# 1n

## 1st

#### Moral internalism is true:

#### [1] Disagreement – Externalist theories fail to explain why some agents have the differing motivation for actions – internalism solves by showing how agents’ motivations are dictated by internal desires. Markovitz

[Markovits 14, Markovits, Julia. Moral reason. https://philpapers.org/rec/ROCJMM Oxford University Press, 2014.//Scopa] SHS ZS

Relatedly, internalism about reasons seems less presumptive than externalism. **We should not assume** that **some of us have** special **epistemic access to what matters**, **especially in the absence of any criterion for making such a judgment**. **It’s better to start from the assumption**, as internalism does, **that everyone’s ends are equally worthy of pursuit** – **and correct this assumption** only **by appealing to standards that are** as **uncontroversial** as possible. **According to externalism** about reasons, **what matters normatively** – that is, what we have reason to do or pursue or protect or respect or promote – **does not depend in** any fundamental way on **what** in fact **matters to us** – that is, what we do do and pursue and protect and respect and promote. **Some of us happen to be motivated by what actually matters**, **and some** of us **are “wrongly” motivated**. **But externalists** can **offer no explanation for this supposed difference** in how well we respond to reasons – **no explanation of why some of us have the right motivations and some of us the wrong ones** – **that doesn’t** itself **appeal to the views about what matters** that they’re trying to justify. (They can explain why some people have the right motivations by saying, e.g., that they’re good people, but that assumes the truth of the normative views that are at issue.22) **A comparison to the epistemic case** helps **bring out what is unsatisfactory** in the externalist position. **We sometimes attribute greater epistemic powers to some people than** to **others** **despite not being able to explain why they’re more likely to be right** in their beliefs about a certain topic. **Chicken-sexing is a popular example** of this among philosophers. **We think some people are more likely to form true beliefs about the sex of chickens than others even though we can’t explain why they are better at judging the sex of chickens.** But in the case of chicken-sexing, **we have independent means of determining the truth, and so we have independent verification that chicken-sexers usually get things right**. **Externalism seems to tell[s] us that some of us are better reasons- sensors than others**, but **without providing the independent means of determining** which of us are in fact more reliably motivated by genuine normative reasons (or even that some of us are).

#### [2] Regress – a priori knowledge is merely an acceptance of an individual’s conception of rationality. Macintyre 81.

[Macintyre 81, Alasdair Macintyre, https://undpress.nd.edu/9780268035044/after-virtue/ After Virtue, 1981] SHS ZS

The most influential account of moral reasoning that emerged in response to this critique of emotivism was one according to which an agent can only justify a particular judgment by referring to some universal rule from which it may be logically derived, and can only justify that rule in turn by deriving it from some more general rule or principle; but on this view [**S]ince every chain of reasoning must be finite**, such **a process of justificatory reasoning must always terminate with the assertion of some rule or principle for which no further reason can be given.** ‘Thus a complete justification of a decision would consist of a complete account of its effects together with a complete account of the principles which it observed, and the effect of observing those principles. **If** [I] **the enquirer still goes on ask ing** ‘But why should I live like that?’ then **there is no further answer to give** him, because we have already, ex hypothesi, [we have already] said everything that could be included in the further answer.’ (Hare 1952, p. 69). **The terminus of justification is thus always**, on this view, a not further to be justified choice, **a choice unguided by criteria.** **Each individual implicitly or explicitly has to adopt his or her own first principles on the basis of such a choice.** The utterance of any universal principle is in the end an expression of the preferences of an individual will and for that will its principles have and can have only such authority as it chooses to confer upon them by adopting them.

#### [3] Motivation – A. Externalist ethics collapse to internalism because agents will only follow external demands if they are consistent with their internal account of the good. For instance, citizens only follow the law insofar as its consistent with their internal beliefs, even when external value structures are being placed upon them.

#### Next, agents justify their actions based on individual moral preferences and deal with ethical dilemmas by prioritizing their own beliefs. Gauthier.

[David Gauthier, Canadian-American philosopher best known for his neo-Hobbesian social contract theory of morality, Why Contractarianism?, 1998, ///AHS PB] SHS ZS

Fortunately, I do not have to defend normative foundationalism. One problem with accepting moral justification as part of our ongoing practice is that, as I have suggested, **we no longer accept the world view on which it depends**. But perhaps a more immediately pressing problem is that we have, ready to hand, an alternative mode for justifying our choices and actions. In its more austere and, in my view, more defensible form, this is to show that **choices and actions maximize** **the agent ’s expected utility**, **where utility is a measure of considered preference.** In its less austere version, this is to show that **choices and actions satisfy, not a subjectively defined requirement such as utility, but meet the agent ’ s objective interests.** Since I do not believe that we have objective interests, I shall ignore this latter. But it will not matter. For the idea is clear; **we have a mode of justification that does not require the introduction of moral considerations.** 11 Let me call this alternative nonmoral mode of justification, neutrally, **deliberative justification**. Now moral and deliberative justification are directed at the same objects – **our choices and actions. What if they conflict?** And what do we say to the person who offers a deliberative justification of his choices and actions and refuses to offer any other? We can say, of course, that his behavior lacks moral justification, but this seems to lack any hold, unless he chooses to enter the moral framework. And such entry, he may insist, lacks any deliberative justification, at least for him. **If morality perishes, the justificatory enterprise**, in relation to choice and action, **does not perish with it**. Rather, one mode of justification perishes, a mode that, it may seem, now hangs unsupported. But not only unsupported, for it is difficult to deny that **deliberative justification** is more clearly basic, that it **cannot be avoided insofar as we are rational agents**, so that if moral justification conflicts with it, morality seems not only unsupported but opposed by what is rationally more fundamental. **Deliberative justification relates to our deep sense of self**. What distinguishes human beings from other animals, and **provides the basis for rationality**, is the capacity **for semantic representation**. You can, as your dog on the whole cannot, represent a state of affairs to yourself, and consider in particular whether or not it is the case, and whether or not you would want it to be the case. **You can represent to yourself the contents of your beliefs, and your desires or preferences**. But in representing them, you bring them into relation with one another. You represent to yourself that the Blue Jays will win the World Series, and that a National League team will win the World Series, and that the Blue Jays are not a National League team. And in recognizing a conflict among those beliefs, you find  rationality thrust upon you. Note that the first two beliefs could be replaced by preferences, with the same effect. Since in representing our preferences we become aware of conflict among them, the step from representation to choice becomes complicated. **We must, somehow, bring our conflicting desires and preferences into some sort of coherence. And there is only one plausible candidate for a principle of coherence – a maximizing principle**. We order our preferences, in relation to decision and action, so that we may choose in a way that maximizes our expectation of preference fulfillment. **And in so doing, we show ourselves to be rational agents, engaged in deliberation and deliberative justification**. There is simply nothing else for practical rationality to be. The foundational crisis of morality thus cannot be avoided by pointing to the existence of a practice of justification within the moral framework, and denying that any extramoral foundation is relevant. For an extramoral mode of justification is already present, existing not side by side with moral justification, but in a manner tied to the way in which we unify our beliefs and preferences and so acquire our deep sense of self. **We need not suppose that this deliberative justification is itself to be understood foundationally. All that we need suppose is that moral justification does not plausibly survive conflict with it.**

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with contractarianism. Agents must engage in the project of mutual self-restraint as to not impede upon the moral authority of others. Stanford.

[Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. “Contractarianism.” <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/contractarianism/> Published 18 June 2000] SHS ZS

A brief sketch of the most complete and influential contemporary contractarian theory, David Gauthier’s, is in order. **Gauthier’s project** in Morals By Agreement **is to employ a contractarian approach to grounding morality in rationality** in order **to defeat the moral skeptic.** (However, Anita Superson (2009) points out that Gauthier attempts to answer only the skeptic who asks “why should I be moral?” but leaves both the motive skeptic, who argues that it is enough to act morally but need not be motivated by morality, and the amoralist, who denies that there is any such thing as morality, that is, that there are true moral statements.) **It is** generally **assumed that humans can have no perfect natural harmony of interests** (otherwise morality would be largely superfluous), and that there is much for each individual to gain through cooperation. However, **moral constraint on the pursuit of individual self-interest is required because cooperative activities almost inevitably lead to a prisoner’s dilemma**: a situation in which the best individual outcomes can be had by those who cheat on the agreement while the others keep their part of the bargain. This leads to the socially and individually sub-optimal outcome wherein each can expect to be cheated by the other. But by disposing themselves to act according to the requirements of morality whenever others are also so disposed, they can gain each others’ trust and cooperate successfully. **The contractarian element of the theory comes in the derivation of the moral norms. The compliance problem—the problem of justifying rational compliance with the norms that have been accepted—must drive the justification of the initial situation and the conduct of the contracting situation**. **It is helpful to think of the contract situation as a bargain, in which each party is trying to negotiate the moral rules that will allow them to realize optimal utilit**y, and this has led philosophers to apply a number of bargaining solutions to the initial contract situation. Gauthier’s solution is the “minimax relative concession” (1986, ch. V). **The idea of minimax relative concession is that each bargainer will be most concerned with the concessions that she makes from her ideal outcome relative to the concessions that others make**. If she sees her concessions as reasonable relative to the others, considering that she wants to ensure as much for herself as she can while securing agreement (and thereby avoiding the zero-point: no share of the cooperative surplus) and subsequent compliance from the others, then she will agree to it. What would then be the reasonable outcome**? The reasonable outcome, according to this view, is the outcome that minimizes the maximum relative concessions of each party to the bargain** (Gauthier 1986, ch. V). Equally important to the solution as the procedure is the starting point from which the parties begin. For some contractarians (like Gauthier) there is no veil of ignorance—each party to the contract is fully informed of their personal attributes and holdings. However, without the veil of ignorance, contractors will be aware of the differences in bargaining power that could potentially affect the outcome of the bargain. **It is important, then, that the initial position must have been arrived at non-coercively if compliance to the agreement is to be secured.** A form of the “Lockean proviso” (modeled after Locke’s description of the initial situation of his social contract): that one cannot have bettered himself by worsening others, may turn out to be beneficial in cases without a veil of ignorance. In sum, **the moral norms that rational contractors will adopt** (and comply with) **are those norms that would be reached by the contractors beginning from a position each has attained through her own actions which have not worsened anyone else,** and adopting as their principle for agreement the rule of minimax relative concession (Gauthier 1986, ch. VII). On one line of thought, contractarianism produces liberal individuals who seem well suited to join the kind of society that Rawls envisioned (Gauthier 1986, ch. XI). On another line, the Hobbesian contractarian argument leads towards the sparse government of libertarianism (Narveson 1988). The controversy here turns on the primary motivation for individuals to make agreements and cooperate. As we said before, there are two such motivations for the Hobbesian contractarian: fear of the depredations of others and benefits from cooperation with others. Libertarianism results when the first of these is primary, whereas when the second is primary, the kind of reciprocity and supportive government that will be discussed in the final section becomes possible.

#### Prefer additionally:

#### [1] Actor specificity – states are not moral entities but derive authority from the contracts that allows them to constrain action. This outweighs on empiricism; states aren’t bound by moral obligations, but they are by their contracts to other entities.

#### [2] Collapses – Contracts takes into account all other ethical theories and allows agents to engage under the index of their own good so long as they don’t violate the constraints of their other. The NC functions as a meta constraint – meaning indicts don’t take it out but they rather prove the truth of a theory under a particular index.

#### Negate:

#### [1] Contracts – employers and employees have contracts which do not include / do not grant workers to strike. Granting workers to strike is a violation of those companies’ contracts, which ow under my fwk since it’s a breaking of a contract.

#### [2] Self-Interest – States each have their own unique reasons for not recognizing the right of workers to strike and forcing them to do so would be imposing an external principle disregarding each individual position – which would be an intrinsic wrong under the framework.

## 2nd

#### The economy is soaring but unemployment remains a glaring weakness.

Cox 3/2

[10% GDP growth? The U.S. economy is on fire, and is about to get stoked even more, <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/03/02/10percent-gdp-growth-the-us-economy-is-on-fire-and-is-about-to-get-stoked-even-more.html>, Jeff Cox, March 2, 2021, finance editor for CNBC.com where he manages coverage of the financial markets and Wall Street. His stories are routinely among the most-read items on the site each day as he interviews some of the smartest and most well-respected analysts and advisors in the financial world. He also is a frequent guest on CNBC.] [SS]

**The** U.S. **economy has roared back to life in 2021**, with first-quarter growth set to defy even the rosiest expectations as **another fresh influx of cash looms**. **Manufacturing** data Monday showed the sector **at its highest growth level since** August **2018.** That report from the Institute for Supply Management in turn helped confirm the notion among economists that **output to start the year is far better than** the low single-digit growth **many had been predicting** in late 2020. **The A**tlanta **Fe**deral **R**eserve, **which tracks data in real tim**e to estimate changes in gross domestic product, now **is indicating a 10% gain** for the first three months of the year. The GDPNow tool generally is volatile early in the quarter then becomes more accurate as the data rolls in through the period. That comes on the heels of a report Friday showing that **personal income surged 10%** in January, thanks largely to $600 stimulus checks from the government. **Household wealth increased nearly $2 trillion** for the month while spending rose just 2.4%, or $340.9 billion. Those numbers, along with **a burst of nearly $4 trillion in savings, point**ed **to an economy** not only **growing powerfully** but also one that is **poised to continue that path** through the year. “The V-shaped recovery in real GDP will remain V-shaped during the first half of this year and probably through the end of the year,” Ed Yardeni of Yardeni Research wrote in his daily note Tuesday. “However, it will no longer be a ‘recovery’ beyond Q1 because real GDP will have fully recovered during the current quarter. Thereafter, **GDP will be in an ‘expansion’ in record-high territory.**” Economists previously hadn’t expected the $21.5 trillion U.S. economy to regain its pandemic-related losses until at least the second or third quarter of this year, if not later. WATCH NOW VIDEO03:21 Global growth expectations are driving rates, not inflation fears, says UBS’s Alli McCartney But a combination of systematic resilience combined with previously unimaginable doses of fiscal and monetary stimulus have helped speed the recovery along considerably. The final quarter of 2020, in which **GDP increased 4.1%,** left the total of goods and services produced **just $270 billion shy of** the same period a year previous, **before Covid-19** struck. “With strong federal fiscal support and continued progress on vaccination, **GDP growth this year could be the strongest we’ve seen in decades**,” New York Federal Reserve President John Williams said in a speech last week. In fact, questions persist about whether the $1.9 trillion spending plan from the Biden administration is necessary, at least to that magnitude. An economy poised to show its fastest annual growth pace since at least 1984 doesn’t seem like a very good candidate for more spending at a time when the federal government already is expected to run a $2.3 trillion budget deficit this year. Respondents to the ISM report indicated soaring prices and trouble with supply chains, with one manager in electrical equipment, appliances and components noting: “Things are now out of control. Everything is a mess, and we are seeing wide-scale shortages.” Markets have worried lately that overheated growth could generate inflation, particulary with the Federal Reserve continuing to keep its foot on the policy pedal. “Too much of a good thing is often just too much,” Yardeni wrote. “The economy is hot and will get hotter with the bonfire of the fiscal and monetary insanities.” A major area of weakness To be sure, **frailties remain** in the economy. **Paramount among them is the gap in employment, particularly in** the **services** sector. As of January, **there were 8.6 million fewer employed than** there were **a year ago**, just before the pandemic began threatening the U.S., according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. About **4.3 million Americans have left the labor force** in that time. Despite a drop in the headline unemployment rate from a pandemic high of 14.8% to 6.3%, **employment in** the **hospitality** sector **has fallen by more than 3.8 million** from a year ago, and **the jobless rate for the industry is stuck at 15.9%, fully 10 percentage points higher than January** 2020. “**The most glaring issue** with where we stand now **has to be the labor market**. We still have [nearly] **10 million jobs** which **are** just simply **missing**,” said Troy Ludtka, U.S. economist at Natixis. “You’re going to see a situation in the coming years, looking back to this moment, where official statistics on things like food insecurity, poverty and inequality are going to reach generational highs.” However, Ludtka sees promise ahead, thanks in part to measures taken to address the ills of the current era. “The good news is that we are very quickly rebounding, and that is a sign of great promise,” he said. “We’re going to see an economy back to pre-pandemic levels of output, we’re going to see a situation in which unnecessary economic insecurity is mitigated.” There’s even some better news coming out of the jobs market, which despite the gaps that remain has recovered nearly 12.5 million nonfarm payroll jobs since the recovery began in May 2020. For one, job postings are on the rebound. Employment network Indeed reports that listings through Feb. 12 were up a seasonally adjusted 3.9% from Feb. 1, 2020, which it uses as the pre-Covid baseline. In early May 2020, postings lagged the baseline by 39%. **Economists are counting on pent-up demand that vaccinations and falling coronavirus numbers will bring to drive job growth.** Nonfarm payrolls for February are expected to show a gain of 210,000 when the BLS reports the numbers Friday.

#### Unions and worker strikes hurt AI innovation.

Skolink 3/16

[Big Tech is fueling an AI "arms race": It could be terrifying — or just a giant scam, <https://www.salon.com/2021/03/16/big-tech-is-fueling-an-ai-arms-race-it-could-be-terrifying--or-just-a-giant-scam/>, March 16 2021, Jon Skolink, staff writer at Salon. His work has appeared in Current Affairs, The Baffler, AlterNet, and The New York Daily News.] [SS]

"It should not come as a surprise that a commission packed with tech billionaires would call for increased intellectual property protections, oppose regulation (including on Lethal Autonomous Weapons), propose toothless ethics principles, and call for more federal funding of their industry," Poulson said in a statement. Indeed, many commission members are past and present tech executives of companies on the fore of AI — companies that have much to gain from future contracting deals with the Pentagon. The commission's chair, for example, is Eric Schmidt, the former CEO of Google, who remains — as Poulson pointed out — a major shareholder in Alphabet, Google's parent company. Google's head of AI, Andrew Moore, is also a member of the NSCAI. **Google already has an extensive history of working with the Pentagon.** According to The Intercept, in a federally-funded $70 million program called Project Maven, **Google developed "algorithmic warfare initiative to apply artificial intelligence solutions to drone targeting."** The company expecting that revenue would steadily rise from $15 million to $250 million a year for such defense projects. Advertisement: In April of 2018, **however, 3,000 Google employees signed an open letter decrying the company's involvement in defense technology, a move that eventually led to Google'**s ultimate decision **to back out of the deal**. Schmidt strongly objected to Google's decision, calling it an "aberration" within the tech industry, which he felt was otherwise inclined to collaborate with the Defense Department. Former Undersecretary of the Navy Robert Work, the vice chairman of NSCAI, called Google's decision "hypocritical," using language that suggested a new cold war is already underway: "Anything that's going on in the AI center in China is going to the Chinese government and then will ultimately end up in the hands of the Chinese military." chief Jeff Dean is an adviser at China's Tsinghua University, which opened an Institute for Artificial Intelligence in June 2018. Stanford University's Artificial Intelligence lab has a partnership with one of China's biggest retailers. In other words, an arms race in which the two nations are locked in silos of information, research and development is not just ethically dubious but logistically impossible. Advertisement: Will China and Russia explore uses of AI in weapons of the future? Almost certainly — both countries have already signaled movement in that direction. But if American politicians and scientists want to maximize the potential of AI, framing its development in terms of an international "arms race" seems like a strategic and philosophical mistake on a huge scale. AI has the potential to revolutionize health care, education, climate science and many other fields — and those things all play a fundamental role in national security. But **these new technologies will not make America more secure if they are understood as weapons of international combat.**

#### There are two impacts

#### 1 - Economic automation boosts growth and solves for stagnation of productivity

Manyika and Spence 18 (James Manyika and Michael Spence; 2/5/18; Harvard Business Review; *‘The False Choice Between Automation and Jobs”*; accessed 12/15/20; <https://hbr.org/2018/02/the-false-choice-between-automation-and-jobs>; James Manyika is the chairman of the McKinsey Global Institute (MGI), the business and economics research arm of McKinsey & Company.; Michael Spence a Nobel laureate in economics, is Professor of Economics at NYU’s Stern School of Business.) RC/HB

We live in a world where productivity, a key pillar of long-term economic growth, has crumbled. In the United States, Europe, and other advanced economies, productivity growth has slowed so drastically in the past decade that economists debate whether we have entered a new era of stagnation — and this at a time when we need productivity growth more than ever to sustain growth, as working populations in countries from Germany to Japan age and shrink. Now comes potential help, in the form of advanced robotics, machine learning, and artificial intelligence, which can already outperform humans in a range of activities, from lip-reading to analyzing X-rays. The performance benefits for companies are compelling and not just (or even mainly) in terms of reducing labor costs: automation can also bring whole new business models, and improvements that go beyond human capabilities, such as increasing throughput and quality and raising the speed of responses in a variety of industries. Automation will give the global economy that much-needed productivity boost, even as it enables us to tackle societal “moonshots” such as curing disease or contributing solutions to the climate change challenge. The catch is that adopting these technologies will disrupt the world of work. No less significant than the jobs that will be displaced are the jobs that will change — and those that will be created. New research by the McKinsey Global institute suggests that roughly 15% of the global workforce could be displaced by 2030 in a midpoint scenario, but that the jobs likely created will make up for those lost. There is an important proviso: that economies sustain high economic growth and dynamism, coupled with strong trends that will drive demand for work. Even so, between 75 million to 375 million people globally may need to switch occupational categories by 2030, depending on how quickly automation is adopted. It is no small challenge. The jobs gained will require higher educational attainment and more advanced levels of communication and cognitive ability, as work requiring rote skills such as data processing or collection increasingly are taken over by machines. People will be augmented by increasingly capable machines acting as digital working partners and assistants, further requiring ongoing skills development and evolution. In advanced economies, which the research shows will be the most affected, downward pressure on middle-wage jobs will likely grow, exacerbating the already vexed issue of job and income polarization, although in emerging economies the balance between jobs lost and jobs gained looks to be more favorable in the short-to-medium-run., and the net effect is likely to be an acceleration of growth in the middle class. Societies everywhere will have important choices to make in response to these challenges. Some may be tempted to try to halt or slow the adoption of automation. Even if this were possible — and it may be as futile as King Canute’s attempts to turn the incoming tide — it would mean foregoing the beneficial productivity effects the technology would bring. Other options are also less than desirable. Going back to the low-GDP growth, low-job growth path we were on in the immediate aftermath of the global financial crisis will mean stagnation — and continued rising discontent about incomes that don’t advance and income inequalities that continue to grow. And rapid automation that brings only efficiency-driven productivity growth rather than value-added expansion, and hence fails to create jobs, could stir social unease. Our view is that we should embrace automation technologies for the productivity benefits they will bring, even as we deal proactively with the workforce transitions that will accompany adoption. The tradeoff between productivity and employment is actually less than it might seem at first sight, since the GDP bounce that productivity brings will raise consumption and hence labor demand, as it has always done in the past. This effect will be stronger and faster if the gains in value added turn into income in the hands of those who are likely to spend it. Broadly distributing income gains will then translate productivity growth into GDP growth. On the supply side, the key will be to address a range of issues that will help us through the transitions. As noted above, a prerequisite will be to ensure robust GDP growth, since without that there will be no job growth. Three other priorities stand out: First, a much sharper focus on skills and training. That means reversing the trend of declining government spending on training that is apparent in many OECD countries. It also means a stepped-up role for companies, which will be on the front line of automation adoption and will know better and faster which skills are required. Second, we should take another look at making the labor market more fluid, including by more active use of digital technologies for job matching and for stimulating the rise of independent work. In fact, the dynamism of labor markets is waning: in the United States, for example, the job reallocation rate dropped by 25% between 1990 and 2013, and the share of workers relocating across state lines annually has fallen by half, to close to 1.5%. Government, businesses, educational institutions, and labor organizations need to collaborate to ensure that incumbents and new entrants to the labor market have accurate forward-looking knowledge of the evolving mix of skill and experience requirements. The third priority should be a reevaluation of income and transition support to help displaced workers or those struggling with transitions to new occupations. Germany set an example here by revamping its labor agency and putting an emphasis on acquiring skills. Its labor participation rate has risen by 10 percentage points since reunification, to above the U.S. level. It will take time. But ultimately, the productivity conundrum can be resolved, if we embrace and unleash the benefits of automation and put in place a smart set of policies to ensure that everyone is prepared for it, and everyone can benefit.

#### 2 - The negative effects of strikes spill over to hurt wages, unemployment, and the overall economy.

McElroy ‘19

[Strikes Hurt Everybody, <https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody>, 10/25/19, John McElroy, editorial director of Blue Sky Productions and producer of "Autoline" for WTVS-Channel 56 Detroit and "Autoline Daily" the online video newscasts.] [SS]

The recent strike at General Motors shows traditional labor practices must change. Not only did the strike cause considerable financial damage at GM, it drove another wedge between the company and its workers. And worst of all, it hurt a lot of innocent bystanders. Thanks to the UAW, the hourly workforce at GM earns the highest compensation in the U.S. auto industry. But you would never know that by listening to union leaders. They attack GM as a vile and heartless corporation that deliberately tries to oppress honest working men and women. Of course, they kind of have to say that. Union officials are elected, not appointed, and they are just as political as any Republican or Democrat. No UAW official ever got elected by saying, “You know what? Management is right. We’ve got to make sure our labor costs are competitive.” It’s the opposite. **Union leaders get elected by attacking management’s greed and arrogance. This creates a poisonous relationship between the company and its workforc**e. Many GM hourly workers don’t identify as GM employees. They identify as UAW members. And they see the union as the source of their jobs, not the company. It’s an unhealthy dynamic **that puts GM at a disadvantage to non-union automakers** in the U.S. like Honda and Toyota, **where workers take pride in the company** they work for and the products they make. **Attacking the company in the media also drives away customers**. Who wants to buy a shiny new car from a company that’s accused of underpaying its workers and treating them unfairly? Data from the Center for Automotive Research (CAR) in Ann Arbor, MI, show that **GM loses market share during strikes** and never gets it back. GM lost two percentage points during the 1998 strike, which in today’s market would represent a loss of 340,000 sales. Because GM reports sales on a quarterly basis we’ll only find out at the end of December if it lost market share from this strike. UAW members say one of their greatest concerns is job security. But causing a company **to lose market share is a sure-fire path to** more plant closings and **layoffs.** Even so, unions are incredibly important for boosting wages and benefits for working-class people. GM’s UAW-represented workers earn considerably more than their non-union counterparts, about $26,000 more per worker, per year, in total compensation. Without a union they never would have achieved that. Strikes are a powerful weapon for unions. They usually are the only way they can get management to accede to their demands. If not for the power of collective bargaining and the threat of a strike, management would largely ignore union demands. If you took away that threat, management would pay its workers peanuts. Just ask the Mexican line workers who are paid $1.50 an hour to make $50,000 BMWs. But **strikes** don’t just hurt the people walking the picket lines or the company they’re striking against. They **hurt suppliers, car dealers and the communities l**ocated **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 **cut**ting **budgets and delay**ing **capital investments** to make up for the lost revenue, **which is a further drag on the economy**. According to CAR, the **communities** and states **where GM’s plants are located** collectively **lost a couple of hundred million dollars in payroll and tax revenue**. Some economists warn that **if the strike were prolonged it could knock** the state of **Michigan** – home to GM and the UAW – **into a recession**. That prompted the governor of Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer, to call GM CEO Mary Barra and UAW leaders and urge them to settle as fast as possible. So, while the UAW managed to get a nice raise for its members, the strike left a path of destruction in its wake. That’s not fair to the innocent bystanders who will never regain what they lost. John McElroyI’m not sure how this will ever be resolved. I understand the need for collective bargaining and the threat of a strike. But there’s got to be a better way to get workers a raise without torching the countryside.

## Case

#### According to Merriam Webster

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/unconditional

Definition of unconditional

1: not conditional or limited : ABSOLUTE, UNQUALIFIED

unconditional surrender

unconditional love

#### unconditional right to strike wouldn’t specifiy that employers can’t use means to try and deter people from striking, just that they can’t stop them forcibly from striking and arrest them