### 1

**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.

Cross apply their exitnctions tuff – idnependantly outweighs on magnitude and probability – even if extinction doesn’t happen economic collapse in and of itself is horrible and leads to mass death

### 2

#### The aff burden is to prove that the resolutional statement is logical, and the reciprocal neg burden is to prove that the resolutional statement is illogical.

#### Prefer:

#### 1. Text – Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

[https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought //](https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought%20//)Massa

#### Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

#### 2. Debatability – a) my interp means debates focus on empirics about squo trends rather than irresolvable abstract principles that’ve been argued for years b) Moral oughts cannot guide action due to the is/ought fallacy – we cannot derive moral obligations from what happens in the real world

#### 3. Neg definition choice – The aff should have defined ought in the 1ac as their value, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition.

#### 4. Independently reject moral oughts – 5 warrants.

**Ronnie De 21** [Ronnie De. . “Five reasons why moral philosophy is distracting and harmful”. 2021-07-23. Aeon. [https://aeon.co/essays/five-reasons-why-moral-philosophy-is-distracting-and-harmful. Accessed 10-1-2021](https://aeon.co/essays/five-reasons-why-moral-philosophy-is-distracting-and-harmful.%20Accessed%2010-1-2021)] //Jia

* Impossible to follow
* Action Freeze
* Irresolvable
* Promotes moral abhorrence
* Self righteousness and masochistic guilt

First, most systems of morality are inherently totalising. Adhering to them consistently is impossible, and so each system is forced into incoherence by setting arbitrary limits to its own scope. Second, our preoccupation with morality distorts the force of our reasons to act, by effecting among them a triage that results in some reasons being counted twice over. Third, the intellectual acrobatics invoked to justify this double counting commit us to insoluble and therefore idle theoretical debates. Fourth, the psychological power of moral authority can promote deplorable systems of evaluation as easily as good ones. And fifth, the emotions cultivated by a preoccupation with morality encourage self-righteousness and masochistic guilt.

**Negate:**

#### [1] Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it is and it isn’t logically going to happen.

#### .

### 3

#### Interpretation: The aff may not specify governments.

#### Violation: They specify the EU

#### Standards:

#### 1] Limits – Giving them the broadest definition of “just” meaning democratic, there are at least 115 possible affs, and that number increases exponentially when you can specify a subset of workers on top of that. They could not give a substantial limit on what “just” means, meaning that number may be even higher

#### 2] Topic education: Forces negative to defend hyper-specific positions, moving the debate away from the core of the topic which is about *just governments*, not specific states, and a broad right to strike, no guarantee of good substance on either side nor meaningful debate

**3] Western domination:** Specc’ing a state in this topic specifically asserts that a specific government is just (i.e. the US) inherently implies other governments are not considered just. Pushes harmful narrative of what countries (namely western countries like the US) are better than others and neglects harms of those countries (i.e. slavery, genocide, etc.)

#### 3] TVA Solves: run the plan as an advantage to whole res

#### Voters:

#### 1] Education – it’s the reason we do debate

#### 2] Fairness - essential for any competitive activity and makes it impossible to judge the round without intervention

#### 3] Prefer competing interps, reasonability invites a race to the bottom

#### 4] Drop the debater: dropping the argument drops their entire advocacy + good for setting norms and deterring future abuse

#### 5] No RVI’s: Being fair isn’t enough to win a debate, RVI’s incentivize frivolous theory as long as they have a prepped out counterinterp and justifies infinite abuse, also leads to baiting where you’ll just run abusive positions – o/ws on reversibility

### 4

#### Permissibility and presumption negate – [a] the resolution indicates the aff has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation [b] Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false.

#### Ethics must begin a priori:

#### [1] Uncertainty – our experiences are inaccessible to others which allows people to say they don’t experience the same, however a priori principles are universally applied to all agents.

#### [2] Bindingness – I can keep asking “why should I follow this” which results in skep since obligations are predicated on ignorantly accepting rules. Only reason solves since asking “why reason?” requires reason which concedes its authority and equally proves agency as constitutive

#### [C] Action theory – infinite division logically concludes from empiricism. i.e If I was brewing tea, I could break up that one big action into multiple small actions. Only our intention unifies these actions. If we were never able to unify action, we could never classify certain actions as moral or immoral.

#### [D] Korsgaards Wager – Korsgaard is or korsgaard is not – inconsistency with perfect duties means infinite badness, that means a 1% chance of apriori ethics being true means you affirm since anything else risks infinite immorality which outweighs any chance of it being wrong.

#### That means we must universally will maxims— any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### Prefer the standard: [a] freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments. Willing that we should abide by their ethical theory presupposes that we own ourselves in the first place. Thus, it is logically incoherent to justify the neg arguments/standard without first willing that we can pursue ends free from others [b] Frameworks are topicality interps of the word ought so they should be theoretically justified. Prefer on resource disparities—a focus on evidence and statistics privileges debaters with the most preround prep which excludes lone-wolfs who lack huge evidence files. A debate under my framework can easily be won without any prep since huge evidence files aren’t required.

#### 1] Strikes violate individual autonomy by exercising coercion.

Gourevitch 18 [Alex; Brown University; “The Right to Strike: A Radical View,” American Political Science Review; 2018; [https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321]](https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321%5d//SJWen) Justin

\*\*Edited for ableist language

Every liberal democracy recognizes that workers have a right to strike. That right is protected in law, sometimes in the constitution itself. Yet strikes pose serious problems for liberal societies. They involve violence and coercion, they often violate some basic liberal liberties, they appear to involve group rights having priority over individual ones, and they can threaten public order itself. Strikes are also one of the most common forms of disruptive collective protest in modern history. Even given the dramatic decline in strike activity since its peak in the 1970s, they can play significant roles in our lives. For instance, just over the past few years in the United States, large illegal strikes by teachers ~~paralyzed~~ froze major school districts in Chicago and Seattle, as well as statewide in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, and Colorado; a strike by taxi drivers played a major role in debates and court decisions regarding immigration; and strikes by retail and foodservice workers were instrumental in getting new minimum wage and other legislation passed in states like California, New York, and North Carolina. Yet, despite their significance, there is almost no political philosophy written about strikes.1 This despite the enormous literature on neighboring forms of protest like nonviolence, civil disobedience, conscientious refusal, and social movements.

The right to strike raises far more issues than a single essay can handle. In what follows, I address a particularly significant problem regarding the right to strike and its relation to coercive strike tactics. I argue that strikes present a dilemma for liberal societies because for most workers to have a reasonable chance of success they need to use some coercive strike tactics. But these coercive strike tactics both violate the law and infringe upon what are widely held to be basic liberal rights. To resolve this dilemma, we have to know why workers have the right to strike in the first place. I argue that the best way of understanding the right to strike is as a right to resist the oppression that workers face in the standard liberal capitalist economy. This way of understanding the right explains why the use of coercive strike tactics is not morally constrained by the requirement to respect the basic liberties nor the related laws that strikers violate when using certain coercive tactics.

#### 2] Means to an end: employees ignore their duty to help their patients in favor of higher wages which treats them as a means to an end.

#### 3] The aff homogenizes all strikes as an unconditional right which is unethical.

Loewy 2K, Erich H. "Of healthcare professionals, ethics, and strikes." Cambridge Q. Healthcare Ethics 9 (2000): 513. (Erich H. Loewy M.D., F.A.C.P., was born in Vienna, Austria in 1927 and was able to escape first to England and then to the U.S. in late 1938. He was initially trained as a cardiologist. He taught at Case Western Reserve and practiced in Cleveland, Ohio. After 14 years he devoted himself fully to Bioethics and taught at the University of Illinois for 12 years. In 1996 he was selected as the first endowed Alumni Association Chair of Bioethics at the University of California Davis School of Medicine and has taught there since.) JG

It would seem then that the ethical considerations for workers striking in an industry such as a shoe factory or a chain grocery store are quite different from the ethical considerations for workers in sanitation, police, or fire departments, or for professionals such as teachers or those involved directly in healthcare. Even in the latter “professional” category, there are subtle but distinct differences of “rights” and obligations. However, one cannot conclude that for workers in essential industries strikes are simply ethically not permissible, whereas they are permissible for workers in less essential industries. Strikes, by necessity, injure another, and injuring another cannot be ethically neutral. Injuring others is prima facie ethically problematic—that is, unless a good and weighty argument for doing so can be made, injuring another is not ethically proper. Striking by a worker, in as much as doing so injures another or others, is only a conditional right. A compelling ethical argument in favor of striking is needed as well as an ethical argument in favor of striking at the time and in the way planned. It remains to delineate the conditions under which strikes, especially strikes by workers in essential industries and even more so by persons who consider themselves to be “professionals,” may legitimately proceed and yet fulfill their basic purpose.

#### 4] Free-riding: strikes are a form of free-riding since those who don’t participate still reap the benefits.

Dolsak and Prakash 19 [Nives and Aseem; We write on environmental issues, climate politics and NGOs; “Climate Strikes: What They Accomplish And How They Could Have More Impact,” 9/14/19; Forbes; <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2019/09/14/climate-strikes-what-they-accomplish-and-how-they-could-have-more-impact/?sh=2244a9bd5eed>] Justin

While strikes and protests build solidarity among their supporters, they are susceptible to collective action problems. This is because **the goals that strikers pursue tend to create non-excludable benefits**. That is, benefits such as climate protection can be enjoyed by both strikers and non-strikers. Thus, large participation in climate strikes will reveal that in spite of free-riding problems, a large number of people have a strong preference for climate action.

### Case

No cards