membership fell to below 10 percent by 2000. But don’t be fooled—that 5 percent change in union membership cannot drive widespread inequality for the entire population, which is also affected by a rise in the knowledge economy as well as a general aging of the population. The far more powerful distributive effects are likely to be those from nonunion workers whose job prospects within a given firm have been compromised by higher wages to union workers. It is even less clear that the proposals of progressives like Sanders, Warren, and Buttigieg to revamp the labor rules would reverse the decline of unions. Not only is the American labor market more competitive, but the work place is no longer dominated by large industrial assembly lines where workers remain in their same position for years. Today, workforces are far more heterogeneous and labor turnover is far higher. It is therefore much more difficult for a union to organize a common front among workers with divergent interests. Employers, too, have become much more adept at resisting unionization in ways that no set of labor laws can capture. It is no accident that plants are built in states like Tennessee and Mississippi, and that facilities are designed in ways to make it more difficult to picket or shut down. None of these defensive maneuvers would be necessary if, as I have long advocated, firms could post notices announcing that they will not hire union members, as they could do before the passage of the NLRA.

#### A massive influx of union power would cause mass unemployment.

**Thompson 12** [Derek Thompson, 6-12-2012, "'Unnecessary' and 'Political': Why Unions Are Bad For America," Atlantic, <https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2012/06/unnecessary-and-political-why-unions-are-bad-for-america/258405/>] //DD PT

WHY UNIONS COULD INCREASE UNEMPLOYMENT Consumers will naturally gravitate toward the best value, which is why Wal-Mart has been successful by imparting downward pressure on prices and the cost of living. That you don't like them because it hurts your profit margin selling whatever it is you're selling doesn't change the fact that basic laws of supply and demand have led to consumers getting the goods they want at lower cost. Subsidies impede creative destruction (though maybe you'd rather still be a peasant in the Dark Ages?), and tariffs force up prices for everyone, decrease choice, and increase the cost of living -- which particularly hurts the poor. I guess you just don't care about poor people, huh? By the same token, employees will work for the employer offering the best terms of employment. Right now there are more job-seekers than jobs, so the leverage lies with employers. The opposite is true in a good economy. Making it more difficult for businesses to hire and adapt may mean some people get better terms, but a larger percentage get no job at all.

1. https://www.google.com/search?q=morality+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS920US920&oq=morality+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j0i512l9.3854j1j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)