

---

# West Coast Publishing

---

## LD 2017-2018

### Universal Basic Income Pt 1

**Edited by Jim Hanson**

Research Assistance by  
Kathryn Starkey

Thanks for using our Policy, LD, Public Forum, and Extemp Materials.

**Please don't share this material with anyone outside  
of your school**

including via print, email, dropbox, google drive, the web, etc.  
*We're a small non-profit; please help us continue to provide our products.*

**Contact us at [jim@wcdebate.com](mailto:jim@wcdebate.com)**

**[www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)**

# WEST COAST DEBATE

## LD 2017-2018

### Universal Basic Income Pt 1

#### Finding Arguments in this File

Use the table of contents on the next pages to find the evidence you need or the navigation bar on the left. We have tried to make the table of contents as easy to use as possible.

#### Using the arguments in this File

We encourage you to be familiar with the evidence you use. Highlight (underline) the key lines you will use in the evidence. Cut evidence from our files, incorporate your and others' research and make new files. File the evidence so that you can easily retrieve it when you need it in debate rounds. Practice reading the evidence out-loud; Practice applying the arguments to your opponents' positions; Practice defending your evidence in rebuttal speeches.

#### Use West Coast Evidence as a Beginning

We hope you enjoy our evidence files and find them useful. In saying this, we want to make a strong statement that we make when we coach and that we believe is vitally important to your success: DO NOT USE THIS EVIDENCE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR YOUR OWN RESEARCH. Instead, let it serve as a beginning. Let it inform you of important arguments, of how to tag and organize your arguments, and to offer citations for further research. Don't stagnate in these files-- build upon them by doing your own research for updates, new strategies, and arguments that specifically apply to your opponents. In doing so, you'll use our evidence to become a better debater.

#### Copying West Coast Evidence

Our policy gives you the freedom to use our evidence for educational purposes without violating our hard work.

- You may print and copy this evidence for those on your team.
- You may not electronically share nor distribute this evidence with anyone other than those on your team unless you very substantially change each page of material that you share.

For unusual situations, you can e-mail us at [jim@wcdebate.com](mailto:jim@wcdebate.com) and seek our consent.

#### Ordering West Coast Materials

1. Visit the West Coast Web Page at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)
2. E-mail us at [jim@wcdebate.com](mailto:jim@wcdebate.com)
3. Fax us at 877-781-5058

Copyright 2017. West Coast Publishing. All Rights Reserved.

**Visit our web page!**

[www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)

*We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)*

WEST COAST DEBATE ..... 2

Resolved: The United States Ought to Provide a Universal Basic Income. .... 4

    Topic Overview ..... 5

    Definitions ..... 9

        Ought ..... 10

        Provide..... 11

        Universal Basic Income..... 12

AFF Sample Case..... 13

    Contention 1: The Growth of Artificial Intelligence is a Concern for the U.S. Economy, and Implementing a UBI is a Means to Solve It. .... 15

    Contention 2: A UBI Can Foster Creativity in the Workplace As Workers Have More Freedom in Their Career Search..... 17

AFF Extensions..... 18

    UBI Key to Human Rights..... 19

    UBI Good for Innovation..... 21

    UBI Ends Poverty ..... 23

    UBI Saves the Environment ..... 26

    UBI Fights the Patriarchy ..... 27

    UBI Necessary to Offset Impacts of Automation on the Workforce ..... 28

NEG Sample Case..... 29

    Contention 1: A Universal Basic Income (UBI) is far too costly of an undertaking to be economically feasible for the United States..... 31

    Contention 2: The UBI is not the only solution to U.S. economic woes; other economic initiatives will be more net-beneficial. .... 32

NEG Extensions..... 33

    UBI Harms Social Fabric ..... 34

    UBI Destroys Welfare ..... 36

    UBI Fosters the Rich-Poor Gap ..... 37

    UBI is Too Difficult to Implement ..... 38

    UBI is Far Too Costly to Implement ..... 40

    UBI Negatively Impacts Taxpayers ..... 41

    UBI is Unnecessary; Automation is Not a Threat ..... 42

**Resolved: The United States Ought to  
Provide a Universal Basic Income.**

# Topic Overview

## Introduction

Economic inequality has been an issue in the United States for decades, if not since the nation's inception. In recent years, discussion about the universal basic income have started to take hold as a potential response to this inequality, government spending, and the future of social programs in this country. The universal basic income (UBI) is a form of government assistance program where every citizen is guaranteed the same amount of money paid to them by the government. It is a program in which citizens are paid on an interval – monthly or annually, to everyone, unconditionally, and is usually a cash payment of some sort. Each UBI varies based on the economy in which it is established, but the general intent is still the same – government payouts to its citizens. Many have adopted a pilot program for UBI, offering it to a group of citizens to study the effects of the program. Finland did so in January 2017, following in the footsteps of Switzerland, some towns in Canada, Namibia, Uganda, and others. Some economic circles in the United States are now discussing the UBI as a means to ameliorate economic disparities in our country, but this idea isn't new. It was discussed by Thomas Paine, and now presidential candidates, tech companies, and economic gurus are making it part of the national discussion once again, and thus we are debating the resolution, "The United States ought to provide a universal basic income."

It is important to understand exactly what the resolution is asking. The two words that change the scope of the resolution are "ought" and "provide." In one interpretation, the resolution is saying that the government should make a UBI available. Ought in this instance means should or would, having a less definite interpretation, and "provide" is interpreted as the government must only make it available, rather than mandate its existence. This would allow for affirmatives like pilot programs to be possible areas of discussion. On the other hand, the resolution could be interpreted that the government must mandate a full UBI for the United States. It is a service that must be provided, and in a strict interpretation of a UBI, all citizens must have access.

## Affirmative Arguments & Strategy

One of the first things you need to do as the affirmative is decide what it is you want to defend. A UBI is a complicated economic policy, so you'd have to decide what kind of UBI the U.S. should implement, which means deciding a dollar amount, number of people to receive it, and when it is received. When you are deciding the amount each citizen receives, the lowest number possible to reduce the poverty gap in a substantial way is likely the best way to hedge against economic arguments from the negative. Also, a limiting interpretation of the resolution would ask you to create a pilot program, which is a very strategic affirmative. Additionally, you must decide whether provide means to allow access or to mandate that a UBI happens. This allows you to stay in the theoretical realm of a UBI for the U.S. versus a world in which you debate that the policy is actually going to be implemented.

There are several values and criteria that you can utilize to demonstrate why the UBI ought be implemented in the United States. The case below uses economic equality as its value. By ensuring all have access to the economy and the basic necessities of living, it means that some of the important impacts like discrimination, dehumanization, poverty all can be discussed in the context of the affirmative. Other values include individual rights – those that are enumerated to us, justice – what is deserved, quality of life – fulfilling the first level of Maslow's hierarchy to attain self-actualization later in life, and even simply equality. The case below uses the criterion of social welfare. It says that the welfare of a nation's citizenry must be prioritized, and a way that can be achieved, particularly in the U.S., is through aiming to create economic equality for all. The rich-poor gap in the U.S. is a substantial problem, and through prioritizing the social

***We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

welfare in legislation, policies like the UBI can truly make a difference. Other possible criteria include deontology or economic determinism.

The case below has two contentions. The first argues that artificial intelligence and technological innovation are a cause for concern. With more automation, it means that low-skill jobs will be replaced by machines. This has been happening for a while now, but with the increase in AI as a multiplier on automation, job replacement will begin happening at an exponential rate, leading to higher levels of unemployment. This has a few negative effects. First, it means that more and more people are forced to live without a paycheck. Those in lower socio-economic brackets often times lack a savings account to cover job loss, which makes impacts of poverty even more amplified. Second, low unemployment levels can have broader economic impacts like higher crime rates, higher payouts from the government to unemployment benefits, reduces national GDP, and raised inflation rates. This contention is uniquely important because lawmakers have not been keeping up with the negative effects of a technology-driven economy. By saying the U.S. ought to implement a UBI, it gives a means for the government to take care of its citizens in a time of crisis.

The second contention argues that implementing a UBI can foster creativity and innovation. Essentially, the argument is based on the notion that those whom are unemployed can take more time to find a career that suits their needs and dreams more effectively. When someone enjoys their career, it leads to less burnout, which benefits both the individual and the company for which they work. When employees enjoy their job, it leads to more creativity, fostering innovation. On an individual level, people feel more content, which leads to lower levels of depression, anxiety, and stress, once again showing how leveling the economic playing field with a UBI can help support the social welfare.

There are several other important lines of argumentation for the affirmative to hedge against negative arguments while showing other benefits of implementing a UBI in the United States. One of the most important arguments for the affirmative is the notion that the UBI is important to protect human rights. It is a means for a government to ensure its citizens have access to the basic necessities to live. It shows people are valued in a time of uncertainty in their lives with employment, or something of the like. This can be framed as one of the biggest impacts in the round, as protecting the social welfare is of the utmost importance. Another one of the interesting lines of argumentation on this topic concerns modeling. The United States has been a world leader for multiple types of policies throughout the years, and with UBI, it could be the same. There is a plethora of nations that have been researching the ins and outs of the UBI for their own nation, but many haven't taken the plunge to implement it. In a world the U.S. adopts a UBI, it allows other nations to see a success story, leading to economic benefits around the world.

## **Negative Arguments & Strategy**

As the negative, the ways in which you frame the definitions in your case to help delineate ground in the most effective way. In the provide/ought ground division, you should frame the debate to force the affirmative to mandate that a UBI is implemented in the U.S. This way, you better divide the ground and ensure they can't just defend a pilot program. There is another important framing argument you can make to help with the division of ground. The resolution is U.S. specific, you can frame the debate in such a way that you only have to deem that UBI in the U.S. is bad, rather than UBI is bad generally. This helps you answer any of the generic UBI good evidence the affirmative may have and force your opponent to provide evidence that it will directly affect the U.S. in a positive way. It can help you decide what you want to defend – general UBI bad or just UBI in the U.S. is bad. You also want to determine what you want the affirmative to defend in the debate in terms of the amount of a UBI. It would be rather advantageous for you to force the aff to defend a certain dollar amount that each citizen would receive from a UBI in the U.S. That way, you can have

***We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

easier access to your economic arguments. A last important framing argument to consider is that the resolution does not include the words “In the United States.” Because of this, it could be interpreted that the U.S. cannot fund a UBI in a different city or nation outside of the U.S. Be prepared for arguments like these.

There are several values and criterions that you can utilize to demonstrate why implementing a UBI in the United States would be a bad idea. The value in the case below is economic equality. Yes, this is the same as the affirmative case, but much of the evidence below suggests that the UBI would fail to fix economic inequality, rather it would cause more inequality in the U.S. if implemented. Other potential values include natural rights, distributive justice, or simply equality. As for criterions, the case below uses pragmatism. By evaluating the case through a lens of pragmatism, it allows the negative to demonstrate both the philosophical and real-world implications of mandating the use of the UBI for the American people. Other criterions include consequentialism, utilitarianism, and Locke’s social contract theory.

There are two contentions in the case in the case below. The first shows that implementing the UBI would be a bad economic move for the U.S. Any good affirmative case will have an econ argument, showing how the UBI will fix poverty, economic issues, etc. The first contention below is a direct answer to any of those contentions, showing that the UBI is so costly, it will crush the economy. It also reduces the labor force to much, leading to issues like inflation. In addition to being costly, it is drastically difficult to implement. Particularly under the Trump Administration, new regulatory agencies would need to be created for the UBI, and those would be difficult to create. Contention two argues that there are alternatives to the UBI to answer the economic problems in the U.S. This contention allows you to bypass the economic issues facet of the debate and force the clash to be about the solution instead. The argument says that other nations have found other ways to ameliorate economic issues from innovation. There could be government incentives in new industries or welfare consolidation as solvency mechanisms instead. It’s also important to remember that our nation has bounced back from automation before, and the economy is rather resilient.

There are several economic disadvantages to implementing the UBI, particularly in the United States. First, it will hurt taxpayers. The discussion of paying taxes is a bit taboo; most do not like to pay them. In order to pay for a UBI, any government would have to find a large source of revenue. Eventually there could potentially be economic benefits reaped from a UBI, but in the short term, the impacts are very large. Individuals would lose more of their paychecks to pay taxes, which would hurt those already in poverty. Additionally, there will be a lag in the coverage of welfare. Increasing taxes alone cannot facilitate an effective UBI policy. Many economists argue that many social services will be cut in order to fully implement a UBI. This means, that for at least a short time, many will lose services that could be vital to their livelihood, like access to shelter, food, medications, and the like. There is also a time frame argument to be made about how individuals will need to learn how to access the goods and services lost due to welfare restructuring, which also leads to the same negative effects. Other industries can change how they interact with government welfare programs, which will make it even harder for the most disadvantaged to access the basic goods and services they need to survive. One of the worst economic problems with implementing the UBI is that instead of reducing the rich-poor gap, it will only increase as a result of the UBI. Lastly, it wouldn’t just negatively affect the U.S., it would have world-wide negative effects. One of the things you can discuss is in the realm of modeling. For decades, the United States has been a world leader, with some nations just following our lead despite if those actions would work best for the nation in question. Contrary to the affirmative arguments on modeling, you can say that if the U.S. were to adopt the UBI, other nations would try to implement the same policy, and that could have devastating effects on other nations’ economies

One of the crucial arguments for the affirmative is that UBI is necessary because automation makes economic inequality inevitable. There are two ways to answer this line of argument as the negative. First,

***We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

automation will not inevitably lead to the demise of the workforce. Yes, technology is growing at a fast rate, but this does not need to be disastrous. There are ways to ameliorate the effects of automation like offering education and training incentives can help prepare the workforce for new industry. Despite all of this, it's important to remember that there have been booms of automation in the past, and the U.S. economy recovered each time. The U.S. is a leader in innovation, so new industries will sprout to help the nation recover as they have in the past. Second, there are other alternatives to implementing the UBI that will serve the same purpose of alleviating economic disparities in the U.S. This is Contention 2 of the negative case, but there are more pieces of evidence in the negative extensions.

# Definitions

## Ought

### **Ought expresses obligation**

**Merriam-Webster, 2017**, "Ought," <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought> (accessed 7/13/17)

Ought —used to express obligation (*ought to pay our debts*), advisability (*ought to take care of yourself*), natural expectation (*ought to be here by now*), or logical consequence (*the result ought to be infinity*).

### **Ought refers to something that is owed**

**Online Etymology Dictionary, 2017**, "Ought," <http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=ought> (accessed 7/13/17)

Ought – Old English *ahte* "owned, possessed," past tense of *agan* "to own, possess, owe" (see *owe*). As a past tense of *owe*, it shared in that word's evolution and meant at times in Middle English "possessed" and "under obligation to pay." It has been detached from *owe* since 17c., though *he aught me ten pounds* is recorded as active in East Anglian dialect from c. 1825. As an auxiliary verb expressing duty or obligation (late 12c., the main modern use), it represents the past subjunctive.

### **Ought refers to a belief statement**

Ralph **Wedgwood**, former professor of philosophy at University of Oxford, **2006**, "The Meaning of Ought," *Oxford Studies in Metaethics*, ed. Russ Shafer-Landau, vol. 1 (2006), <http://www-bcf.usc.edu/~wedgwood/meaningofought.htm> (accessed 7/13/17)

Different philosophers of language have taken radically different approaches to both of these tasks. In addressing the first task, most philosophers assume that it is at least part of understanding a term that one has the ability to use declarative sentences involving that term to express certain mental states. However, philosophers differ over what sort of mental state is normally expressed by the use of declarative sentences involving 'ought': cognitivists think that these mental states are just straightforward beliefs, of basically the same kind as the beliefs that are normally expressed by most other declarative sentences; non-cognitivists think that they are mental states of some crucially different kind, such as emotions, or desires or intentions of the sort that are typically expressed by commands or prescriptions. Philosophers have also taken various different approaches to the second task, including what I shall call the "factualist" approach and the "non-factualist" approach.[1] According to the factualist approach, the fundamental explanation of the logical properties of the term essentially involves the idea that the content of any declarative sentence involving the term is a proposition that is either true or false. According to the non-factualist approach, even if one eventually "earns the right" to speak of propositions that are true or false, the fundamental explanation of the term's logical properties need say nothing about sentences involving these terms having as their contents propositions that are either true or false.

## **Provide**

### **Provide means to make available**

**Dictionary.com, 2017**, "Provide," <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/provide?s=t>

Provide 1. to make available; furnish: to provide employees with various benefits. 2. to supply or equip: to provide the army with new fighter planes. 3. to afford or yield. 4. Law. to arrange for or stipulate beforehand, as by a provision or proviso. 5. Archaic. to prepare or procure beforehand.

### **Provide indicates something must happen**

Cambridge Dictionary, 2017, "Provide," <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/provide> (accessed 7/13/17)

Provide: (of a law or contract) to state that something must happen or be done: [ I ] The new statute provides for life imprisonment without parole. [ + that clause ] Many loan agreements provide that the interest rate will change.

### **Provide means to make available for use**

**Oxford Dictionary, 2017**, "Provide," <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/provide> (accessed 7/13/17)

Provide: verb 1 [with object] Make available for use; supply. 'these clubs provide a much appreciated service for this area' 1.1 provide someone with Equip or supply someone with (something useful or necessary) 'we were provided with a map of the area' 1.2 Present or yield (something useful) 'neither will provide answers to these problems'

## Universal Basic Income

### **UBI is a periodic, unconditional cash payment to all members of a society**

Basic Income Earth Network (**BIEN**), **2017**, “About Basic Income,” <http://basicincome.org/basic-income/> (accessed 7/13/17)

A basic income is a periodic cash payment unconditionally delivered to all on an individual basis, without means-test or work requirement. That is, basic income has the following five characteristics: Periodic: it is paid at regular intervals (for example every month), not as a one-off grant. Cash payment: it is paid in an appropriate medium of exchange, allowing those who receive it to decide what they spend it on. It is not, therefore, paid either in kind (such as food or services) or in vouchers dedicated to a specific use. Individual: it is paid on an individual basis—and not, for instance, to households. Universal: it is paid to all, without means test. Unconditional: it is paid without a requirement to work or to demonstrate willingness-to-work. A wide variety of Basic Income proposals are circulating today. They differ along many other dimensions, including in the amounts of the Basic Income, the source of funding, the nature and size of reductions in other transfers that might accompany it, and so on.

### **UBI is a regular payment to all citizens, enough to lift them out of poverty**

Christine **Emba**, columnist, September 28, **2015**, “Universal basic income,” Washington Post, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/28/universal-basic-income-a-primer/?utm\\_term=.44da2da4ec84](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/28/universal-basic-income-a-primer/?utm_term=.44da2da4ec84) (accessed 7/13/17)

Enter universal basic income. Also referred to as “guaranteed income” or the “basic income guarantee,” the concept is simple: in order to ensure that all citizens can afford to meet their basic needs, the government provides every citizen with a set amount of money on a regular basis, enough to lift them above the poverty line. This cash income would be universal and unconditional, meaning that every citizen would receive it no matter what — no work requirements, no means-testing and no restrictions on how the money is used.

### **UBI is the right to a basic income which assures life under worthy material conditions**

**Catalonia Institute of Human Rights, 2009**, “Universal Declaration of Emerging Human Rights,” [http://www.world-governance.org/IMG/pdf\\_DUDHE.pdf](http://www.world-governance.org/IMG/pdf_DUDHE.pdf), pp. 82 (accessed 7/13/17)

The right to basic income, which assures all individuals, independently of their age, sex, sexual orientation, civil status or employment status, the right to live under worthy material conditions. To such end, the right to an unconditional, regular, monetary income paid by the state and financed by fiscal reforms, is recognised as a right of citizenship, to each resident member of society, independently of their other sources of income, and being adequate to allow them to cover their basic needs.

## AFF Sample Case

I stand resolved: The United States ought to provide a universal basic income.

Before presenting my value, criterion and contentions, I will clarify a few of the key terms in today's debate.

I define, "provide" as:

### **Provide means to make available**

**Dictionary.com, 2017**, "Provide," <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/provide?s=t>

Provide 1. to make available; furnish: to provide employees with various benefits. 2. to supply or equip: to provide the army with new fighter planes. 3. to afford or yield. 4. Law. to arrange for or stipulate beforehand, as by a provision or proviso. 5. Archaic. to prepare or procure beforehand.

AND

"UBI" as:

### **UBI is a regular payment to all citizens, enough to lift them out of poverty**

Christine **Emba**, columnist, September 28, **2015**, "Universal basic income," Washington Post, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/28/universal-basic-income-a-primer/?utm\\_term=.44da2da4ec84](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/28/universal-basic-income-a-primer/?utm_term=.44da2da4ec84) (accessed 7/13/17)

Enter universal basic income. Also referred to as "guaranteed income" or the "basic income guarantee," the concept is simple: in order to ensure that all citizens can afford to meet their basic needs, the government provides every citizen with a set amount of money on a regular basis, enough to lift them above the poverty line. This cash income would be universal and unconditional, meaning that every citizen would receive it no matter what — no work requirements, no means-testing and no restrictions on how the money is used.

### **VALUE: Economic Equality**

#### **Economic Equality Ought to be Pursued**

Bo **Rothstein**, Swedish Science Council, Eric M. **Uslaner**, Russell Sage Foundation, **October 2005**, All for All: Equality, Corruption, and Social Trust, p. 46

**Government policies have a large impact on economic equality. Universal social programs that cater to the whole (or very broad sections) of society, such as we find in the Scandinavian countries, promote a more equitable distribution of wealth and more equality of opportunity in areas such as education and the labor market. Both types of equality lead to a greater sense of social solidarity – which spurs generalized trust. Generalized trust, in turn, provides at least part of the foundation for policies (such as universal benefits) that lead to more equality.**

*We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)*

### **CRITERION: Social Welfare**

By doing so, a government can ensure the rich/poor gap can be alleviated to reduce the number of individuals living under the poverty line. A just government enacts a UBI ordinance to prioritize the social welfare, which is why this is the criterion for the debate.

### **The Social Welfare Ought to be Prioritized**

Gosta **Esping-Andersen**, Portuguese Advisor, **March 2000**, A Welfare State for the 21st Century, p. 31  
**A revised social model requires a future-oriented perspective, and must therefore focus on those who will become tomorrow's adults. When goals for the future are defined in terms of maximizing Europe's competitive position in the world economy, the need to invest in today's children becomes obvious.**

## **Contention 1: The Growth of Artificial Intelligence is a Concern for the U.S. Economy, and Implementing a UBI is a Means to Solve It.**

**Automation is more problematic in today's age because AI is beginning to outperform humans.**

Yuval Noah **Harari**, author of "Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind" and "Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow," and lecturer at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, **June 4, 2017**, "Universal basic income is neither universal nor basic," Bloomberg News, <https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2017-06-04/universal-basic-income-is-neither-universal-nor-basic> (accessed 8/7/17)

Not everybody agrees that UBI will be necessary. **Fears that automation will create massive unemployment go back to the 19th century, and so far they have never materialized.** In the 20th century, for every job lost to a tractor or a computer at least one new job was created, and in the 21st century automation has so far caused only moderate job losses. **But there are good reasons to think that this time it is different, and that machine learning is a real game-changer.** The experts who cry "job loss!" are a bit like the boy who cried wolf. In the end, the wolf really came. **Humans have basically two types of skills -- physical and cognitive. In the past, machines competed with humans mainly in raw physical abilities. Humans always had an immense cognitive edge over machines. Hence, as manual jobs in agriculture and industry were automated, new service jobs emerged that required the kind of brainpower only humans possessed. Now AI is beginning to outperform humans in more and more cognitive skills, and we don't know of any third field of activity where humans retain a secure edge.**

**The growing use of robotics and AI means law makers must do something to protect the labor force, and a UBI can help solve those issues.**

Lauren **Thomas**, News Associate for CNBC, **March 25, 2017**, "Universal basic income debate sharpens as observers grasp for solutions to inequality," CNBC, <https://www.cnbc.com/2017/03/25/universal-basic-income-debate-sharpens.html> (accessed 8/7/17)

Meanwhile, **developments in robotics and artificial intelligence have grave implications for the labor force.** A report issued this week from consulting firm PwC found that **more than a third of U.S. jobs were at risk from automation, upping the ante for policy makers to cushion the blow to workers.** Advocates for **UBI argue that a guaranteed paycheck could serve as a way to fight poverty and uncertainty in an evolving U.S. economy, and encourage workers to take more risks in the job market if they had some extra money as a cushion.**

**A Universal Basic Income ensures people are valued in a time of an unknown economic future.**

John **Thornhill**, Innovation Editor at the Financial Times, **August 7, 2017**, "Why Facebook Should Pay Us a Basic Income," Financial Times, <https://www.ft.com/content/5103204e-7b5b-11e7-ab01-a13271d1ee9c> (accessed 8/7/17)

**The idea of guaranteeing a basic income for everybody** has many obvious flaws but one overwhelming virtue. It **enshrines the principle that every citizen is a valued member of society and has a right to share in its collective wealth. That conviction has animated radical thinkers for 500 years since the argument was first sketched out in Sir Thomas More's Utopia. The idea has gained renewed resonance in our own times as we fret about the erosion of living standards, the concentration of wealth and the possible threat of mass unemployment caused by technological change.**

## **Contention 2: A UBI Can Foster Creativity in the Workplace As Workers Have More Freedom in Their Career Search.**

**A UBI ensures people have the essential means to live and be better workers in the future.**

Frances **Coppola**, Writer for Forbes, **August 1, 2017**, "The latest experiment in Finland proves that universal basic income works – so why not bring it to the UK?" The Independent, <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/finland-universal-basic-income-uk-needs-to-start-testing-it-a7871596.html> (accessed 8/7/17)

**UBI ensures that everyone, regardless of circumstances, has the essential means to live. People with insecure work don't have to worry about whether they will earn enough this week to pay for food. People who are unemployed can take the time to search for the right job. People who are sick, or who have caring responsibilities, or who want to improve their skills through studying, can reduce their working hours or take a break from paid work.** There would be important economic benefits too. The way we organise work at present is highly inefficient.

**A UBI recognizes individual worth, ensuring access to more freedom in individual career choice.**

Ashley **Blackwell**, Writer for BIEN, **July 28, 2017**, "CANADA: Mowat Center Report Shows Impact of Basic Income on Social Entrepreneurship," Basic Income Earth Network, <http://basicincome.org/news/2017/07/canada-mowat-centre-report-shows-impact-basic-income-social-entrepreneurship/>

**"A basic income could help to shift society from a system where an individual's worth is determined by the amount of money they earn to one where individuals earn esteem through the ways they choose to use the money to which everyone is automatically entitled. When conceived in this basic way, a basic income represents a validation of every individual's inherent worth and, by extension, a validation of and a support for their freedom to choose the life path that they see as most appropriate for them and the contributions they make to society in doing so."**

## AFF Extensions

## UBI Key to Human Rights

### **UBI creates a psychology of abundance – a prerequisite to freedom**

Erich **Fromm**, social psychologist, **1966**, “The Psychological Effects of the Guaranteed Income,” Erich Fromm Document Center, <https://opus4.kobv.de/opus4-Fromm/files/1647/1966c-eng.pdf> (accessed 7/18/17)

A guaranteed income, which becomes possible in the era of economic abundance, could for the first time free man from the threat of starvation, and thus make him truly free and independent from any economic threat. Nobody would have to accept conditions of work merely because he otherwise would be afraid of starving- a talented or ambitious man or woman could learn new skills to prepare himself or herself for a different kind of occupation. A woman could leave her husband, an adolescent his family. People would learn to be no longer afraid, if they did not have to fear hunger. (This holds true, of course, only if there is also no political threat that inhibits man’s free thought, speech, and action.) Guaranteed income would not only establish freedom as a reality rather than a slogan, it would also establish a principle deeply rooted in Western religious and humanist tradition: man has the right to live, regardless! This right to live, to have food, shelter, medical care, education, etc., is an intrinsic human right that cannot be restricted by any condition, not even the one that he must be socially „useful.“ The shift from a psychology of scarcity to that of abundance is one of the most important steps in human development. A psychology of scarcity produces anxiety, envy, egotism (to be seen most drastically in peasant cultures all over the world). A psychology of abundance produces initiative, faith in life ‘ solidarity. The fact is that most men are still geared psychologically to the economic facts of scarcity, when the industrial world is in the process of entering a new era of economic abundance. But because of this psychological „lag“ many people cannot even understand new ideas as presented in the concept of a guaranteed income, because traditional ideas are usually determined by feelings that originated in previous forms of social existence.

## **Universal Basic Income is key to upholding human rights**

Daniel **Raventós**, lecturer in Economics at the University of Barcelona, **and** Julie **Wark**, advisory board member of the international political review Sin Permiso, January 8, **2016**, “Basic Income, Basic Issues,” Counter Punch, <https://www.counterpunch.org/2016/01/08/basic-income-basic-issues/>

Of all the political mechanisms that have been debated in recent years, the most rational and perhaps the only one that would seem capable of providing a sound foundation for universal human rights is basic income. In its different theoretical forms and experiments today it is usually presented instrumentally. For example, the right sees it as a way of dismantling state institutions, and the left as a policy for tackling poverty or robotisation of the workforce. If considered normatively it is much more than that. It is a guarantee of the three great human rights principles, as classical democratic republicanism taught long ago. People can't be free unless their material existence is guaranteed socially and politically. Indeed, both democratic and oligarchic republicanism shared this conception of freedom. The difference was: whose freedom? For oligarchic republicanism it was confined to adult male property owners, while democratic republicanism championed freedom for every member of the community. All arbitrary interference infringes on individual freedom but some forms are normatively more relevant than others in social policy because they are intimately linked with the basic mechanisms governing the dynamics of human societies. Swindling and lying, for example, affect the lives of individuals and can be used to support the economic status quo but society is not structured by falsehood. It is founded on property (which may then rely on a whole zoo of porkies, red herrings, cock and bull to shore it up). Enter the rich and the poor. Not in the statistical sense (which has its own illustrative merit) but the Aristotelian sense of materially independent people and the rest. The inequalities which limit or deny the freedom of some members of society are the result of several factors, most notably political economy. Any political economy favours some sectors and handicaps others. In the present-day world most of the population can easily be dispossessed by policies like “austerity” and, to quote Jeremy Corbyn, “Austerity is a political choice not an economic necessity.” In that case we can be sure that the choosers won't be the losers. Since so many lose, a universal counter-measure would seem to be needed and a basic income would be an important component – but only a component – of a political economy and political system that would make the “choice” of tackling social problems. And “social” problems are much broader than people tend to think. Naomi Klein is very clear about the environmental connection as well: “That's why I talk about basic income as well, that there has to be a stronger social safety net because when people don't have options, they're going to make bad choices.”

## UBI Good for Innovation

### **UBI gives people time to pursue education, focus on self-improvement and innovation**

C. Robert **Gibson**, news analyst, May 13, **2014**, “The Case for a Basic Guaranteed Income for All,” Huffington Post, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/carl-gibson/the-case-for-a-basic-guar\\_b\\_5311330.html?utm\\_hp\\_ref=tw](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/carl-gibson/the-case-for-a-basic-guar_b_5311330.html?utm_hp_ref=tw) (accessed 7/18/17)

What does \$1,000 a month buy? It can pay for a modest apartment in the \$600 to \$700 range, a meager amount of groceries, provide enough to pay for a basic phone plan, and leave enough left over for bus/cab fare. It can't pay for high-end cars, flat screen TVs, condominiums, dining out for every meal or a cocaine habit. That amount of money is roughly the same amount of money one would get working a minimum wage job at part-time hours for a large corporation that only sees you as a tool to use for increasing its own profit margin. This means people working at fast food corporations like McDonalds would be able to quit their jobs and have enough to meet the most basic expenses, while looking for more fulfilling work, getting an education, starting their own businesses and otherwise working toward their dreams. Conversely, if someone spends one third of a 24-hour day sleeping, and one third of the day working a job they hate that doesn't pay nearly enough to live on, that only leaves another eight hours for meeting all of their daily obligations, caring for their families, and finding ways to dig themselves out of wage slavery. Until we get a basic guaranteed income for all, a wide majority of Americans who are lucky enough to be employed will serve indefinite sentences of indentured servitude to immensely profitable and profoundly greedy fast food and retail robber barons.

### **UBI lets innovators focus on innovating**

Roy **Bahat**, head of Bloomberg Beta, October 2, **2015**, “To support innovation, subsidize creators.” The Washington Post, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/10/02/to-support-innovation-subsidize-creators/?tid=a\\_inl&utm\\_term=.fca0e9fce32f](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/10/02/to-support-innovation-subsidize-creators/?tid=a_inl&utm_term=.fca0e9fce32f) (accessed 7/17/17)

A basic income program, if we can afford to offer it at a livable level, might have the opposite effect. Universal basic income might be the most meaningful way we could subsidize the earliest stages of innovation. It could multiply, by many factors, the amount of time people can spend creating. Creators — of art, of technology, of the new companies that will change the way we live — often struggle to solve a basic problem: How do you make a living and still have time to work on the Next Great Thing? The side job that a screenwriter holds while working on his or her first screenplay is such a common trope we barely think about it. Startup founders receive endless advice, some absurd, on how to make money while starting a company — from freelance web development to selling bodily fluids.

## UBI leads to increased innovation

Nathan **Schneider**, news analyst, January 6, **2015**, "Why the Tech Elite Is Getting Behind Universal Basic Income," Vice, [https://www.vice.com/en\\_us/article/mv5d3y/something-for-everyone-0000546-v22n1](https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/mv5d3y/something-for-everyone-0000546-v22n1)

One might not expect such enthusiasm for no-strings-attached money in a room full of libertarian-leaning investors. But for entrepreneurial sorts like these, welfare doesn't necessarily require a welfare state. One of the attendees at the Singularity meeting was HowStuffWorks.com founder Marshall Brain, who had outlined his vision for basic income in a novella published on his website called Manna. The book tells the story of a man who loses his fast-food job to software, only to find salvation in a basic-income utopia carved out of the Australian Outback by a visionary startup CEO. There, basic income means people have the free time to tinker with the kinds of projects that might be worthy of venture capital, creating the society of rogue entrepreneurs that tech culture has in mind. Waldman refers to basic income as "VC for the people." Chris Hawkins, a 30-year-old investor who made his money building software that automates office work, credits Manna as an influence. On his company's website he has taken to blogging about basic income, which he looks to as a bureaucracy killer. "Shut down government programs as you fund redistribution," he told me. Mothball public housing, food assistance, Medicaid, and the rest, and replace them with a single check. It turns out that the tech investors promoting basic income, by and large, aren't proposing to fund the payouts themselves; they'd prefer that the needy foot the bill for everyone else. "The cost has to come from somewhere," Hawkins explained, "and I think the most logical place to take it from is government-provided services."

**When individuals are given a universal basic income, it leads to fostered entrepreneurship, impacting all facets of an individual's life in a positive way by alleviating stressors and healing inequities.**

Ashley **Blackwell**, Writer for BIEN, **July 28, 2017**, "CANADA: Mowat Center Report Shows Impact of Basic Income on Social Entrepreneurship," Basic Income Earth Network, <http://basicincome.org/news/2017/07/canada-mowat-centre-report-shows-impact-basic-income-social-entrepreneurship/>

**By helping to potentially further support role models and community leaders making positive impacts in their neighborhoods, a basic income is able to make social entrepreneurship a more appealing and viable career path.** This may attract a critical mass of people to integrating principles of social entrepreneurship into their ways of living, beyond their career. **A basic income can help sustain social entrepreneurship by providing financial protection from unexpected losses in income. Another positive affect is bolstering the holistic health and wellness of a social entrepreneur by reducing stress and anxiety created by financial insecurity and instability. Chronic stress and anxiety can lead to chronic illnesses such as depression, cardiovascular disease, obesity and diabetes among others. Particularly among historically marginalized populations, these chronic illnesses are disproportionately prevalent, which adds to how, under the current structure, they experience increased barriers to social entrepreneurship. By alleviating these stressors, a basic income could be a pathway in healing historical trauma and inequities between classes of people.**

*We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)*

## UBI Ends Poverty

### **UBI increases workers' bargaining power and education without waste**

James **Surowiecki**, finance journalist, June 20, **2016**, "The Case for Free Money," The New Yorker, [www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/06/20/why-dont-we-have-universal-basic-income](http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/06/20/why-dont-we-have-universal-basic-income) (Accessed 7/14/17)

The U.B.I. is often framed as a tool for fighting poverty, but it would have other important benefits. By providing an income cushion, it would increase workers' bargaining power, potentially driving up wages. It would make it easier for people to take risks with their job choices, and to invest in education. In the U.S. in the seventies, there were small-scale experiments with basic-income guarantees, and they showed that young people with a basic income were more likely to stay in school; in New Jersey, kids' chances of graduating from high school increased by twenty-five per cent. Critics of the U.B.I. argue that handing people cash, instead of targeted aid (like food stamps), means that much of the money will be wasted, and that a basic income will take away the incentive to work, lowering G.D.P. and giving us a nation of lazy, demoralized people. But the example of the many direct-cash-grant programs in the developing world suggests that, as the Columbia economist Chris Blattman puts it, "the poor do not waste grants." As for the work question, most of the basic-income experiments suggest that the disincentive effect wouldn't be large; in Manitoba, working hours for men dropped by just one per cent. It's certainly true that the U.B.I. would make it easier for people to think twice about taking unrewarding jobs. But that's a good consequence, not a bad one.

### **UBI grants freedom to let people invest in their futures**

Matt **Zwolinski**, associate professor of philosophy at the University of San Diego, September 28, **2015**, "Our welfare system insults the poor. Basic income could do better." The Washington Post, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/28/our-welfare-system-insults-the-poor-basic-income-could-do-better/?tid=a\\_inl&utm\\_term=.21e916c5bafc](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/28/our-welfare-system-insults-the-poor-basic-income-could-do-better/?tid=a_inl&utm_term=.21e916c5bafc) (accessed 7/17/17)

A basic income program that replaces in-kind transfers like food stamps or Medicaid with a simple, universal cash grant would not only provide more effective aid to the poor, it would provide that aid in a manner more consistent with the values of human dignity and responsibility. The efficiency argument on behalf of cash grants is straightforward: unlike in-kind benefits, people can use cash on whatever they need the most. If what they need is food, they can use the cash they're given on groceries—and they're no worse off than if they had received food stamps. But if what they need is something else—to pay their rent, or an overdue utility bill, or maybe even to save a little for the future—then cash is much better. As long as we assume that people know more (and care more) about their own needs than the government does, the case for cash over in-kind benefits is powerful. Cash is flexible. Cash is freedom. This isn't just theory. There is a growing body of empirical evidence showing that the poor use the freedom cash provides to make real improvements in their lives. From the Bolsa Familia program in Brazil, to cash grants in Uganda and Mexico, we've seen that poor people who are given cash grants typically use the money responsibly: purchasing basic necessities and trying to generate sustainable streams of revenue. Those benefits often add up to real, long-term improvements in health and educational outcomes.

### **UBI guarantees freedom from poverty**

Matt **Bruenig**, researcher on poverty and welfare systems at the thinktank Demos, September 30, **2015**, "Tired of capitalism? There could be a better way." The Washington Post, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/30/tired-of-capitalism-lets-try-basic-income/?tid=a\\_inl&utm\\_term=.99f30faa44e0](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/30/tired-of-capitalism-lets-try-basic-income/?tid=a_inl&utm_term=.99f30faa44e0) (accessed 7/17/17)

***We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

Labor protection in the form of safety laws, collective bargaining and prohibitions against harassment and discrimination have helped cut down on many of the worst employer abuses. But no amount of labor regulation can ever undo the fact that workers are confronted daily with the choice between obeying a supervisor or losing all their income. The only way to break the coercion at the core of the employment relationship is to give people the genuine ability to say no to their employers. And the only way to make that feasible is to guarantee that working-age adults, at least, have some way to support themselves whether they work or not. Even as capitalism makes some workers' lives miserable, those who can't work are in even worse shape. Even after counting some or all public welfare benefits, the U.S. poverty rate in 2013 was anywhere from 15 percent to 18 percent. Most of this poverty is endured by vulnerable populations that markets discard as useless. According to my own calculations of the 2014 Annual Social and Economic Supplement, more than 80 percent of the officially poor are either children, elderly, disabled, students, caretakers or the involuntarily unemployed. Because they cannot work or they have a diminished ability to work, these groups often receive little to no direct income from the market and suffer a high risk of poverty as a result. The United States' relatively small welfare state kept 39 million people out of poverty in 2013, cut the overall poverty rate by 38 percent since 1967 and radically reduced the poverty rate of the elderly by as much as 72 percent since 1960. Globally, the countries with the highest levels of welfare spending — Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden — are also those that have the lowest levels of economic hardship. But even in these countries, poverty is not zero percent and small numbers of people still register an occasional inability to acquire basic needs such as food and housing. Supplementing the existing welfare state with a basic income would, if successful, ensure that nobody falls completely through the cracks of the social welfare system and thereby finds himself or herself destitute.

## **UBI solves poverty – empirics**

Rutger **Bergman**, journalist, March 6, **2017**, “Utopian thinking: the easy way to eradicate poverty,” The Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/mar/06/utopian-thinking-poverty-universal-basic-income> (accessed 7/18/17)

It’s an incredibly simple idea: universal basic income – a monthly allowance of enough to pay for your basic needs: food, shelter, education. And it’s completely unconditional: not a favour, but a right. But could it really be that simple? In the three years that followed, I read all I could find about basic income. I researched dozens of experiments that have been conducted across the globe. And it didn’t take long before I stumbled upon the story of a town that had done it, had eradicated poverty – after which nearly everyone forgot about it. This story starts in Winnipeg, Canada. Imagine a warehouse attic where nearly 2,000 boxes lie gathering dust. They are filled with data – graphs, tables, interviews – about one of the most fascinating social experiments ever conducted. Evelyn Forget, an economics professor at the University of Manitoba, first heard about the records in 2009. Stepping into the attic, she could hardly believe her eyes. It was a treasure trove of information on basic income. The experiment had started in Dauphin, a town north-west of Winnipeg, in 1974. Everybody was guaranteed a basic income ensuring that no one fell below the poverty line. And for four years, all went well. But then a conservative government was voted into power. The new Canadian cabinet saw little point in the expensive experiment. So when it became clear there was no money left for an analysis of the results, the researchers decided to pack their files away. In 2,000 boxes. When Forget found them, 30 years later, no one knew what, if anything, the experiment had demonstrated. For three years she subjected the data to all manner of statistical analysis. And no matter what she tried, the results were the same every time. The experiment – the longest and best of its kind – had been a resounding success.

## UBI Saves the Environment

### **UBI empowers workers and consumers to protect the environment**

Alyssa **Battistoni**, doctoral candidate in political science at Yale University, November 9, **2015**, “More Future, Less Work,” Dissent Magazine, [https://www.dissentmagazine.org/online\\_articles/more-future-less-work-alyssa-battistoni-universal-basic-income-environmental-justice](https://www.dissentmagazine.org/online_articles/more-future-less-work-alyssa-battistoni-universal-basic-income-environmental-justice) (accessed 7/14/17)

One of the most useful things about a basic income is that it gives workers more power and leverage. This has particularly important implications for connecting environmental justice struggles to the labor movement: a basic income gives workers more power to say no to industries that are damaging the environment, their health, and the health of their communities. The communities most impacted by environmental injustice tend to be communities of color and working-class communities. People in these communities, working these jobs, are usually the first to know about the harmful effects of the industries they rely on for their livelihoods. Yet they often feel they don't have any choice but to keep working in those industries. A basic income could be one piece in a puzzle of offering alternatives. The second benefit of a basic income in environmental terms is the challenge it presents to the implied link between production and consumption: if you have a job where you produce and make money, you can then consume and have the things that you need to live, and you need to consume enough to keep the economy booming so that there are enough jobs to go around. Meanwhile there's a tendency in environmentalism to talk a lot about overconsumption and how we need to cut back, which can easily tip into the language of austerity. I think that's very dangerous to any sort of environmentally just vision. Whatever problems there may be with current consumption patterns, we shouldn't point the finger at everyday people for wanting to lead comfortable lives. If we really want to challenge overconsumption, we need to look at it within that vicious cycle of production and consumption: the conventional economic wisdom imposes a kind of consumption blackmail, where we're told that if you don't consume enough, you're putting people out of work. Let's start by challenging that.

### **UBI creates new visions of success, which aren't tied to environmental destruction**

Alyssa **Battistoni**, doctoral candidate in political science at Yale University, November 9, **2015**, “More Future, Less Work,” Dissent Magazine, [https://www.dissentmagazine.org/online\\_articles/more-future-less-work-alyssa-battistoni-universal-basic-income-environmental-justice](https://www.dissentmagazine.org/online_articles/more-future-less-work-alyssa-battistoni-universal-basic-income-environmental-justice) (accessed 7/14/17)

But another equally important part of the transition to an ecologically sustainable and just society is to move toward working less. There are several studies that suggest that working less is beneficial to people's well-being: people like to choose more leisure when they actually have an option—as opposed to the current reality, which is that more leisure time usually means that you are un- or underemployed. Working less also tends to decrease energy use and ecological footprints, as scholars like Juliet Schor have shown. Related to this point is my third one. Basic income suggests a new vision of the good life to which we can aspire: one that's sustainable but not austere, where we work less and have more time to do the other things that make life worthwhile. The underlying question here is: how can we build a world that is less resource intensive but more enjoyable in other ways? And low-carbon leisure is part of the answer.

## UBI Fights the Patriarchy

### **UBI would serve as reparations for unpaid reproductive labor done by women**

Judith **Shulevitz**, senior editor at The New Republic and former editor of Lingua Franca, January 8, **2016**, “It’s Payback Time for Women,” New York Times, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/10/opinion/sunday/payback-time-for-women.html> (accessed 7/14/17)

If mothers are glorified hobbyists who produce less value than nonmothers, it follows that they’re getting a free ride on everyone else’s labor. This can lead to tensions between colleagues, and also colors relations between breadwinning husbands and stay-at-home wives, who notoriously have less bargaining power in their households. I’d argue that this view of motherhood gets it exactly backward. Actually, it’s society that’s getting a free ride on women’s unrewarded contributions to the perpetuation of the human race. As Marx might have said had he deemed women’s work worth including in his labor theory of value (he didn’t), “reproductive labor” (as feminists call the creation and upkeep of families and homes) is the basis of the accumulation of human capital. I say it’s time for something like reparations. It’s an odd kind of reparations, you may object, that goes to fathers as well as mothers, the unattached as well as those with family responsibilities. But entertain this radical proposition: The universal basic income is a necessary condition for a just society, for it recognizes the fact that most of us — men, women, parents and nonparents — do a great deal of unpaid work to sustain the general well-being. If we’re not raising children, then we may be going to school, or volunteering around the neighborhood.

### **UBI would mitigate poverty, especially gendered forms of poverty**

Judith **Shulevitz**, senior editor at The New Republic and former editor of Lingua Franca, January 8, **2016**, “It’s Payback Time for Women,” New York Times, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/10/opinion/sunday/payback-time-for-women.html> (accessed 7/14/17)

Besides, basic income policies have been shown to mitigate specifically female kinds of poverty. When cash-transfer experiments were conducted in poor towns in India, girls gained more weight and increased the time they spent at school at greater rates than boys, probably because when cash is scarce, the girls get less to eat and are kept home more. In the United States, as Kathryn J. Edin and H. Luke Shaefer showed in their book on extreme poverty, “\$2.00 a Day,” the process of qualifying for food stamps and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, the welfare-to-work program created in 1996, can be so demanding, bewildering and degrading that many applicants simply give up. And who are the patient souls who wait in those daylong lines, pee into cups for drug tests or go home empty-handed? Women, more often than not, since there are more than four times as many families run by single mothers as by single fathers, and a third more households headed by women are on the dole than those run by men. As for stay-at-home mothers supported by their partners, a basic income would let them put aside money of their own. Most retirement-savings instruments are linked to paychecks, which means that so-called nonworking parents have no way to pay into Social Security, 401(k)’s or I.R.A.s. A basic income would let them save for old age. For nonwage-earning mothers trapped in abusive relationships, cash would make it easier for them to leave.

## **UBI Necessary to Offset Impacts of Automation on the Workforce**

### **The use of robots is on the rise, which will cause a massive disruption to jobs.**

Lauren **Thomas**, News Associate for CNBC, **March 25, 2017**, "Universal basic income debate sharpens as observers grasp for solutions to inequality," CNBC, <https://www.cnbc.com/2017/03/25/universal-basic-income-debate-sharpens.html> (accessed 8/7/17)

**The discussion has taken on added urgency as economists nervously eye the wave of disruption posed by automation. Studies show so-called robot-to-worker ratios are increasing at a steady pace worldwide, and that has broad implications for a workforce lacking in technology-related skills. "To ignore the possibility and not plan [for automation] would be a huge mistake"** Stern said this week, invoking the warnings presented by former Microsoft CEO Bill Gates, Musk and physicist Stephen Hawking. **"Studies all say there will be a massive disruption in jobs."**

### **The instability of the U.S. economy shows that action must be taken.**

Sebastian **Johnson** is a senior associate with Freedman Consulting, LLC, **June 29, 2017**, "The case for a universal basic income," Los Angeles Times Op-ed, <http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-johnson-universal-basic-income-20170629-story.html> (accessed 8/7/17)

But the idea is gaining unprecedented traction right now with good reason. **The U.S. economy is increasingly unstable, with wealth accruing at the top while most Americans remain stuck in low-paying jobs.**

**Globalization has weakened the power of labor unions, squeezing the middle class and narrowing paths into the middle class for the poor. Economists have chronicled the rise of the "precariat," a growing class of workers who rely on insecure gig work with few benefits. And we haven't even begun to feel the brunt of that other looming threat, the A-word. According to an Oxford University study, nearly half of all Americans – 47% – are at "high risk" of losing their jobs to automation.**

## NEG Sample Case

I stand against the resolved: The United States ought to provide a universal basic income.

Before presenting my value, criterion and contentions, I will clarify a few of the key terms in today's debate.

I define, "Provide" as:

### **Provide indicates something must happen**

Cambridge Dictionary, 2017, "Provide," <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/provide> (accessed 7/13/17)

Provide: (of a law or contract) to state that something must happen or be done: [ I ] The new statute provides for life imprisonment without parole. [ + that clause ] Many loan agreements provide that the interest rate will change.

AND

"Universal Basic Income" as:

### **UBI is a periodic, unconditional cash payment to all members of a society**

Basic Income Earth Network (BIEN), 2017, "About Basic Income," <http://basicincome.org/basic-income/> (accessed 7/13/17)

A basic income is a periodic cash payment unconditionally delivered to all on an individual basis, without means-test or work requirement. That is, basic income has the following five characteristics: Periodic: it is paid at regular intervals (for example every month), not as a one-off grant. Cash payment: it is paid in an appropriate medium of exchange, allowing those who receive it to decide what they spend it on. It is not, therefore, paid either in kind (such as food or services) or in vouchers dedicated to a specific use. Individual: it is paid on an individual basis—and not, for instance, to households. Universal: it is paid to all, without means test. Unconditional: it is paid without a requirement to work or to demonstrate willingness-to-work. A wide variety of Basic Income proposals are circulating today. They differ along many other dimensions, including in the amounts of the Basic Income, the source of funding, the nature and size of reductions in other transfers that might accompany it, and so on.

## **VALUE: Economic Equality**

### **Economic Equality Ought to be Pursued**

Bo **Rothstein**, Swedish Science Council, Eric M. **Uslaner**, Russell Sage Foundation, **October 2005**, All for All: Equality, Corruption, and Social Trust, p. 46

**Government policies have a large impact on economic equality. Universal social programs that cater to the whole (or very broad sections) of society, such as we find in the Scandinavian countries, promote a more equitable distribution of wealth and more equality of opportunity in areas such as education and the labor market. Both types of equality lead to a greater sense of social solidarity – which spurs generalized trust. Generalized trust, in turn, provides at least part of the foundation for policies (such as universal benefits) that lead to more equality.**

### **Criterion: Pragmatism**

By evaluating the value and contentions through a lens of pragmatism, it allows the negative to demonstrate both the philosophical and real world implications of mandating the use of the UBI for the American people.

### **Pragmatism concerns itself with practical implications of our actions.**

William **James**, philosopher and Former Professor of Psychology at Harvard, **2004**, Pragmatism, p. 20

**A glance at the history of the idea will show you still better what pragmatism means.** The term is derived from the same Greek word πράγμα meaning action, from which our words ‘practice’ and ‘practical’ come. It was first introduced into philosophy by Mr. Charles Peirce in 1878. In an article entitled ‘How to Make Our Ideas Clear,’ in the ‘Popular Science Monthly’ for January of that year **Mr. Peirce, after pointing out that our beliefs are really rules for action, said that to develop a thought’s meaning, we need only determine what conduct it is fitted to produce: that conduct is for us its sole significance . And the tangible fact at the root of all our thought-distinctions, however subtle is that there is no one of them so fine as to consist in anything but a possible difference of practice. To attain perfect clearness in our thoughts of an object, then, we need only consider what conceivable effects of a practical kind the object may involve – what sensations we are to expect from it, and what reactions we must prepare. Our conception of these effects, whether immediate or remote, is then for us the whole of our conception of the object, so far as that conception has positive significance at all.**

## **Contention 1: A Universal Basic Income (UBI) is far too costly of an undertaking to be economically feasible for the United States.**

### **The UBI is far too expensive; there are other ways to fix the rise of automation.**

Trent **Gillies**, CNBC Producer for "On the Money," **July 30, 2017**, "Money for nothing: The good and the bad of a guaranteed government paycheck," CNBC, <https://www.cnbc.com/2017/07/30/universal-basic-income-may-be-humane-or-a-3-trillion-dollar-black-hole.html> (accessed 8/7/17)

"A lot of people when they first hear this idea really like it," said Jason Furman, former chief economic advisor to President Obama. That is, until you read the fine print "And then when you look at the details it turns out it just doesn't work," Furman explained to CNBC. **"It costs two to three trillion dollars. You would need to double the current income tax to make it work."** Furman, a professor at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government, added that **"the premise underlying it is wrong too. There's going to be a lot of automation but there's also going to be a lot of jobs and our focus should be on making sure people can get those jobs not giving up. And universal basic income represents giving up in the face of that challenge."**

### **Unions say the UBI will reduce the labor force, making it impossibly expensive; Finland proves.**

Raine **Tiessalo**, Staff Writer for the Independent, **February 9, 2017**, "Universal basic income 'useless', says Finland's biggest union," The Independent, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/news/universal-basic-income-finland-useless-says-trade-union-a7571966.html> (accessed 8/7/17)

**The union begs to differ. Not only does SAK say that the system may reduce the labour force — for instance by tempting mothers of small children or those close to retirement to take more time off — but the union also suggests that making it easier to refuse unpleasant jobs may create inflationary bottlenecks. In any case, the model being tasted in Finland is “impossibly expensive, since it would increase the government deficit by about 5 per cent” of gross domestic product,** said Kaukoranta.

## **Contention 2: The UBI is not the only solution to U.S. economic woes; other economic initiatives will be more net-beneficial.**

**A UBI is not the only answer to the current issues of automation; there are ways to develop new services to create new jobs instead.**

Scott **Rasmussen**, founder and president of the Rasmussen Media Group, **August 3, 2017**, "Automation isn't new and we don't need a universal basic income," News Max, <http://www.newsmax.com/ScottRasmussen/jobs-automation-unemployment-income/2017/08/03/id/805608/> (accessed 8/7/17)

**The technology and the culture will always find a way around the political obstacles.** It's true that jobs will be lost and the transition will be difficult for many. This is a serious problem not to be ignored. But **the answer is not to fantasize about giving everyone a Universal Basic Income. The answer is to recognize that the new wave of services and possibilities will create many more jobs than are lost during the transition.**

**There are other solutions to the UBI like consolidating our welfare programs like other nations have done.**

Michael D. **Tanner**, Senior Fellow at the CATO Institute, **August 26, 2014**, "The Basic Income Guarantee: Simplicity, but at What Cost?" CATO - Unbound, <https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/26/basic-income-guarantee-simplicity-what-cost> (accessed 8/7/17)

The virtues of the universal basic income lie in its universality and simplicity. **But the closer the program hews to those goals the more likely it is to increase the cost of the welfare state.**

**Until these questions can be answered, it might be worth experimenting with something similar to what the British government recently undertook with some of its major welfare programs. Britain consolidating its six major welfare programs (the jobseeker's allowance, the income-support allowance, the employment-support allowance, the child tax credit, the working tax credit, and housing benefits) into a single cash grant, payable monthly to recipients. The United States could follow suit by consolidating our own disparate welfare programs and, instead, pay recipients a direct cash benefit instead.** Such a baby step would allow us to realize some, though not all, the upside of a UBI, while giving us time to further investigate the potential problems. Opponents of the welfare state have long criticized its supporters for believing that good intentions justified even failed programs. In considering some form of a universal basic income, we should avoid falling into the same trap.

## NEG Extensions

## UBI Harms Social Fabric

### **UBI devalues labor, which causes social decay**

Oren **Cass**, senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, September 29, **2015**, “Basic income won’t fix America’s social divide,” Washington Post, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/29/basic-income-wont-fix-americas-social-divide/?tid=a\\_inl&utm\\_term=.29968c70e430](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/29/basic-income-wont-fix-americas-social-divide/?tid=a_inl&utm_term=.29968c70e430) (accessed 7/17/17)

Some approaches might constructively engage both social and economic challenges, but the basic income does not. It moves policy in precisely the wrong direction, focusing virtually all government resources on material well-being at the cost of devaluing labor, and eliminating the social stigma and economic consequences associated with not working. That approach only reinforces the ongoing decline of work, which is a critical step in the cycle of social decay. Unstable families in weakened communities often fail to endow their children with life skills or marketable skills; without being able to successfully enter the labor market, their path to adulthood often leads to unstable families and weakened communities of their own. In his 2012 book “Coming Apart,” Charles Murray reports that in 2010, only 53 percent of white households in his working-class cohort included a full-time worker, compared with 81 percent in 1960. Since 1990, America’s labor force participation rate has fallen by 10 points among prime-age workers relative to Europe’s rising participation rate. The U.S.’s decline has actually accelerated since the recession’s end. Ensuring that even those with very low human capital enter and remain in the workforce offers one of the highest leverage points for breaking the cycle of social decay. A job provides not just a wage, but also structure, skills and social engagement. It gets someone onto the first rung of the economic ladder, which is the first step to climbing any higher. New policies should aim for this outcome — making work pay, not paying regardless of work.

### **UBI unravels the social fabric of work**

Jonathan **Coppage**, associate editor at The American Conservative, October 15, **2015**, “The terrible cost of universal basic income,” The Washington Post, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/10/01/selling-out-civil-society/?tid=a\\_inl&utm\\_term=.8cd79101f49b](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/10/01/selling-out-civil-society/?tid=a_inl&utm_term=.8cd79101f49b)

But the freedom of no longer being needed is a vicious gift to give, and “no strings attached” money is rarely as costless as it seems. When we enter the marketplace, ties are formed between people: between employer and employee, between customer and salesperson, between coworkers and suppliers and the sandwich shop next door. These transactions and interactions are the threads that bind individuals together at the most granular level, weaving them into the multi-layered, tight-knit, resilient fabric of civil society. And it is necessity — our reliance on work to provide for our material concerns — that draws us into that essential weave. A universal basic income, however, would not connect us to each other. Rather than knitting us to our coworkers, our employees, our collaborators and our families, a basic income would tie every American directly back to Washington, via millions of isolated and attenuated threads. It might sound grand to be able to give a check to every citizen. But if we would need to unravel the social fabric to get there, it’s a cost we should not hope to afford.

**The UBI does not solve the social problems of social stature and identity that jobs provide people.**

Vivek **Wadhwa** is Distinguished Fellow and professor at Carnegie Mellon University Engineering at Silicon Valley and a director of research at Center for Entrepreneurship and Research Commercialization at Duke, **June 9, 2017**, "why universal basic income and tax breaks won't save us from the jobless future," The Washington Post, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/innovations/wp/2017/06/09/why-universal-basic-income-and-tax-breaks-wont-save-us-from-the-jobless-future/?utm\\_term=.4dc85e7813e1](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/innovations/wp/2017/06/09/why-universal-basic-income-and-tax-breaks-wont-save-us-from-the-jobless-future/?utm_term=.4dc85e7813e1) (accessed 8/7/17)

But these tech moguls are simply kicking the can down the hill and shifting responsibility to Washington. **UBI will not solve the social problems that come from loss of people's purpose in life and of their social stature and identity — which jobs provide. And the politicians in Washington who are working to curtail basic benefits such as health care and food stamps plainly won't consider the value of spending trillions on a new social-welfare scheme.** In a paper titled "A New Deal for the Twenty-First Century," Edward Alden and Bob Litan, of the Council on Foreign Relations, propose solutions for retraining the workforce. They believe that there will be many new jobs created in technology and in caring for the elderly — because Western populations are aging.

## UBI Destroys Welfare

### **UBI would be used to destroy the welfare system and exclude immigrants**

Alyssa **Battistoni**, doctoral candidate in political science at Yale University, spring **2017**, “The False Promise of Universal Basic Income,” Dissent Magazine, <https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/false-promise-universal-basic-income-andy-stern-ruger-bregman> (accessed 7/14/17)

Who exactly should get a basic income is another question. It’s sometimes called a “citizen’s dividend,” explicitly limiting recipients by nationality. More generally the “universal” is aspirational: basic income programs have only seriously been proposed at the national or local levels. So, as with other welfare programs, debates over basic income will undoubtedly be bound up with questions about nationality and migration. In the European context, we should be wary of the deployment of basic income to solidify Fortress Europe as the refugee crisis intensifies. In the debates over the Swiss program, for example, Luzi Stamm, a member of parliament for the right-wing Swiss People’s Party, said he could imagine supporting UBI—but only for the Swiss. “Theoretically, if Switzerland were an island, the answer is yes,” he said at the time. “But with open borders, it’s a total impossibility, especially for Switzerland, with a high living standard.” In the United States, meanwhile, the combination of nativism and libertarianism that makes up the Trump coalition is particularly dangerous: it’s hard to imagine any way a basic income program implemented in the Trump era would be anything but a vehicle for dismantling the remains of the welfare state while simultaneously reinforcing nationalism by excluding non-citizens from shared prosperity. That said, basic income doesn’t seem likely to be on the agenda of the Trump administration anytime soon. Instead of inventing the future, Trump’s move is to borrow from the past via boondoggles like the Carrier deal, which give public money to private companies in an attempt to revive a mid-century imaginary where men had real factory jobs. Welfare programs, meanwhile, are likely to come under renewed attack from a Republican administration ready to slash government spending.

### **Right-wing governments will use UBI to destroy welfare**

Ellie Mae **O’Hagan**, political analyst and freelance journalist, June 23, **2017**, “Love the idea of a universal basic income? Be careful what you wish for,” The Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/jun/23/universal-basic-income-ubi-welfare-state> (accessed 7/14/17)

In their incendiary book *Inventing the Future*, the authors Alex Williams and Nick Srnicek argue for UBI but link it to three other demands: collectively controlled automation, a reduction in the working week, and a diminution of the work ethic. Williams and Srnicek believe that without these other provisions, UBI could essentially act as an excuse to get rid of the welfare state. What’s needed is not the arbitrary adoption of UBI, but an entirely different conversation about what a welfare state is for. As David Lammy MP said, after the Grenfell Tower disaster: “This is about whether the welfare state is just about schools and hospitals or whether it is about a safety net.” The conversation, in light of UBI, could go even further: it’s possible for the welfare state not just to act as a safety net, but as a tool for all of us to do less work and spend more time with our loved ones, pursuing personal interests or engaging in our communities. UBI has this revolutionary potential – but not if it is simply parachuted into a political economy that has been pursuing punitive welfare policies for the last 30 years.

## UBI Fosters the Rich-Poor Gap

### **A UBI will in fact make the rich-poor gap bigger, not smaller.**

Yuval Noah **Harari**, author of "Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind" and "Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow," and lecturer at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, **June 4, 2017**, "Universal basic income is neither universal nor basic," Bloomberg News, <https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2017-06-04/universal-basic-income-is-neither-universal-nor-basic> (accessed 8/7/17)

Whichever way you choose to define basic human needs, once you provide them to everyone free of charge, they will be taken for granted, and then fierce social competitions and political struggles will focus on non-basic luxuries -- be they fancy self-driving cars, access to virtual-reality parks, or enhanced bioengineered bodies. Yet if the unemployed masses command no economic assets, it is hard to see how they could ever hope to obtain such luxuries. Consequently, the gap between the rich (Tencent managers and Google shareholders) and the poor (those dependent on universal basic income) might become bigger and more rigid than ever

### **The UBI would be bad for the rich-poor gap.**

Alex **Gray**, senior writer at Formative Content, **June 15, 2017**, "Universal Basic Income is no magic bullet against poverty, finds OECD," World Economic Forum, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/06/universal-basic-income-is-gaining-support-but-could-it-make-poverty-worse/> (accessed 8/7/17)

The report also says that not everyone would benefit. The rich and the poor would gain the least, while people on middle incomes would gain the most. Early retirees also stand to lose out. Those currently on benefits would lose out, says the OECD, especially in countries where existing social protection is comprehensive. The OECD concludes that, without targeted benefits, or much higher spending, the risk of poverty might actually increase, as people lose their existing benefits in favour of UBI.

## UBI is Too Difficult to Implement

**Regional variation in the cost of living makes the UBI difficult for the U.S., making some low-income people in high-cost areas to be disadvantaged.**

Michael D. **Tanner**, Senior Fellow at the CATO Institute, **August 26, 2014**, "The Basic Income Guarantee: Simplicity, but at What Cost?" CATO - Unbound, <https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/26/basic-income-guarantee-simplicity-what-cost> (accessed 8/7/17)

**Another issue that would arise in any national level implementation of a UBI is how to address the regional variation in the cost of living. The benefit might be more than sufficient in low cost states like South Dakota, but it might not be enough in high cost states like California and New York.** A recent study by the Tax Foundation looked at the purchasing power of \$100 in each state, with the relative value ranging from \$84.60 in Washington D.C. to \$115.74 in Mississippi. Our current system addresses this disparity to some extent, although some of the variation may be due to states increasing benefit generosity for reasons other than cost of living differences. In *The Work versus Welfare Trade-off 2013*, I found that the benefits package from the same seven programs ranged from \$25,491 in Arkansas to \$49,175 in Hawaii. **The impact of the UBI would vary by location, and low-income people in high cost areas could be worse off. It is not hard to imagine a scenario where people advocate for some kind of benefit adjustment based on the cost of living in the area.** While this could potentially be a better design, it would again add a layer of complexity to what initially seemed like a very simple program.

**UBI fails due to its politicization.**

Alison **McGovern**, Labour MP for Wirral South and the co-chair of the all-party parliamentary group Friends of Syria, **February 20, 2017**, "Forget universal basic income - this is how we can include voters in economic growth," *The New Statesman*, <http://www.newstatesman.com/politics/staggers/2017/02/forget-universal-basic-income-how-we-can-include-voters-economic-growth> (accessed 8/7/17)

**Universal basic income fails for another crucial reason. It would fail for the same reason that tax credits were economically effective but open to political challenge. For most people, the part of government, of the state, that they wish to defend are the things they can see, they can touch, emotionally engage with. The hospital their child was born in, that cared for a sick parent, the school they went to, the park they played in with their grandchild. They prefer to earn their wages, and do a job they enjoy. Transfer payments from the state are always harder to defend, as the history books attest.**

**UBI is too radical of a shift that, according to reports from the OECD, UBI won't work.**

Alex **Gray**, senior writer at Formative Content, **June 15, 2017**, "Universal Basic Income is no magic bullet against poverty, finds OECD," World Economic Forum,

<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/06/universal-basic-income-is-gaining-support-but-could-it-make-poverty-worse/> (accessed 8/7/17)

**UBI is a radical shift away from current means-tested welfare systems, and is based on the idea that everyone, regardless of status, employment or wealth, receives a regular sum of money from the government. As a handful of countries experiment with basic income schemes and high-profile tech entrepreneurs endorse the concept, a new study by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) suggests that UBI might not be all it's cracked up to be.**

## UBI is Far Too Costly to Implement

**The cost of the UBI to the welfare state is nearly impossible, as not enough money could be raised to cover the bill.**

Michael D. **Tanner**, Senior Fellow at the CATO Institute, **August 26, 2014**, "The Basic Income Guarantee: Simplicity, but at What Cost?" CATO - Unbound, <https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/26/basic-income-guarantee-simplicity-what-cost> (accessed 8/7/17)

**For example, if every American were to receive a flat cash grant that was large enough so as to enable the poor to support themselves in the absence of other welfare programs, the cost would likely be prohibitive.** Zwolinski does not propose any specific income, but cites **Charles Murray's suggestion of \$10,000 per person. Spread over a U.S. citizen population of roughly 296 million, the cost of such a program would be \$2.96 trillion, or almost 3 times our current welfare expenditure. And there is considerable question as to whether \$10,000 would be a sufficient grant. Last year, the poverty threshold for a single individual under 65, after all, was \$12,119.**

**Of course, some suggest using the basic income to replace middle-class social welfare programs such as Social Security and Medicare, as well as those targeted to the poor. The idea of abolishing Social Security and Medicare is far more problematic, both politically and practically, than using UBI to replace more conventional welfare programs. Besides, it still wouldn't raise enough money to fund a truly universal basic income.** Using CBO data for 2013, eliminating welfare state programs including Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, income security and so forth (but excluding tax expenditures) would yield only \$2.13 trillion. If we also included, as some have suggested, so-called tax expenditures, such as the mortgage interest deduction and the exclusion of employer contributions, as well as Social Security, EITC and CTC related tax expenditures, we could add an additional \$393 billion for a total of \$2.5 trillion. That still wouldn't be enough.

**The math doesn't work - there will be a negative impact on the economy that does not outweigh any potential benefits of UBI**

Stephanie **Slade** is a public opinion researcher and writer based in Washington, D.C. and works for a nonprofit advocacy group focused on fiscal issues, **July 29, 2017**, "Basic income, complex costs," US NEWS & World Report, <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/stephanie-slade/2014/07/29/why-a-universal-basic-income-could-be-bad-for-the-economy> (accessed 8/7/17)

The issue then is whether reducing the incentive for any given individual to be productive by giving him the option to stay home would lead to markedly less aggregate economic output. Matthews' piece says that "a generous plan set to 100 percent of the poverty line would all the same only cost about 1.5 percent of GNP." In simple terms, proponents think the cost of implementing a basic income would be small in relation to the size of the country's economy as a whole. **But even if the cost of such a program is more or less fixed, the denominator in that equation is not. The size of the economy (which is another way of saying the sum total of the workforce's productive output in a year) is directly affected by how productive Americans are with their time.** None of this proves the costs of a basic income outweigh the benefits. It's true that if you give everyone enough money to lift them out of poverty, by definition you've lifted everyone out of poverty. It's also true that if your policies cause enough people to stop contributing economically, by definition you've shrunk the economy.

*We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)*

## UBI Negatively Impacts Taxpayers

### **A UBI would violate the rights of taxpayers.**

Michael D. **Tanner**, Senior Fellow at the CATO Institute, **August 26, 2014**, "The Basic Income Guarantee: Simplicity, but at What Cost?" CATO - Unbound, <https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/26/basic-income-guarantee-simplicity-what-cost> (accessed 8/7/17)

Though a basic income might increase people's freedom, it would require the state to violate the rights of taxpayers. To justify this, one would have to argue, not merely that the rights violation is required to secure a modest net increase in "freedom," but that the rights violation is required to prevent something many times worse from happening. Such, I take it, is the logic of rights.

### **The UBI is bad for tax payers.**

Chris **Giles**, Reporter for the Financial Times, **May 27, 2017**, "Universal basic income would fail to cut poverty, says OECD," The Financial Times, <https://www.ft.com/content/82334db2-414d-11e7-9d56-25f963e998b2> (accessed 8/7/17)

If instead a basic income were paid at the level of minimum guaranteed income in that country, higher taxes would generally be needed. "Large tax-revenue changes are needed to finance a basic income at meaningful levels," the report concluded. "Tax burdens would go up for most people as a result, further increasing tax-to-GDP ratios that are currently already high in the OECD area.

## **UBI is Unnecessary; Automation is Not a Threat**

**Automation is not going to be the end of the job market.**

**University of Pennsylvania, March 14, 2017**, "Is a Universal Basic Income a Good Idea?" Knowledge @ Wharton - the University of Pennsylvania, <http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/universal-basic-income-good-idea/> (accessed 8/7/17)

However, **Peter Cappelli, Wharton management professor and director of the school's Center for Human Resources, says he has yet to see evidence that robots are going to cause massive joblessness.** Observes Kent Smetters, Wharton professor of business economics and public policy: **"The evidence is that robotics is a labor complement and is increasing skilled wages. While robotics are replacing some lower-skilled jobs, the most efficient response is to not kill the golden goose but to make sure we have job training programs that are effective in increasing skills."**