### **DA- Innovation**

#### **Global tech innovation is 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> TCHS-CS

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 [innovation is slowing down] 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.

#### **Unfortunately, the aff is incompatible with sustained 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. TCHS-CS

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.”

#### **Specifically, massive changes in union power distribution like the aff mobilizes unions in the IT sector, in turn decreasing tech innovation**

**Vynck et al 21** [Gerrit De; Carleton University, BA in Journalism and Global Politics, tech reporter for The Washington Post. He writes about Google and the algorithms that increasingly shape society. He previously covered tech for seven years at Bloomberg News; Nitashu Tiku; Columbia University, BA in English, New York University, MA in Journalism, Washington Post's tech culture reporter based in San Francisco; Macalester College, BA in English, Columbia University, MS in Journalism, reporter for The Washington Post who is focused on technology coverage in the Pacific Northwest; “Six things to know about the latest efforts to bring unions to Big Tech,” The Washington Post; <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/01/26/tech-unions-explainer/>] TCHS-CS

In response to tech company crackdowns and lobbying, gig workers have shifted their strategy to emphasize building worker-led movements and increasing their ranks, rather than focusing on employment status as the primary goal, says Veena Dubal, a law professor at the University of California Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco. The hope is that with President Biden in the White House and an even split in the Senate, legislators will mobilize at the federal level, through the NLRA or bills such as the PRO Act, to recognize gig worker collectives as real unions.

#### **Technological innovation is key to solve countless existential threats**

**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> TCHS-CS

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

### **DA- Econ**

#### **The economy is fragile! It’s slowly recovering but is uneven and requires sustained growth. A significant economic externality would derail the global economic recovery.**

**World Bank 21-** World Bank. “The Global Economy: on Track for Strong but Uneven Growth as COVID-19 Still Weighs.” *World Bank*, June 8, 2021, <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2021/06/08/the-global-economy-on-track-for-strong-but-uneven-growth-as-covid-19-still-weighs> TCHS-CS

A year and a half since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the global economy is poised to stage its most robust post-recession recovery in 80 years in 2021. But the rebound is expected to be uneven across countries, as major economies look set to register strong growth even as many developing economies lag.

Global growth is expected to accelerate to 5.6% this year, largely on the strength in major economies such as the United States and China. And while growth for almost every region of the world has been revised upward for 2021, many continue to grapple with COVID-19 and what is likely to be its long shadow. Despite this year’s pickup, the level of global GDP in 2021 is expected to be 3.2% below pre-pandemic projections, and per capita GDP among many emerging market and developing economies is anticipated to remain below pre-COVID-19 peaks for an extended period. As the pandemic continues to flare, it will shape the path of global economic activity. The United States and China are each expected to contribute about one quarter of global growth in 2021. The U.S. economy has been bolstered by massive fiscal support, vaccination is expected to become widespread by mid-2021, and growth is expected to reach 6.8% this year, the fastest pace since 1984. China’s economy – which did not contract last year – is expected to grow a solid 8.5% and moderate as the country’s focus shifts to reducing financial stability risks. Lasting Legacies Growth among emerging market and developing economies is expected to accelerate to 6% this year, helped by increased external demand and higher commodity prices. However, the recovery of many countries is constrained by resurgences of COVID-19, uneven vaccination, and a partial withdrawal of government economic support measures. Excluding China, growth is anticipated to unfold at a more modest 4.4% pace. In the longer term, the outlook for emerging market and developing economies will likely be dampened by the lasting legacies of the pandemic – erosion of skills from lost work and schooling; a sharp drop in investment; higher debt burdens; and greater financial vulnerabilities. Growth among this group of economies is forecast to moderate to 4.7% in 2022 as governments gradually withdraw policy support. Among low-income economies, where vaccination has lagged, growth has been revised lower to 2.9%. Setting aside the contraction last year, this would be the slowest pace of expansion in two decades. The group’s output level in 2022 is projected to be 4.9% lower than pre-pandemic projections. Fragile and conflict-affected low-income economies have been the hardest hit by the pandemic, and per capita income gains have been set back by at least a decade. Regionally, the recovery is expected to be strongest in East Asia and the Pacific, largely due to the strength of China’s recovery. In South Asia, recovery has been hampered by serious renewed outbreaks of the virus in India and Nepal. The Middle East and North Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean are expected to post growth too shallow to offset the contraction of 2020. Sub-Saharan Africa’s recovery, while helped by spillovers from the global recovery, is expected to remain fragile given the slow pace of vaccination and delays to major investments in infrastructure and the extractives sector. Uncertain Outlook The June forecast assumes that advanced economies will achieve widespread vaccination of their populations and effectively contain the pandemic by the end of the year. Major emerging market and developing economies are anticipated to substantially reduce new cases. However, the outlook is subject to considerable uncertainty. A more persistent pandemic, a wave of corporate bankruptcies, financial stress, or even social unrest could derail the recovery. At the same time, more rapid success in stamping out COVID-19 and greater spillovers from advanced economy growth could generate more vigorous global growth.

### 

#### **Prolonged, unconditional strikes cause widespread economic harm- GM strikes prove.**

**McElroy 19-** John McElroy, “Strikes Hurt Everybody.” Wards Auto Industry News, October 25, 2019, <https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody> TCHS-CS

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. 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.

#### **Strikes now would trigger food shortages, undermine health care and threaten the economy.**

**Pettypiece 21-** Shannon Pettypiece “Biden on the sidelines of 'Striketober,' with economy in the balance,” October 2021, NBC News, <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/white-house/biden-sidelines-striketober-economy-balance-n1282094> TCHS-CS

But President Biden faces a different dynamic from candidate Biden, because strikes risk adding to labor shortages and supply chain disruptions that are already driving up prices as the global economy reels from pandemic strains. While the strikes could benefit workers by driving up wages in the long term, the near-term impact of persistent or growing work stoppages could include worst-case scenarios like food shortages or lack of access to hospitals. "This will come at an economic cost to employers and therefore the economy, and I think that may be why Biden has gone a little silent," said Ariel Avgar, an associate professor of labor relations, law and history at Cornell University. "It is tricky for him. On the one hand, he is on the record supporting unions and their ability to use collective action. On the other hand, the point of strikes is to extract an economic price for employers unwilling to negotiate in a way the union feels is appropriate.”

### 

#### **Sustained economic growth reduces poverty, improves quality of life, and is key to finding solutions for future global calamities. The economic shock caused by the aff makes these goals unattainable since it halts the sustained economic growth the economy is experiencing coming out of COVID-19**

**DFID-**  (Department for International Development. Growth: Building jobs and prosperity in developing countries. <https://www.oecd.org/derec/unitedkingdom/40700982.pdf>) TCHS-CS

**Economic growth is the most powerful instrument for reducing poverty and improving the quality of life in developedcountries. Both cross-country research and country case studies provide overwhelming evidence that rapid and sustained growth is critical to making faster progress towards the Millennium Development Goals – and not just the first goal of halving the global proportion of people living on less than $1 a day.** Growth can generate virtuous circles of prosperity and opportunity. Strong growth and employment opportunities improve incentives for parents to invest in their children’s education by sending them to school. This may lead to the emergence of a strong and growing group of entrepreneurs, which should generate pressure for improved governance. Strong economic growth therefore advances human development, which, in turn, promotes economic growth. But under different conditions, similar rates of growth can have very different effects on poverty, the employment prospects of the poor and broader indicators of human development. The extent to which growth reduces poverty depends on the degree to which the poor participate in the growth process and share in its proceeds. Thus, both the pace and pattern of growth matter for reducing poverty**. A successful strategy of poverty reduction must have at its core measures to promote rapid and sustained economic growth.** The challenge for policy is to combine growthpromoting policies with policies that allow the poor to participate fully in the opportunities unleashed and so contribute to that growth. This includes policies to make labour markets work better, remove gender inequalities and increase financial inclusion. Asian countries are increasingly tackling this agenda of ‘inclusive growth’. India’s most recent development plan has two main objectives: raising economic growth and making growth more inclusive, policy mirrored elsewhere in South Asia and Africa. Future growth will need to be based on an increasingly globalised world that offers new opportunities but also new challenges. New technologies offer not only ‘catch-up’ potential but also ‘leapfrogging’ possibilities. New science offers better prospects across both productive and service sectors. Future growth will also need to be environmentally sustainable. Improved management of water and other natural resources is required, together with movement towards low carbon technologies by both developed and developing countries. **With the proper institutions, growth and environmental sustainability may be seen as complements, not substitutes**. DFID will work for inclusive growth through a number of programmes and continues to spend heavily on health and education, which have a major impact on poor people’s ability to take part in growth opportunities. More and better research on the drivers of growth will be needed to improve policy. But ultimately the biggest determinants of growth in a country will be its leadership, policies and institutions

#### **Independently, econ decline causes World War III. (I stole this card from my old pal/arch-nemesis Nicholas Lloyd Davillier. He beat me with this card in round 2 of the LHSSL December Classic. While he went on to lose every one of our remaining matchups, his generic evidence is much appreciated).**

**Liu 18-** Qian Liu 18. China-based economist. “From economic crisis to World War III.” Project Syndicate. 11/8/2018. <https://www.projxsect-syndicate.org/commentary/economic-crisis-military-conflict-or-structural-reform-by-qian-liu-2018-11> NICHOLAS LLOYD DAVILLIER

The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the **current social, political, and technological landscape**, a **prolonged economic crisis**, combined with rising income inequality, could well escalate into a **major global military conflict**. The 2008-09 global financial crisis almost bankrupted governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including **q**uantitative **e**asing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates. But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labour markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies. Policymakers have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment. The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929. As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilise and stimulate the economy. If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend far beyond the economy. According to Harvard’s Benjamin Friedman, **prolonged periods of economic distress** have been characterised also by public **antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries** – attitudes that can help to **fuel unrest**, **terrorism**, or even **war**. For example, during the Great Depression, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. In the subsequent five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, World War II had begun. To be sure, WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors; there is no standard path to war. But there is reason to believe that high levels of inequality can play a significant role in stoking conflict. According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster. Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels. This is all the more worrying in view of the numerous other factors stoking social unrest and diplomatic tension, including technological disruption, a record-breaking migration crisis, anxiety over globalisation, political polarisation, and rising nationalism. All are symptoms of failed policies that could turn out to be trigger points for a future crisis. Voters have good reason to be frustrated, but the emotionally appealing **populists** to whom they are increasingly giving their support are offering ill-advised solutions that will **only make matters worse**. For example, despite the world’s unprecedented interconnectedness, **multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed**, as countries – most notably, Donald J. Trump’s US – pursue unilateral, isolationist policies. Meanwhile, **proxy wars** are **raging in Syria and Yemen**. Against this background, we must take seriously the possibility that the **next economic crisis could lead to a large-scale military confrontation**. By the logic of the political scientist Samuel Huntington, considering such a scenario could help us avoid it because it would force us to take action. In this case, the key will be for policymakers to pursue the structural reforms that they have long promised while replacing finger-pointing and antagonism with a sensible and respectful global dialogue.

### **CP- UBI**

#### **Text: A just government ought to provide a Universal Basic Income of $1,000 per year**

#### **A UBI boosts GDP, labor force participation, prices, and wages without affecting business confidence or causing strikes**

**Nikifros et al 17-** Michalis Nikiforos, Marshall Steinbaum, and Gennaro Zezza 17, Michalis Nikiforos is a research scholar working in the State of the US and World Economies program, Marshall Steinbaum is Research Director and a Fellow at the Roosevelt Institute, Gennaro Zezza is an associate professor of economics at the University of Cassino, Italy, 8-29-2017, "Modeling the Macroeconomic Effects of a Universal Basic Income," Roosevelt Institute, http://rooseveltinstitute.org/modeling-macroeconomic-effects-ubi//HM

**$1,000 for all adults annually - expands the economy by 12.56% over the baseline after eight years.** After eight years of enactment, the stimulative effects of the program dissipate and GDP growth returns to the baseline forecast, but the level of output remains permanently higher. • When paying for the policy by increasing taxes on households, the Levy model forecasts no effect on the economy. In effect, it gives to households with one hand what it is takes away with the other. • However, when the model is adapted to include distributional effects, the economy grows, even in the taxfinanced scenarios. This occurs because the distributional model incorporates the idea that an extra dollar in the hands of lower income households leads to higher spending. In other words, the households that pay more in taxes than they receive in cash assistance have a low propensity to consume, and those that receive more in assistance than they pay in taxes have a high propensity to consume. Thus, even when the policy is tax- rather than debtfinanced, there is an increase in output, employment, prices, and wages. Levy’s Keynesian model incorporates a series of assumptions based on rigorous empirical studies of the micro and macro effects of unconditional cash transfers, taxation and government net spending and borrowing (see Marinescu (2017), Mason (2017), Coibion et al (2017), and Konczal and Steinbaum (2016)). Fundamentally, **the larger the size of the UBI, the larger the increase in aggregate demand and thus the larger the resulting economy is.** The individual macroeconomic indicators are (qualitatively) what one would predict given an increase in aggregate demand: **in addition to the increase in output, employment, labor force participation, prices, and wages all go up as well.**