Novice NEG

I negate the resolution resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

# My single standard is Utilitarianism

## We must use frameworks that can apply to governments because the actor of the resolution is the US. Governments cannot know specific details of situations they have to make decisions about. This requires a utilitarian metric that can make decisions without all knowledge.

Robert E. Goodin, 1995 Goodin is a Professor of Philosophy at the Research School of the Social Sciences at the Australian National University. Cambridge University Press, “Utilitarianism As a Public Philosophy” pg 63

(Goodin 95) My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more plausible for them (or, more precisely, makes them adopt a form of utilitarianism that we would find more acceptable) than private individuals. Before proceeding with that larger argument, I must therefore say what it is that is so special about public officials and their situations that makes it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first the argument from necessity. Publicofficials are obliged to maketheir choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices-public and private alike- are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Publicofficials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all. That is enough to allow public policy makers to use the utilitarian calculus – if they want to use it at all – to choose general rules of conduct. Knowing aggregates and averages, they can proceed to calculatethe utility payoffsfrom adopting each alternative possible general rule. But they cannot be sure what the payoff will be to any given individual or on any particular occasion. Their knowledge of generalities, aggregates and averages is just not sufficiently fine-grained for that.

# Contention 1: The Auto Industry

## Subpoint A: Strikes are economically devastating for the US auto industry.

McElroy 19McElroy, John. “Strikes Hurt Everybody.” Wards Auto. October 25, 2019. Web. October 12, 2021. <<https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody>>.

(McElroy 19) But strikes don’t just hurt the people walking the picket lines or the company they’re striking against. They hurt suppliers, car dealers and the communities located near the plants. The Anderson Economic Group estimates that 75,000 workers at supplier companies were temporarily laid off because of the GM strike. Unlike UAW picketers, those supplier workers won’t get any strike pay or an $11,000 contract signing bonus. No, most of them lost close to a month’s worth of wages, which must be financially devastating for them. GM’s suppliers also lost a lot of money. So now they’re cutting budgets and delaying capital investments to make up for the lost revenue, which is a further drag on the economy. According to CAR, the communities and states where GM’s plants are located collectively lost a couple of hundred million dollars in payroll and tax revenue. Some economists warn that if the strike were prolonged it could knock the state of Michigan – home to GM and the UAW – into a recession. That prompted the governor of Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer, to call GM CEO Mary Barra and UAW leaders and urge them to settle as fast as possible. So, while the UAW managed to get a nice raise for its members, the strike left a path of destruction in its wake. That’s not fair to the innocent bystanders who will never regain what they lost. I’m not sure how this will ever be resolved. I understand the need for collective bargaining and the threat of a strike. But there’s got to be a better way to get workers a raise without torching the countryside.

## Subpoint B: The auto industry is key to the US economy as a whole.

Hill, Kim. “Contribution Of The Automobile Industry To The Economies Of All Fifty States And The United States.” Center for Automotive Research. April, 2010. Web. October 12,

2021. <<https://www.cargroup.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/CONTRIBUTION-OFTHE-AUTOMOTIVE-INDUSTRY-TO-THE-ECONOMIES-OF-ALL-FIFTY-STATES-AND-THEUNITED-STATES.pdf>>.

(Hill 10) The United States automotive industry is a critical component of economic growth with extensive interconnections across the industrial and cultural fabric of the U.S. This report outlines many known elements and highlights tremendously important associations beyond the market space of manufacturing. It touches on the following elements as they relate to the automotive industry: national and regional employment; research, development and innovation; state and local government revenues; foreign direct investment; education; health care; U.S. trade; and quality of life. The paper is organized into two sections: Section I provides qualitative context and current market metrics for the automotive industry, both of which are needed to truly appreciate the contributions of the industry to the broader economy and gauge where the sector may be heading; Section II features an in-depth quantitative analysis of employment and personal income associated with the automotive sector. Section II is subdivided into four primary sections to capture the distinct contributions of suppliers, assemblers, and dealers to the national economy with a final summary section that describes the state-level employment associated with the automotive industry. The auto industry is one of the most important industries in the United States. It historically has contributed 3 – 3.5 percent to the overall Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The industry directly employs over 1.7 million people engaged in designing, engineering, manufacturing, and supplying parts and components to assemble, sell and service new motor vehicles. In addition, the industry is a huge consumer of goods and services from many other sectors, including raw materials, construction, machinery, legal, computers and semiconductors, financial, advertising, and healthcare. The auto industry spends $16 to $18 billion every year on research and product development – 99 percent of which is funded by the industry itself. Due to the industry’s consumption of products from many other manufacturing sectors, it is a major driver of the 11.5% manufacturing contribution to GDP. Without the auto sector, it is difficult to imagine manufacturing surviving in this country. Recently, the auto industry has fallen on tough times. However, the U.S. market is still one of the largest motor vehicle markets in the world; consequently, many automakers sell and manufacture in the U.S. In fact, many automakers make the lion’s share of their profits in North America. There has been a period of restructuring by the three U.S.-based companies in order to right-size their operations and be able to respond to this fierce competition in the U.S. market. In the latest restructuring, a bursting of the housing bubble and a collapse of the financial sector led to the current period of extremely tight credit, making it nearly impossible for companies and consumers to make investments. During this period, many supplier companies, dealerships and a couple of manufacturers found themselves fighting for survival and turning to the lender of last resort–the federal government. This led to an amazing time of public introspection concerning the value to the country of a U.S.-based auto industry. In this paper, the authors touch on many of the factors that support the auto industry’s importance and standing in the national economy, along with an estimate of the industry’s employment and economic contribution to the national economy and to each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia. As previously mentioned, over 1.7 million people are employed by the auto industry. In addition, the industry is a huge consumer of goods and services from many other sectors and contributes to a net employment impact in the U.S. economy of nearly 8 million jobs. Approximately 4.5 percent of all U.S. jobs are supported by the strong presence of the auto industry in the U.S. economy. People in these jobs collectively earn over $500 billion annually in compensation and generate more than $70 billion in tax revenues.

# Contention 2: Global effects

## Subpoint A: US economic decline has significant spillover effects for the global economy.

Kose, M. Ayhan. “The Global Role Of The U.S. Economy: Linkages, Policies And Spillovers.” Koc University-Tusiad Economic Research Forum, Istanbul. March, 2017. Web. October 12, 2021. <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/166746/1/884608719.pdf>.

(Kose 17) The objective of this paper is to fill a gap in the literature by providing a comprehensive overview of the role of the United States in the global economy and quantifying the extent of the global spillovers from changes in U.S. growth, monetary and fiscal policies, and uncertainty in its financial markets and economic policies. Specifically, the paper addresses the following questions: What are the major channels of transmission of developments in the U.S. economy to other countries? The United States is the world’s single largest economy: it accounts for roughly one-quarter of global output and about one-tenth of total trade flows. It is also the single largest international creditor and debtor. Given its massive size and the strength of its ties with the global economy, shocks to the U.S. economy are transmitted globally through a variety of channels, including trade, finance, and commodity market linkages. How strong are business cycle linkages between the United States and other economies? U.S. business cycles are highly synchronized with global business cycles. Growth is often higher in the rest of the world during periods of U.S. expansions than it is during U.S. recessions. The four global recessions since 1960 all coincided with severe recessions in the United States. How large are global spillovers from shocks originating in the United States? Shocks to U.S. growth, changes in U.S. fiscal and monetary policies, or uncertainty in U.S. financial markets or policies have significant global spillovers. For example, a surge in U.S. growth can be expected to accelerate activity in the rest of the world. Our estimates suggest that a 1 percentage point increase in U.S. growth could boost growth in other advanced economies by 0.8 percentage point, and in EMDEs by 0.6 percentage point, after one year. Investment could respond even more strongly. In contrast, lingering uncertainty about the direction of U.S. policy could dampen activity and investment abroad. A sustained 10 percent increase in U.S. economic policy uncertainty could, after one year, reduce U.S. output growth by about 0.15 percentage point and EMDE output growth by 0.2 percentage point. How important is the global economy for the United States? Because of its size and reach, the United States is at the center of global trade and financial networks. U.S. multinational corporations and their affiliates abroad are deeply integrated into global supply chains. Financial linkages between the U.S. and the rest of the world, including emerging market economies, have grown rapidly, widening the potential for spillovers in either direction. These two-way channels imply that, important as the U.S. economy is for the global economy, the U.S. economy is in turn affected by developments in the rest of the world. In a highly integrated global economy, cross-border linkages translate into significant cyclical spillovers. These spillovers have material implications for all countries, irrespective of their size. Understanding these linkages and associated spillovers remains a fertile area of future research.

## Subpoint B: Economic growth key to check every world crisis — disease, food shortages, pollution, poverty, military readiness

Ferrara 14 \*\*\*edited for ableist language\*\*\* 2014, January 14th. Peter Ferrara: https://www.forbes.com/sites/peterferrara/2014/01/14/why-economic-growth-is-exponentially-more-important-than-income-inequality/#4b4f36b91483) SW

(Ferrara 14) Such economic growth has produced dramatic improvements in personal health as well. Throughout most of human history, a typical lifespan was 25 to 30 years, as Moore and Simon report. But “from the mid-18th century to today, life spans in the advanced countries jumped from less than 30 years to about 75 years.” Average life expectancy in the U.S. has grown by more than 50% since 1900. Infant mortality declined from 1 in 10 back then to 1 in 150 today. Children under 15 are at least 10 times less likely to die, as one in four did during the 19th century, with their death rate reduced by 95%. The maternal death rate from pregnancy and childbirth was also 100 times greater back then than today. Moore and Simon further recount, “Just three infectious diseases – tuberculosis, pneumonia, and diarrhea – accounted for almost half of all deaths in 1900.” Today, we have virtually eliminated or drastically reduced these and other scourges of infectious disease that have killed or [injured] billions throughout human history, such as typhoid fever, cholera, typhus, plague, smallpox, diphtheria, polio, influenza, bronchitis, whooping cough, malaria, and others. Besides the advances in the development and application of modern health sciences, this has resulted from the drastic reduction in filthy and unsanitary living conditions that economic growth has made possible as well. More recently, great progress is being made against heart disease and cancer. Also greatly contributing to the well-being of working people, the middle class, and the poor in America has been the dramatically declining cost of food resulting from economic growth and soaring productivity in agriculture. As Moore and Simon report, “Americans devoted almost 50 percent of their incomes to putting food on the table in the early 1900s compared with 10 percent in the late 1900s.” While most of human history has involved a struggle against starvation, today in America the battle is against obesity, even more so among the poor. Moore and Simon quote Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, “The average consumption of protein, minerals, and vitamins is virtually the same for poor and middle income children, and in most cases is well above recommended norms for all children. Most poor children today are in fact overnourished.” That cited data comes from the U.S. Census Bureau. As a result, poor children in America today “grow up to be about 1 inch taller and 10 pounds heavier than the GIs who stormed the beaches of Normandy in World War II.” That has resulted from a U.S. agricultural sector that required 75% of all American workers in 1800, 40% in 1900, and just 2.5% today, to “grow more than enough food for the entire nation and then enough to make the United States the world’s breadbasket.” Indeed, today, “The United States feeds three times as many people with one-third as many total farmers on one-third less farmland than in 1900,” in the process producing “almost 25 percent of the world’s food.” Moreover, it is economic growth that has provided the resources enabling us to dramatically reduce pollution and improve the environment, without trashing our standard of living. Moore and Simon write that at the beginning of the last century, “Industrial cities typically were enveloped in clouds of black soot and smoke. At this stage of the industrial revolution, factories belched poisons into the air—and this was proudly regarded as a sign of prosperity and progress. Streets were smelly and garbage-filled before the era of modern sewage systems and plumbing.” Not any of these truly dramatic advances for the poor, working people and the middle class could have been achieved by redistribution from “the rich.” Only economic growth could achieve these results. Nor would it have been worth sacrificing any of these world shattering gains for greater economic “equality.” And Barack Obama’s leftist protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, economists have long recognized the conflict between economic equality and maximizing economic growth. Put most simply, penalizing investors, successful entrepreneurs, and job creators with higher taxes, to reward the less productive with government handouts, to make everyone more equal, is a sure fire way to get less productivity, fewer jobs, lower wages, and reduced economic growth. The above history, and the future prospects below, are why to most benefit the poor, working people, and the middle class, our nation’s overriding goal must be to maximize economic growth. Consider, if total real compensation, wages and benefits, grow at just 1% a year, after 20 years the real incomes of working people would be only 22% greater. After 40 years, a generation, real incomes would be 50% more. But with sustained real compensation growth of 2%, after just 20 years the real incomes and living standards of working people would be nearly 50% greater, and after 40 years they would be 120% greater, more than doubled. At sustained 3% growth in wages and benefits, after 20 years the living standards of working people will have almost doubled, and after 40 years they will have more than tripled. The U.S. economy sustained a real rate of economic growth of 3.3% from 1945 to 1973, and achieved the same 3.3% sustained real growth from 1982 to 2007. (Note that this 3.3% growth rate for the entire economy includes population growth. Real wages and benefits discussed above is a per worker concept). It was only during the stagflation decade of 1973 to 1982, reflecting the same Keynesian economics that President Obama is pursuing today, that real growth fell to only half long term trends. If we could revive and sustain that same 3.3% real growth for 20 years, our total economic production (GDP) would double in that time. After 30 years, our economic output would grow by 2 and two-thirds. After 40 years, our prosperity bounty would grow by 3 and two-thirds. If we are truly following growth maximizing policies, we could conceivably do even better than we have in the past. At sustained real growth of 4% per year, our economic production would more than double after 20 years. After 30 years, GDP would more than triple. After 40 years, a generation, total U.S. economic output would nearly quadruple. America would by then have leapfrogged another generation ahead of the rest of the world. Achieving and sustaining such economic growth should be the central focus of national economic policy, for it would solve every problem that plagues and threatens us today. Such booming economic growth would produce surging revenues that would make balancing the budget so much more feasible. Surging GDP would reduce the national debt as a percent of GDP relatively quickly, particularly with balanced budgets not adding any further to the debt. Sustained, rapid economic growth is also the ultimate solution to poverty, as after a couple of decades or so of such growth, the poor would climb to the same living standards as the middle class of today. With sustained, robust, economic growth, maintaining the most powerful military in the world, and thereby ensuring our nation’s security and national defense, will require a smaller and smaller percentage of GDP over time. That security itself will promote capital investment and economic growth in America. The booming economy will produce new technological marvels that will make our defenses all the more advanced. With the economy rapidly advancing, there will be more than enough funds for education. There will also be more than enough to clean up and maintain a healthy environment.