## FW

The standard is maximizing pleasure.

#### Utilitarianism shows a broader view of morals beyond one person.

Robert Cavalier 96 (Robert Cavalier, Director of CMU’s Center for Advancement of Applied Ethics and Political Philosophy, President of the International Association for Computing and Philosophy, Chair of the APA Committee on Philosophy and Computers) Online Guide to Ethics and Moral Philosophy 1996No Publication http://caae.phil.cmu.edu/cavalier/80130/part2/sect9.html#Top%20of%20Page //DebateDrills TJ

**Utilitarianism is a normative ethical theory that places the locus of right and wrong solely on the outcomes (consequences) of choosing one action/policy over other actions/policies. As such, it moves beyond the scope of one's own interests and takes into account the interests of others.** [John Stuart Mill](http://caae.phil.cmu.edu/cavalier/80130/part1/sect4/BenandMill.html) adjusted the more hedonistic tendencies in Bentham's philosophy by emphasizing (1) **It is not the quantity of pleasure, but the quality of happiness that is central to utilitarianism**, (2) the calculus is unreasonable -- **qualities cannot be quantified (there is a distinction between 'higher' and 'lower' pleasures)**, and (3) utilitarianism refers to "the Greatest Happiness Principle" -- **it seeks to promote the capability of achieving happiness** (higher pleasures) **for the most amount of people** (this is its "extent").

Utilitarianism should be preferred over all other frameworks for 4 reasons.

#### First, Pleasure and pain are intrinsically valued on a biological level.

Prof. Dr. Francisco Tigre **Moura**, 7-13-20**21**, "Dopamine: More Than Pleasure, The Secret is the Anticipation of a Reward," LiveInnovation.org, <https://liveinnovation.org/dopamine-more-than-pleasure-the-secret-is-the-anticipation-of-a-reward/> //DebateDrills TJ

Well, all of those behaviors have something in common: they trigger our brains to produce a powerful neurotransmitter called: DOPAMINE. **Dopamine, together with Serotonin, Endorphin and Oxytocin are the four main neurotransmitters** related to all activities **which** truly **gives us a sensation of pleasure.** This includes sex, exercise, sleep, learning, music, food and many more. Dopamine and The Reward System So as mentioned, **our brains have a few structures which are triggered to reward us for behaviors associated with evolutionary forces, such as survival and reproduction.** Thus we tend to think that dopamine production is simply related to receiving a reward. However, instead, it is not simply produced when a reward is received. For example, as described by Robert Sapolsky (author of “Behave“), imagine the following experiment with a monkey in a laboratory: there is a light (signal) in a cage where the monkey is which at times comes on. Once it is on, the monkey should press a lever (work/task) and when he does so, he receives food (reward).

#### Second, As a whole, a functioning government should use Utilitarianism to measure the morality of an action. Because a government has many different individuals and ideologies, the only unchanging part of the action would be the result. Thus, optimizing the action around the result to maximize pleasure and minimize harm would be the only avenue of finding morality behind actions in government. In this way, all governments should use utilitarianism as a moral compass to benefit the most people.

#### Third, Moral uncertainty calls for utilitarianism as a sustainable moral value.

Nick **Bostrom**, Faculty of Philosophy and Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford, 20**12**, "Existential Risk Prevention as a Global Priority," No Publication, <https://www.existential-risk.org/concept.html> //DebateDrills TJ

These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest **a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability.** Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. **We may not now know** — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine **the best ends of our journey.** If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that **there is a great option value in preserving** — and ideally improving — **our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly.** **Ensuring** that there will be **a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely** **is** plausibly **the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value.** To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe. We thus want to reach a state in which we have (a) far greater intelligence, knowledge, and sounder judgment than we currently do; (b) far greater ability to solve global-coordination problems; (c) far greater technological capabilities and physical resources; and such that (d) our values and preferences are not corrupted in the process of getting there (but rather, if possible, improved). Factors b and c expand the option set available to humanity. Factor a increases humanity's ability to predict the outcomes of the available options and understand what each outcome would entail in terms of the realization of human values. Factor d, finally, makes humanity more likely to want to realize human values.

#### Fourth, actors don’t evaluate their actions or policies the same way as their future selves.

John **Tierney**, 1-3-20**13**, "Why You Won’t Be the Person You Expect to Be (Published 2013)," No Publication, <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/04/science/study-in-science-shows-end-of-history-illusion.html> //DebateDrills TJ

When we remember our past selves, they seem quite different. We know how much our personalities and tastes have changed over the years. But when we look ahead, somehow **we expect ourselves to stay the same**, a team of psychologists said Thursday, describing research they conducted of people’s self-perceptions. They called this phenomenon the “end of history illusion,” in which people tend to “underestimate how much they will change in the future.” **According to their research**, which involved more than 19,000 people ages 18 to 68, **the illusion persists from teenage years into retirement.** “Middle-aged people — like me — often look back on our teenage selves with some mixture of amusement and chagrin,” said one of the authors, Daniel T. Gilbert, a psychologist at Harvard. “What we never seem to realize is that our future selves will look back and think the very same thing about us. **At every age we think we’re having the last laugh, and at every age we’re wrong.**” Other psychologists said they were intrigued by the findings, published Thursday in the journal Science, and were impressed with the amount of supporting evidence. Participants were asked about their personality traits and preferences — their favorite foods, vacations, hobbies and bands — in years past and present, and then asked to make predictions for the future. Not surprisingly, the younger people in the study reported more change in the previous decade than did the older respondents. But when asked to predict what their personalities and tastes would be like in 10 years, **people of all ages consistently played down the potential changes ahead.** Thus, the typical 20-year-old woman’s predictions for her next decade were not nearly as radical as the typical 30-year-old woman’s recollection of how much she had changed in her 20s. This sort of discrepancy persisted among respondents all the way into their 60s.

**This shows that future selves won’t identify with our decisions. Thus, we should always use a constant util framework to evaluate our policies. Because util is consequentialist, it will always maintain consistency in the moral value of the decision.**

## Business fear

#### Businesses will fear any new power grasps

**ACIP 09**, (American Council on International Personnel, “Examining Proposals to Create a New Commission on Employment-Based Immigration,” 6-18-2009, [http://www.immigrationworksusa.org/uploaded/file/ACIP Commission Paper Final.pdf](http://www.immigrationworksusa.org/uploaded/file/ACIP%20Commission%20Paper%20Final.pdf))//AK

**Employers would see the most glaring flaw** in these proposals as the empowerment of a small group of people to overrule the hiring decisions of thousands of employers. Any attempt to micromanage which foreign-born professionals can be hired is likely to be problematic, since employers do not hire people in the aggregate, in general or economy wide. Businesses engage in ongoing recruitment that identifies individuals who will enable a company to compete better in the domestic or global economy. No small group of people, regardless of their backgrounds, could know how many of such individuals, or which qualifications, U.S. companies as a whole require in a given year.

#### Businesses fear: strikes cause uncertainty

Davis 50 (Davis, Richard G. “Governmental Employees and the Right to Strike.” *Social Forces*, vol. 28, no. 3, Oxford University Press, 1950, pp. 322–29, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2572018>.)//AK

The labor problem of government employees is different from that of the workers in private in- dustry, for it involves a contest between a specific group of citizens on the one hand and all of the people, acting through the instrumentality of gov- ernment, on the other.4 There is no substantial body of reference material on the question of employee organization in government, chiefly because the comparative quiescence of government workers in respect to labor conflict has never served to bring the question sharply to the attention of the public. There have been occasional strikes by public employees ever since 1836, and the dramatic police strike in Boston in 1919 is an outstanding example; but in general it is fair to say that "few government walkouts have approximated in se- verity, extent, length and social impact various strikeson the railroads,in coal mines, in automobile and rubberplants, and others in private industry."5 It is thus a very apt statement of Fisher's that "most of the antagonists of employee organization have in the main been concerned over the possible threatof strike or sabotage contained in the ex- istence of organizations of workers in govern- ment,"'6 rather than basing their opposition on historical evidence.

#### Business confidence key to the economy- cycle

**Braithwaite 4** (John, Fellow @ Australian Research Council Federation, March, 592 Annals 79, lexis)

The challenge of designing institutions that simultaneously engender emancipation and hope is addressed within the assumption of economic institutions that are fundamentally capitalist. This contemporary global context gives more force to the hope nexus because we know capitalism thrives on hope. **When business confidence collapses, capitalist economies head for recession**. This dependence on hope is of quite general import; business leaders must have hope for the future before they will build new factories; consumers need confidence before they will buy what the factories make; investors need confidence before they will buy shares in the company that builds the factory; bankers need confidence to lend money to build the factory; scientists need confidence to innovate with new technologies in the hope that a capitalist will come along and market their invention. Keynes's ([1936]1981) *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* lamented the theoretical neglect of "animal spirits" of hope ("spontaneous optimism rather than . . . mathematical expectation" (p. 161) in the discipline of economics, a neglect that continues to this day (see also Barbalet 1993).

## Offshoring

#### Unionization turns jobs – offshoring

**Gaston 2** (Noel Gaston, School of Business, Bond University, June, 2002. Gold Coast, “The Effects of Globalisation on Unions and the Nature of Collective Bargaining”. 377-396 Vol. 17 No.2)//AK

Most importantly, for present purposes, Proposition 1 also states that **the domestic union** is adversely affected by a higher value of the firm’s disagreement outcome. Mezzetti and Dinopoulos (1991) interpret as the value of the option to switch production abroad. That is, varies positively with **a credible outsourcing alternative** for the firm.13 It is **a credible threat** in the case of a multinational enterprise because of the lack of coordination between domestic and foreign unions or workers. As Caves (1996) notes, multinational enterprises enjoy bargaining ploys that national firms simply do not possess. Further, “[i]f the MNE maintains capacity to produce the same goods in different national markets, output curtailed by a strike in one market can be replaced from another subsidiary’s plant. ... the MNE can credibly threaten to close down a given plant, or shelve any expansion plans there, and choose another market for any additions to capacity.” Caves (1996, p.125). The ability to outsource shifts the domestic collective bargaining outcome in favour of the firm. That is, when it bargains with a domestic union, the firm can threaten to close the domestic plant and switch production to the foreign country. During any dispute, the domestic firm supplies the market from abroad. The threat point of the firm is therefore its reservation profit when its production facilities are moved offshore.14 A pertinent issue is how unions might respond to the possibility of outsourcing production and employment by firms. If foreign direct investment and outsourcing production facilities overseas by firms are features of the new global environment, then it is simply unrealistic to assume that unions and workers sit idly by. Unions adapt to the new global environment or risk extinction. Labour market institutions evolve

#### Offshoring hurts salaries, jobs, and innovation

**The Economist 03** (The Economist, 2003 (“Stolen Jobs?,” Leaders, December 11th, Available Online at <https://www.economist.com/leaders/2003/12/11/stolen-jobs>,))//AK

IN AMERICA, in Britain, in Australia, an awful thought has gripped employees in the past six months or so: India may do for services what China already does for manufacturing. Any product can be made in China less expensively than in the rich countries. Is it merely a matter of time before any service that can be electronically transmitted is produced in India more cheaply too? As “offshoring”—a hideous word to describe work sent overseas, often outsourced—has spread from manufacturing to white-collar services, so the pressure on legislators to step in has increased (see article). Manufacturers have used overseas suppliers for years. But now, cheaper communications allow companies to move back-office tasks such as data entry, call centres and payroll processing to poorer countries. India has three huge attractions for companies: a large pool of well-educated young workers, low wages and the English language. But plenty of other industrialising countries also handle back-office work. Moreover, given the pressure on costs in rich countries, offshore sourcing of services will grow: a much-quoted study by Forrester, a consultancy, last year predicted that 3.3m American jobs (500,000 of them in IT) would move abroad by 2015. And the quality of outsourcing will improve. Many of the jibes at Indian outsourcing today—about thick accents and unreliable technology—sound like the jeers at unreliable and ugly Japanese cars 30 years ago. No wonder politicians are under pressure to discourage companies (and public agencies) from sending service work abroad. To do so, though, would be as self-defeating as stopping the purchase of goods or components abroad. For, although the jobs killed by outsourcing abroad are easy to spot, the benefits are less visible but even greater. Like trade in goods, trade in services forces painful redistributions of employment. A study for the Institute for International Economics found that, in 1979-99, 69% of people who lost jobs as a result of cheap imports in sectors other than manufacturing found new work. But those figures are only for America, with its flexible job market, and leave a large minority who did not find new employment. Moreover, 55% of those who found new jobs did so at lower pay, and 25% took pay cuts of 30% or more. Some of the gains from free trade need to be used to ease the transition of workers into new jobs. But those gains are substantial. Some arise simply from organising work in more effective ways. A fair part of the work that moves abroad represents an attempt by companies to provide a round-the-clock service, by making use of time zones. To that extent, offshoring directly improves efficiency. In addition, a recent report on offshoring from McKinsey estimates that every dollar of costs the United States moves offshore brings America a net benefit of $1.12 to $1.14 (the additional benefit to the country receiving the investment comes on top). Part of this arises because, as low value-added jobs go abroad, labour and investment can switch to jobs that generate more economic value. This is what has happened with manufacturing: employment has dwindled, but workers have moved into educational and health services where pay is higher (and conditions often more agreeable). The thirst for the new What of innovation, though? At present, most new products and services are developed in the rich world—and, indeed, predominantly in the United States. Many Americans fear that all those bright young Chinese and Indians will steal not just jobs but the rich world's most precious skills. One of the uglier side-effects of the growing hostility to exporting service jobs has been a move to reduce the availability of visas for temporary workers in skilled jobs and especially in IT, on the grounds that they transfer knowledge and skills back home, taking jobs and innovation with them.

#### Offshoring bad for employement, spending and leadership- discount any studies that say offshoring is good because they are one sided

Roberts 16 (Paul Craig Roberts, American economist, journalist, blogger, and former civil servant, former Assistant Secretary of the US Treasury, former Associate Editor of the Wall Street Journal, frequent contributor to Global Research, BA in Economics from the Georgia Institute of Technology, PhD in Economics from the University of Virginia, Fellow in Economics at the University of Oxford, 2016 (“The Offshore Outsourcing of American Jobs: A Greater Threat Than Terrorism,” Global Research, March 13th, Available Online at <https://www.globalresearch.ca/the-offshore-outsourcing-of-american-jobs-a-greater-threat-than-terrorism/18725>, Accessed 7-03-08))//AK

Is offshore outsourcing good or harmful for America? To convince Americans of outsourcing’s benefits, corporate outsourcers sponsor misleading one-sided “studies.” Only a small handful of people have looked objectively at the issue. These few and the large number of Americans whose careers have been destroyed by outsourcing have a different view of outsourcing’s impact. But so far there has been no debate, just a shouting down of skeptics as “protectionists.” Now comes an important new book, Outsourcing America, published by the American Management Association. The authors, two brothers, Ron and Anil Hira, are experts on the subject. One is a professor at the Rochester Institute of Technology, and the other is professor at Simon Fraser University. The authors note that despite the enormity of the stakes for all Americans, a state of denial exists among policymakers and outsourcing’s corporate champions about the adverse effects on the US. The Hira brothers succeed in their task of interjecting harsh reality where delusion has ruled. In what might be an underestimate, a University of California study concludes that 14 million white-collar jobs are vulnerable to being outsourced offshore. These are not only call-center operators, customer service and back-office jobs, but also information technology, accounting, architecture, advanced engineering design, news reporting, stock analysis, and medical and legal services. The authors note that these are the jobs of the American Dream, the jobs of upward mobility that generate the bulk of the tax revenues that fund our education, health, infrastructure, and social security systems. The loss of these jobs “is fool’s gold for companies.” Corporate America’s short-term mentality, stemming from bonuses tied to quarterly results, is causing US companies to lose not only their best employees-their human capital-but also the consumers who buy their products. Employees displaced by foreigners and left unemployed or in lower paid work have a reduced presence in the consumer market. They provide fewer retirement savings for new investment. Nothink economists assume that new, better jobs are on the way for displaced Americans, but no economists can identify these jobs. The authors point out that “the track record for the re-employment of displaced US workers is abysmal: “The Department of Labor reports that more than one in three workers who are displaced remains unemployed, and many of those who are lucky enough to find jobs take major pay cuts. Many former manufacturing workers who were displaced a decade ago because of manufacturing that went offshore took training courses and found jobs in the information technology sector. They are now facing the unenviable situation of having their second career disappear overseas.” The “New Economy” Is The No Jobs Economy American economists are so inattentive to outsourcing’s perils that they fail to realize that the same incentive that leads to the outsourcing of one tradable good or service holds for all tradable goods and services. In the 21st century the US economy has only been able to create jobs in nontradable domestic services-the hallmark of a third world labor force. Prior to the advent of offshore outsourcing, US employees were shielded against low wage foreign labor. Americans worked with more capital and better technology, and their higher productivity protected their higher wages. Outsourcing forces Americans to “compete head-to-head with foreign workers” by “undermining US workers’ primary competitive advantage over foreign workers: their physical presence in the US” and “by providing those overseas workers with the same technologies.” The result is a lose-lose situation for American employees, American businesses, and the American government. Outsourcing has brought about record unemployment in engineering fields and a major drop in university enrollments in technical and scientific disciplines. Even many of the remaining jobs are being filled by lower paid foreigners brought in on H-1b and L-1 visas. American employees are discharged after being forced to train their foreign replacements. US corporations justify their offshore operations as essential to gain a foothold in emerging Asian markets. The Hira brothers believe this is self-delusion. “There is no evidence that they will be able to outcompete local Chinese and Indian companies, who are very rapidly assimilating the technology and know-how from the local US plants. In fact, studies show that Indian IT companies have been consistently outcompeting their US counterparts, even in US markets. Thus, it is time for CEOs to start thinking about whether they are fine with their own jobs being outsourced as well.” The authors note that the national security implications of outsourcing “have been largely ignored.” Outsourcing is rapidly eroding America’s superpower status. Beginning in 2002 the US began running trade deficits in advanced technology products with Asia, Mexico and Ireland. As these countries are not leaders in advanced technology, the deficits obviously stem from US offshore manufacturing. In effect, the US is giving away its technology, which is rapidly being captured, while US firms reduce themselves to a brand name with a sales force.