

BUSINESS, SOCIETY & ETHICS

Debate #4: This House Believes Uber Drivers are Contractors, Not Employees

As you read the material for our next class, keep the questions below in mind. To answer these questions you will have to reflect critically on what you have read and possibly re-read important passages. Keep in mind that there are two basic kinds of information that you need to look for in the reading:

1. What are the main points or conclusions that an author accepts with respect to a particular issue?
2. What are the reasons, important considerations, and evidence that lead the author to accept that conclusion?

For our purposes, *it is information of the second sort that will be our primary concern* since our most basic task is to *evaluate the reasons and evidence* that are offered to support accepting one possible conclusion about an issue, rather than another.

Although I strongly suggest that you write out brief answers to these questions, you do not have to turn in written responses. You do, however, need to be prepared to speak intelligently about these issues at our next class meeting.

Questions

1. What seem to be the strongest arguments that support and justify this debate's motion?
2. What seem to be the strongest arguments that critique and reject this debate's motion?

Readings

- Adam Brinklow, "Year in Preview: What the Uber Lawsuit Means for Workers in the Sharing Economy".
- James Surowiecki, "Gigs with Benefits".
- Stephen Gandel, "Uber-nomics: Here's What It Would Cost Uber to Pay Its Drivers as Employees".
- Harry Campbell, "Do Uber Drivers Even Want To Be Employees?"
- Daniel Fisher, "Uber Says Drivers Oppose Lawsuit That Would Make Them Employees".
- Rebecca Smith, "It Won't Kill Uber to Treat Drivers Like Employees".
- Steven Davidoff Solomon, "Uber Case Highlights Outdated Worker Protection Laws".
- The Wall Street Journal, "California's Uber Raid".
- The Wall Street Journal, "Shackling the Sharing Economy".