# Innovation Da

## Global tech innovation high now.

**Mercury News et al 21** [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.

## Unionization wrecks innovation.

**Frick 15**, Walter. (Walter Frick is executive editor, membership at Quartz. Before that he was an editor at Harvard Business Review for six years, most recently as Deputy Editor of HBR.org. He's based in Boston and is interested in economics, technology, and the future of media.) "When Treating Workers Well Leads to More Innovation." Harvard Business Review, 3 Nov. 2015, hbr.org/2015/11/when-treating-workers-well-leads-to-more-innovation.

But not everything that's good for workers is necessarily good for innovation. A forthcoming paper in Management Science examined the impact of unionization on innovation. It looked at U.S. firms from 1980 to 2005 that voted to

unionize, but where the vote was close. The idea was that a close vote mirrored an experiment – the vote could plausibly have gone either way, so it was somewhat random whether the firm ended up unionized. The researchers found that unionization caused a significant decline in innovation, measured by the number and quality of patents issued. (Previous research on how unionization impacts innovation, measured by R&D spending, has been more mixed.) Why might some worker benefits make firms more innovative, but not others? Economic theory suggests the answer may have to do with long-term incentives. If workers feel pressure to deliver results in the short-term, either for fear of being fired or in order to be promoted, they may be less likely to pursue riskier innovations. On the other hand, if failure in the short-term is acceptable or even rewarded, and if workers have a stake in the company's long-term performance, they should be more likely to innovate. Employee stock options clearly meet these criteria, by tying workers' incentives to the long-term fate of the company. Other worker benefits may also encourage workers to take a longer view, at least indirectly; more satisfied workers stay at the firm longer, and therefore have more of a stake in the company's long-term success. Labor laws may have a similar effect. So what's different about unions? Daniel Bradley, a professor at the University of South Florida and co-author of the unionization study, suggested the answer is loyalty. "Union employees invest significantly less in their company's 401k compared to non-union workers," he told me, citing a 2009 study which interprets this fact as evidence that union workers are less loyal to their employer. "Unionization inhibits employee loyalty," he continued, "because having a too loyal workforce would jeopardize the collective bargaining process." "Ultimately, firms must find a way of motivating employees to be willing to take risks in order to come up with innovative inventions," said Edward Podolski-Boczar, professor at LaTrobe, and co-author of the worker treatment paper. "Not all forms of improved employee conditions naturally translate into improved innovation outcomes," he added, when I asked about the unionization result. But as his research demonstrates, many do. Treating workers well is part of building an innovative company, but it isn't enough. Employees also need to have a long-term stake in the company's success.

# Technological innovation solves every existential threat – which outweighs.

**Matthews 18** Dylan. Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University. 10-26-2018. "How to help people millions of years from now." Vox. https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the **future**. It's reasonable to suggest that those **quadrillions** of future people have, accordingly, **hundreds of thousands of times** more moral weight than those of us living here **today** do. That's the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead's 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, "On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future." It's a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It's not just something that weird utilitarians have to deal with. And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a charitable fund for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned "long-termism" into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community. But what does prioritizing the far future even mean? The most **literal** thing it could mean is preventing human **extinction**, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity's continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a pandemic, or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality. But in a set of slides he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that's certainly **part** of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address **specific threats** to humanity (which he calls "**targeted**" approaches to the far future) have to **complement** "**broad**" approaches, where instead of trying to **predict** what's going to kill us all, you just **generally try to keep civilization running as best it can**, so that it is, as a

whole, well-equipped to deal with **potential** extinction events in the **future**, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million. In other words, caring about the far future **doesn't mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation**; it also means **acting on pressing needs now**. For example: We're going to be **better prepared** to prevent extinction from **AI** or a **supervirus** or **global warming** if society as a whole makes **a lot of scientific progress**. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn't get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs we need as a civilization to survive and thrive. So maybe one of the **best things** we can do for the **far future** is to improve school systems — here and now — to harness the group economist Raj Chetty calls "lost Einsteins" (**potential innovators** who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world. What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now? Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions): Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive Meta-research: improve **incentives** and **norms** in **academic work** to better advance human knowledge Improve education Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X "If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute," Beckstead writes. "An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards." Look at those examples again: It's just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party's platform are good. All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren't that special, or at least maybe we don't have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol' do-goodery.

# Econ DA

## Post-Covid economic recovery is fragile now- inflation is adding pressure.

**Lynch 6-11** [David J. Lynch Washington, D.C. Financial writer covering trade and globalization Washington Post, 6-11-2021, "Rising prices in the U.S. could rattle other countries amid uneven global recovery," https://www.washingtonpost.com/us-policy/2021/06/11/inflation-fed-biden-recovery/] 6/13/2021

**U.S. leaders** stumbled in their initial pandemic response. But they did **flood[ed] the economy with several trillion dollars**, powering through the worst of the health scare and quickly **resuming growth.** Europe provided less direct relief to its citizens and has seen weaker results. By the end of June, U.S. output should be slightly above its pre-pandemic level while the European Union will still be about 4 percent below its starting point, said Sheets. Still, **the U.S. rebound has been anything but smooth. Labor market progress has disappointed** and an uneven reopening has led to widespread shortages, including of semiconductors, resin, ketchup and lumber. Those supply-chain headaches are going global. An **increasing number of countries are suffering supply disruptions, shipping problems and delivery delays, forcing companies to raise prices** to compensate, said Robin Brooks, chief economist for the Institute of International Finance, an industry group. "The world has never seen the kind of global supply disruptions we are seeing now," Brooks wrote this week. The Federal Reserve insists that May's 5 percent annual inflation reading — the highest since August 2008 — represents a temporary fever. The supply of goods will improve as more companies resume normal operations while consumer demand will ease as government stimulus payments taper off, it says. Fed officials insist they will stay the course even as rising prices draw attacks from Republican lawmakers and high-profile economists such as Lawrence Summers of Harvard University, a former Democratic treasury secretary. In Summers's view, the Biden administration's lavish multitrillion-dollar spending plan coupled with the Fed's near-zero interest rates means "overheating is now the largest risk" to the U.S. economy. Summers took to Twitter this week to warn that if the Fed or financial markets ultimately push rates higher in response to galloping inflation, "there will be enormous risks to an already fragile and over leveraged global economy." There is no doubt that pricing pressures are increasing. G-III Apparel Group, which distributes clothing under brands such as DKNY, Donna Karan, Tommy Hilfiger and Calvin Klein, told investors this week that it plans "to selectively raise prices to largely offset higher freight costs." Rising raw material and shipping costs likewise prompted Donaldson Co., a maker of filtration systems, to raise prices this year and to draw up plans to do so again, the company said earlier this month. And home builder Hovnanian Enterprises said it will follow suit. "We plan to continue to raise prices to keep up with rising material and labor costs, align sales pace with our ability to start homes and improve our margins," CEO Ara Hovnanian said this month. But amid Summers's alarms, financial markets yawned. The S&P 500 index hit a record high on Thursday while the yield on 10-year Treasury bonds continued a month-long decline, reflecting investor comfort with the outlook. The Fed's patience has been rewarded. Lumber, one of the suddenly scarce commodities that saw prices spike, has fallen by one-third over the past month with the return of more sawmills to normal operations. Despite talk of a labor shortage, the three-month moving average of median hourly wage growth is lower today than at the start of the year, according to a Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta gauge. That means **individuals' expectations of future inflation are not yet driving demands for higher pay**, a key component of an unbridled price rise. Central bankers elsewhere are mimicking the Fed. In Canada, where inflation jumped to 3.4 percent in April, the Bank of Canada on Wednesday opted to leave its benchmark lending rate unchanged. "We expect inflation to stay around 3 percent through the summer and then to ease later in the year as remaining slack in the economy pushes inflation down," said Tim Lane, deputy governor of the Bank of Canada, in a speech to a group of financial advisers. In Europe, consumer prices in May breached the European Central Bank's policy goal for the first time since 2018, rising at an annual rate of 2 percent. On Thursday, the ECB said it would continue its bond purchases to support the economy while raising its inflation forecasts for this year and next to 1.9 percent and 1.5 percent, up from 1.5 percent and 1.2 percent. Much of the rise in European inflation is due to developments that are unlikely to be repeated: a doubling in oil prices since October and the reinstatement of a German value-added tax that had been suspended during the pandemic, ECB President Christine Lagarde said. In China, producer prices in May rose 9 percent from one year earlier, the National Bureau of Statistics said on Wednesday. Surging global commodity costs — copper is up 80 percent over the past year — were largely to blame for the highest jump since September 2008. Chinese factories so far are largely absorbing the costs. People's Bank of China Gov. Yi Gang said this week that consumer price growth this year will be below 2 percent, lower than the government's 3 percent annual goal. Hiring troubles prompt some employers to eye automation and machines History offers support for the Fed's sanguine stance. Following the 2008 financial crisis, the Bank of England held its fire while the inflation rate more than doubled to 4.5 percent in about a year and a half. Ultimately, the increase fizzled and the authorities were vindicated. Indications that there remains enormous slack in the labor market, even as the unemployment rate has dropped from 14.8 percent in April 2020 to 5.8 percent today, also explains the Fed's patience. The share of the population age 16 and above that is working or looking for work remains near its lowest point since women entered the workforce in large numbers in the 1970s. Just 61.6 percent of the population is in the labor force today, down from more than 66 percent in 2007. Fed Chair Jerome H. Powell wants to run the economy hot enough, long enough, to lure many of them back to productive work. If that means enduring a year or more of fast-rising prices, it's a bargain the Fed is willing to take. **The Fed says it won't raise rates for three years. But if it's forced to act sooner, a sudden rate hike would slow the economy and lead to a stronger dollar**. That could trigger **destabilizing capital flows from developing nations and make repaying dollar loans more expensive for foreign businesses that earn local currency from their operations.**

## Unions' demands for higher wages causes an inflationary spiral.

**Guida 6-4** Victoria Guida [an economics reporter covering the Federal Reserve, the Treasury Department and the broader economy. She has spent her Washington career writing about bank regulations, monetary policy and trade negotiations.
A Dallas native, she graduated from the University of Missouri with a double major in journalism and political science.] , 6-4-2021, "Biden's back door to wage hikes," POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/news/2021/06/04/bidens-back-door-to-wage-hikes-491911

"The 'shortages' we are seeing in lower-wage jobs and the accompanying wage pressures are an early sign of success" for the president's agenda, said Julia Coronado, founder of MacroPolicy Perspectives. That success may be short-lived. **Higher wages could be among the biggest factors in pressuring the Federal Reserve to raise interest rates** if clear signs of an inflation spike appear. They also risk slowing hiring for those who will increasingly seek to return to the workforce as the pandemic subsides, as companies try to keep costs down. That's why workers' pay was a major focus for Fed officials in Friday's U.S. employment report for May. They want to see wage gains for the workforce — but what's behind those raises matters. Wage growth "is positive if it reduces hardship, reduces inequality and is not eaten away or reversed by higher inflation," said Tim Duy, an economics

professor at the University of Oregon and a former U.S. Treasury economist. “But we should be cognizant of the possibility that we’re inducing more inflation.” Income growth has been relatively strong, particularly in the last couple of months, despite disappointing overall job growth. Wages were up about 2 percent in May compared to the year before, and that number likely underestimates the real amount of income growth for technical reasons; lower-wage workers disproportionately lost jobs last year, making the overall average for those who kept their positions look higher then, and the opposite effect is now occurring as Americans return to the labor market. "Anyone looking at the 2.0% increase in yr/yr wages is missing the story," Jason Furman, a Harvard professor and former top economic adviser to President Barack Obama, said in a tweet. "Nominal wages up 1.2% in April/May. That is a 7.4% annual rate. That is huge." The pressure to do more to attract employees could continue to grow in certain public-facing industries. According to the Labor Department’s jobs report, about 2.5 million people are still being held back from looking for work because of the pandemic. Wages for non-managerial leisure and hospitality workers grew 1.3 percent last month and are up 3.7 percent compared to May 2020. **At the heart of the fight for higher pay is a desire for workers to share in a greater portion of the nation's economic rewards after decades of sluggish wage growth — the result of the weakening of labor unions**, companies shifting production overseas and increased use of job-displacing automation. This would ideally show up as bigger raises as the economy expands faster. **But if higher wages are instead passed along to customers at higher prices, that can create an inflationary cycle, as opposed to the one-time price increases** that many experts believe the economy can absorb as people’s behavior, and global supply chains, return to normal. “In the near term, I wouldn’t say this is necessarily a dangerous situation if we’re just raising wages for a group of people who have been traditionally disadvantaged,” Duy said. But **the longer** there are shortages that make **employers feel more comfortable raising prices as well as wages**, “that’s where **you get into this potential shift in the psychology where the wage gains and the price gains become linked**.” Heidi Shierholz, director of policy at the left-leaning Economic Policy Institute and a former chief economist at the Labor Department, said Americans are not seeing the type of widespread shortage-induced wage increases that would be cause for concern. “Things are re-normalizing; it’s not like things are out of whack,” she said, adding that some of the wage increases for leisure and hospitality workers might have come from a return to normal tipping practices as restaurants reopened. “I have longer-run concerns,” she added. “The wages were too low in that sector before Covid hit, so re-normalizing is not exactly where we want to be.” For its part, the Fed is pursuing a state of “full employment,” where wages rise because most people have jobs, and the central bank has said it’s willing to tolerate inflation above its 2 percent target to get there. But the hesitance by some workers to return to the labor force is only creating the illusion of that dynamic, said Adam Ozimek, chief economist at Upwork. “If employers are raising wages right now due to temporary shortages, then that risks slowing job growth when those temporary shortages are gone,” with millions still out of work, Ozimek said. “If we were at full employment, and we were seeing inflationary pressures, that wouldn’t concern me at all,” he added. “You’re getting it because of good and sustainable reasons. That’s not the same thing as inflation due to temporary supply shortages.”

### That collapses the economy.

**Colombo 18** [Jesse Colombo is an economic analyst and Forbes contributor who warns about bubbles and future financial crises], “How Interest Rate Hikes Will Trigger The Next Financial Crisis”, Forbes, 9-27-18, https://www.forbes.com/sites/jessecolombo/2018/09/27/how-interest-rate-hikes-will-trigger-the-next-financial-crisis/?sh=5401bf966717

On Wednesday, **the U.S. Federal Reserve hiked its benchmark interest rate** by a quarter-percentage point **to 2% - 2.25%, which is the highest level since April 2008**. As rates continue to climb off their post-Great Recession record lows, market participants and commentators are showing almost no signs of fear as the stock market is hitting records again and complacency abounds. Unfortunately, "soft landings" after rate hike cycles are as rare as unicorns and **virtually all modern rate hike cycles have resulted in a recession, financial, or banking crisis. There is no reason to believe that this time will be any different.** As I've explained in the past, periods of **low interest rates** help to **create credit and asset booms** in the following ways: By encouraging more borrowing by consumers, businesses, and governments By discouraging the holding of cash versus spending and speculating in riskier assets & endeavors Investors can borrow cheaply to speculate in assets (ex: cheap mortgages for property speculation and low margin costs for trading stocks) By making it cheaper to borrow to conduct share buybacks, dividend increases, and mergers & acquisitions By **encouraging higher rates of inflation**, which helps to support assets like stocks and real estate When central banks set interest rates and hold them at low levels in order to create an economic boom after a recession (as our Federal Reserve does), they interfere with the organic functioning of the economy and financial markets, which has serious consequences including the creation of distortions and imbalances. By **holding interest rates at artificially low levels, the Fed creates "false signals**" that encourage the undertaking of businesses and other endeavors that would not be profitable or viable in a normal interest rate environment. The businesses or other investments that are made due to artificial credit conditions are known as "malinvestments" and typically fail once interest rates rise to normal levels again. Some examples of malinvestments are dot-com companies in the late-1990s tech bubble, failed housing developments during the mid-2000s U.S. housing bubble, and unfinished skyscrapers in Dubai and other emerging markets after the global financial crisis. Though it can be difficult to tell precisely which investments or businesses are malinvestments in a central bank-distorted economy, a quote by Warren Buffett is extremely applicable: "only when the tide goes out do you learn who's been swimming naked." For the purpose of this discussion, "the tide going out" refers to rising interest rates. The mass failure of malinvestments in an economy as interest rates rise typically **results in recessions or banking and financial crises**.

# Case

# Framework

**I value morality, which is defined by Merriam Webster as beliefs of what is right behavior and what is wrong behavior.**
**Being that the resolution is a question of individual action, in the determination of moral culpability, our natural starting point or analysis must rest within the individual, as a rational agent**
**All actions by rational agents must be consistent with self-interest which entails evaluating consequences.**

**Vallentyne**, Peter, ed. 19**91**, Contractarianism and Rational Choice, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gauthier defends **an instrumental conception of practical rationality, according to which a choice is rational if and only if relative to the agent's beliefs it is the most effective** means **for achieving the agent's goals.** Except for certain minimal formal conditions of coherence, the instrumental conception of rational choice rejects any attempt to assess the rationality of the goals themselves. Value (**utility**), Gauthier argues, **is** subjective (**dependent on the affective attitudes of individuals). Therefore there are no external norms for assessing someone's preferences,** Gauthier claims, **except the formal coherence properties.**

Extend Valentyne 91 (1) which shows that all actors will make decisions which allow them to comply to their own beliefs and achieve their own goals, this shows that the individual will serve as an advocate for themselves

**Even though we look to consequences, aggregation is impossible as people have different conceptions of the good.**
**Furthermore, these moral agents not only work for immediate self-interest, but also can constrain themselves to appear credible for the others.**

"Notes on David Gauthier, Morals by Agreement" Dick **Arneson** For Philosophy 160

David Gauthier's view is close to egoism. He holds that **the sole rational goal for each person is maximizing the satisfaction of her own interests**. Here one's interests are fixed by one's basic (noninstrumental) preferences or desires. **If you happen to desire the good of others** in some ways or to some degree, **then your interests include achieving the good of others** is some ways or to some degree. **But the mere fact that another person would benefit from getting some good does not per se give you any reason to bring about the person's getting that good.¶** Gauthier thinks that **practical reason so understood justifies moral constraints.** He says, "We shall defend the traditional conception of morality as a rational constraint on the pursuit of individual interest" (p. 2). Example: If morality as traditionally conceived includes the rule that one should not steal other people's property, this rule is a constraint on the pursuit of my own interests. Morality tells me not to steal other people's property even when doing so would be the best way available to advance my interests. How can this be? If what is rational is maximizing the satisfaction of one's interest and morality constrains the pursuit of one's own interest, how can acceptance of moral constraint be rational? Gauthier asserts,

"**rational constraints on the pursuit of interest have themselves a foundation in the interest they constrain. Duty overrides advantage, but the acceptance of duty is truly advantageous**" (p. 2).¶ Here's a story that illustrates what Gauthier has in mind. Suppose that if you are a nice, cooperative person, one who keeps her agreements, you will be recognized as such by other persons and admitted by them into mutually profitable cooperative arrangements. **If you are not a** nice, **cooperative person, but instead prone not to keep your agreements, you will be recognized as such by other persons and shunned by them. They will avoid interaction with you.** If the social world you face has these features, then it is easy to see that being disposed to keep one's agreements will sometimes lead you to do disadvantageous acts—acts that are really disadvantageous, disadvantageous to you even in the long run, not merely seemingly disadvantageous or disadvantageous-in-the-short-run-but-advantageous-in-the-long-run. However, being disposed this way will still lead you to be better off if the disadvantages of keeping your word are outweighed by the advantages of being recognized as a trustworthy person and being admitted into mutually profitable associations. **Having the character trait of being disposed to keep one's promises can be advantageous even if the act of keeping one's promises is sometimes truly disadvantageous.** Example: suppose tom and sally are farmers growing crops on adjacent fields. Tom's crop ripens first, Sally's a few weeks later. Both will be better off if they Sally helps Tom harvest his crop and then Tom helps Sally harvest her crop. **So a mutually advantageous deal is possible**. But this is threatened, if Tom acts according to egoismn on each occasion of choice. Having already been helped by Sally, he has nothing to gain from helping her later. So he won't. Foreseeing this, Sally will not help Tom first. If Tom had disposed himself to be what Gauthier calls a constrained maximizer, specifically one who pursues his own interests except that he keeps his promises, then if sally recognizes this is so, she will be willing to make a deal with tom and be willing to help him first, foreseeing he will do his part of the bargain later, when her crop ripens. Note: In this situation, Tom's helping Sally to harvest her crop is really and not merely seemingly disadvantageous for him.

Extend Arneson this card shows that people will follow their interests but that typically their interests are not hedonistic and instead will lead them to be cooperative with society as a whole as it allows them to be socially accepted and over time benefits them more

**And contracts are the only means to take into account this self-interest as rational people would never join a contract that harms him/herself.**

**Vallentyne**, Peter, ed. 1991, Contractarianism and Rational Choice, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gauthier agrees that a **rational agreement should make everybody at least as well off as under the nocooperative outcome, but** argues nontheless that **the non cooperative outcome should not be t reated as the initial bargaining position. A rational agreement**, Gauthier claims, **must be one with which it is rational** for the agents **to comply**, and agreements based on the noncooperative outcome do not satisfy that condition. In particular, **it is irrational**, he argues, **for those who would be net victims** of noncooperative interaction (ie those who would be worse off in the presence of the noncooperative activities of others than they would be if left completely alone) **to comply with agreements based on the non-cooperative outcome. Such agreements would perpetuate the benefits and costs of coercive activity** even though such activitiy would no longer take place, and therefore be unstable. Gauthier claims that, **in order for there to be a rational basis for all to comply** with an agreement, **the initial bargaining position must be the hypothetical result of noncooperative interaction** constrained by the Lock-ean Proviso, that is, of noncooperative interaction subject to the constraint that no one makes him/herself better off by making someone else worse off. **Like the noncooperative outcome, this represents an outcome where all social cooperation ceases**. Unlike the noncooperative outcome, however, it is based on the assumption that no one engages in coercive or predatory activity. **People neither help nor harm others.**

Extend Valentye 91 (2) this shows that a rational agreement is one where neither party will receive a negative outcome from either engaging in the process of making the contract or as a result of the contract that is established

**This means that there can be no objective side constraints as it's up to the individual to decide if following a particular constraint or action is consistent with self-interest. Contracts resolve potential issues with moral subjectivity because people can subjectively decide which agreement is best for them.**

**These contracts must exist outside a realm of coercion and be free from undue duress and coercive practices otherwise it violates the autonomy of agents**

Bigwood, Rick (1996). *Coercion in Contract: The Theoretical Constructs of Duress. The University of Toronto Law Journal, 46(2)* doi:10.2307/825693 Pp 204

**Doubtless, freedom and choice play central roles in liberal societies such as our own. Choice, after all, is a morally valuable expression of our autonomy, and of our freedom to shape, for good or for ill, our own lives." The freedom to undertake binding contractual obligations is but one important aspect of this autonomy.**12 The freedom to exer- cise the power one acquires by virtue of physical or economic strength is yet another."' **Freedom and coercion, however, are generally con- sidered to be 'antithetical relations or realities,' such that 'freedom entails the absence of coercion, and coercion involves the absence of freedom."'** Thus, to say that D forced or coerced P to do X, or that P did X under duress, understandably gives rise to some powerfully emotive questions about precisely what it means to be 'coerced.' To denominate D's conduct toward P as 'coercive' is generally to condemn D. **But beyond its obvious tendency emotively to persuade in favour of the coerced party, a 'coercion claim' (or any of its more technical ana- logues) can have special significance in law. For what one is really claiming when one complains of 'being coerced' is that because of coercion or duress, one should be relieved of the normal moral or legal consequences of one's actions.'5 Hence, as a result of coercion in this context, contracts are not binding**: the 'consent' brought to them is treated in law as revocable.16

Extend the Bigwood 96 evidence this shows

**This means that there cannot be coercion used in the deliberation and association of individuals that are established through contracts.**

**Thus my value criterion is maintaining consistency with the contractarian system of mutual constraint, we specifically do this through preserving social contracts between members of a society.**

**Prefer this criterion because**

**1) Contracts are the only consistent view of morality regardless of culture or ideas.**

Jan **Narveson** OC is professor of philosophy emeritus at the University of Waterloo, in Waterloo, Ontario, Canada "The Libertarian Idea" 2001

Why accept the contractarian view of morals? Because **there is no other view that can serve the requirements: namely, of providing reasons to everyone for accepting it, no matter what their personal values or philosophy of life may be, and thus motivating** this informal, yet **society- wide "institution".** Without resort to any obfuscating intuitions, of "self- evident rights" and the like, **the contractarian view offers an intelligible account** both **of why it is rational to want a morality** and of what, broadly speaking, the essentials of that morality must consist in: namely, those general rules that are universally advantageous to rational agents. **We** each **need morality**, first **because we are vulnerable to the depredations of others, and second because we can all benefit from cooperation** with others. So **we need protection, in the form of the ability to rely on our fellows** not to engage in activities harmful to us; and **we need to be able to rely on those with whom we deal. We each need this regardless of what else we need or want or value.**

**This precludes any epistemic arguments because the way people come to know is through their cultural adaptations. Other ethical theories that attempt to derive how we come to know don't take into account how people are raised in different cultures and ideas, which only contracts can take into account. This essentially means that contracts resolve any questions of cultural relativism.**

**2) Morality and justice, which are the central questions of the resolution, always begs the question of why we should follow them- contracts is the only way to resolve this issue in a manner that is both efficient and respectful or subjective agency.**

David **Copp** University of Western Ontario Aprio 26 1987 "Contractarianism and Moral Skepticism"

**A contractarian sees the main skeptical challenge as consisting in a view of moralities as imposed ideologies that often call on people to act irrationally against their self-interest.** The skeptic holds that people are neither rational to comply with morality nor to dispose themselves to comply. To be sure, **many of use have preferences that can make it rational to comply with certain moral requirements**. We have been socialized to comply with the going moral code, and we have emotions and feelings and attachments to other people that can make it rational to comply with the going moral code. In addition, certain of the going moral requirements are supported by sanctions in a way that can make it prudent to comply. But **the skeptical position is that these are reasons for compliance that obtain only adventitiously or** because the going requirements have been imposed on us **through socialization or** threats of **sanctions.** A person would not rationally choose to have the preferences, or the emotions, feelings and attachments, or to be subject to the sanctions, that can make it rational to be moral. The contractarian strategy for defeating this challenge is to argue that **[However contracts mandates that] there is a set of moral requirements such that, at least under certain conditions, a population of fully rational people would agree to comply with them**, dispose themselves to comply with them, and in fact comply with them, **given the**

**reasonable expectation of mutual benefit. People would** be rational so to agree, and rational to **comply, even if**, hypothetically, **they had no antecedent** moral **preferences and no attachments to other people,** and even if they

were bargaining outside of society, where they were not subject to the sanctions of an antecedently accepted societal moral code. **The contractarian claims that the moral requirements that are adequately and appropriately justifed are those**, and only those, if any, that are defensible in this manner, as objects of hypotenhetical rational agreement and rational compliance.

**The thesis of the Negative is that an unconditional right to strike harms the ability of workers to enter and create contracts with other agents.**

## Contention 1: Striking Prevents Contracts

Modern-day employee-employer relationships are social contracts

**McCarthy**, Jeremy. "The Social Contract at Work." *The Psychology of Wellbeing*, 18 Oct. 2011, psychologyofwellbeing.com/201110/the-social-contract-at-work.html. Accessed 3 Nov. 20**21**.

Most **employers understand** their **relationship with** their **employees as** being based on **a simple** employment **contract. The employee is provided with** a **compensation** package including a living wage and a certain amount of benefits **and in return they are expected to fulfill certain functions** of the job, usually outlined in an employee handbook and/or a "standard operating procedures" (SOP) manual.

"The Employment Relationship and the Nature of Strike Activity." ***NTHR***, 10 June 20**16**, newtohr.com/the-employment-relationship-the-nature-of-strike-activity/. Accessed 3 Nov. 2021.

The changing structure of the workforce in this economy has added to the change in the employment relationship. **Work has become** very **fragmented and employers need** more flexible **workers, job**

**insecurity is at an all time high** pushing to and **encouraging a** highly **individualistic** **labour force**, without the same 1990's values and beliefs.

Therefore **this** is **mak**ing **industrial action** (in an individualistic way) very **difficult as people do not have the same core values.** (think of the many freelancers and women that have come into the workforce) Individual bargaining is a 'new' way of by-passing unions and mediating with the employer directly.

**Employers are** now more **aware about what employee relations entails.** (this does not however mean that it is always applied!!) Things like **training and development** have **strengthen**ed **the** **bargaining power of employees**, by creating commitment and motivation **effectively** trying to **improve employee relations.**